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RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Sheffield is a city of half a million people: it has a diversity of industries, but steel and engineering predominate.1 Approximately one-third of the employed men work in metal manufacturing, engineering and cutlery: other prominent occupations, apart from higher level work in the professions and management, are transport, clerical work, building, coal-mining and the distributive trades. A relatively high proportion of manual workers, notably those in the steel and engineering industries, are skilled. There is, then, a range of jobs open to secondary modern boys, although most of the girls—as is generally the case throughout the country—are restricted to the three basic occupations of clerk, shop assistant and factory worker.

There is a large working class population, as is to be expected in an essentially industrial city. The social class distribution

---

1 Parts of this discussion are taken from Chapter 2 of Home, School and Work, op.cit.
of occupied and retired males of fifteen and over is shown in Table I. Compared with other large cities, Sheffield has about the same proportion of people in the two highest social classes as Birmingham and Manchester, but a rather lower proportion than Leeds and Bristol.

\[\text{Table I}\]

**SOCIAL CLASS DISTRIBUTION IN SHEFFIELD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrar General's Social Class Categories</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield (%)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales (%)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although several secondary modern schools in Sheffield drew many of their pupils in the 1950s from middle class homes, most of them had a majority of working class children—albeit coming from a range of different social backgrounds. At the beginning of 1959 there were 32 secondary modern schools and about one-fifth of the children who were not attending selective schools were pupils at

---

1 Figures are taken from the 1951 Census Reports: the 1961 Reports are, unfortunately, not to hand at the time of writing.
"all-age" schools which had senior departments. Several thousand boys and girls leave school each year in the city: approaching 6,000 children started work at the age of fifteen in 1959. The present study is based mainly upon the attitudes and behaviour of a very small "sample" of these.

It has already been explained that five schools were deliberately selected to provide diversity with regard to quality of buildings and amenities, educational orientations and policies pursued, and the social backgrounds of the pupils. Three of the schools were co-educational, although in one of these there was little contact between boys and girls: the other two schools had separate departments for boys and girls, but these were on the same premises.

From each of the five schools, 10 boys and 10 girls were chosen by random numbers tables from lists of the fifteen-year-old children leaving at Easter 1959, and the same numbers from lists of Midsummer leavers. The schools varied in size, but a total of 360 boys and 360 girls were due to leave at the above times, and the sample thus comprises, overall, 1 in 3.6 of the children from the

---

1 Since that time there has been a steady phasing out of all-age schools in accordance with national and local policy: and the policy of introducing comprehensive education at the secondary level is now being implemented.

2 In the event, 23 respondents remained at school for at least one extra term, and 5 of them for an extra year. Only 3 of the latter, however, are involved in the present follow-up study, 2 boys and 1 girl.
five schools. The respondents are best regarded as "case-studies" rather than as a representative sample, however, although there is no reason to suppose that the children concerned in this study are particularly unrepresentative of secondary modern pupils. The children were interviewed, during the first research programme, on three occasions—during their last term at school, three months after they had left school and one year after they had left school.¹

Response to this first phase of the research was good. All the children participated in the first interviews, held at school. All except 3 participated in the second interviews, and all except 3 (not the same ones) in the third interviews. The follow-up phase of the research was conducted in the summer of 1964, after a break in contact with the respondents of four years. No attempt was made to keep in touch with the young workers during this time because it was not envisaged that they would be interviewed again. The problems of obtaining the co-operation of respondents after this lapse of time were therefore substantial. In the event, most did agree to be interviewed, and the major difficulty proved to be that of tracing youths and girls who had moved house. With the help of the Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, the City of Sheffield Housing Manager, and Records Officers of H.M. Forces, and by dint of a considerable amount of detective work on the part of a team of research assistants, who sought information from neighbours and

¹"Pilot" interviews were conducted with children from a sixth school.
local shopkeepers, 92 youths and 88 girls were traced. 6 youths and 4 girls refused to be interviewed. The follow-up data is therefore derived from 86 youths and 84 girls. Over one-quarter of these youths and nearly two-fifths of the girls had changed their addresses at least once since they were interviewed in 1960. These changes were the result of various factors, including demolition of slum property, parents' change of employment, and marriage. A special complication in tracing girls, indeed, was that an appreciable number of those who had changed addresses had also changed names, on marriage: in all, 31 of the 84 girls were married by the time of the fourth interviews.

It was not possible to ascertain the reasons for the refusal by 10 of the respondents to be interviewed at the follow-up stage, although opposition to the idea by husbands was a factor in the case of at least 2 of the girls. As regards the respondents who could not be traced (8 youths and 12 girls) it became known that some had left Sheffield in pursuit of employment or in consequence of marriage and it can be speculated that these factors applied to several others, also. As a general point, it may be said that the distribution of respondents involved in the follow-up, in regard to such attributes as measured I.Q., parental occupation, size of family of origin, schools attended and areas lived in, was not significantly different from that obtaining for the original 200 boys and girls.
Of the 86 youths, 80 were interviewed and 6 completed a postal questionnaire (these consisted of respondents who had moved some distance away from Sheffield, several of them being overseas in H.M. Forces). Similarly, 4 of the 84 girls completed postal questionnaires, the remaining 80 being interviewed. All of the interviews were held in the respondent's own home or that of a relative or friend. As in the case of the earlier series of interviews, over-crowding and/or the prevailing mores ensured that in some cases interviews were held in the presence of other persons—and sometimes to the accompaniment of television or radio. But a sufficient degree of privacy was obtained for the interviews to be successful: interviewers had been briefed to concentrate on the respondents' attitudes and activities, and it is evident from their interview schedules that they adhered to this instruction.¹

I was assisted in the interviews by a team of five senior undergraduate students from the University of Edinburgh. Four of these were studying in the Department of Social Anthropology and one was a student of Modern History.² Before starting the interviewing,

¹In at least one case, the presence of the father of a respondent apparently strengthened rapport—the Interviewer reported that when he asked a question on amount of earnings, the father swore, and asked what business it was of his. The respondent, a youth, retaliated and there ensued a brief quarrel, the result of which was a greater show of interest in the interview on the part of the youth.

²Miss E.V. Gowman (now Mrs. Davis); Miss Caroline Paulin; Mr. N. Atkinson; Mr. M.B. Jedrez; and Mr. (now Dr.) A. Robertson.
the interviewers were subjected to a "training" programme: this included trial interviews and detailed discussion of and instruction in regard to the interview schedule. This was very important because of the "free" interviewing technique used: their background in the social sciences was of great importance to the interviewers in their appreciation of the required approach. The interviewers were also asked to read Home, School and Work in order that they would become attuned to the research. They were, of course, subject to supervision during the course of the interviewing programme.

Interviews were begun at the beginning of June and most were completed by early August: the interviewers were not all employed for the full period.

The interviews were based upon a schedule: answers were sought to specific questions, many of an "open-ended" type, and respondents were encouraged to expatiate upon items relevant to the research.  

1 See Appendix 'A': the Postal Questionnaire used for respondents in the main sample is given in Appendix 'B'.

Interviewers had been counselled to be patient and the results confirm that they adopted the desired approach. The majority of the interviews were, in consequence, long—few lasted for less than an hour, and many went on for two hours or more. Notes were taken during the interview and verbatim reports were made of certain responses. Interviews were written-up subsequently, either the same evening or the following day. The writing-up process involved a re-living of the interview and normally took much longer than the interview itself. Both the interviews and the writing-up demanded considerable concentration, and a maximum of two interviews a day was normal—most interviews were held during the evening, when respondents were home from work, or at weekends. The sex of the interviewer was not taken into account when allocating respondents, since previous experience had suggested that responses were not adversely affected by a male interviewing a female, or vice versa. The main criterion in allocation was convenience in regard to locality. It may be noted that the interviewers were only two or three years older than the respondents (with the exception of the author) and this, together with their training in social science, probably contributed to the undoubted excellence of the rapport which they succeeded in establishing with the bulk of the respondents.

Because of the smallness of the numbers involved in the main enquiry, it was decided to attempt to broaden the base of the research in regard to certain aspects—mainly occupational histories,
attitudes towards education and relationships with the opposite sex—by conducting a postal survey amongst a larger sample of youths and girls who had left school at the same time as members of the original sample. It was stated above that approaching 6,000 Sheffield boys and girls left school on reaching the age of fifteen in 1959. The records of the Youth Employment Service were kept in such a way as to relate to children reaching the age of 15 in that year (they included, that is, children who remained at school beyond the age of 15). Because of the complications of separating the 15-year-olds who left school from those who stayed on, and the limitations of research resources, the sample was drawn from the wider population, which amounted to 7,602 boys and girls. A 1 in 6 sample was taken on the basis of the Youth Employment Service Record Cards. Postal surveys rarely generate much interest amongst recipients of questionnaires, and it was not expected that the response rate would be particularly high. Changes of address and of name, on marriage, were an added difficulty, and the final complication was a postal strike. Even so, the response was not so disappointing as to occasion doubts about the merits of conducting it. Questionnaires were sent out during the latter half of 1959 to 1,267 youths and girls. There were 412 replies, initially, and 118 questionnaires were returned undelivered because of demolition of property and changes of address for other reasons. An

1 The sample was taken by Miss Flora Mitchell, who had considerable experience as Secretary of the Department of Social Anthropology.
attempt was made to analyse the reasons on the basis of the information stamped on the envelopes by the G.P.O. ("Gone away", "Premises demolished", "House empty", etc.). But the data had been filled in in such a cursory way by postmen that it defied analysis. It is possible that many other letters were not delivered or were delivered to out-of-date addresses. In early 1960 a "pilot" batch of 70 "second attempt" postal questionnaires were despatched, and this produced a response of 14. It was considered that this was sufficient to warrant second attempts with the remaining respondents, and a further 667 second attempts were accordingly sent out. The response was 70, with 30 returned undelivered. The position in regard to postal questionnaires was thus: despatched, 1,267; replies, 496; undelivered, 148 (at least). The response rate of 40 per cent was not unreasonable in the circumstances, and useful data was obtained. Only 443 of the questionnaires, relating to 235 youths and 208 girls lent themselves to coding, however.

There is, of course, certain bias in the postal responses—apart from the fact that a sample was drawn from a population which included youths and girls who had remained at school until the age of sixteen, the low response implies that substantial and important sections of the population are under- or unrepresented. Certain dimensions of the bias, probably, are not susceptible to being discerned, least of all calculated. In general, it may be
hazarded that the postal respondents, as a group, contain a disproportionately high proportion of relatively successful and aspiring young workers, together with some rather extremely despondent and rebellious youths and girls. Inspection indicates a weighting towards youths in skilled occupations and girls in clerical jobs and work of a comparable status. Data from the postal survey is, in any case, treated circumspectly in the analysis: but it is appropriate at this point to stress its limitations.¹

The field-work for this study, then, derives from an originally small main "sample", depleted over the course of the years—but augmented in regard to certain perspectives, albeit in a limited way, by responses to a postal survey. In part because of the exigencies of this situation, but also because of the conviction that a deep and penetrative study would be of more value than one which covered a wider range of respondents but at the more superficial level, the emphasis of the research is exploratory. Even when pre-coded or "forced" answers could have been used, open-ended questions were usually preferred, because of the aim of seeking out nuances which might otherwise not have emerged. In part, of course, limitations in the study were inevitable because of the relatively small amount of the research funds available—approximately £1,000.

¹The Questionnaire for the Postal Survey is given in Appendix 'C'.
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In planning the research, the fact had to be faced that after four years it might prove impossible to contact a sufficient number of the respondents to make the project worthwhile. It was not felt to be justified to seek more than a fairly small research grant, therefore. So that the paradox had to be accommodated that research failure would be well-funded whilst success would lead to some restrictions consequent upon the modesty of the budget.

In the event, the response was good. In pointing to the limitations of the study, however, it should perhaps be stated that whilst exploratory in orientation and unassuming in scope, it nevertheless draws upon a considerable amount of data obtained during the course of the series of four intensive interviews.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF OCCUPATIONS

The first aim of this Chapter is to examine the occupational profiles which obtained in regard to the respondents at the various stages of the research: special attention is given to the analysis of jobs held five years after leaving school. The second aim is to relate occupations to a variety of other factors—notably measured intelligence and attributes associated with family and social background—with a view to establishing patterns. And the third aim is to account for the departure of certain individuals and categories of individuals from the patterns to which they might have been expected to conform.

By the time of Interview No.4, then, the respondents were twenty years of age. They had left school five years previously and, with the exception of married women who were housewives, they had been in employment for the same length of time. With the possible exceptions of some youths who had not yet completed their apprenticeships, and a few other youths and girls who were potentially
upwardly mobile occupationally over the next few years, the respondents were established in a work pattern to which they were likely to adhere for the remainder of their working lives—until retirement in the case of youths and marriage in the case of girls (with, for the latter, the prospect of a return to work after child-bearing, at a level in the occupational structure at or below that which they presently occupied).

Despite certain problems occasioned by the fact that the respondents were part of the bulge in school leavers referred to above, they entered employment in 1959 at a time when the national economic situation was buoyant, and Sheffield reflected this overall high level of employment and economic activity. Had this not been the case, the respondents would have encountered more difficulty than they did in finding jobs at all, or in finding the particular jobs that they aimed at—and this could have had lasting deleterious effects upon their occupational histories.

In general terms, as it transpired, the respondents as a group entered occupations on leaving school which accorded with what was to be expected, having regard to their socio-economic backgrounds and the nature of the education which they had undergone. At the end of five years in employment, the range of occupations was somewhat broadened, reflecting the fact that certain jobs are not open to school leavers, but depend upon age—motor-bus driver and conductor are examples. The occupational profile in regard to youths is given in Table 2 below, which shows the numbers in particular
categories of employment at the four stages of the research—the first stage relating to aspirations and the latter three to actual occupations at these times.

TABLE 2
JOB ASPIRATIONS AND ATTAINMENTS—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview No.1 Aspirations</th>
<th>Interview No.2 First Job Obtained</th>
<th>Interview No.3 Job at One Year</th>
<th>Interview No.4 Job at Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steel and Engineering</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder, Painter/Decorator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Mechanic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manual Employ-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Non-manual Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>92*</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 6 boys had 2 jobs equally in mind as possibilities.

The pervasiveness of steel and engineering in Sheffield is reflected in the job aspirations of respondents—approximately one-quarter of the boys (22) aimed at such employment when interviewed during their last term at school. The aspirations were echoed in the actual jobs obtained, 39 boys entering such employment—this is a clear indication of the structure of opportunities open to secondary modern school leavers in Sheffield. This number fell by over one-third during the first
year in employment, however, indicating a reaction against the vastness, the dirt and the noise of the steel industry, and, in some measure, also, representing a challenge to the dominance of steel and a resentment at its apparently all-embracing influence. By the end of the five-year period in employment, nonetheless, there had been a move back to the steel and engineering industry, 28/86 youths then being employed in such work—approximately one third. The possibility of high wages compared with other types of employment for which respondents were qualified, and of bonus, piece-work, overtime and shift-work earnings, were largely responsible for this shift back to steel: in some cases, the need for higher wages resulted from marriage and/or the arrival of a child. These matters will be discussed in more detail below. Here it suffices to underline the point that the logic of the occupational structure in Sheffield is manifested in the employment profile of the respondents and notably in regard to the predominance of steel and engineering. The actual extent of job changing—not least of movement in and out of steel and engineering—in fact exceeds the considerable amount suggested by the above figures, which relate only to the position at specific points in time, and therefore do

---

1 For details, see Home, School and Work, op.cit., pp.178-179.
2 79 out of the 235 Postal Respondents (Youths) were employed in steel and engineering, approximately 34 per cent.
not demonstrate movements by individuals other than at these points. This matter is also developed further below.\footnote{For an analysis of job changing during the first year at work in steel and engineering compared with all other occupations entered by respondents, see \textit{Home, School and Work}, \textit{op.cit.}, Table 31, p.178.}

Of particular interest in Table 2 is the excess of aspirants for certain occupations—notably electrician, motor mechanic and carpenter—over the number actually able to find employment in such work. Opportunities in these occupations do not match up to demand: there is still competition from boys who have had a selective secondary education, furthermore. Since these occupations tend to require the serving of an apprenticeship, the die is cast for most boys by the time they have reached the age of sixteen (Interview No.3 in the present enquiry). More generally, there is a disparateness between aspirations and achievements. Bearing in mind that the particular occupations aimed at by some children whilst they were in their last term at school were "nominally" held for the sake of the Research Interview and/or enquiring Youth Employment Officers, (who required an answer of some sort), and taking into account the fact that an additional 14 boys and 7 girls were very vague as to their job aims, there remains a substantial discrepancy between stated aims and jobs obtained. About one-third of the boys and one-half of the girls took first jobs which were precisely the same as, or closely related to, their choice of work at the first interview—the overall result of the many job changes during the first year at work was that rather
fewer boys and girls were in their Interview No. 1 first-choice at the end of the year than at the beginning. Approximately one-eighth of the boys and one-fifth of the girls entered jobs which had been their second-choice at Interview No.1. Many of the remaining children took jobs which were only tenuously related to their job aims, and one-quarter of the boys and one-eighth of the girls entered jobs which were in no way related to either their first or their second choices at Interview No.1. As the result of job changes, these proportions rose to two-fifths of the boys and one-fifth of the girls during the course of their first year at work. By the end of five years in employment, in consequence of further job changing, the proportions who were in jobs other than those which had been aimed at at school was one-third of the youths (28) and one-quarter of the girls (21). It is not intended to suggest that there was widespread dissatisfaction associated with discrepancy between jobs aimed at and jobs occupied. This would be to exaggerate the importance of choices as at present made when at school; and the number of respondents who still, five years after starting work, regretted not having obtained the job originally aimed at was small indeed—3 youths and 2 girls, with a few more who had vague and apparently romantic notions of what might have been, had their luck run differently. But these figures do point to the disjunction between perception of opportunities and associated aspirations on the one hand, and actual opportunities on the other.
A further point to be noted especially here is the low number of youths in clerical and other non-manual employment. This reflects directly the relatively low educational level of the respondents and is also indicative of the repudiation of non-manual work by the majority of them, a repudiation induced in response to a socio-economic background in home and neighbourhood which regards the man who does not use his hands and soil his clothes as different, alien and odd—if not actually "queer". Thus, none of the youths at the stage of Interview No.4 were engaged in clerical work. A few, by virtue of special ability, and/or of family connections, and by reference to norms and values, old-established or newly acquired (as, in one case, through involvement with a girl from a higher socio-economic class and with a different style of life), had already, by the age of twenty years, established themselves on an occupational rung higher than that typically associated with secondary modern leavers. But the bulk of the youths were firmly placed in non-manual employment, whether skilled, semi-skilled or unskilled.¹

¹It should be noted that despite the fact that a high proportion of male clerical workers have had a selective education, compared with manual workers, there remain opportunities for boys with a non-selective education to enter such work. There is some evidence, indeed, that such opportunities are increasing. Lockwood, for example, cites data indicating that the number of males from grammar schools becoming clerks decreased between 1930 and 1948, whilst the number of males employed in clerical work increased by 6% during that time. cf. D. Lockwood, The Blackcoated Worker: A Study in Class Consciousness, Allen and Unwin, London, 1958, p.117.
The occupation profile for girls is shown here in Table 3

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Aspirations and Attainments—Girls</th>
<th>Interview No.1 Aspirations</th>
<th>Interview No.2 First Job Obtained</th>
<th>Interview No.3 Job at One Year</th>
<th>Interview No.4 Job at Five Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office, Shorthand/typing, Secretary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop Assistant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory and Warehouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 4 girls had 2 jobs equally in mind as possibilities.

Sixteen girls were housewives and not working; in these cases, the last full-time occupation has been taken for present purposes; the matter is further analysed below. It should be noted that the occupational categories cover a wide range of work—office work includes routine clerical, shorthand-typing and secretarial work, for example; whilst shop assistant covers counter assistant in Departmental Stores, and sales assistant in Multiple stores as well as the wide range of work in smaller shops—grocers, green-grocers, chemists, shoe shops, tobacconists, etc.
The three major occupations open to secondary modern girl leavers are office, shop assistant and factory/warehouse work. It is seen that the bulk of girls were engaged in one or other of these occupations at each stage. Well over one-quarter of the girls aimed at office work during their last term at school (27) and a somewhat higher proportion in fact entered this employment, although the number declined slightly over the subsequent years. It should be noted that there was a good deal of movement between occupations, nonetheless. Specifically, a number of girls moved between office work and shop assistant, whilst others moved between shop assistant and factory/warehouse work. The extent and nature of job changing is discussed in detail below. The essential point here is that the occupational structure of Sheffield, as it related to girls with a secondary modern education, imposed an overall structure: a structure which implied that at any given stage during the first five years in employment something of the order of 35 per cent would be engaged in office work, and, similarly, approximately 25 per cent would be engaged in work as shop assistant (a somewhat lower proportion than aimed at this type of employment during their last term at school, in the present enquiry).

The most noticeable discrepancy between job aims whilst at school and jobs actually obtained is that in regard to factory and warehouse work—whilst only 5 respondents aimed at such work, 17 entered it. The same number were in this occupation one year after leaving school, and the number rose to 28 by the end of the five years. Factory and
warehouse work is not attractive to girls whilst they are at school: some subsequently are attracted to it because it can offer high wages or convenient hours for the married woman, and this explains in large measure the rise in the number of factory workers towards the end of the five year period. But taking account of such changes in aspirations or preparedness to do factory/warehouse work, the substantial point remains that the occupational structure requires a higher proportion of girls to do this work than would wish to do so if they had the choice of alternative employment.

With regard to nursing, only one-half the number of girls who aimed at this employment were able to enter it initially. Whilst some remained unable to gain admission to the profession, several others did manage to do so on attaining the age of 18, 19 and, in one case, 20 years. Another major discrepancy between aspirations and attainment relates to hairdressing. Eight girls aimed at this: 5 girls (not all of them included in the 8 aspirants) succeeded in finding such employment. Of the 5, 3 found the work unsatisfactory, mainly because they were not able to obtain posts in the more fashionable establishments to which they aspired, but only in much more modest concerns, in less salubrious districts and offering less pay, prospects, training and 'glamour' than had been envisaged. Another point to be made is that the "miscellaneous" category masks some notable contradictions between aspirations and attainments. The 14 girls in this category at Interview No.1 included 3 who aimed at work with animals, 3 who wished to be telephonists and 3 who wanted to become window dressers. The 6 girls in this category at
Interview No. 4 consisted of 1 telephonist, 1 petrol pump attendant, 3 bus conductresses, and 1 girl who did domestic work.

Five years after leaving school, then, the girls were well established in a particular pattern: over one-third (31) were already married, and, of these, approximately one-half had given up work to act as housewives, at least for some years. Others of the married girls planned soon to stop work and start to raise a family. Many of the single girls, too, envisaged marriage in the near or not-so-distant future. The general point seems clear that the level of occupation at which they could expect to find employment in the immediate or the long-term future (for example, when children had grown up) was firmly set. Girls who do return to work subsequently will probably do so at the same or at a lower level, with reference to a hierarchy of jobs that places office work at the top, shop assistant in the middle and factory/warehouse at the bottom (the hierarchy will be discussed further, below). There were a few girls, however, who were still potentially mobile upwardly, either through marriage or through their own achievements occupationally. This, too, we will return to below.

Having examined the nature of employment entered, and having traced some of the effects of the local occupational structure upon aspirations and achievements, I propose now to change the focus somewhat and analyse jobs held at Interview No. 4 in terms of skill and ability required, as related to the personal and social characteristics of the respondents. The argument to be followed here
is that certain basic relationships may be discerned as between type of work held and attributes of the individuals concerned; and that apparent deviations from these relationships are explicable in terms of special personal and/or social qualities. These propositions will be examined firstly with reference to the youths and then, using the same procedures, with reference to the girls.

The details of occupations held by youths, five years after they had left school, in relation to skill, are shown in Table 4 below. There is an arbitrariness involved in the distinctions between skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled. Historical factors, reinforced in some cases by trade union insistence upon the perpetuation of demarcation in regard to certain nominal occupations which no longer accord with actual tasks performed in the modern production process, account for some of the difficulty in assigning particular types of employment to a level of skill. And the emergence of new occupations in consequence of technological change—refrigeration engineer is an example—adds to the problem of assessing skill involved. Thus, the situation is that various occupations which still ostensibly are skilled, and which require, notionally, the serving of an apprenticeship, in fact no longer require special training and ability, since new machinery now performs the intricate tasks previously performed by a man. Whilst

---

1 Of the 235 Postal Respondents, 117 youths were apprentices, 95 were semi-or unskilled workers and 23 were non-manual workers.
other newly emerging occupations—in the fields of electronics or chemical processing, for example—may well require special ability but, as yet, have no formalised or generally recognised training programme.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOBS AT FIVE YEARS IN RELATION TO SKILL—YOUTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting/Decorating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher/Cook........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Cellarman.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Steel...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.M. Forces.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Mechanic......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber.............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver..............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Conductor.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwork............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher/Shop Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Rep...........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furn. Removals......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial Rigger........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police..............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer/Commercial Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postman/Clerk.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/Surveyor...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse/Worker.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals...............</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the present analysis, "skilled employment" refers to that in which an apprenticeship of five years duration or more is being served or has been served. "Semi-skilled" refers to employment in which some training leading to special expertise is involved: in the majority of cases the training is not formal, but consists of learning through observing others. And whilst in certain occupations—for example, butcher—the training may well be prolonged, in others it consists of but a few months or weeks: machine operators in factories are examples of the latter. In the analysis, the attempt has been made to discriminate between boys of the same occupation who have had different levels or amounts of training—so that of the 4 youths who were builders, for example, 3 had served apprenticeship whilst the fourth had only undergone a small amount of instruction. "Unskilled" workers consist of those doing manual work which requires little special ability other than that of physical effort: of the 12 youths concerned, 6 were labourers (4 of them digging and road making) and 3 were warehouse workers, whose jobs entailed lifting goods from one part of the warehouse to another, or loading them on trucks. The aerial rigger's job was to help erect T.V. aerials on houses: this required no special skill. Possibly it would have been more sensible to classify the two bus conductors as semi-skilled, but their training was very short in duration, and the work was routine in nature, even though some facility in handling money was, obviously, requisite in the work.
Five years after leaving school, then, there were 29 apprentices, rather fewer than had aimed at such employment whilst at school: indeed, the number of boys in apprenticeships declined appreciably from the peak of 39 who entered such work on first employment, as Table 5 shows.

**Table 5**  
Apprenticeships—Aspirations and Attainments

| Aimed at apprenticeship whilst at school | 35 |
| Apprenticehip in first job | 39 |
| Apprenticehip at one year after leaving school | 31 |
| Apprenticehip at five years after leaving school | 29 |

Although the total number in apprenticeships five years after leaving school was only slightly less than at one year after leaving school, the personnel involved changed somewhat during this time. Even so, a close examination of the 29 youths who were apprentices five years after leaving school, or who had by then already completed their apprenticeships, indicates a consistency in their aspirations and their performance which is in contrast with the meanderings, in terms of aspirations, numbers of jobs held and numbers of occupations, which characterise a high proportion of non-apprentices. Twenty of the 29 apprentices had stated their wish to be apprentices at the time of Interview No.1, during their last term at school. This aspect will be pursued further below, in the discussion of the nature and extent of job changing.
Some youths who had no particular aspirations for apprenticeships whilst at school, in fact found themselves in such employment in their first jobs—a reflection of the haphazard way in which jobs are sought and offered. ¹ Despite the relative stability in regard to apprenticeships that has just been referred to, the general point should be made that whilst the occupational structure which obtains in Sheffield in regard to this secondary modern segment of young workers (which in fact adheres closely to the national average in this regard) is reflected in the total numbers and proportions of boys in the particular categories of skill, the overall profile disguises the fact of substantial movement by individuals in and out of the various levels of employment.

In Chapter III of this study, I pointed to various strands which were influential in the formulation of children's aspirations, and which affected their ability to obtain particular sorts of employment. I indicated also the way in which these strands might be inter-twined (as when home, school and neighbourhood exert complementary influences upon aspirations and subsequent achievements) or might be in conflict with each other with the result that the

¹See Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 7
influence of the school, usually, is minimal. I propose now to consider the ways in which various of these factors—including school attended, size of family, skill of father—are related to the level of job held at five years after leaving school, measured in accordance with the above categories of skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled and non-manual work. Certain themes are elicited which will be taken up again and developed in later Chapters. I wish to emphasise there, however, that because a comparatively small number of respondents are involved, the use of figures can easily be misleading. Comments deriving from the "case studies" are therefore to be regarded as suggestive rather than conclusive. In subsequent Chapters I will attempt to enlarge upon the bare bones of the statistics which are presented below, by reference to supportive evidence that does not lend itself, or at least does not do so readily or convincingly, to quantitative formulation.

In Table 6, level of job at five years after leaving school is compared with father's skill. Analysis is complicated because of the relatively high number of youths whose fathers' level of skill is not known (6—all of whom were manual workers) or who were not working at the time of Interview No.1 and did not enter work subsequently (5 who were either dead or disabled—again, all had been manual workers). With this qualification, the pattern may be said
to conform broadly with the general expectation that sons of skilled and non-manual fathers are more likely to enter such work themselves than are sons of semi-skilled and unskilled fathers. Thus only 5 of the 29 youths who were apprentices had fathers who were semi-skilled and only one had a father who was unskilled.

TABLE 6
LEVEL OF SKILL AT FIVE YEARS
COMPARSED WITH FATHERS' SKILL—-YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Un-Skilled</th>
<th>Non-Manual</th>
<th>Not Known/Not Applicable</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A precisely neat "fit" between fathers' occupational level and sons' is not to be expected—on the one hand there are problems of definition of level of skill, especially for purposes of inter-generational comparisons, and these difficulties are complicated by difference in ages of fathers, such that some were long-standing workers who had (or had not) learnt their skills many years previously, whilst others were comparatively recently qualified (the fathers of 13 boys were aged 40 or under at the time of Interview No.1 as were the mothers of 32—when the boys themselves were aged
about fifteen, that is). To expect a neat "fit" would also, of course, be to deny or ignore many of the differential factors in terms of children's aspirations and social backgrounds which it has been the purpose to direct attention to above. If the broad relationships can be said to stand, then it is notable that there are many exceptions to the postulated pattern—most strikingly, perhaps, in regard to boys in semi-skilled employment, well over one-third of whom had fathers in skilled employment or in non-manual employment.

It is instructive to attempt to explain some of the apparent "anomalies". The first, relating to the apprentice whose father is in unskilled employment, is quickly accounted for. Although now employed as a servitor, the father was doing this work in retirement after a career in the Fire Service, work which would be properly classified as skilled. The 5 youths in semi-skilled employment who were sons of non-manual fathers are not quite so readily explained. In the case of 3, however, the categorising of fathers as non-manual is perhaps misleading—they were certainly not of the managerial or professional level. On the contrary, they would best be regarded as equivalent to skilled workers, since one was a minor clerical worker and "rate-fixer"; one was a minor clerk/accountant; and one was an inspector with some managerial responsibilities in a small tool factory. The fathers of the other two youths were on a higher occupational level. One was a Safety Officer in a steel-works; his son, whilst in the semi-skilled category, nonetheless
had received a certain amount of training in his job as a Laboratory Assistant. The father of the other youth was a shop manager in a steelworks, a position to which he had risen after many years of skilled work as a pattern maker. His son worked in the steel industry: he had obtained an apprenticeship on leaving school, but had not been able to hold on to the job, finding it too demanding and not taking kindly to the surroundings or the other workers. This youth was of the lowest Intelligence Grade: three of the others were in Grade 3 whilst the fifth boy, the Laboratory Assistant, was in Grade 2.¹

The third set of anomalies consists of the 3 unskilled youths who were the sons of skilled fathers. It is noticeable that each of these youths was of low intelligence—1 in Grade 3, and 2 in Grade 4. Two came from larger families, 1 being the fifth child in a family of five children, and another the sixth child in a family of six children: the remaining youth was the third child in a family of three children. Two of the youths attended schools in the "slum" area, and were resident within the area: the other lived on the inter-war housing estate, and went to the school situated there.

None of these youths received stimulation from the home in regard to work, either before they left school or subsequently: nor had their schools made much impression in this context. They had thought

¹For detailed analysis by I.Q. Grades, see below.
very little about what jobs to aim at and were vague about the nature of work, whilst at school. One youth had two jobs and one occupation during his first five years at work: another had three jobs and three occupations: and the third had six jobs and six occupations. The wages of 2 of the youths were relatively high—£15-16 gross and £13-14 gross respectively; the third received £10-12 per week. None of the youths had had much affection for school, although 2 of them said that they would like their children to remain at school at least until the age of sixteen—this appeared to be a reaction to their own condition, as unskilled workers with limited prospects, which they attributed in part to lack of education. All three saw themselves as unambiguously working class, and whilst one did not know which Party he would vote for in an election, the others said that they would support Labour. The explanation for these sons of skilled men being employed in unskilled work would seem to lie in a combination of factors, then, of which low intelligence, uninterested or overworked parents (vide the large families) and a school and general social background which militated against, or at least was not positively conducive towards, high aspirations, are of special importance.

The remaining anomalous case is the youth in unskilled employment whose father was a non-manual worker. This is a special case, the youth having been adopted into a middle class home (the foster-father was professionally qualified): the only child in the family, he was
of independent mind and always regarded as a problem at the school which he attended—the school with a substantial middle class element, and pretentions to the academic. He had never liked school, had never done well there (he was of Intelligence Grade 4) and was relieved as well as jubilant on leaving. He had had six jobs during his five years in employment, four of them as labourers.

It is not, of course, the purpose here to examine in detail the factors making for this respondent's attitude and actions—whilst it would be possible to elicit a certain amount of data in this regard, it would be incomplete. The salient point here is that there are special features which, on the face of it, would seem to have an important bearing upon the fact of this boy entering a type of employment that is contrary to the pattern to be expected, given the father's occupation and socio-economic class.

One aspect of family background to which reference has been made in the attempt to account for departures from expected patterns is size of family. The analysis of influences upon aspirations and upon development of ability in Chapter III above showed the general importance of size of family in educational orientation and achievement. Table 7 shows level of skill in occupations at five years after leaving school compared with size of family at the time of Interview No.1, when respondents were aged about fifteen years. The family size at age fifteen is taken partly for reasons of convenience—the complications associated with decline in size through death of a parent or sibling in the five year period are thereby
avoided, as are those connected with the birth of brothers and sisters subsequent to Interview No.1, of which there were a few cases; but it seems sensible to take the age of fifteen, also, because this could be said to represent the end of the childhood phase—and whilst there may be disputes as to the precise limits of the formative years in a child's development, it is not to be denied that until the school-leaving age more of the child's life revolves around the home-setting than is usually the case when he has started work. The point should be explained that the analysis here is in terms of number of children in the family at a given time, not the size of household: thus, deceased siblings are not included, but people living away from home—married sisters, for example, or brothers away in the army, are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Child</th>
<th>2-3 Children</th>
<th>4 Children</th>
<th>5+ Children</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern is, indeed clearcut, the association between level of
skill and size of family being direct. A somewhat different perspective is in terms of position in the family—first-born, second-born etc. Table 8 examines this relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Child</th>
<th>2nd Child</th>
<th>3rd Child</th>
<th>4th Child</th>
<th>5th Child</th>
<th>6th Child</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The striking relationship between first-born children and apprenticeships and non-manual employment is bound up with the fact of smaller families already established in Table 7, of course. But it is also suggestive of the possibility of a tendency to stronger parental interest in the first-born, and encouragement in regard to work. This could be associated with age of parents: some relationship could be hypothesised, for example, between young parents.

---

1 In the Postal Survey, 40 of the 235 youths were "only" children: 3 of them were in non-manual occupations (total of 13); 23 were apprentices (total of 105) and 14 were semi-skilled workers (total of 117).
and high aspirations for children—put loosely, the argument being that such young parents are more attuned to the "affluence" of the post-war years and more cognisant of opportunities and possibilities; whilst older parents could be regarded as more traditionally orientated and less knowledgeable about present-day employment. The numbers in the present enquiry are quite inadequate for conclusions in this matter—and there are numerous and complex factors interacting which would make the testing of the hypothesis necessarily a very sophisticated exercise in its own right. All that can be said at this point in terms of the statistics available is that the argument is by no means ruled out. Table 9 shows the position. Size of family, position in family, age of parents, sex of siblings, age gap between siblings—all of these, and the interplay between them, are aspects of the domestic cycle. Normally, only one or two of these aspects are used in research into the sorts of problems at present under discussion: the numbers in this enquiry, it has to be repeated, are inadequate to do more than posit possible connections.

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' Age at Interview No.1</th>
<th>Father Aged 40-</th>
<th>Mother Aged 40-</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from skill of father and various aspects of the size and structure of the family, the educational experience of near relatives, and especially of parents, was indicated in Chapter III as an important factor in shaping aspirations and orientations to work, and hence in affecting the nature of the employment entered by school leavers. The majority of parents in the present study had a non-selective education, and this was true of most of the respondents' siblings. Table 10 indicates that there is a relationship to be discerned between a family's experience of selective education—although the experience was limited in most cases—and the level of employment held by respondents.

TABLE 10
LEVEL OF SKILL AND FAMILY'S EXPERIENCE OF SELECTIVE EDUCATION—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT LEAST ONE MEMBER OF FAMILY WITH SELECTIVE SECONDARY EDUCATION</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria governing the selection of the five schools from which the sample of children was obtained were discussed above—the schools varied in regard to the policies which they sought to prosecute (and, in relation to this, in the amenities and staff with
which they were equipped) and they varied in regard to the socio-economic complexion of their pupils—in this connection it will be recalled that whilst certain dominant strains could be discerned in the schools, each of them had, nonetheless, substantial numbers of pupils whose socio-economic background was at variance with the typical pattern, and these divergences were reflected in the samples from the schools. Analysis in terms of school attended is, then, complicated: especially since numbers are so small. What is being attempted in such an analysis is to use the school as a focal point not only of its own perspectives and orientations, but of the pre-dominant socio-economic character of the neighbourhoods which it serves. Relationships in this context were established in regard to youths entering jobs at particular levels of skill over a five-year period prior to the research, and as regards the sample itself connections can be demonstrated between level of job first entered and school attended. The strong association between certain schools and the likelihood of boys entering the iron and steel industry can also be seen. Table 11 shows the level of skill in jobs at five years compared with school attended. The association between school 'B' and apprenticeships, schools 'A' and 'E' and non-manual employment and schools 'E' and 'D' and unskilled work confirms the patterns earlier identified.¹

¹For details, see Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 3, especially pp. 30-34 and pp.65-67.
TABLE 11

LEVEL OF SKILL AND SCHOOL ATTENDED—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL 'A'</th>
<th>SCHOOL 'B'</th>
<th>SCHOOL 'C'</th>
<th>SCHOOL 'D'</th>
<th>SCHOOL 'E'</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table indicates that the relationship previously discerned still stood at the stage of Interview No. 4. The position can be assessed briefly school by school. School 'A' is on the post-war housing estate, serving a predominantly working class population; many parents were youngish but not on the whole aspiring or ambitious. The school tried to give a lead, and responded to children who themselves showed special interest. There is nothing remarkable about the distribution of boys' jobs in terms of level of skill. School 'B' is the inter-war school in a zone of deterioration, with children predominantly from small terraced houses; the parents were long established working class, many of the fathers being employed in local steel and engineering factories. The school had a distinctive vocational streak in the curricula for boys. Whilst an apprenticeship was thought by the teachers to be the height of attainment likely for all except a few boys, who might reasonably aspire to non-manual work,
the teachers did take the view that, with effort, a substantial proportion could, indeed, obtain apprenticeships—many of them locally. The policy would seem to have been applied with success, and is reflected in the relatively high proportion of boys from this school in apprenticeships—8 out of 19 respondents.

School 'C' is the school in a slum area, where much of the teachers' efforts could best be regarded as "social" rather than more narrowly educational, much of their time being spent on "rescue operations" for children from broken or uncaring homes. The area which the school serves consists of tiny terraced houses situated midst giant steelworks: jobs in steel and engineering are "automatic" and "natural" for many boys. Some of them get apprenticeships—4 out of 17 in the present sample: many are semi-skilled, however, and a substantial proportion, 5/17 in the sample, are destined for unskilled work. Non-manual work is rarely a possibility for youths in the neighbourhood because few of them receive the education which would qualify them for it, and it is in any case castigated as "cissy".

School 'D', the inter-war school on the fringe of a large, dull, inter-war council estate strives hard but not particularly imaginatively to induce an interest in and respect for education in the predominantly unimaginative and indifferent populace of the estate. Bright boys from interested homes receive every encouragement—6 out of 18 in the sample became apprentices. But many boys followed a rather slothful and uninvolved career at school by a similar career in semi-skilled (8/18) or unskilled (4/18) employment.
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The final school, 'E', is the post-war school, serving a socially mixed area which includes a substantial middle class element, but also a sizeable number of children from indifferent, poor and "broken" homes. The result is reflected in the occupations at five years, which show a fairly high proportion of youths in apprenticeships and non-manual work, but with one unskilled youth and six others in semi-skilled employment.

The various dimensions referred to above in relation to level of skill at the age of twenty, five years after leaving school, will be taken up again, below, in various contexts. Additional dimensions such as comparisons between marital status and level of skill, and various facets of the work situation and conditions, including wages and attitudes towards work, will be considered in the appropriate Chapters. The relationships between level of employment and job changing will also be considered in detail. There remains one important dimension which it is useful to examine in detail at the present point, namely, that of intelligence in relation to level of employment. I propose to make use of this dimension for a fairly intensive examination of the respondents, drawing upon data already provided above in the attempt to explain divergences from the expected distribution. It is necessary to rely, here, upon I.Q. at the age of 11-plus. For the purposes of the research, respondents
were classified in four "Intelligence Grades" based upon their performances in the tests used in the selection procedure for secondary education, tests which included a Moray House verbal reasoning component. The caution must be given here that the use of these particular measurements, the only ones available, precludes the consideration of "late developers", of whom there could well have been some in the sample. And in concentrating upon measured intelligence, one is conscious of the neglect of other important qualities—"personality" is of importance to the girl receptionist or the boy car salesman, for example ("gift of the gab" is so well recognised as a valuable, if to others irritating, attribute as to be part of British folklore). "Perseverance" and application to studies, are other attributes which are not measurable, or at least which have not been measured in the present study, although these qualities can compensate for lack of intelligence they are, of course, qualities which may reflect encouragement from home and school. For the subsequent analysis, however, we are dependent upon measured intelligence. Although this is not claimed as the key variable, it obviously is a key variable—but the main point here is that it represents a convenient device for considering the interplay of a range of variables.

The overall distribution of respondents by Intelligence Grades, youths and girls, is given in Table 12.
**Table 12**

DISTRIBUTION BY INTELLIGENCE GRADES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade II</th>
<th>Grade III</th>
<th>Grade IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104+</td>
<td>93-103</td>
<td>82-92</td>
<td>81-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the level of occupation in relationship to Intelligence Grades.

**Table 13**

LEVEL OF SKILL AND INTELLIGENCE GRADES—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade I</th>
<th>Grade II</th>
<th>Grade III</th>
<th>Grade IV</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain propositions may be made on a priori grounds as to the relationship between level of employment and measured Intelligence. In the present instance, given that the respondents are similar in certain broad respects—none of them scored sufficiently highly in the I.Q. tests at 11-plus to qualify for a non-selective education, and none of them were of such low measured I.Q. as to require education.
in a special school for the sub-normal—differentiations may none-
theless be made between them. Although the small numbers in the
present study forbid conclusive testing, the data available is suf-
ficient to be suggestive of the validity of the propositions here
put forward. Thus, it may be posited that given (a) perfect know-
ledge of employment opportunities and (b) equality of opportunity
amongst persons of similar ability in gaining employment, and given
(c) a sharedness of assessment as to the merits and desirability of
particular levels or types of employment, then the more intelligent
boys will enter—or more pertinently for the present argument, will
persist in or eventually succeed in obtaining—apprenticeships or
non-manual jobs. And, as a complement to this, the less intelli-
gent boys will enter semi-skilled employment, and the boys of lowest
intelligence will enter, or "end up" in, unskilled employment.

In fact, of course, none of the above three propositions can be
accepted without reservations. There is not perfect knowledge of
employment opportunities, but very imperfect knowledge.1 As regards
(b) it is clear that certain boys have an advantage in securing employ-
ment as a consequence of knowing or being related to someone who is
able to exercise influence on their behalf;2 whilst selection proce-
dures used by many firms when taking on juvenile labour has little or
no reference to the relative capability of the various applicants.3

---
1 See Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 5
2 Ibid., Chapter 7, p.172 et seq.
3 Ibid., especially p.175 et seq.
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As far as (c) is concerned, the point was laboured in Chapter III above that there are significant variations in aspirations within the working class, and that these are associated with various socio-cultural factors.

Taking these factors into account, it would not be expected that there would be a neat correspondence between intelligence and jobs obtained. And yet, Table 13 does suggest an overall adherence to the propositions that the more able boys attain the more demanding jobs in terms of intelligence. Certain points by way of explanation may be made here. In the first place, on the whole the more intelligent boys will have been put into 'A' stream classes at school and thus been directed, consciously and indirectly, formally and informally, to aspire to what the schools regard as higher level jobs, such as apprenticeships—the aspirations "appropriate" to their intelligence are thereby likely to have been induced. Secondly, a higher proportion of the more able boys in secondary modern schools are likely to come from homes which give positive support to the school and which take a special interest in the child's education and employment—whilst, materially (for example, in the provision of books) the home is more likely to foster educational attainment than is the case with less able boys.  

Conversely, children of lesser ability are more likely to come from homes whose life styles and attitudes to school and employment direct a child towards semi-

---

1 See Chapter II above for reference to the studies broadly supporting these statements.
or unskilled work as a "natural" or "normal" course: whilst the schools will tend to support such aspirations in the lower stream children as proper, or, indeed, unavoidable or best not avoided. Finally, it may be suggested that the fact that certain jobs do indeed require more ability than others will ensure that, at the end of five years in employment, youths originally in jobs for which they are incompetent—who have obtained them in consequence of "influence" or because of faulty or inefficient selection processes—will have been weeded out, and will have been able to secure only that employment for which their ability suits them.

If Table 13 is examined bearing these various considerations in mind, the expected pattern in the light of the original propositions and of qualifications to them does indeed seem to obtain. But there are some deviations or "aberrations" which demand further exploration. The suggestion here is that such explanation is possible in terms of particular features of the individuals concerned and/or of their social environment.

The first set of "deviants" are the six youths of Grade III intelligence who were nonetheless apprentices at the time of Interview No.4. Some of these had, indeed, already completed their apprenticeships, and the others would shortly do so. Scrutiny of these individuals reveals that they had certain characteristics conducive to them aspiring to apprenticeships and advantageous to them in overcoming the handicap of a relatively low I.Q. Thus, in terms of family background, 5 of the 6 came from small families—3 were only children,
and 2 were the only boys in families of two children. The sixth boy was a member of a family of three children, but he was employed as an apprentice in his father's own (small) business. One respondent was from a family at least one member of which had received selective education—suggestive, however tenuously, of some possible influence, whether direct or indirect, upon aspirations. In terms of influence of parents upon aspirations, and parents' knowledge about apprenticeships, it is to be noted that the fathers of four of the boys were skilled men; of the two other fathers, one was non-manual, and the other, although now unskilled (a servitor), was retired on pension from the fire service. Three of the boys obtained their apprenticeships with the help of, or as a direct result of, "influence" used on their behalf by a relation or friend. There is some evidence, too, which is suggestive of the influence of the school upon aspirations and/or knowledge about how best to obtain employment. Thus, of the 6 youths, 3 attended the school which, as indicated above, placed considerable emphasis upon the vocational element in secondary education, which fashioned its courses in some degree to the employment opportunities in the neighbourhood of the boys' homes, and which constantly set an apprenticeship before the pupils as the appropriate career. A fourth boy attended a school which gave less resonant and specific encouragement to such aspirations, but which did go out of its way to assist boys who clearly displayed interest in an apprenticeship. For whatever reasons, although doubtless including some of the elements of family and
school influences above referred to, these boys of lower ability who became apprentices exhibited a greater interest in their chosen occupation, a greater knowledge about work and more stability in it than is true in regard to other respondents of similar ability but lesser achievement in terms of level of occupation. Five of the 6 were particularly realistic whilst still at school in regard to the nature of the work involved in the jobs of their choice, for example, whereas only 31 of the total of 86 boy respondents were thus realistic in all. Three of the boys, also, had set their minds on this sort of employment some considerable time before leaving school—well over eighteen months, in two cases. These 3 had already taken steps to find the employment of their choice at the time of Interview No. I, furthermore. During their last term at school, 5 of the 6 had already set their minds on an apprenticeship; they were determined that that was the employment at which to aim. The evidence, then, is of a greater interest and knowledge and of more "know-how" about finding the jobs chosen, than obtains in the sample generally. Conscientiousness in their jobs is suggested by the fact that one youth had attended Evening School regularly in the previous year, one had attended Day Release Classes regularly, and two had attended both regularly. The youths showed a greater stability in their jobs, furthermore, than was true of the sample as a whole—4 remained in the same job throughout their first five years of employment; 1 boy had two jobs and two occupations (but the first job and occupation were only stop-gap, and he remained
in it but three weeks). The sixth boy had had three jobs and three occupations—after five months as a clerk and fourteen months as a sales assistant, both jobs having made him "fed up", he settled down in an apprenticeship.

There is some further evidence in terms of attitudes towards education, and in broader terms of perception of society and of their place in it, which suggests that these 6 youths were orientated in a way which was conducive to successful endeavour at work. All 6, for example thought that it definitely was possible for persons who worked hard and who were so minded to "get to the top" in their occupations—regardless, that is, of initial disadvantages socially or educationally. A favourable disposition towards education was reflected in the case of 3 of the youths who unreservedly favoured the raising of the school leaving age to sixteen, and of 1 other who supported this measure in principle but had some qualifications. Four of the youths said that they would prefer a grammar school education for any children they might have: 2 said that they would definitely like their children to remain at school at least until the age of seventeen. Five of the youths viewed a "really successful man" as being in a professional or managerial position, and the other saw him as being in a non-manual occupation of some kind—this matter will be discussed further below: here, I need merely make the point that, without pushing the evidence unreasonably, this can legitimately be interpreted as a sign of adherence to a set of values conducive to aspirations towards the higher level jobs open to the secondary modern boy. The same may be said of four of them
in regard to claimed social class membership—although 2 affiliated themselves with the "working class", 3 said that they were "upper working class" and 1 said that he was "middle class".

Another deviant case is that of a youth of Intelligence Grade III who was in non-manual employment. In terms of social background, he was from a lower middle class home, assessed in terms of house (privately owned and semidetached, with a garden), parental occupations and education—the father, although now in manual employment, had had a public school education, and the mother was a clerical worker. The youth was one of two children in the family. He saw himself as middle class, and said that he would vote Conservative in a General Election. He was knowledgeable about the world of work whilst at school, clear as to what he wanted to do, and enthusiastic about the prospects. Although he did not immediately get the work of his choice on leaving school, he did manage to get an apprenticeship, and then changed to his chosen occupation when the opportunity arose.

The next set of "deviants" are the 5 youths of Intelligence Grade I who were in semi-skilled employment—that is, in jobs which were, on the face of it, less demanding than their intelligence would seem to qualify them for. Here, the evidence is perhaps less persuasive than might be allowed in the cases just discussed. In large measure this can be attributed, probably, to the fact that the semi-skilled employment category covers a fairly wide spectrum of occupations, and 3 at least of the respondents here concerned, whilst not apprentices, nonetheless had received substantial training—one as a butcher,
one as an electrician, and one as a painter/decorator (one of the other youths worked as a shop assistant, and the other was a routine machine operator at an engineering firm). Only 1 of the youths came from the school with the pronounced vocational orientation. Two were from the school which tended to repudiate the vocational aspect, whilst 2 were at the school which gave encouragement, but tended to expect the initiative in discussions about work to come from the boy. Two of the youths had held apprenticeships on leaving school, but did not remain in them—in one case because of redundancy, in the other because of general dissatisfaction.

The youths as a group displayed less job movement than was apparent amongst semi-skilled workers as a whole—at the five-year stage—4 of them had had only two jobs, and two (in one case three) occupations. The other had had six jobs, but had remained in the same occupation throughout, as painter/decorator—he had been subject to some ill-luck through redundancy and lay-offs associated with employment of this nature in small firms subject to sub-contracting uncertainties and to seasonal variations in demand. Two of the youths were very vague at the time of Interview No.1, during their last term at school, as to their job aims, and indeed about work in general—although the other three were notably clear on these scores.

In regard to family backgrounds, the fathers of only 2 of the youths were skilled, one was semi-skilled and one unskilled (for one there was no information). One of the youths had a close relation who had received a selective secondary education. All five were from
families in which there were either one or two other children—that is, there were no only children but nor where there any from the large families of 4 or more children. One of the youths had a gross weekly wage of £19, which in part explained his satisfaction with semi-skilled work; but that this was not an important feature in the other cases is suggested by the fact that they were all within the lowest category of wage earners (approximately one-quarter of all youths were in this category) with gross wages of between £5 and £9 per week.

In terms of attitudes and aspirations, 4 of them thought that a young person could "get to the top"—and whilst they were not themselves at the apprenticeship level, it is worth recalling that 3 of them were in the upper reaches of the semi-skilled category. 3 of the 5 definitely favoured a school leaving age of sixteen, one was indifferent, and the other was definitely against the proposal. However, 3 said they would definitely like their children to leave school at the age of seventeen or above, and 4 said that they would prefer a grammar school education for such children as they might have. 3 saw a "really successful" man as being in a non-manual occupation and the other two as in manual work. 2 regarded themselves as middle class and 3 as working class.

In sum, the evidence in regard to these 5 youths, whilst by no means clear-cut, appears to suggest that, on the one hand, they are in the "better" or more demanding jobs within the semi-skilled range (at least, this is true of 3 of them) and that they tend to conform
in terms of job changing and overall attitudes to work to the picture which obtains in regard to apprentices. On the other hand, these youths have rather less background support and fewer advantages, in terms such as family size, occupation of father and school attended, than is the case with most of the youths in skilled employment.

The next of the more obvious “deviants” is the youth of Intelligence Grade I who was employed in unskilled work. This respondent had given little thought to work whilst at school, and although at the time of Interview No.1 he stated a wish to obtain an apprenticeship, he showed little knowledge about the nature of the occupation which he envisaged. He did obtain an apprenticeship on leaving school—he attended the school which gave special emphasis to placing boys in skilled occupations. But he remained in this job, in an engineering factory, for only three months: he did not like the work much, and welcomed the opportunity which arose through the services of his brother of working in the fresh air, as a baker’s delivery boy: an additional important attraction was the higher wage, compared with that which he was paid as an apprentice. He remained in this job for two years, and then changed to the job which he still held at five years, as a labourer: his task was to load sheet-glass into lorries. The particular attraction of the work was the gross wage of between £17 and £18 per week (much of this was spent on gambling on “the dogs” and racehorses).

The youth was third in a family of three children and was much
influenced, it may be inferred from the mother's remarks, by his brother, who was two years older than he and who was himself an unskilled worker who had had several occupations. A younger sister became a wallpaper-shop assistant when she left school. The father was a railway shunter, and neither he nor his wife attached particular importance to the type of work which their son did; they tended, rather, to be detached from the matter, and to take the view that "if he wants more money, the best thing for him to do is to change jobs": the mother said, "It's up to him what he does—if he wants to change, he must please himself," and she presented this sort of view consistently over Interview Nos. 2, 3 and 4. Diffident in disposition, the youth displayed little interest or enthusiasm for anything—he was glad that he had left school when he did, at the age of fifteen, since he had "never liked school" and "always wanted to leave": he was definitely against the proposal to raise the leaving age to sixteen, a proposal which struck him as punitive and ridiculous. As to whether a young person could progress in his sort of work, he was uninterested and non-committal; he did not know how he would vote in an election, or whether he would do so—nor was he able to describe or, indeed, envisage a man who was "really successful in his job". The failure of this respondent to capitalise on his ability would, then, seem to be directly related to his unobtrusive and subdued personality and to a lack of stimulation and interest in the home and neighbourhood setting.
The final group of "deviants" consists of 3 youths of Intelligence Grade II who were in unskilled employment. It might have been expected that youths of this level of ability would be in semi-skilled work at least. In fact, one was a labourer and 2 were warehouse workers. All three had been vague whilst at school about the nature of work in general, and not one of them had had any clear idea about what occupation to aim at. All showed fairly high job turnover—one had had three jobs and three occupations; one had had four jobs and four occupations; and the third had had five jobs and four occupations. Their wages were not outstandingly high at the time of Interview No. 4—one received £13-14 gross, and another £10-12, and the third received only £5-9.

The home backgrounds of all three were uninspiring in regard to vocational matters—at no time during the transition from school to work and the subsequent adjustment to employment was there serious or informed discussion at home, or, indeed, much interest displayed on the part of parents. One youth was from a family of two children and the other two were from families of five children. The fathers of two of the youths were semi-skilled and the father of the other was unskilled. All three saw themselves as working class; two stated a preference for secondary modern school for their children's education (the other favoured grammar school)—but all three said that they would like their children to stay at school until the age of sixteen, although not beyond then. One of the youths attended the school which responded to pupils' displayed interest in careers
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but was not especially active in promoting such interest: another went to the school in the slum area which had its work cut out to make any impression; and the third attended the school on the vast, colourless housing estate—a school which, also, had to work hard to elicit even the minimum of response from its pupils. These children, then, came from family and social settings which did not stimulate such ability as the youths did possess.

In the above analysis, the attempt has been made to explain divergences from expected patterns in terms of social and personal characteristics of the individuals concerned. There is, of course, a danger of circular argument in this sort of discussion: and a further hazard is that of making use of evidence arbitrarily and selectively in order to make a case. I should therefore explain at this point that I do not seek to prove conclusively the arguments that I state, but only to demonstrate their plausibility: substantiation would require investigation on a larger scale, and with other or at least additional techniques to those employed in this study. I should also underline the further point, that the particular information which I have provided in the assessments of the various "deviant" cases has been derived from detailed information covering a wide range of topics, as the Interview Schedules indicate. My selection of material is intended to be illustrative rather than comprehensive,
and I have sought to represent faithfully, by reference to only a relatively small amount of detail, the overall picture which obtains in regard to the respondents concerned. With these reminders as to the objectives of the present procedures, and the limitations inherent in them, I propose to move on to the consideration of the girl respondents, using a similar approach and perspective.

The broad profile of girls' occupations was given in Table 3 above, which indicated the major importance of the three categories, office work, shop assistant and factory/warehouse. A more detailed analysis is given in Table 14 below, which refers to the jobs held at five years after leaving school by single girls and by married girls who were still working, and to the last full-time occupation of the 16 married girls who had ceased working. (It is seen from the Table that 31 of the girls were married by the time of Interview No. 4, but 13 of these were still at work, the remainder being housewives). To facilitate analysis, respondents other than those in the three main occupations of office work, shop work and factory work have been bracketed with/or other of these, to give three categories, 'A', 'B' and 'C'. The assignment has been made with reference to several criteria—firstly, the apparent ability required in terms of intelligence and demeanour or appearance (on these grounds it

---

1 Of the 208 Postal Respondents, 134 girls were in Category 'A' employment, 30 in Category 'B' and 44 in Category 'C'.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY 'A'</th>
<th>SINGLE</th>
<th>MARRIED AND WORKING</th>
<th>MARRIED NOT WORKING</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand/typing and general</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptometer Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdressing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CATEGORY 'B' |        |                     |                     |        |
| Shop Assistant: |        |                     |                     |        |
| Small shop     | 7      | 4                   | 3                   | 14     |
| Salesgirl      | 1      | -                   | 1                   | 2      |
| Supermarket Cashier | -     | -                   | 1                   | 1      |
| Florist        | 1      | -                   | -                   | 1      |
| Petrol Pump Attendant | -   | -                   | 1                   | 1      |
| **Totals**  | 9      | 4                   | 6                   | 19     |

| CATEGORY 'C' |        |                     |                     |        |
| Factory/Warehouse | 14     | 7                   | 3                   | 24     |
| Seamstress     | 1      | -                   | -                   | 1      |
| Bus Conductress | -     | -                   | 3                   | 3      |
| **Totals**  | 15     | 7                   | 6                   | 28     |

| TOTALS IN CATEGORIES | 53 | 13 | 18 | 84 |
could be that the two sales girls and the florist would in some ways more appropriately be classified with the office girls but some arbitrariness is unavoidable). Secondly, the implicit criteria employed commonly by teachers and Youth Employment Officers, who tend to associate the various occupations according to the manner used here, on the basis of estimated prestige. And thirdly, the categorization has taken note of the appraisal of the girls themselves, as stated and as demonstrated in their attitudes towards work and to occupational changes. These aspects will be explored in more detail below.

We may now make an analysis of girls' occupations in terms of the various factors already considered in regard to boys. One important reservation must be especially borne in mind when drawing conclusions in regard to girls. Namely that, not untypically, girls on marriage, or prior to marriage but in anticipation of it, move from one occupational level to another—from office girl to shop assistant, for example, or even to factory work. This is associated with the wish for a higher wage, or for convenience to the home or in terms of hours worked. On marriage, or just prior to it, then, is a new set of criteria employed by some girls, associated with a new perspective of the meaning of work to them. The matter will be further discussed below, but here it is important to note that because both married and unmarried girls are under consideration there is, in Table 15, a built-in complication.
In Table 15 girls' occupations are compared with the fathers' skill. Whilst by no means clear-cut, the distribution does tend to support the hypothesis that there is a direct relationship between high skill of father and high level job of daughter, and vice versa. Thus, 26 of the 37 girls in Category 'A' are daughters of skilled or non-manual men, but only 7 of the 28 girls in Category 'C'. The three main sets of "deviants" relate to the 3 girls in Category 'A' who were daughters of unskilled men; the 4 factory girls whose fathers were skilled workers; and the 3 factory girls whose fathers were non-manual workers.

Of the 3 Category 'A' girls whose fathers were unskilled, one was married and not working at the time of Interview No.4. The girl was untypical of the Category in that she had had two previous jobs in Category 'C', as a seamstress for six months and a warehouse packer
for two-and-a-half years, prior to entering nursing at a rather lowly level, but with prospects of training for promotion. After ten months in this post, she left upon marriage. She was Intelligence Grade 2—not, that is, of very low ability.

The 2 single girls were both office workers. One, of Intelligence Grade 3, was a routine office clerk, a job which she had entered after working as a counter assistant in a large chemists' shop for nearly five years. There were four people in her family: a younger brother who was an apprentice; her mother, who did not work; and her father, who worked in the steel industry. A girl with an active mind, she received encouragement from the family in matters to do with school and work. She was engaged to an apprentice whom she had known for two-and-a-half years. The second girl was a progress clerk and had remained in the same job since leaving school. An only child, her father was a window cleaner, in business on his own account. The mother assisted him in this work, and it was in consequence of her initiative that the job was found for her daughter. The girl was in Intelligence Grade 2. She was a thorough worker whilst at school, and subsequently in her job. In regard to these three girls, then, the evidence is that they were in the less demanding of the Category 'A' jobs: and in the two cases of the single girls, at least, there were features of their family background which were helpful to the girls in securing the type of employment obtained.
Of the 4 Category 'C' girls whose fathers were skilled, one was a seamstress, and as such was in a job which was more demanding in terms of ability than was the case with the bulk of the occupations in Category 'C'. The other three girls were all married and had previously worked as shop assistants. One stated that she had changed jobs because of her marriage (for convenience of hours worked); the other two said that they "simply felt like a change", but the aspect of convenience appeared to have some pertinence with regard to them, too.

The remaining apparent inconsistency related to the 3 Category 'C' girls whose fathers were non-manual workers. One of the girls had previously been a shop assistant; her father was a locally travelling sales representative for an electrical firm, and could perhaps be best thought of as being on the semi-skilled level. The father of the second girl, who had consistently done factory work and warehouse work since leaving school, was a tailor's representative, calling at people's homes to take orders and measurements—he had a largely working class clientele and would not be judged as being of a particularly high occupational status. The third case relates to a girl of clearly middle class background (in terms of house, district and father's occupation as a professional man), whose parents had been killed in an accident. The girl had led a somewhat desultory working life—she had not been keen to start work, and had spent two-and-a-half years on a very low wage assisting
in a riding stable. She was dismissed after an argument with the owner, and had subsequently had various short-term jobs as shop assistant. The crucial factor here appears to be the death of the parents: she inherited a legacy, which gave her some financial independence. She had also "married down", eighteen months previous to Interview No.4, to a porter/van driver. The inconsistency as this between girl's occupation and that of father would, then, appear to be one facet of a drastic change in aspirations, orientations and life style consequent upon or associated with domestic upheaval in her home, and her own marriage—two factors which may not be un-relatable, although the evidence available on this matter is rather slight.

The next dimension to be considered is size of family, and this data is presented in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL OF OCCUPATION AND SIZE OF FAMILY—GIRLS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Child</th>
<th>2-3 Children</th>
<th>4 Children</th>
<th>5+ Children</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 'A'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'B'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'C'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation that there would be a distinctly higher proportion of Category 'A' girls coming from small families is not sustained in comparison with Category 'B'. What does emerge, however, is that
relatively few girls of Category 'A' or Category 'B' are from the larger families with four or more children, compared with the number—8 out of 28—of such girls in Category 'C' jobs, that is factory and warehouse work, predominantly. The analysis in terms of position in the family broadly reflects that in regard to size of family, as Table 17 shows.

**Table 17**

**LEVEL OF OCCUPATION AND POSITION IN FAMILY—GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Child</th>
<th>2nd Child</th>
<th>3rd Child</th>
<th>4th Child</th>
<th>5th Child</th>
<th>6th Child</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 'A'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'B'</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'C'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis in terms of parents' age also tends to be indefinite (Table 18).

**Table 18**

**LEVEL OF OCCUPATION AND AGE OF PARENTS—GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' Age at Interview No.1</th>
<th>Father Aged 40-</th>
<th>Mother Aged 40-</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 'A'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'B'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'C'</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In the Postal Survey, 35 of the 208 girls were "only" children; 27 of them were in Category 'A' employment (of a total of 115); 6 were in Category 'B' (of a total of 33); and 2 were in Category 'C' (of a total of 39).
Roughly the same proportion of girls in each category had a relatively young father and/or mother. But when the occupational categories are analysed in terms of families with experience of selective education, the expected relationships do appear, a markedly higher proportion of girls in Category 'A' coming from such families compared with Category 'B', and a markedly lower proportion of Category 'C' children. Table 19 shows the position.

**Table 19**

**Level of Occupation and Family's Experience of Selective Education—Girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 'A'</th>
<th>At Least One Member of Family With Selective Secondary Education</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'B'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'C'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of girls' occupations with reference to school attended—recalling that the school is here used as a rough indication of the neighbourhood background of the pupils as well as in the context of its own amenities and policies—similarly reveals the expected profile. Table 20 examines the relationships.

**Table 20**

**Level of Occupation and School Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 'A'</th>
<th>School 'A'</th>
<th>School 'B'</th>
<th>School 'C'</th>
<th>School 'D'</th>
<th>School 'E'</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'B'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'C'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reviewing the position school by school, it is seen that in School 'A', the post-war school on a post-war council housing estate, a high proportion of girls were employed in office work, and an appreciable proportion in factory/warehouse work, but only 2 of the 17 were shop assistants. The latter fact is most easily explained—there were very few shops on the estate, so that the area did not have the readily available opportunities which was true in regard to the bulk of children attending the other schools—the estate was at a considerable distance from the centre of the city, furthermore. (It should be noted, of course, that a relatively small number of girls overall were in Category 'B' employment at the time of Interview No.4). There was, however, an industrial area nearby, and this provided opportunities not only for factory/warehouse work, but also for office work. Several of the 9 girls in Category 'A' employment were in the more menial or routine types of office work, and it is reasonable to suppose that some at least of these would have readily entered Category 'B' employment had such work been more easily available. This said, the high proportion of girls in office work can be said to reflect the school's attempts to encourage aspirations, and the parent's response to this prompting.

School 'B' shows a somewhat smaller but nonetheless substantial proportion of girls in Category 'A' employment—in large measure this is a reflection of the headteacher's insistence upon girls getting the sort of employment appropriate to their academic level (office work for 'A' stream girls, factory/warehouse work for 'C' stream girls, with 'B' stream girls becoming shop assistants).
Although the area is situated near the city centre, relatively few girls were employed as shop assistants; an important part of the explanation would seem to be that there were numerous local opportunities in factory and warehouse work. This, too, was a major factor in regard to School 'C', which is the slum school. A noticeably small proportion of girls were in Category 'A' employment, a direct reflection of family background. There were many small shops in the district, and 4 of the 16 girls were in such employment. But half of the girls were in Category 'C' jobs, most of them being factory and warehouse workers.

The low aspirations in regard to occupations and, indeed, the overall limited horizons that characterised children attending school 'D' are reflected in the employment profile for the girls, with only 5 of the 16 in office work, or other work of that level. Whilst there were not many opportunities for shop assistants in the immediate area, the estate was connected by 'bus with many other nearby districts in which such employment was available, the city centre itself not being far distant from one end of this inter-war council estate. Factory/warehouse employment opportunities were somewhat more limited, a fact that is reflected in the numbers employed in such work. As regards School 'E', the post-war school serving a mixed area but with a substantial middle class element, the expected large proportion of girls in Category 'A' employment and the correspondingly low proportion in Category 'C', is clearly apparent.
Of course, the numbers involved are so small, and the factors affecting type of employment held so complex, that it would be foolish to attempt to draw too many conclusions from the present data in regard to school attended. The direct comparison between type of job at Interview No. 4 and school attended should properly be assessed in terms of intervening factors. Age of marriage is one such factor; it has already been noted that marriage—or anticipation of it—may precipitate a change from one occupational category to another and, specifically, from either office work or shop assistant to factory/warehouse work. This theme will be taken up again below. All that is being attempted, at this point, is to indicate that predictable or expected patterns regarding schools and occupations do emerge, in however crude a fashion, and to suggest some of the factors which are salient in this process.

In the light of the above discussion, we may now turn to the analysis of girls' occupations in terms of measured Intelligence. Table 21 shows the occupational categories in relation to I.Q. Grades.

Table 21 shows the occupational categories in relation to I.Q. Grades.

**Table 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 'A'</th>
<th>Grade I</th>
<th>Grade II</th>
<th>Grade III</th>
<th>Grade IV</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 'B'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'C'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same reservations obtain in regard to girls as were enunciated in the case of youths (p.168 above). Given these, it is not to be expected that there will be a straightforward connection between level of employment and measured intelligence, but it is to be expected that a broad pattern will emerge, such that the girls of the highest Grades will tend to have Category 'A' type employment, the girls of middle range intelligence will have category 'B' type jobs, whilst the less intelligent girls will tend to be in category 'C' type jobs. Table 21 shows that this is, indeed, the position in general terms. As in the case of the youths, I now propose to examine the "deviant" cases, with the object of tracing special factors which help to explain the departures from the expected patterns.

Firstly, there are the 5 girls of Intelligence Grade III and the one girl of Intelligence Grade IV, who are nonetheless in Category 'A' type employment. The Grade IV girl can be dealt with first, as being a relatively clear-cut case to explain. She attended the school on the post-war council estate, but did not live on this estate. A trainee hairdresser, she had not served an apprenticeship as such in this work. She was not receiving the rigorous training normally associated with hairdressing apprenticeships, and was working rather as a general help in a small business, receiving little instruction and being paid a low wage of only £4 gross per week. A key fact about this girl was her reluctance to do any work which demanded much effort—she was content, rather, with a low wage. (She had no complaints that, as she said, it was "not a proper rate"); recognising
that she could scarcely be said to be doing a "proper job"). Her father was manager of a middle class Social Club: the family lived on the premises and her father was able to support her on the basis of her low wage (she was from a small family with just one sister, aged six years). After leaving school she obtained employment as assistant to a hairdresser through the influence of her father, who knew the proprietress. She left this job after three years "because of ill-health, and getting run-down, bored and fed-up with it". After about a year as a shop assistant in a chain-stores, she obtained the job she held at Interview No.4, having heard of the vacancy from a friend. This "deviant" case can therefore be understood in terms of the job itself being on the fringe of the occupational category, and in terms of the ability of the girl's family to help her enter a type of employment, and to sustain her in it, which she could otherwise not aspire to. Were it not for this family backing, she would probably have been compelled to cast aside her diffidence and get down to the comparatively hard slog and low prestige (in her eyes) of shop assistant, or even factory work.

Two of the 5 Grade III girls in Category 'A' employment were single. One of them was of very smart appearance. She had worked as a counter assistant in Boots, the Chemists, for almost five years before obtaining her present employment as a routine clerical worker. She changed jobs because she wanted a (somewhat) higher wage, and
because she felt that she had done more than her "stint" of Saturday work (probably her engagement to an apprentice tool fitter had been an important factor here, the need to work on Saturdays being a constant complaint from girls who were courting—especially if the boy friend, as in this case, worked only a five day week). The idea of office work had, in any case, long attracted her—so much so that she had attended a course of shorthand-typing over a period of three years, although she had stopped going the previous year, because it was a long way to travel in winter conditions. The girl was from a small family, having just one brother, an apprentice gas fitter. Her father was a skilled steelmaker, whilst her fiancé, to whom she had been engaged for two-and-a-half years, was a regular attender at Evening Classes and Day Release Classes.

In sum, although she was of a low Intelligence Grade, the girl was far from being dull: on the contrary, she showed a liveliness and a determination which helped to equip her for work of the Category 'A' level. Her aspirations for this sort of work were supported and reinforced by the orientations of her father and her brother, and also by her fiancé. She attended the inter-war school on the council estate, but this does not seem to have affected significantly her occupational attainment, which would seem, as was suggested, to be explicable, directly in terms of the girl's own qualities and of her social background.
The other single girl of Intelligence Grade III was also employed in routine clerical work, as an addressograph operator. She had held this job for two years, after working as an assistant in a wallpaper shop for well over two years. She had left the latter post because a chemical used in the paper aggravated a chest complaint. She thought that she might soon seek another change of employment, and had applied for the post of sales assistant in an exclusive multiple stores. Her father was a skilled maintenance fitter and she had one brother, an apprentice fitter. She attended the inter-war school in the zone of deterioration, a school which enjoined able girls to seek work which would test them to the utmost of their capacities. Again, a combination of competence in the girl and appropriate home circumstances and encouragement would seem to explain the *prima facie* anomaly.

Of the three married girls in Category 'A' employment who were of Intelligence Grade III, one was working at the time of Interview No4 and the other two were housewives. The one who was working attended the school on the post-war estate. She was an only child, the daughter of a skilled steel worker, and she lived in one of the few privately-owned houses which her school served. She was in her fourth job, but all of them had been routine shorthand-typing work. At the instigation of her parents, and supported by the school, she did shorthand-typing lessons during the evenings whilst at school, and continued them on starting work. She was now married to a school
teacher who was registered as a part-time student for a higher degree. Family background, in this case, clearly provided the orientation and the encouragement to succeed in attaining the appropriate level of employment.

One of the married girls who was no longer working was from a middle class home—her father owned his own business and she had one sibling only, a brother who was an apprentice photographer. The parents had paid for her to attend Commercial College for a year, when she left school, and she had qualified as a shorthand-typist. She was now married to a medical student, also from a middle class home, and she had one child. She had attended the post-war school which had a substantial middle class element whose hopes and aspirations it endeavoured to satisfy. The home background obviously compensated for such limitations as were to be detected in the girl's intellectual ability.

The final "deviant" case refers to a girl who has previously been cited in connection with family size—from a large family, she had entered nursing at a lowly level after several years in factory/warehouse employment. She had ceased work some months prior to Interview No. 4 on the birth of her baby. Her husband had become a trainee nurse after being employed as a wire-drawer for some years after leaving school. They had met at the hospital where they both worked.

The next obvious "deviant" to consider is the girl of Intelligence Grade I who was a factory worker. This girl worked as a despatch
clerk in a local warehouse on leaving school, and remained in the
post for three years. On becoming engaged, a time which corresponded
with her attaining the necessary age of eighteen, she obtained work
as a 'bus conductress. Her stated reason was that she was "fed up"
with clerical work (which was, indeed, routine and undemanding for
a girl of her ability) and that since her sister worked on the 'buses
and enjoyed it, she thought that she, too, "might as well give it a
try". She enjoyed the work, but after one year gave it up because
of the greater attraction of doing domestic work for her husband
(a skilled engineer) and for her sister and brother-in-law, with
whom they shared a house. This, then, represents an excellent
example of the process referred to earlier, whereby a girl in one
level of employment re-orientates herself on marriage or in antici-
pation of it, to another level because different criteria in regard
to the choice of work now come to the fore—in the present case,
the relatively high wages which could be earned as a 'bus conduc-
tress were of importance in view of the expenses of the impending
marriage and of setting up a home.

There were 9 girls of Intelligence Grade II who were employed in
Category 'C' employment at the time of Interview No. 4 and who could
thus be said to depart from the expected pattern—2 of them were
single girls and 4 of the remaining 7 married girls were still in
full-time employment.
One of the single girls was a bright, vivacious girl with a mind of her own: she had wanted, whilst at school, to study to become a pathologist or a bacteriologist, but limitations in her own ability together with restrictions in the opportunities provided in the secondary modern school conspired against this. Furthermore, she declared herself consistently over the four Research Interviews to be "impatient to earn money", as all her friends were doing. She now regretted, at times, that she had not made an effort to pursue further education courses after leaving school. She had, indeed, passed a domestic science qualifying examination which would have enabled her to attend a course, but, as she said, she "did not have the patience to continue with schooling". She had never found the stimulation at school which her disposition called for (she attended the post-war school on the council housing estate). Having recognised the barriers to her attaining the professional-level work which she would have really liked, she reacted by taking the view that it did not much matter what particular occupation within the secondary modern range that she did enter—all were mediocre. Far better to concentrate on a jolly time in leisure hours, than unrealistically seek satisfaction at work. She worked for six months as a green-grocery shop assistant on leaving school, but was dismissed for taking a Saturday morning off to go on a trip to Blackpool. After six months of work in a Tailors and Outfitters, also as a shop assistant, she left to take a job in a factory, lining cabinet cases—
a job which offered higher wages. This girl lived in a council house; her father was a heavy transport driver and her mother worked part-time as a shop assistant. She had one brother aged fourteen years. The father had "always" hoped for better things in regard to his daughter's occupation, and was dissatisfied with her job, because, in his words, "Factory work of any kind is demoralising—it is boring, with no initiative or interest: one falls into a trance and a repeated routine, which is bad, both mentally and physically". He was backed in this view by his daughter's fiancé, an apprentice. But the girl had a mind of her own. She enjoyed the company of the other girls at work, and had an active and enjoyable leisure time—dancing, rambling, singing in a "pop" group and with the city choir. Her father and her fiancé, in her view, were surely deluding themselves as to the possible satisfaction in any sort of employment open to a girl in her situation.

The second single girl had already been referred to as being untypical of Category "C"; her occupation being that of a seamstress. Her father was a Railway Guard, and she had one brother, who was a university student. All that can be said in regard to her is that she is untypical, and would perhaps have been more appropriately classified in Category 'B'. Of the 4 working married women of Intelligence Grade II, 2 followed the pattern of shifting to factory/warehouse work in consequence of, or, at least in association with, marriage or impending marriage. One, the daughter of a semi-skilled
steel worker, was married to a skilled cutlery worker. She had had a succession of three jobs as a grocer's shop assistant before taking up her present employment, packing penknives, nine months previously. She had been married for four months and the reasons which she gave for the change to factory work were more money, no Saturday work, and less tiring work since she was sitting down all day rather than standing up. The other girl had made a similar shift to factory work. She, however, had become a junior clerk on leaving school, thanks to the influence of her father with the employer. She left this after a brief spell, because she "couldn't get used to it," and then had two shop assistant jobs in hosiery and grocery before changing to the present job as a warehouse packer, one year prior to Interview No. 4 and six months before her marriage to a semi-skilled plumber. Both of the other two married women who were working had been in factory/warehouse work since leaving school. One had not known what work she wanted on leaving school, and had been generally indifferent about the matter. She had had three jobs during the first five years in employment, a time which had been broken by two pregnancies, one during the first year after leaving school and the other two years prior to Interview No. 4. There had been much trouble at home consequent upon her early pregnancy and forced marriage, and the girl emphasised that the vital determinant in type of work for her was to get as high a wage as possible. The break with her parents meant that she and her husband had a serious
housing problem. Furthermore, she and her husband were determined that he should complete his apprenticeship, despite the present low wages that this implied, as an investment for the future. The possibility of this girl changing to a level of occupation more commensurate with her ability was thus ruled out, early in her working life, by domestic complications. The other married woman who was working came from a large slum home. She worked as a packer, her second such job since leaving school. She had left the first "after a row"; she declared that she had always wanted factory or warehouse work—indeed, this was the pattern for many girls in the neighbourhood—and her present job was additionally welcome because it was close to her home. Her change to the present job coincided with her marriage, one year previously, to a semi-skilled engineering worker.

The remaining three married women of Intelligence Grade II, who were in Category 'C' employment, had ceased work on marriage or on having children. One had become a shop assistant in a multiple stores on leaving school, but had changed to warehouse work, then laundry work and, finally, on engagement and on reaching the necessary age, to 'bus conductress. Her husband was a 'bus driver. The second girl had had a series of jobs after leaving school—three factory jobs, one job as a shop assistant, and two as a cook: all these jobs had been held during the first two years after leaving school—she then stopped work because of marriage and childbirth. Her husband was a demolition worker at the time of Interview No. 4 but had had a similar rate and diversity of job changing experience.
The girl lived in a slum area and attended the slum school: she had difficult home circumstances whilst at school, living in an over-crowded house with her married sister, in preference to residing with her father and step-mother. She had had little or no guidance, about work or anything else, from anyone.

There remain to consider 6 girls in Category 'B' occupations who were of Intelligence Grade I, and who might therefore be said to be "deviant" in that girls of such ability tend to be in Category 'A' type employment. Three of the girls were single. One of them had remained with the same firm since leaving school: starting as a wholesale shop assistant, this was still her primary work at the time of Interview No.4, but she did then have some clerical responsibilities. It could reasonably be said that she had graduated to employment with some of the attributes of Category 'A'. Another girl worked for over a year as a clerk on leaving school, but then seized the opportunity of a job as a shop assistant in a Chemist's because she had always wanted such work, and because, as an added inducement, it was conveniently near home. The last of the single girls was very shy and unassuming: her disposition may well have been associated with the fact that she had a step-father and a young step-brother (aged eighteen months at the time of Interview No.1). Whilst the home appeared happy and kindly, and both parents showed considerable interest in the girl and her career, she remained withdrawn and self-effacing—a fact which troubled the step-father and her mother alike. They would have liked her to "come-out" a bit. The girl had remained in the same job since
leaving school, as a shop assistant in a local grocery store. She had set her mind on this particular job prior to leaving school, having got to know the people there as a consequence of doing errands for her mother. She obviously felt sheltered and safe, protected from the unknown, outside world, in this job and nothing would budge her from it.

Finally, there were the 3 married women of Intelligence Grade I who were working. All of them were in the more demanding of the jobs included in Category 'B'. One had previously been a junior laboratory technician, a post which she held for two years after leaving school, and which she left because of the opportunity of more money and more interest in a job as a sales representative in cosmetics—a post for which her smart appearance and controlled demeanour were added qualifications. An only child, she was now married to a post-graduate trainee with the National Coal Board. Her husband was an Indian, and they planned to make a home in India when he had completed his training. The second girl had hoped to become a Market Gardener on leaving school, but she was unable to find such work. As a compromise she worked in a fruiterers shop, but had to leave because of a skin infection. At the time of Interview No. 4 she had been in her then job for over four years, as a wholesale shop assistant with some clerical duties. Her position was thus analogous to the girl just mentioned above. The final case is of a bright and lively girl who, unable to obtain work as a children's nurse—her real ambition—had been recommended to try
for a job in a toy shop (because the work would bring her into contact with children). After five years, during which time she had married a skilled shop-fitter, the girl had worked herself up to the responsible position of Senior Sales Assistant with a small staff under her, and the task of buying and stocking for her sub-department.

On closer analysis, then, it emerges that either the girls are less "deviant" than first perusal of the data might suggest, or that there are special features which account, or help to account, for the discrepancies between ability and jobs held. This said, it remains true that the pattern in regard to girls, as with that in regard to youths, is not clear-cut. For girls, indeed, there are two particular additional factors which help to blur any tendency to a direct relationship between Intelligence Grade and occupational category. The first is that the overlap in terms of ability required and perceived attractions of jobs in the three categories is considerable, and especially is this so as between categories 'A' and 'B', where the job of sales assistant in a "high-class" gown shop might be rated higher on several dimensions than that, for example, of hairdresser, whilst other less glamorous shop assistant's jobs could also be more demanding and more appealing to a girl than that of routine office worker. The second factor is the wide-spread tendency for parents, even those who are particularly anxious for their sons to "get on", to take the view that a girl's work is a relatively unimportant matter, and for girls to
take a similar view. In consequence, parents are more inclined to let the girl make her own decision about choice of work, even if that choice is contrary to what they would have wished. Furthermore, girls tend to think of satisfactions in the short-term, before marriage, rather than of long-term policies.

The object of the above analysis has been to demonstrate connections between certain variables which influence a child's aspirations and attainments in regard to employment. The analysis has shown that the majority of respondents were confirmed after five years experience at work in the type and level of occupation to be expected, given the validity of the arguments put forward in Chapter III above, relating to the interplay between home, school and work. Deviations from expected patterns have been explained in terms of the special attributes of individual respondents or of their social environments. Some at least of the variables used are rather crude measures, but the Chapter has served to set the scene, and the arguments propounded will be refined during the course of the ensuing discussion.
CHAPTER VI
THE NATURE AND CONDITIONS OF WORK
AND REACTIONS TO IT

It is not proposed to attempt to give a detailed description
of the content of the work done in the various occupations in
which respondents worked, but it is appropriate to make a few
general points in this context.

The nature of the work done in many of the occupations entered
by secondary modern school leavers may seem fairly obvious and self-
explanaory—the work of the shop assistant, the carpenter or the
'bus conductor, for example. It should be pointed out, however,
that there is in many cases more to a job than the outsider discerns.
I do not have in mind here the sophistications of job analysis in
terms of motor-skills and the alacrities to which specialist assessors,
whether in the field of psychology or of time-and-motion studies,
may draw attention. I mean, merely, that the 'bus conductor, for
example, is responsible for making up his books and for recording
ticket sales at particular points of the route; whilst the shop
assistant may well have stock-taking tasks to perform as well as
serving the customer. In both these examples, too, relationships with the public are an important element of the job, but one which is largely unexplored. Not just in range of function, but in terms of ability and skill required, furthermore, certain jobs are much more demanding than a cursory appraisal might suggest. An example is provided by a furniture removals worker who, whilst declaring himself to be semi-skilled, remarked that "Although you might not think it, there is definitely a right way and a wrong way of moving furniture." A car salesman made a similar point, saying, "Some people can do it, some can't"—although there is "no real training" because "it is not a skill, but just a knack". The youth's point is well made, that particular jobs may call for particular personalities and dispositions—although it is also true that the vast range of semi- and unskilled jobs, particularly, call for no special qualities whatsoever. In this connection it should be noted that certain of the occupational categories used in the present study involve the grouping together of a wide range of work-tasks. "Steel and Engineering", for example, covers routine milling on a capstan lathe—the machine being set up by a skilled man and the operative merely having to turn a few switches and synchronise a few operations; rolling mill work—which often involves heavy manual labour; and highly skilled pattern-making. Within the category of "office work", too, there are considerable differences in the work done by a filing-clerk, for example, compared with that done by a secretary—whilst the contrasts between work in a chain stores
or a multiple stores and work in a small corner-shop are obvious enough.

Although occupations may offer more variety of tasks than is immediately apparent, however, it should be stressed that much of the work done by manual workers, skilled as well as unskilled, is of a routine nature. This, as we will see, often leads to boredom—but it does not always do so.¹ For the fact that work is "easy" and makes so few demands, either mentally or physically, can represent a positive attraction for the un-aspiring young worker. And, more generally, where the expectation in regard to work is that it is necessarily routine, the reaction may take the form of not allowing oneself to get bored—not thinking about work in terms of it being other than something which has to be done. The young worker may then neutralise himself from the work situation, by thinking about other things so far as possible, and just getting on with the job, almost as if he were an automaton. The following are a few examples of routine, repetitive work: a corporation labourer spent each day asphalting and levelling tarmac on the roads; a warehouse worker spent the whole of his time loading and unloading glass sheets into lorries; a storeman described his work as 'Just prattling about doing odd jobs'. Youths in factories stood a greater chance of variety—although not much greater—than girls, for whereas youths might be moved from one machine to another, or be

¹For a further discussion, see Into Work, op.cit., pp.164-169.
given different tasks to perform, girls tended to remain on the same machine or were kept in the same packing or despatch unit, week in, week out, year in and year out, doing routine, repetitive jobs. One such task, calling for rather more involvement than was normally the case for girl factory and warehouse workers, involved using a micrometer screw-gauge to test various thicknesses of wire produced by the firm. A girl "comber" operated a machine which turned out auto-clip combs for conveyor belts in coal mines by the gross. A warehouse worker spent her time glueing cloth for sticking on to cutlery cabinet cases, whilst the task of several other girls was to fasten scissors and knives, endlessly, on to display cards. One girl stood in front of a lemonade filling-machine all day, attending to the bottle labelling part of the operation; her job was to feed the machine with stacks of labels periodically. Rather more variety was afforded a worker in a food manufacturing factory—she had a cycle of three jobs: the first week was spent compressing lemonade crystals into blocks; the second week was spent wrapping-up the blocks; and the third week's task was to pack the blocks into cartons.

Only a small proportion of the respondents had more than a very vague notion about how their particular tasks fitted into the overall production process in the enterprise. Of course, some jobs were fairly self-contained—carpenters, for example, or hair-dressers. But in the occupations in which this was a relevant dimension, it was exceptional for young workers to be cognisant of their place in
the overall organisation. Shop assistants in multiple stores, for example, tended not to know about aspects of retail work such as stock-taking, ordering and invoicing, other than those in which they were directly involved. The place of the young worker in the larger enterprise is of most relevance in regard to factory employment. And here, it was found that, with very few exceptions, respondents had only a vague notion of what went on in their firms or even in the next work shop. A centre-less grinder, for example, said that his was the last task to be performed on a particular tool product before it was inspected. But he did not know what the various stages were before the tool reached him; he thought that "other things" might be done to the product after it left him, and before it arrived at the consumer—but he was not sure about this.

Fourteen of the youths and ten of the girls worked for firms which employed up to ten employees: 23 youths and 22 girls were employed by firms with between ten to one hundred employees; and the remaining 49 youths and 34 girls at work were employed by firms with over one hundred employees. Viewed from a different angle, 20 youths and 11 girls worked on their own (for example, as a postman or a hair-dresser); 22 youths and 22 girls worked in work-groups from one to three other persons (for example, shop assistants in small shops); and 44 youths and 33 girls worked in settings in which there were more than three other people (although they did not necessarily constitute a group in the sense of continuous inter-action between all members).
Roughly two-thirds of the youths were in jobs in which the relationship of the tasks done to the overall activity of the enterprise were less than obvious. Of these, less than one-quarter had a reasonably accurate appreciation of the way in which their work fitted into the overall organisation—8 of the 13 youths concerned were apprentices, 2 were semi-skilled and 3 were in non-manual occupations. Of the 29 apprentices, 19 were in jobs in which the tasks they did were integrated with tasks done by other workers—yet, as has been seen, less than half of these had a reasonable knowledge of the relationship between their work and that of others.

So far as the girls were concerned, 50 of the 66 who were at work at the time of Interview No. 4 were in jobs in which the work was integrated, at however simple a level, with the work of others. But only 4 of these girls had a reasonably clear picture of the overall working of the production or service process, and of their place in it. The remainder, as with the majority of youths, had never given much, or any, thought to the matter—it had not occurred to them to do so.
Relationships With Immediate "Bosses".

The work situation varies considerably from one occupation and/or job to another, of course: the relationships of a shop assistant in a corner-stores to his immediate boss, the proprietor of the shop, is obviously of a different order from that of an apprentice fitter operating a machine in a factory in which there are ten thousand employees of various skills, statuses and functions. In the first example, the boss/employee relationship may resemble that between a parent and a child (it by no means always does) with an emphasis upon effectivity: in the latter, whilst there may be a "pocket" of friendly relationships between the young worker and his immediate superior, this occurs within an overall bureaucratic context which is governed by economic criteria and the efficient running of the organisation—the emphasis is upon the young worker as a unit of production rather than as a human being. Of course, there are many variations within these two extremes. Some occupations are such as to accord a substantial amount of independence to individuals within the overall constraints of the job. Whilst a van-delivery driver is bound to certain tasks, for example, he may have considerable discretion in the order and pace at which he performs them, and he is not subject to constant scrutiny from above. It could be, however, that in such jobs, where a taste for independence is induced, but only partially satisfied, there is a greater degree of alienation
than in jobs where freedom of action is more constricted.¹ This said, some broad generalisations may be attempted in regard to the relationships between young workers and their "immediate bosses"—by this term I mean the charge-hand, foreman, supervisor or office manager—people, that is, who are responsible for giving orders and who have reasonably close contact with the young worker.

The first point to note is that in the majority of cases contact, other than for the giving and receiving of orders, is slight. The reluctance of respondents to seek advice about their careers with bosses at work represents one facet of this.² Contact tends to be related directly to the work task, then, with the possibility of some light bantering or joking—especially in the case of male supervisors vis-à-vis female operatives or clerks. It is not possible to say here how the immediate bosses view the situation—that would constitute another research topic. But in regard to the respondents, the basic premise of many would seem to be that all bosses, whether high ranking or immediate (although perhaps more emphatically the former) are to be looked upon with suspicion—as a machine operator said, "I dislike the gaffers. Well, that's natural isn't it!" The "naturalness" refers to the conviction, or recognition—felt rather than thought-out—of a difference of interest as between the "ordinary working man" and the employer and his lieutenants.

²See below.
Given this basic premise, there were relatively few major expressions of dissatisfaction about bosses—the attitude was that it is a fact of life that one is in opposition to the boss, but, having said this, one has to live with him. There was, that is to say, an accepted pattern of authority—accepted intuitively, rather than rationally, and without much thought at all. The pattern was recognised by young workers as appropriately pertaining to the particular occupations and work situations in which they were involved. Following from this, the important thing was for the pattern, once accepted, not to be disturbed; the "good" boss was, then, one who adhered to the accepted "rules of the game"—like the foreman in a factory of whom the respondent said, "He's alright, you play fair with him and he'll play fair with you". Some firm discipline was recognised as "only to be expected" and essential to the running of the enterprise—as an engineering apprentice remarked of his chargehand, "He's strict, but that's his job, I suppose".

But as a reciprocal to the acceptance of the need for discipline, and the toleration of strictness, there was an emphasis upon the need for "fair play"—one manager, for example, was applauded as being a "very fair man", a man, that is, who did not abuse his position. Research has shown that both management and employees have concepts of what constitutes reasonable behaviour by the other, and expectations in regard to each other derive from these concepts. A.W. Gouldner has shown that expectations are the product not just
of the formal, contractual terms of employment, but are the outcome, also, of informal pressures and influences. The "official" terms are, in fact, amended and modified by the "indulgence" pattern to which the informal employer/employee relationships give rise. So that expectations in regard to behaviour have reference to this indulgence pattern in addition to, or even rather than, the formal contractual terms of employment. The set of expectations which obtain in a particular firm would seem to derive from a variety of factors which include not just the "internal" history of the firm or industry, but also features of the social backgrounds of the employees—features which are imported into the work place. In general terms, young workers may be said to take to work with them some notion as to the differences between the "employer class" and the "employee class" in the wider society. And whilst there may be an element of deference by the employee to the employer, if the latter makes demands—either in terms of the amount of work done or in terms of the status to be accorded him—which are in excess of what are regarded by the worker as reasonable (if, that is, the basis of the legitimacy of the deference is removed) then conflict is likely to develop. But the area of toleration or indulgence is fairly well recognised on both sides—managerial incursions of it tend to be slight, and felt as pin-pricks rather than as threats to the overall situation. The set of expectations is so implanted
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and accepted by the majority, indeed, that workers themselves may condemn other workers' complaints or actions if they feel that they are going beyond what is reasonable and justifiable—if, that is, they are being unfair. The importance of this indulgence pattern is signified in the remarks of an apprentice who said that his boss was "a little bit keen" ("keen" in the sense of sharpness, not enthusiasm): the youth meant that the boss tried to ensure too close an adherence to the "formal" conditions and code of behaviour for employees. The complaint was that it is not right, or just, that workers should be made to comply rigidly with their stated duties, and the boss was, clearly, treading a dangerous path: the respondent, interestingly, explained the situation in terms of the newness of the boss in his post—doubtless he would in due course come to recognise the actual limits imposed in the work situation upon his formal powers, and would then become less "keen" and could even turn out to be a "good" boss.

Such expressions of active dislike of immediate bosses as there were can be understood, in part at least, by reference to the boss's presumed breach of what the worker thought he could legitimately expect of him—the breach took various forms, such as too strict adherence to hours, meal-break times, output norms and so on. There were also breaches of a different order—for example, bosses were not just "distant" but "aloof" or even "rude","disdainful" and "inconsiderate". Or bosses might impose too much in terms of personal relations—by requiring employees to put up with displays of
temper, moodiness or excessive familiarity. Thus, whilst one student nurse thought that her matron was "very nice and understanding", another found hers to be "like starched lace". The latter matron did not meet the expected criterion of being "human", that is. A warehouseman similarly complained that his boss was "a fiend for statistics—his workers are just numbers, one, two, three, to him".

Respondents felt that they were entitled not to have to put up with extremes in bosses—a rapid and seemingly irrational shift of mood from "pleasant" to "horrible", for example, or extreme verbosity or the opposite. Extreme meanness ("He won't part with a farthing") was another deficiency in a boss: this was seen as being symbolic of a lack of recognition of common human identity, or, put another way, as an insistence by the boss upon difference and superiority, since workers normally are not so mean in money matters, and the contexts in which the meanness occurs are usually such that a contribution would manifest goodwill and, in some sense, solidarity, as with a parting gift, for example, or a marriage gift for an employee or participation in a Christmas Sweep-stake.

Other examples of bosses who fell short of what respondents thought could reasonably be expected had reference to exaggerated claims for respect. A labourer protested that his foreman "likes everyone to bow under him": the respondent refused to do this, however, remarking that "You have to stand up for your rights". A girl cost clerk, too, said that bosses "sometimes think a lot of themselves, think they
are 'it'. As a rather more extreme example—at least, one that was posed in distinctly more extreme language—a girl factory worker declared that her foreman was known as "Little Hitler" because of his looks, and "because he doesn't keep his mouth shut and expects everyone to fall on his knees to him". Another labourer, too, said that his relations with his foreman were terrible. "It's as if you are back in the war when he tells you what to do."

The assumed or demonstrated lack of competence of persons in authority was also an important source of friction—and represents another way in which employers may be deemed to be failing to fulfil properly their part of the bargain; the employee feels that he is entitled to expect a reasonable degree of competence in his boss. It is not just that the worker has to do more work, or put more effort into it, then would be the case if the boss were competent, but that the basis of the work relationship is not fulfilled. Furthermore, an incompetent boss stirs up feelings of the underlying unfairness, in terms of inequality as between the "employer class" and the "employee class" which, it was suggested above, remain latent normally. One acceptable basis of legitimacy for the authority structure at work, and hence one reason for accepting, however reluctantly, a low position in it, is the special expertise or competence of those in charge. If they are patently lacking in such qualities, the whole question of worker-employer relationships and, by implication, of worker class and employer class in the
broader framework of society, comes up for challenge again. A shop assistant thus castigated her manager as "a supercilious, pompous idiot". Whilst a comptometer operator complained that the man in charge of the office "interferes with the paper work, prevents the operators from working systematically and messes things up, generally" and this, all because "he doesn't know how things really go on—he has never learnt how to operate a comptometer machine". It was all the more galling for the young worker when, as in several instances, he had to expend energy on "covering up" for a supervisor. This tried the loyalty overmuch—and it represented a situation in which the ultimate employer, or boss, was, unknowingly but nonetheless unjustly, extending his expectations of the young worker beyond what could be regarded as reasonable. A further example of the employer making exaggerated demands relates to a typist who said that her boss was "in his second childhood—he's 78: he mopes now and then, when he feels people are not nice to him. We have to treat him with care." There were, indeed, several cases in which annoyance was expressed in regard to older people who were bosses—people who were "getting beyond it". The annoyance was tempered in some cases by a sympathy, or at least some understanding of the position. This charitable disposition seemed to be related to a recognition, in the back of the mind, that in the sort of work concerned—semi-or unskilled manual work especially—this is the inexorable path that life holds in store for the respondents, too. One day they would be nearing retiring age, not much
further on then they were now, with little to look forward to, but finding work less easy because of failing faculties and confidence. Thus a painter/decorator said of his foreman that he was "too moody" and went on to explain that "He thinks he’s on his way out, so he drinks." And a labourer on road repair work said of his ganger that "he whittles" (i.e. complains and worries): "He is almost 65, and he is worried in case he gets sacked before he reaches 68, when he would get a special pension for fifteen years service with the corporation. We can't do anything right, he has to do it all himself." The respondent could see the difficulties of the ganger's position, and had some sympathy for it. He could also see that he might be similarly placed himself, in due course. But, at the age of twenty years, he could permit himself some scorn that the ganger had succumbed so completely to the system.

Competence in a boss, by contrast, was welcomed and even admired, but it could be pushed too far—so that the employee was afforded no scope for initiative or interest. A machinist thus said of his foreman that "he's a clever bloke, too clever, cocky! you can't tell him anything". With some bosses, too, it was not just that they were competent at their work: they did have skill and authority in regard to work tasks, but they were not content with this. They attempted to spill over their expertise and their power to areas in which there was no legitimation for them—to areas such as politics, religion, football, sex, "the lot" ("they know it all, or they think that they do"). Their pretensions and insistence on knowledge superior
to that of the young worker represented to him an intrusion into a part of his life which the employer was not paying him to sell.

It was suggested above that the definition of a "good" or a "bad" boss was in terms of a pattern of behaviour which could reasonably be expected by employers of employees, and vice versa. In addition, some clashes between employers and employees derived not so much from the work setting as from clashes of individual personality—and these were recognised by the respondents as such. Thus, one typist said in regard to her relationship with the typing pool superintendent that "We don't get on with each other—it's on account of our both having red hair" (meaning, that is, the fiery temperament commonly associated with this). It should be reiterated here that the concern is with the young worker's perceptions of the situation, and with an explanation for them. No doubt many young workers default in regard to their part of the informal contract, do not entirely fulfil their obligations and the legitimate expectations held of them by employers and bosses, and thus give just cause for grievance to them.

Complementary to the definitions of "bad" bosses were the qualities which were held to constitute a "good" boss. These were bosses who fulfilled their part of the employment contract adequately or even generously—but not overwhelmingly, to the point of intrusion upon the legitimate privacy (and desired reserve of justification for grievance?) of the young worker. The employer/employee
relationship needed to be sustained, and not over-ridden by kindly bosses who would be deemed to have some ulterior motive for their excessive beneficence. One millhand described his foreman as "a good bloke" and explained that "He is easy-going. He lets his men get on with the job and doesn't bother them." The importance of being allowed some measure of independence and some scope for initiative is reflected in this appraisal—and also important was the implicit recognition accorded by the boss of the young worker's ability to do the job without overmuch supervision. A labourer similarly referred to his "good gaffer", who "tells you what to do and leaves you to get on with it". What was appreciated here was not just conformity by the boss to a code of expectations, but the provision by him for the possibility of positive satisfaction in work, through the exercise of initiative and independence. Dignity in work was appreciated: an electrician, for example, said of his foreman, "Whatever he says, goes—but he talks to you as men, not underdogs."

Special competence in work was also admired in a boss, especially if he had acquired it against the odds—in the sense of having overcome a disadvantageous family or social background—and the more so if the boss had not allowed his success to "go to his head". Thus an apprentice said of his chargehand that he "worked his way up from an apprenticeship, and knows what's what". Competence as an instructor, too, was highly regarded by young workers who were keen to learn—a nurse said of the surgeon superintendent that "he
is a great help. He takes the lectures for the nurses, and when doing the rounds of the wards he is always careful to explain things to you. He is very good indeed... "Practical experience was especially valued by youths in skilled manual work—a steel worker apprentice respected his chargehand, saying, "he is old, and therefore doesn't know much of the theory, but he has had plenty of practical experience and knows the job through and through." Another element in a "good" immediate boss was his ability and inclination to maintain the appropriate balance in obligations and duties as between workers and higher management. A builder, for example, said in reference to his foreman, "he is a good bloke, not forever hounding you, and he'll stand by you against the management". The converse of this was represented in several examples of dislike, and even scorn, for foremen and supervisors who had "worked their way up" but in the process had "gone over to the management camp": these were regarded by respondents as traitors and deserters. An engineering apprentice said of his supervisor, "He's only just started this job; he used to be alright when he was one of us engineers, but he crawls to the gaffers now."

There was a clear tendency for girls to be critical of women bosses—this is in conformity with the conclusions of a study of supervision in industry which suggests that women supervisors are not popular amongst female labour, partly because of the traditional dominance by men, partly because women suspect female supervisors of being unfair and of basing their actions upon personal feelings
rather than upon the relevant factors in the work situation. Indeed, it could be argued that women and girls, by virtue of their primary affiliation to domestic, or at least non-work involvements (e.g. courtship, leisure activities, having babies) tend not to assume sufficiently the norms and values which the work situation calls for, and, rather, base their attitudes and actions upon non-work considerations. A female boss is treated, then, not in accordance with her expertise or authority in regard to the work setting, but by reference to the fact that she is getting on in years as a spinster. This matter will be touched upon again below. Girls wanted their bosses to be "understanding" and they found that men were more inclined to this than (normally) older women bosses. As one girl said: "Men understand you more than women. They listen to you more if you have a problem". Ironically, it would seem that it is often not, as the study cited above would seem to suggest, that women bosses fail to stick to the rules or criteria of the work setting but that they do adhere to them (having become de-womanised, as it were, in their role at work), whilst the expectation or hope of the young woman worker is that bosses will not abide rigidly by the "book", but will base their actions upon kindly personal feelings and "understanding", rather than upon the relevant criteria of the work situation. One facet of the tendency of girls
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to import "non-work" considerations into the work setting is revealed in the reverence in which certain of them held their male bosses, whom they admired in a romantic way, seeing them as "handsome" and "so kind"; the day could be got through in a dream, the work situation per se almost forgotten in the glow deriving from proximity to such a man.

The thesis being put forward here, then, is that specific likes and dislikes in regard to the immediate boss, and the complex of relationships with him, may be understood in terms of a tacit understanding of a code of behaviour, rights, and obligations. The precise definition of the code, its boundaries and depths, are tested by reference to particular actions on the part of the boss or the worker—and in this sense is constantly under review. The code doubtless varies in content, though probably not substantially in principle, from one occupation to another and in accordance with size of firm, type of organisation, and technological contrasts: and it is seen not as a product merely of the work-place, but in part, too, as a reflection or resolution in each particular case of socio-economic factors "external" to the place of employment and of its organisational structure—the social composition of the management and of the labour force, for example, and the values which they bring to the work-place from the wider social setting. Thus, the code which obtains as between foreman and factory-bench worker is dependent upon, or has reference to, the working class background and the values which both share. And from awareness of this code come notions of "fairness" and,
especially, of the duty of the foreman to be on the side of the worker against the management, if it comes to the crux. In non-manual work the code of expectations tends to be heavily dominated by notions of politeness which are imported from the middle class background of the bosses and the middle or upper working class backgrounds of the young worker. Thus a policeman said of his superintendent, that he was "a decent sort, a Scoutmaster, and all that, you know". I have indicated that in particular situations bosses and employees may define differently the code of expectations, with consequent friction. But normally there is an agreement, untabulated and unspoken, as to what might reasonably be expected on either side. If there is disagreement in regard to the code of expectations—if employer and employee define the code differently, then there may be strike action, either official or unofficial. The dispute, or difference, might relate not to the body of workers as a whole, however, but to particular individuals. In such cases it is likely either that the worker will leave the firm Voluntarily, or that he will be dismissed. Of course, a young worker may take to the work-setting a false set of expectations, and may be unable to reconcile them with what he actually finds there. A middle class youth who was unable to stand the swearing and generally rough demeanour of the boss on the factory floor provides one example. Another relates to a working class girl who found the particular brand of politeness,

speech and appearance which obtained in the office work which she entered foreign to her, and intolerable. She left her job, as did the youth his. The employer/employee relationship can only persist, then, if there is basic agreement as to the nature of the game that is being played, and as to its rules.

It is particularly interesting that whereas criticism of bosses at the stage of Interview No. 3 (one year after the respondents had started work), tended to be posed on personal terms, by the time of Interview No. 4 they tended to be analysed, or thought of, in terms of structural considerations—that is, to relationships between bosses and employees (of "boss class" and "working class") within and outwith the firm. This is suggestive of a process of adjustment accomplished over the first five years in employment whereby the young worker gradually identifies himself more and more with a body of workers with similar interests. This feature was, indeed, more marked in regard to respondents who were involved in semi- and unskilled employment, and skilled respondents working in large firms, such as steel works. It was less evident in skilled workers employed in smaller firms and in non-manual workers, who tended to see their relationships with the immediate bosses as being on an equal footing, with goodwill on both sides.

Contact between the respondents and top level bosses or employers in the large firms was slight, and in many cases did not occur at all. If there was contact, it tended to result in exaggerated approval ("He's ever so clever: must be to run a place this size"), or
exaggerated repudiation ("He's big-headed and knows nothing, and is always asking ridiculous questions of the men and giving corny advice: he wouldn't be here if it wasn't for his father's money"). In principle, it would seem, if upper level bosses were thought about at all (and they rarely were) it was with suspicion and watchfulness: their motives were always suspect, and they were accorded the worst of the benefit of any doubt—as one millhand put it, "The Managing Director soft-soaps the union man, but the union man sees through it."

One facet of the tendency to look upon the work situation as one in which employers (including "bosses") are in opposition to the (young) worker is the reluctance of the respondents to seek advice or even information from people in authority at work as to their prospects and plans. Only 6 youths and 5 girls said that they would propose to discuss a possible change of job with their immediate boss or with someone at a higher level. In some of the larger firms in which respondents were employed, there were personnel officers with whom, ostensibly, young workers could discuss their position, to whom they could take their grievances, and from whom they could seek advice. There was no case in which a respondent availed himself of this facility. Part of the reason is that some respondents were unaware that the facility existed—and it could be that personnel departments in the large firms tend to become over-bureaucratised, and concerned with records, selection tests and annual reports rather than with promoting personal contacts with young workers. But the
main point here is that young workers tended not to think in terms of discussing personal matters with anyone in authority at work—as one youth said, "There is a Personnel Officer, but I wouldn't go to him!" Where no formal personnel machinery existed, respondents did not seek advice from a foreman or a manager—even when they had real worries or doubts about their conditions of service. They were, indeed, conscious of sanctions against consulting anyone in authority at work—several respondents pointed to a lack of confidentiality, one youth remarking that "You can't say anything to anyone without it spreading all over the works." There was, furthermore, the danger that other workers would regard too close a contact with the boss as disloyalty—the worker could then appear as a "bosses' man", some sort of agent concerned to cause trouble for the workers, or at least a person of dubious intentions: as one factory worker put it, "You dare not talk to the boss—if you go near him, too many stories get about."

There was, further, an appreciation that the relationships between boss and worker are normally restricted to matters of work tasks. The lack of contact is not, that is, just a matter of bad intentions, but of different preconceptions, interests and starting points as between management and labour. So that a shorthand typist who admired her manager for his good memory and general competence nevertheless said that it would be of no use to try to discuss personal matters to do with her career with him, because "he doesn't relate". Boss and employee spoke, and lived, different languages,
as it were, associated with and deriving from different statuses and functions within and outwith the firm. In the few cases in which youths and girls said they would seek advice from someone in authority at work, the person concerned was particularly friendly, and (as in nursing) such contact was well established. Alternatively, the person was sufficiently close in status to the young worker, and of the appropriate demeanour for the consultation to be on more or less equal terms—thus a youth who said that he would turn to his formeman for advice, explained "He is sociable, and you see him out at night in the pubs, and he'll always talk to you, and buy a round." He was, as the respondent put it, "one of us".

In regard to broader issues than that of seeking advice or information on the personal level, there was a similar reluctance to approach the boss, whether in large firms or small. In the large firms, especially, such matters as grievances over conditions were thought to appropriately left to the formal negotiating machinery. And although often, it would seem, minor grievances were not taken up by trade unions or shop stewards, young workers preferred to put up with a grievance rather than take action outwith the formal machinery. There were exceptions to this; a notable example relates to a warehouse worker in a small firm, who found when he started the job that it was "freezing". So he asked the Union man if some heating could be provided. Nothing transpired, and he therefore went to the Managing Director, with the result that infra-red heating was installed within two days. But, in principle, the feeling of the young workers
was that either joint action should be taken or no action at all. Relationships between bosses and workers, it was thought, especially those which patently and explicitly had reference to material conditions and rewards for labour, should be kept on a contractual basis, and personal factors or perspectives or involvements should not intrude. As a girl warehouse worker said, "One doesn't complain as an individual. If one has a complaint, and it is backed by everyone else, the motto is 'stick together.'" Failure to contact bosses was also associated, however, with a general cynicism as to the personal position of the working man; the employer, it was thought, cares nothing for the comfort of the worker. Thus an apprentice engineer said, "You could talk to the boss, but it wouldn't get you very far."

Respondents' Views on Efficiency of Organisation at Work

It was noted above that there was widespread ignorance amongst young workers as to the relationship between the particular work task which they performed themselves and other operations in the productive process. Complementary to this was an obvious lack of knowledge about the way in which the firms for which they worked were organised. There were a few exceptions to this general rule—such as a shop assistant in a co-operative stores who had learnt a good deal at Day Release Classes about business organisation, a private secretary employed by the National Coal Board, whose work entailed a knowledge
of the administrative structure, and a skilled machine-operator whose keenness on trade union matters had led him to acquire a knowledge of the way in which his firm was organised. But, for the most part, the extent of knowledge was confined to an awareness of the immediate superiors who gave orders and a vague notion that there were persons superior to the immediate bosses, who gave orders to them.

Despite this general lack of knowledge about the organisational structure of the enterprise in which they were engaged, however, some respondents did react to the way in which the organisation impinged upon them, and some hazarded opinions as to the general efficiency of the way in which the firm was organised. Without pretending to any detailed knowledge as to the working of the firm, that is, they were prepared to comment upon the net outcome in terms of success or failure, as they saw it. The comments, elicited in response to the question, "What do you think of the way things are run where you work?" are of interest mainly for the light which they throw upon the respondents' general attitudes to employment, and the criteria which they employ in assessing the merits or demerits of employers, in the broad sense of the overall organisation rather than of particular individual bosses, and as distinct from the matters just discussed relating to the code of expectations (although, of course, efficiency of the enterprise as assessed by the young worker can, as has been seen, be an important element in that code). Again the reminder should be given that the types and sizes of the firms concerned varied considerably: exhaustive analyses are not possible
here, therefore, and the following tends to be impressionistic. Further, the concern is not to deal with questions of the efficiency of British management practice, but to make some assessment of young workers' perceptions of the efficiency of the organisations in which they were employed.

The bulk of the respondents replied to the question in phrases such as "alright" and "not so bad". Most of them had given little or no thought to the matter, but some were expressing in this way a positive appraisal, that their firms were reasonably efficient. Those who expatiated, then, tended to be young workers who were critical of the running of their firm. A few respondents complained that their firms were too efficient for their liking. Thus a policeman referred to the military character of the organisation of the force, remarking that it was "too bloody efficient, sometimes"—acceptable and reasonable demands as to discipline were sometimes exceeded, that is, in the interests of super-efficiency. The policeman, at least, permitted himself the freedom of criticism: this was not so with a naval rating, who illustrated the efficiency of the service by replying to the question with the ejaculation, "Are you kidding?" His point was that, as a serviceman, he was immersed in his rank, and there was no issue, for him, as to the overall organisation—as a serviceman, you do as you are told, without thinking about it.

But the general consensus of those who did express views was that the organisation of their firms was poor—and a few extrapolated
from this to a general condemnation of all firms, especially large ones: there were strong undertones of scorn for the alleged "red tape" associated with bureaucracy. An engineer, for example, said that in general his firm was "badly managed", and added that "like most firms, the organisation is cock-eyed". A shorthand typist in a large steelworks said that things there were "terrible"—"The people in charge don't know what's going on, or at least that's the impression they give." A railway employee said, "It's hopeless, the organisation just isn't there." Whilst a factory worker argued that "It's a question of 'too many cooks': too many people in charge and not enough to do the actual work." Government and local authority employers were subject to particularly strong criticism—an apprentice in a government factory said of the organisation at work that it was "terribly lack-a-daisical, typically Government". He added, "There is a sense of apathy at the top conveyed to employees. A lot of the interest in the work has been knocked out of it for me because of this." A corporation labourer put forward a similar verdict, and added, "The corporation is not like a private firm that has to show a profit. Some jobs are done at grotesque parsimony and others with tax wastage." (The vocabulary is untypical; the phrase had probably been picked up from somewhere). Another labourer, who was employed on road mending by the City Engineer's Department, said that the organisation was "not much cop", and went on to say, "They go the long way around and waste a lot of time, and they hire machines when it would be cheaper to buy them."
One theme which was prominent in criticism of organisation at work referred not to direct aspects of production, but to the seeming inability of the management to pick out its reliable and loyal employees and reject the inefficient and uncaring ones. A warehouse worker, whose task was to despatch goods, complained that "There are lots of things going on that the management don't know about which make it inefficient: slacking, and fiddling". Management's toleration, or unawareness, of this sort of thing gave rise to contempt in the young workers. Unawareness suggested inefficiency, toleration suggested that managers themselves were slackers and cheaters or that they were making so much money out of the workers that they did not have to worry about minor losses. Implicit in such comments by the respondents was a notion of the importance of good morals amongst workers, and an impatience of employers' apparent rejection of this. A furniture removals worker said, for example, "The organisation is bad, there is a lot of favouritism and rumours about people getting different wages." A steelworker, too, argued the same sort of point, saying of the management that "they were a bit rough. They don't really care about employees as individuals as long as the work is done. They don't know, or don't seem to care, who their good workers are, and who the bad ones". A rolling mill operative said, "The workers aren't respected: it's no way to treat them, as if they can't be trusted with a job." The organisation in his case was such as to leave no scope for independence or initiative, and the firm seemed
oblivious to the detrimental effects of this. An apprentice steel-worker said: "They have an entirely wrong approach to matters of employment. They do not allow the younger workers to come fully to grips with a job, but shift them around so that they become too much jacks-of-all-trades". His claim was that the firm ought to give more thought to such matters, and more consideration to the outcome of its policy decisions: as he saw the position, the failure to do so was indicative not of ill-will or unconcern by management, but of their bad organisation.

A further criticism of organisation related to the alleged failure to modernise—this probably represented the impatience of the young, in part, and an ignorance of the mechanics and finances attached to replacing capital equipment: but it seemed also to mark a disgruntlement at employers' attitudes towards change in general as distinct from their actual programmes for obsolescence. Thus, a milling machine operator considered that, as in the case of his own firm, "The majority of firms in Sheffield use out-of-date machines and methods—for old peope won't give way to new ideas in factories today." This comment was echoed by a printing apprentice, who said of his firm that it was "out-of-date—very much so. The old boy who owns it is a self-made man with a 'things have always been done this way and always will be' attitude".

From the comments and criticisms of the respondents, certain conclusions may be drawn. The first is that the majority of youths
and girls thought little or not at all about the organisation of the firm for which they worked, except within the narrow limits of their relationships with immediate bosses. But, secondly, there is a substantial number of young workers—preponderately youths—who do think about such matters. Their responses to the question as to the way in which "things were run" in their firms indicate some of the problems which young workers face in adjusting themselves to employment—accommodating themselves to inefficiency, favouritism, managerial complacency and unconcern for the morale of employees, for example. Of course, as was stressed above, many school leavers did not expect other than this, but for some, at least, (as the above comments illustrate) the extent of the inefficiency and unconcern came as a surprise, and to others the existence of these features was both unexpected and off-putting—their expectations about work were confuted.

Inefficient organisation and associated favouritism or disregard of slack and irresponsible workers, was seized upon by some young workers as justification for more extensive grievances about their place in society: the particular firm which employed them became a scapegoat for all their woes and for their lack of success relative to their contemporaries at school—they were enabled, as it were, to "blame the system". But there are other aspects. The young worker feels that his own particular efforts are devalued in a context in which overall inefficiency and down-right slacking are tolerated, and that his own qualities of keenness and loyalty are disparaged—
thrown in his face—if obviously inefficient workers are kept in the firm's employ. Beyond this, there would seem to be a compensatory satisfaction for doing otherwise dull, routine work, if the work is being done within an efficient setting, and if productivity is known to be high. The worker is enabled to feel that he is part of an efficient process, and that his contribution is of importance even though, in isolation, the tasks which he performs are repetitive and may appear to be trivial. There is, too, a pride to be derived from being associated with a firm which is known to be highly regarded by other workers, for the scope of its work and for the efficiency of its organisation: just as certain young workers gained satisfaction from this fact, others were disappointed that their own firms were deficient in this respect.

A further aspect of respondents' comments about faulty organisation at work is that they indicate the resentment of certain young workers at finding themselves, by virtue of the nature of their home and social background and the education which they have received, in inferior positions to those who organise the firm's activities—inferior not just in the work setting but in terms of extra-work features, too, in regard generally to life-chances and life-styles. And yet, the superiors, when it came to the practical test, were apparently, sometimes obviously, not so superior in terms of skill or organisational ability: at least, their inefficiency indicated that they were not the paragons which their superior rewards, monetary or otherwise, would seem to imply (there would be some justification
of the differential rewards if the bosses were efficient). Young workers, in making such an appraisal, may think in terms of injustice: but this was not always the case, and some registered it unemotionally as yet another inconsistency, one of many which they had noted in society and which they were unable to fathom. By extension, the apparent inefficiency of the organisation called into question for some respondents the whole nature of British society, with capitalist enterprises and governmental bureaucracy standing as giants against which the poorly armed, secondary modern educated workers are called to pit their strength: in such circumstances, while seemed to them to be the only tactic, and their concern at work was to get as much out of it as they could, and to put as little into it as they were able to "get away with"—for that, as they saw it, was what everyone else at work, bosses included, did.

Relationships With Other Employees

The content of relationships with other people at work—other "ordinary workers", that is, as distinct from bosses—varied from very close friendship to scarcely veiled antagonism. In the discussion of reasons for job changing it will be seen that dislike of fellow workers was an important reason for some respondents changing jobs and a supporting reason for others. The fact that the respondents
worked in firms of varying size has already been noted, and
variations in the size of the work groups and the nature of the
tasks which they did—whether in common or as complementary to
each other—have also been recorded. These differences have
implications for the quality of the relationships between workers
at the "informal" level.¹ There is not the appropriate data from
the present study to explore such matters, and the present dis-
cussion is of a more general order, concerned to illustrate broad
categories of relationships as they obtained in regard to the young
workers.

Approaching one-third of both youths and girls at work spent some
time out of working hours with a person or group of people with whom
they worked (27/86 youths and 20/66 girls at work). Having made this
point, it is important to put it in perspective by pointing out,
firstly, that the majority of youths and girls spent no time at all,
outside of work, in the company of fellow workers—that is, in
leisure activities as distinct from travelling to work on the same
bus, for example. Furthermore, in the bulk of the instances of
youths who spent some time with fellow workers, the amount of time
was small—restricted, perhaps, to a drink in the local works pub
on pay day: this contact could appropriately be regarded as a small
extension of the work orientation into non-work hours: working

¹ cf., for example, G.C. Homans, The Human Group, Routledge and
clothes were worn, conversations began at work were continued, and the proceedings were recognised, it would seem, as being confined in their scope, restricted in the topics of conversation that were acceptable, circumscribed as to the degree of familiarity which would be tolerated, and limited in the mutual obligations which members of the group deemed to derive from the fact of coming together in leisure time. Of course, there were some cases of strong friendships as between youths at work, where much of the leisure time was spent together, at evenings and at weekends—but this was so in only a handful of cases. The most notable exception was a policeman, who mixed with other policemen for tennis and varied social activities: the constraints of this type of employment were at the root of this closeness with other fellow workers, the respondents remarking that "a policeman's only friend is a policeman".

The same broad arguments may be applied with regard to girls, save that, with girls, the emphasis was rather more upon regular joint leisure activities—going to the cinema together, for example, or to a dance. Leisure activities pursued together with fellow workers will be referred to again below. Here the important point to note is that there is a playback from such leisure involvements to the work situation itself: at the most obvious level, for example, firm friendship in out-of-work hours can be conducive to greater satisfaction during work hours themselves, since they are spent in company, or in contact, with a friend. The friendships
with fellow workers, just discussed, mostly relate to workers of the same sex. There were some mixed-sex friendships at work, and several respondents were courting friends from work, whilst others had married people whom they had met at work. But by no means all work-places provide opportunities for meetings between members of opposite sexes—and certain places of employment are almost exclusively one-sex. At an age when thoughts are turning increasingly to the opposite sex, the composition of the labour force has an obvious bearing on the chances of friendships developing at work. In many firms in which youths and girls are employed, there is segregation of the sexes: office girls in a large factory, for example, not only tend to be in a minority, but are also, usually, inaccessible—cut off by physical barriers from the factory floor, and by social barriers. The machine operator who presumes to aspire so high encounters many obstacles, then. (There is a discussion of courtship and marriage below).

One reason why the number and strength of friendships with others at work were fairly slight was that the opportunity simply was not there for those working in small firms. Another was that, often, fellow workers came from different parts of town, and to meet for a "proper" leisure activity (that is, after having travelled home, eaten and washed and changed into leisure clothes) would have been difficult and time-consuming. But probably a more important reason, and one of a different order, was the tendency for workers to want to keep work separate from leisure activities. When they had
finished in the evenings and at weekends, they wanted to forget about work altogether. People met at work were looked upon as fellow workmen—people in the same boat, as it were—rather than as potential friends and collaborators in the enjoyment of hours away from work. What respondents wanted to do when work was over was to forget about it—not have workmates around to remind them of it, no matter how pleasant they might be whilst at work: as one youth said, "Life would become monotonous if you were with the same people all the time." That this argument applies less strongly in regard to girls could be taken as symptomatic of the more general tendency for work to have distinctive meaning for girls as compared with youths, girls tending to carry over, or to attempt to do so, personal considerations and criteria applicable to the non-work setting into the work situation. This aspect will be referred to again. One special case that may be mentioned here is that of a girl factory worker who found herself in a lower status job than she had aspired to—she said that she did not mix with the other girls in out-of-work hours because "they aren't the same type, and show you up a bit when you are out—they are rather coarse and rowdy".

An additional sign of the tendency to dissociate the work and non-work sectors of life was the reluctance of respondents to discuss their plans, about changing jobs for example, with people at work, or to seek advice on matters of work in general. "Reluctance" is not the appropriate word in regard to many cases, indeed. It simply did not occur to respondents that they might disclose this
"private" part of their lives to fellow workers—although they might well talk about it with "real friends". There were a few more complicated instances, in which the very thought of such discussions was intolerable—as with a labourer who declared, "I wouldn't want advice from anyone about anything" and least of all from the other men at work who, he indicated, were patently in no better position so far as work was concerned than he—who were they to give advice, for they, too, were at the bottom of the "heap". For his own pride, this respondent felt the need to dissociate himself from his fellow workers.

Having outlined the limitations upon friendships with people at work, outside of working hours, it is now possible to make a more adequate appraisal of relationships as they occurred within the work setting. One point to bear in mind here, and a point which makes for further discrimination as between youths and girls, is that the age-ranges of fellow workers varied considerably—but that in many of the firms in which respondents, especially youths, were employed, fellow workers were aged anything between 15 and 65 years or more. One youth, pointing out this fact, remarked that he "got on well with all of them". And it would seem that age differences although not important were of lesser importance for youths at work than for girls—at any rate, this was the case by the time the youths had reached the age of eighteen years or so, although prior to this some did have difficulties in their relationships with older men. Analysis
at the stage of Interview No.3 did not suggest that such difficulty was a marked feature, however.\footnote{cf. Home, School and Work, op.cit.} There was some evidence to the contrary—a motor mechanic, for example, was enthusiastic in saying that his fellow workers were "smashing, mostly young".\footnote{The father of another respondent, himself a factory worker like his son, remarked that "Older men spoil many of the younger workers by their attitudes and by their everlasting criticism of the young ones' social life. Older workers like to harp back to the bad old days, and think that the younger generation should have a tougher time." But the views of this father were not echoed in the appraisals of the bulk of the male respondents.}

With girls, on the other hand, there are often sharper divisions as between the different age groups at work. Indeed, this is another facet of the tendency of girls and women to transport into the work setting non-work features. There tend to be, with girls and women, clear-cut differences in interests, activities and capabilities in reference to non-work matters, which separate old from middle-aged, and middle-aged from young; cutting across the age differences are other differentials—one could almost say barriers—in regard to marital status and stage in the domestic cycle—married and unmarried, with several children, one child, or none at all. So fine are the distinctions made by girls, indeed, that it would seem that the fact of engagement is capable in some circumstances of affecting relationship at work—as in an office where the older woman, the younger married women, the engaged girls and the single, unattached girls...
form identifiably separate groups. Between girls and women in the various categories there is, not infrequently, the evidence would suggest, misunderstanding, lack of understanding, jealousy and rancour. In the following discussion, youths are considered first, and then girls—but the fact of differences in regard to them should not disguise the common attributes in regard to their relationships with fellow workers.

A labourer who said of his fellow workers that they were "a good bunch to work with" was typical of those respondents who, on the whole, liked the other people at work—with possibly a few dislikes of one or more particular persons. The phrase "to work with" indicates the separateness of the criteria applied to the work setting, as discussed above. And the use of the word "bunch" signifies the importance of the group atmosphere at work, which calls for co-operation and some "give and take" if work is to be tolerable. Workers are thought to owe it to each other, as it were, to make the best of a bad situation: if workers do not do this, they are compounding the employers' sins. Another labourer referred to his fellow workers with some affection, saying that they were "rogues": that is to say, they were good mates in the sense that they united together in common disaste for their employer, and with a sense of community in having to do the sort of work which they did; they supported each other by their complicity to such mild "fiddling" of time sheets and so on, which they might be able to manage in partial compensation for having to
endure their lot. They were honest rogues, with no falseness or pretence amongst themselves: they were honest to the condition in which they were placed, as unskilled workers doing heavy manual labour day in, day out, year in and year out. There was a shared spirit between them, which helped to keep them going. In a rather milder form, the same sort of sentiment was conveyed by an apprentice joiner, who said of his mates that they were "average—alright—the typical working class who do not bother about anything". By the latter phrase, he did not mean that they were irresponsible, but rather that they did not allow their morale to fall in the face of their condition—they made the best of it and did not allow anything to bother them. Thus they provided mutual support for each other, and, especially, welcome support for the young worker. Shared interests do not necessarily imply harmony and flowing friendship all the time at work. As a rolling mill operative said of his mates, "They are rough and ready, and always having rows." But this, he thought, was a normal and expectable response to a hot and heavy job, and he was confident that the hearts of his fellow workers were in the right place. Whilst the altercation had to be accepted along with the heat of the furnace, as part of work, it was good to be freed from it, and from reminders of it, come the end of the day.

To illustrate the smoothness of his relationships with his fellow workers, one steel-worker said, "We've got black ones, yellow ones, pink ones, but they're all good blokes to work beside." The common
interests and experience of the work situation, and, perhaps, of their expectations from it, surmounted potential conflicts deriving from extra-work factors. But this was not always the case, and there were indications in the comments of a few respondents of racialism and, especially, a dislike of working with coloured men. This came out most clearly with a 'bus conductor (who, probably, would have had to work only irregularly with a coloured driver, and then without the necessity of close contact): he said that he didn't "like coloured workers" and that he found them to be "an embarrassment, and difficult to get on with". The clue to this probably lay in the superior status (and wages) accorded to the 'bus driver—the white conductor is made to feel, or feels himself, to be placed in an inferior position to his coloured colleague. Whereas in the rolling mill, the hard physical work is common to the rolling mill team, and imparts a spirit of co-operation and effort on equal terms. This represents another aspect of the way in which the work situation and processes may affect relationships between workers.

Two youths made comments which were more characteristic of girl respondents, with their greater emphasis upon "personal" matters. An engineer working in a small firm, with just ten other machine operators, said, "You can't tell anyone anything in confidence. It all gets around as fast as lightning. Never in my life have I come across such gossiping. Everyone talks about everyone else." Similarly, a labourer in a small warehouse complained of favouritism "on the part of the gaffer" and went on to say that "the other workers
pull you to pieces behind your back all the time". These two instances are suggestive of a connection between "gossip", "talking behind your back", and general "bickering" on the one hand and size of firm and/or work group on the other. When the firm or work group is small enough for everyone to know everyone else, and in a situation in which there is a fairly close degree of equality, in terms of status with reference to position in the authority structure, and in type of work done and level of responsibility involved, competition may arise in other terms such that personal attributes, non-work behaviour and involvements, and under-cover activities come under scrutiny: rumours are started to promote the status of the teller of the story, and to repudiate the object of it. Complaints of this sort of behaviour were, as has been suggested, much more common amongst girl respondents, and this may not be merely because of the tendency, already noted, to apply criteria relating to extra-work and to personal matters, but also because of the fact that a large proportion of them were involved in the work situations which I have suggested may be particularly conducive to this outcome: notably in office work, but also in work groups in factory and in warehouse.\footnote{The figures above indicating size of work group do not adequately reflect this difference between youths and girls at work.}

Another source of friction which emerged particularly with reference to youths was that arising from differential payment systems for people doing similar or comparable work and having contact with
each other at work. A maintenance fitter, for example, said the other men at work were "easy to get on with, except that the piece-workers get a bit hysterical when their machines break down";

there was in-built strain in the system, that is, whereby the maintenance men and the piece-workers were likely to come into conflict. A somewhat different point, but one which follows upon the same theme, is the considerable importance of what to the outsider might appear to be minor and insignificant differences of status. The men actually involved in the comparison regard them as anything but trivial.

This is so with reference to the intra-occupational comparisons (as between ordinary worker and assistant chargehand, for example) and to inter-occupational comparisons. Within the steel and engineering industry, for example, there is a strongly felt superiority amongst pattern-makers when comparing themselves with millers or centreless grinders, even though all have served apprenticeships (for sure, not all of equal intensity). When the felt superiority is not satisfied by appropriate deference from the inferior, then tension seems to develop: there were indications of strain at work of this order involving several respondents. A somewhat different facet of this is provided by examples of fellow workers with no formal claims to superiority and no formal authority, but who "push themselves" and assume authority unto themselves. This is particularly reprehensible to fellow workers if the pushing is done in front of the boss—for this represents a debasement of their own position. There is special loathing, too, for "crawlers"—fellow workers who go out of their
way to defer to the boss. These were perpetual irritants to respondents—they detracted from the solidarity of the work group in the face of the employer (just as did the immediate boss who was excessively committed to the employer's side): and, on another level, they were manifestations of the fate that threatened the working man, the loss of pride and dignity traded for a modicum of extra reward, however earned. Such seemed to be the springs of the dislike of the "crawlers".

In their comments upon fellow workers, girls tended to be more personal, as has been repeatedly said: they also tended to be more extreme—in acclamation, but, more usually, in condemnation. People at work were regarded on the one hand as "lovely" and "super", on the other hand as "horrid" and "ghastly". It has already been indicated that those girls who did spend leisure time with other girls from work tended to do so on a grander scale than was the case with youths, the effort being made to change a dress ready for the outing, for example. Perhaps a leisure garment was changed into at the office when work ceased, and the girls would then have a meal at a restaurant before going on to a dance. Nevertheless, most of the girls concerned did not go out regularly with friends from work, but only from time to time, or on special occasions such as birthdays. And often, too, an important subsidiary aim—possibly even the main aim—was to meet boys rather than for the pleasure of each other*.

---

*Willmott also noted this. Cf. Adolescent Boys of East London, op.cit.
company. But these friendships between girls at work are not to be discounted, and they represent an acceptance of "positive" friendship at work, and the intention of being "nice" to each other. As one respondent said of the other girls in her factory, "They are pleasant, and willing to help, and they ask you out at nights." They welcomed her fully into the group, that is.

With regard to relationships with the other sex at work, a few girls referred to the men as a "nuisance" because of their perpetual teasing, and rather more complained of the men's "roughness" of language. On the whole, however, girls who were in fairly close and continual contact with men at work—notably factory and warehouse girls, expected the men to be rough: it was taken for granted that men were like that. As one factory girl said, "The people at work are alright: the language tends to be rough, but you know what working men are."

What featured large in girls' comments was the "cattiness" of other girls at work—in its various forms and degrees of intensity, this was evident in all types of jobs, but it was particularly pronounced amongst factory and warehouse girls working in small groups, and amongst office girls. "Cattiness" is so universal, it would seem, that girls themselves regard it as inevitable and normal. As one warehouse girl put it. "They're alright at work, but when you get a lot of girls together, they can be catty." A comptometer operator spoke similarly, saying, "Some are a bit catty—you find that in
most offices when there are a lot of girls." A typist averred that "Although every one's alright on the surface, they are all catty behind each other's backs." And an office girl with previous experience as a shop assistant contrasted the two occupations in regard to "cattiness" by saying of her current colleagues, "Well, they are very nice girls, but girls in offices are more catty than girls in shops. They take more notice of what happens—for example, if you have a ladder in your stocking. In a shop, girls don't have time to notice such things". This girl went on to analyse the point further, saying that it all boils down to the fact that office girls are a different type from shop assistants—they come from a different social background, and feel that they are superior: they are "snooty" and unfriendly. In contrast, shop assistants, she said, are less quiet, more boisterous and "muck in together, to get the work done". The contrasts in social background and associated personal dispositions comes out in the work setting, then, according to this respondent office girls are ever concerned not to demean themselves, and "argue about childish things", for example, "who is to do the sweeping up".

"Cattiness", to summarise, seems to be associated with two main factors. The first is the fact of proximity, working in small groups, on top of each other all the time, with work that does not occupy the mind—and with minds which have not been educated for serious discussion. The second has already been discussed at some length, and
has to do with the meaning of work for the woman as compared with the man. Competition between women at work—the quest for prestige—is not based on criteria derived from the work itself, but results from an appraisal of self and others with reference to extra-work features, such as appearance, dress, success of husband, and ability to attract boy friends. At work, women are, as it were, out of place. Thrust together in the work situation but transitorily, girls assess each other by reference not to the work situation as such, but to values, norms and aspirations founded upon the place of women outside of the work context, in the broader social setting. Relationships between women in the work setting are thus determined by the varied life styles and statuses to which they conform, or to which they aspire, viewed in the context of age, stage in the domestic cycle, husband's occupation, home and neighbourhood background, and so on.

As with some of the youths, girls in certain jobs found that their relationships with fellow workers were made difficult because of social class factors. There was one example of a shop assistant in a multiple stores who disliked some of her fellow workers because they were "snobs"—"They make remarks when a dirty working man in overalls goes to their counter". But most instances referred to office work. Difficulties of this order, were often associated with some measure of upward immobility. When a girl from a social background

---

1 For aspects of this in a different context, see J. Littlejohn, Westringa, the Sociology of a Cheviot Parish, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1963.
which would normally have channelled her into work as a shop assistant found herself, through intelligence, effort, enthusiasm or fortuity, in a clerical job, and when she was not consciously aspiring to the new style of life associated with the occupation, she might have difficulty in accepting the new norms and values. What her fellow workers see as obvious superiority, she sees as snobbery.

Respondents' Views of Young Workers

The respondents were asked, "What do you think of younger workers?", meaning the 15 and 16-year-old recent school leavers. The object of the question was to get another slant upon the respondents' own attitudes towards work by reference to the behaviour and qualities of a younger generation, to focus respondents' attention in a detached way upon the problems of adjustment to employment (as faced by a person other than himself, that is), and to elicit clues as to the respondents' perceptions of social change or stability as evidenced by the behaviour of the young. (Further aspects of the latter point are considered elsewhere). The point should be made that approximately half of the youths and the same proportion of girls at work had little or no direct contact in their own place of work with younger workers, and the following analysis must be seen in this perspective. Furthermore, where opportunities for contact did exist, or where some contact was unavoidable, it was often minimal.
The problems for the school leaver were referred to by a substantial number of respondents—approaching one-fifth of those who had direct contact with young workers. The respondents were, of course, viewing the situation from the perspective of a twenty-year-old with five years experience in employment: but some at least were also, clearly, rethinking their own experiences of the transition from school to work. Thus, an apprentice engineer said that young workers were "cheeky"—"Like we were, I suppose. They think everyone is trying to pick on them and they act cheekily." A clerk referred to the lack of expertise of young workers, saying, "They are a pretty average lot for their age. I suppose I were the same; you can't pick it up in two months, I've been here five years and haven't learnt the half of it yet." A sales assistant, too, said of the young workers, "They are quite a nice bunch. My junior is a lovely girl: she is interested in the work. The boys are a bit—you know—they are great kids, playing tricks, but they are good lads with it. The girls do need training, like all girls when they leave school—good training, like I had. The first person you are put under is very important, I always think."

The respondents' remarks in general supported the conclusions of the earlier study that, on the whole, the transition is not a particularly difficult time; although there are awkwardnesses and difficulties of a superficial and temporary nature, the young workers "soon get used to it". But several respondents stressed particular
features of the transition which they thought it was important to recognise and deal with—as in the case of the sales assistant just quoted, who pointed to the need for proper training. A painter/decorator put stress upon the importance in the adjustment to employment for the young people to make an effort to "get on well with the older blokes"—this was of particular salience in his own occupation, in which the young worker was "isolated" with a small group of older men, and dependent upon them for training and for general guidance. A steelworker apprentice, too, criticised young workers for "slacking" but went on to attach prior blame to the way in which apprenticeships were organised by his firm. The school leaver was given twelve months on probation, and during this time, no great demands were made upon him—in consequence, "he gets into the habit of abusing work". Young workers should, the respondent argued, "be shown the right methods of work immediately, from the start", but, as has been stated, the stress was upon the ease of the transition, and the tendency was to suggest that it was merely a matter of time before the young worker became adjusted. There were, indeed, some hints of the calculated ease with which certain young workers had themselves approached work, determined from the start not to be exploited. As one labourer remarked of the younger generation of workers, "If they're like us, as they probably are, they'll dodge all they can."
Another category of response to the question on younger workers had reference to the special characteristics of age at the 15-16 years stage—to the foibles and fallacies of the young worker. This was significant of the respondents' own feelings of adjustment—they felt themselves to be long since past the years of frivolousness, naivety and insecurity. As one apprentice put it, "They are like I was at their age—a bit daft at times: they tend to mess about, like any fifteen-year-old." A sheet-metal worker remarked, "When the younger workers first start, they are all giddy, and just don't know the value of the materials they are using. Wasteage gives rise to real barneys, and then they get fed up—but after a year or two they settle down O.K.". This comment, indicative of the behaviour and approach of the young worker, was also significant as a pointer to the respondent's own serious approach to work, now that he had matured in it. So, too, was the comment of another sheet-metal worker, who said that the younger workers were "like I was—they don't know much about the job, and they get on your nerves at times". "Scatty" was an adjective used by several respondents, and there were also criticisms of the alleged proclivity of young workers to keep changing jobs—"they never seem to stay long", and, "they seem to be cocky", to "moan and groan" and to "think that they know everything". Less assured young workers were also mentioned—youths who were "quiet at first, but soon grew into the way of things and livened up". All of this was seen in the light of the
special characteristics of the fifteen-year-old individual, however; criticisms were explained away because the behaviour or attitude was thought to be "natural" for someone of that age—for there is, as one respondent put it, "a big difference between a fifteen-year-old and an eighteen-year-old". The naive, cumbersome and even annoying behaviour of the young worker was thus tolerated and excused: "They're a bit crazy, but they're alright", "They're a bit irresponsible, but they'll soon cure it". Several respondents, however, pointed out the variety in young people: "There is a cross section: Mods and Rockers, dim-wits, the lot. You always get the odd one or two who are difficult, but they are either straightened out or thrown out."

There were, however, a good many adverse comments about young workers—indeed, approaching a half of the comments contained some elements of criticism. It was an indication of the extent to which respondents had, in the space of five years, moved over to the sorts of attitudes which, earlier, they had regarded in their parents as bigoted and lacking in understanding—a further sign, too, of the way in which they had "settled down", leaving behind their youthful exploits. Some of the criticisms were ultra-conservative in tone, condemnatory of the radical attitudes and behaviour of the younger generation: "What is the world coming to?" these respondents asked themselves. An apprentice joiner said that he wondered whether he was "like that" when he "started out": he obviously felt that he could not have been so bad, so uncaring and irresponsible. And an
apprentice engineer used the classic phrase, "They are not what they used to be." A grocer's shop assistant said, "They don't put their heart and soul into the job, like we used to do". A typist observed that "They don't know what work is, they shirk." With evident self-righteousness which transcended his own series of five dismissals from jobs for bad time-keeping, a labourer asserted that to-day's young workers are "rough"; "They lark about too much". A nurse replied to the question by saying, "Well, probably our seniors felt the same about us, I suppose, but they have not half the smartness that we had." She would be ashamed of them if she were the matron—but "they're being allowed to get away with it". An apprentice bricklayer dismissed the two younger apprentices at his firm as "rubbish"—"They won't do as they're told, they are not keen workers, and they are cheeky." Therein lies a clue to some of the antipathy felt by the respondents towards young workers—the latter did not accord them the respect which they felt they deserved as established workers: pushing the matter further, it would seem that the failure of young workers to accord respect roused suspicion in respondents' minds or confirmed it, that, maybe, they were not all that superior, did not know all that much more in their semi- and unskilled and even skilled work after five years of employment. The young worker stood as a reminder of the occupational dead-end, or cul-de-sac into which they had moved. Thus a butcher said of the younger workers, "They're cocky—you can't teach them anything": he resented their unwilling-
ness to take him seriously as a mentor. An apprentice engineer similarly commented: "They're a bit cheeky, high and mighty, you know. You can't tell them anything, they think they know it all." A motor mechanic affirmed this, saying "They won't be told anything", and a girl packer in a biscuit factory complained that "The younger girls think they know it all, and won't be told anything. They simply say, 'You're not my boss' and they refuse to accept any useful hints about how to do the work". What was really a fight or dispute over status was thus translated, or rationalised, into an issue in regard to training and competence. Special irritation was expressed by a few girls who had some supervisory functions and whose work was made more difficult by feckless and unco-operative or even just happy-go-lucky young girls—even though, probably, the supervisors had been no less contrary (or apparently so) in their own first years at work.

One factor which seemed to make for an extremely critical view of the younger generation, evident amongst several girls particularly, was marriage. Married girl respondents who were at work tended to come down rather heavily upon young girl workers. "They are cheeky and will please themselves, whatever they are asked to do," one office worker said. This, to her, seemed to reflect not just the wish for status due to her as a more experienced worker, an aspect already discussed, but a feeling, too, that she was entitled to the respect appropriate from the young to a married woman—a respect which was not forthcoming.
There were several suggestions that the whole of the younger generation had gone off the rails. An office girl said that "Girls now don't seem to like work so much. They are not as staid, they are always on the move and think nothing of changing jobs, and even going off to Skegness to work for Butlin's for the summer." Values, obviously, had changed rapidly since her own younger days. Times are, indeed, changing, as a factory girl observed—"Girls are looking older than what we did, when we left school, and they are more independent". Making the same point, an office girl said that she thought this accelerated maturity was "in some ways good, in some ways bad": another factory girl welcomed the new trend, however, saying that younger girls at work were "more broad-minded—-a good laugh". The reaction of an apprentice draughtsman was of quite a different order: he said that "At work these long-haired so-and-so's give us all a bad name—they're not keen, don't work, and only want money". Another respondent was likewise incensed: in his seventh job, he denounced the younger generation of workers as "barmy" and averred that "These Mods and Rockers want shooting". A nurse felt similarly strongly about the arrogance of young workers—"Their 'I'm better than you' attitude" and their apparent sophistication and confidence in such matters as relations with the opposite sex.

A few respondents referred to a greater keenness amongst young workers, and a greater ability as compared with school leavers five years previously, when the respondents themselves left school. They
attributed this to improvements in education and training programmes. Thus an engineering grinder said, "They've got better opportunities as far as jobs are concerned, better chances to get on, than we had." A corporation labourer said, "I think there are far more opportunities for advancement than there ever was in my day". The phrase "in my day" is indicative of a widespread feeling amongst young workers that their own fate was now resolved: they would not have the opportunity of progressing significantly further in their jobs.

Certain of the themes discussed with special reference to young workers will be taken up again below, in the consideration of respondents' attitudes towards "the younger generation" as such. At this point it is sufficient to underline the sense of difference which respondents had from younger workers, their identification with adult norms and values of stability and conformity, and the identification of many of them with the tenet of doing a decent day's work—unlike the irresponsible young people now entering employment.
Wages

All except one respondent gave information about their wages. The exception was a youth who refused consistently to discuss matters concerned with money at each of the four Interviews held with him. (In all other matters he was very co-operative). Many respondents gave the information in great detail, down to the last halfpenny, and some of them produced pay chits. The point may appropriately be made here, nevertheless, that the amount earned is a matter which the young workers tended, in principle, to keep private, as an indication of their independence—whilst prepared to reveal it to a Research Interviewer, they were reluctant to let parents know what their earnings were, other than in general terms, and the size of the wage was often a closely guarded secret from younger brothers and sisters who, it was thought, should be kept in their place. One cutlery worker, whilst being interviewed, accordingly wrote down her wage secretly, rather than answering verbally in the presence of her fifteen-year-old brother, who was watching T.V.

There are necessarily some reservations in the following analysis, consequent upon seasonal variations in wages, and differences from one week to the next as a result of overtime or piece-work fluctuations. But the following certainly gives a reasonable picture of the wages pattern. Table 22 shows the gross average wages (including overtime and hours); "take-home" pay is given for comparison and
because this has obviously more relevance for certain matters, such as leisure expenditure. It is clear from the comparison that taxation, insurance schemes, and other deductions substantially reduce gross earnings, especially in the higher wages brackets.

**TABLE 22**
GROSS AND "TAKE-HOME" PAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT per Week</th>
<th>YOUTHS</th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>&quot;Take-Home&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to £5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5 -£9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 -£12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£13 -£14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15 -£16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£17 -£18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£19 -£20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£21+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The generally higher wages for youths compared with girls is obvious—although there is a small amount of overlap. Youths' wages cover a distinctly wider range, furthermore, from £5+ gross to £21+, compared with less than £5 to £15 - £16 for girls. The highest wage was £27 gross per week earned by a rolling mill operator: this amount included regular overtime and shift-work payments (incidentally, the youth complained because he was doing "a man's job for a lad's pay"—it is, in fact, very heavy physical work). The top girls' wages were nearly £16, earned by one respondent who was a sales representative and another who was a private secretary. The lowest paid of all the respondents was a hairdressing assistant whose wages were £3 gross per week.
One point that emerges from Table 22 is that by no means all young people are paid the inflated wages that is often presumed: as one clerk/typist said, "A lot of rubbish is talked about teenagers with too much money. These are a minority. Most work hard and long for a small wage." A substantial proportion of the youths, especially apprentices, earned less than £10 gross per week, and all except 8 of the 66 girls who were at work earned less than £10 gross. Some of the less highly paid respondents had substantial domestic commitments but, on the other hand, many retained the bulk of their net wages for personal expenditure. (See Chapter 15 below).

The gross wages of both youths and girls rose considerably during the course of their five years in employment. In small part this reflected changes in wage rates in consequence of rises in the cost of living, but mainly it represented the increasing rewards with age and experience. In their first jobs on leaving school, none of the respondents, youths or girls, had a gross wage exceeding £5 per week, and two-thirds received £3 or less. And in their jobs at one year after leaving school, only one-tenth of the youths, and no girls, received more than £5 gross a week, although distinctly higher proportions of both youths and girls now received over £3 gross.¹

An analysis of youths' gross weekly earnings in terms of level of skill is given in Table 23.

¹Details are given in Home, School and Work, op. cit., Table 26, p. 152.
### TABLE 23
### YOUTHS' GROSS WEEKLY EARNINGS AND LEVEL OF SKILL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Weekly Wage</th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Un-Skilled</th>
<th>Non-Manual</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£5 - £9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10 - £12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£13 - £14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15 - £16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£17 - £18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£19 - £20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£21+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has already been noted above that a substantial proportion of apprentices were on fairly low wages—but so too were many of the semi-, unskilled and non-manual workers. The apprentices could expect an appreciable rise in pay on completing their training, and non-manual workers could also expect rises. But the likelihood of substantial increases was remote for many of the semi- and unskilled workers. Most of the higher wages were earned by semi-skilled workers, especially those operating machines in engineering factories, and in receipt of piece-work and bonus payments. Few skilled men, having completed their apprenticeships, are likely to command wages comparable with the highest paid semi-skilled workers—although already, it is seen, one apprentice was in the top wages bracket. There were substantial variations in earnings within the broad occupational
categories—one semi-skilled grinder receiving less than £9 gross, for example, and another earning over £17. Variations were mainly attributable to availability or otherwise of overtime and to employers' policies in regard to the payment of piece-work incentives or bonuses.

Of the 6 girls earning £10 gross or more per week, apart from the sales representative and the private secretary already noted, one was a 'bus conductress, one was a senior assistant in a hairdressers' and two were factory machine-operators. Shop assistants tended to be amongst the lowest paid workers, but there were appreciable variations in earnings within the same occupations, as with the youths—even though the responsibility, level of skill and amount of work involved were similar.

**Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Regard to Wages**

Most respondents were, on the whole, satisfied that their pay was "reasonable": some remarked that "No one is ever really satisfied with their pay", and that "We'd all like a little bit more, wouldn't we?; but they were not seriously complaining. Amongst those who were unequivocably satisfied, there were considerable variations in the actual wages received. It would seem that young workers base
their assessment of what is a satisfactory wage upon a compound of factors which includes, in different degrees with different individuals (a) the hardness (or ease) of work, physically and mentally; (b) convenience of access (local, or involving a lot of travelling to work); (c) advantages, such as training, which will lead to greater rewards in the future; (d) the amount that siblings or peers of whom they know, earn (or say they earn, which is not always the same thing, apparently); (e) the amount that they know or hear others in the same occupation working elsewhere, earn; (f) domestic responsibilities, to parents, wives, husbands and children; (g) whether or not they are courting seriously (and hence in need of money to spend on the girlfriend, or to save); and (h) more generally, the pattern of leisure activities—for whilst it is often presumed that the amount of money to spend shapes the nature of leisure (or limits it), there is some evidence of the reverse process: a youth seeking a highly paid job to satisfy his need for money for drink or betting, for example; dissatisfaction or satisfaction with a particular wage is affected in such cases. The various criteria will be illustrated below.

One example of a highly satisfied respondent was a naval rating, with "all found" as far as food and board was concerned, who said, "You bet I'm satisfied—you wouldn't mind eight quid a week pocket money, would you?" A cutlery worker, in his third job said, "Oh, yes, £10 take-home is as good as I've had anywhere, and I couldn't do
better than that, not in relation to the amount of work you do." A machine operator with a gross wage of £10 said, "It could be better, I suppose, but it's pretty good, really." An assistant to an estate agent was well satisfied with his gross wage of just under £7, because he anticipated a very substantial rise when he qualified. And a warehouse labourer was pleased with his £10 gross wage because he felt the job was worthwhile—he would, accordingly, have been prepared to do it even at a lower wage.

As to the girls, a factory machine-operator with £10 take-home pay said that she did not know of another job so well paid—there was a long waiting list of girls who wanted jobs with her firm, and such was the demand that "You really need someone to pull strings to get you a job here at all." The girl had worked at the firm for four years, having obtained the job through the services of her mother and her grandmother, both of whom knew the supervisor and spoke on the respondent's behalf. A girl with a much lower take-home pay, £5.10s, was no less satisfied, saying that the wage was "Excellent for a girl of my age": a telephonist, too, observed that £6.10s take-home was "good money for a twenty-year-old". A shop assistant thought that her £5.9s.6d take-home pay was "a high wage according to many wages for girls of my age"—the fact that this was not actually so was not relevant, she believed that her wage compared favourably with others.
The amount that had to be expended in connection with work—on 'bus fares, and meals, if there was no canteen, for example, was in some cases considerable. Conversely, respondents were satisfied with relatively low wages if such expenditure was small: a girl with £5.17s take-home pay was nevertheless well content, for example, because—as she explained—"I don't have any 'bus fares" (as others do). Factory girls tended to score over office girls in this respect—many of them worked locally, and avoided fares and expensive mid-day snacks in town: many of them went home for a meal, or they had a cheap lunch in the subsidised works canteen.

Assessment of wages in terms of effort required in the job is illustrated in the remark of a factory girl that her £6.15s take-home pay was "Not bad for the job we're doing—it's pretty routine, that anyone can do." A cutlery worker similarly thought that her take-home pay of £5.10s was "not bad, because there isn't a lot of work to do". Conversely, a surgical goods packer who received £5.13s.6d net each week said she was not "absolutely satisfied with the pay" having regard to the responsibilities that she had in supervising three other packers: she thought she ought to be paid more. There were, of course, other expressions of dissatisfaction with pay and it will be seen below that this is often a factor in decisions to change jobs. But most of those who indicated some dissatisfaction with their wages did not propose to leave their jobs—either because there were compensatory advantages in their present work, or because they were aware that they could not command a substantially higher
wage elsewhere. A clerk earning £6.14s net, for example, said that she would "certainly take more", but would not move unless a "helluva lot more" were offered.

Two nurses, however, were particularly critical of their wages—with approximately £6 a week take-home pay, they thought that they were distinctly under-paid—"It bears no relationship to the responsibility or inconvenience," said one. But she would not think of leaving the work, because she felt it to be a vocation. Nonetheless, there was a mild resentment at the thought of being exploited. Actually, the wages of £6 at the age of 19 - 20 years does not compare badly with the general level for girls' wages, although at earlier ages a nurse's pay is distinctly lower than in many other jobs, and nurses tended to feel that they had never enjoyed the opportunity for a "little self-indulgence"—ever since leaving school they had had difficulty in "making ends meet".

The impact of domestic responsibilities upon satisfaction with wages is illustrated with reference to a warehouse worker with a wife and one baby. He described his take-home pay of £8.8s as "miserable". There is a further discussion of wages in relation to marriage, below.

It has been noted that some of the apprentices were earning relatively high wages: these youths were, on the whole, satisfied with their pay—and so, too, were some of the rather lower paid apprentices, because of the future prospects attached to the skill which they were learning. An apprentice printer, for example, was satisfied with his £8.15s net wage because, as he said, "The trade I am
learning will give good dividends later." Other apprentices merely accepted a relatively low wage as inevitable—one, when asked if he was satisfied with his wage, replied, "It's a case of having to be, being an apprentice." But about a third of the apprentices were dissatisfied with their pay, some of them intensely so—these were the youths who felt that their training, as well as their wages, were inadequate. The low pay would have been tolerable if the job was evidently preparing them for a better future. But if training was poor, youths were resentful, the more so because it seemed to them that there was nothing that they could do except suffer the situation—other, that is, than leaving, as some did—but in the process forfeiting the opportunity of being styled skilled men, with all that that may imply, in terms of pay, security and social status. Thus, a steel worker apprentice said of his net wage of £10, "I think it's rubbish, and even when I am 21 I still won't be getting a full man's wage." Several apprentices were, in fact, engaged upon routine production work, and receiving no special training—"So why," as one of them put it, "shouldn't they pay me a proper wage for what I do?" Another apprentice said, "There is no incentive for young people to take skilled jobs now, because unskilled and semi-skilled people get much higher wages by comparison." (The analysis above indicated, however, that this was by no means always the case, and many semi-and unskilled workers were on low wages). The position was exasperating, however—what is the point of a skill, if it means low wages when learning it, and not particularly
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good wages when it is learnt? An apprentice electrician argued that "Tradesmen's wages are well below unskilled and repetition workers' wages—the reverse of the position before the second world war. It should be altered." Another apprentice said, "Speaking for myself, as an engineer, when I left school everybody told me to get an apprenticeship and you will be better off in your pocket now and definitely later. But I haven't found this true. An apprentice doesn't get the money whilst serving his time and only gets about the same, if not less, when he has served it as people who just take any old job when they leave school."

Another source of disgruntlement was that some apprentices were receiving much less in wages for doing the same work as men who had already qualified—"I'm doing exactly the same amount of work as an older man," said one, "but getting £8 a week less for it." An apprentice die-sinker said, "I think it is disgraceful that a young person should be penalised with poor wages for learning an apprenticeship. Apprentices are the future skilled workers of the country, but in many cases they earn less money than semi-skilled and unskilled men. This, in my opinion, is why many young people won't take apprenticeships nowadays."¹

The suggestion that employers regard apprentices as convenient forms of cheap labour was made by several respondents. An apprentice brick-
layer said, "Many organisations take an interest in apprentices today, but the individual firms use this as a form of cheap labour, and do not give apprentices a chance to see the administrative side of the job. This most times leads to boredom and loss of interest, as has happened in my case. I am a bound apprentice until I am twenty-one. This leaves no chance to find a job I am really interested in." An apprentice motor mechanic made the same complaint, saying, "The apprentice is firstly for the financial side of the employer. The employer gets five years' cheap labour out of every apprentice. In my trade the apprentice has the same responsibility as a skilled man from the age of about $16\frac{1}{2}$ to 17. From that age he is working entirely on his own. At my firm there are about sixteen apprentices for one skilled man. We cannot leave, but we can be dismissed. I think that something should be done to protect apprentices from employers who just wish to exploit them. I tried to stand up to my employers over many points in my agreement, but was threatened with instant dismissal. I now have a wife to think of, and can no longer argue."

The deprivation implicit in low wages was particularly felt by married men and engaged men—indeed, from the age of about 17 or 18 apprentices begin to feel acutely their low wages, which hold them back from participation in the "adult" activities to which they are then drawn—although, as will be seen, a high proportion of apprentices compared with youths in other sorts of employment were
engaged to be married by the time of Interview No. 4—which suggests that their social participation was not unduly hampered. Of course, by no means all apprentices were as dissatisfied as those who have been quoted. Not were the "bad" apprenticeships (or the "good" ones) associated with any particular occupation or size of firm. But the evidence is clear of a pervasive mood of grievance amongst apprentices. It is important to recognise that this has to do with not merely wages, working conditions and inadequate training: the apprentices' concern is of a wider order, and represents dismay at the clash between the actuality of an apprenticeship nowadays and the expectation which they had formulated in regard to it whilst they were still at school, and during their early days at work. They perceive that the whole way of life of a skilled man in modern society is undergoing change—and has already been devalued in relation to that of the semi- and unskilled worker: they recognise that their "standing" in society, as well as the financial rewards for their job, is lower than that to which they aspired.

Some respondents, mainly youths who worked in steel and engineering, received piece-work and bonus payments. A car salesman who was given commission on sales doubled his wages from £9 to £18-20 in this way. And a quantity surveying trainee was well satisfied with his wage of £8 net because, in addition, there was "a car thrown in for free".
Most respondents in receipt of piece-work payments had no criticism to make—they regarded the system as representing an appropriate connection between effort and reward. But there were complaints on two scores. Firstly, that piece-work was nothing but an "ugly rat race" in which workers competed against each other to see how much they would earn—with the consequence that employers expected everyone to work at a faster rate which the actual piece-work earnings did not compensate for. And, secondly, that it led to uncertainty in regard to weekly income—as one youth explained, "You don't know where you are. It's a bad system. Some weeks the money is alright, other weeks it isn't. It depends on the material you get to work on. If the material is bad you slave your guts out for next to nothing." He would have preferred a "regular wage for regular work."

**Hours Worked**

The basic hours worked by the respondents is shown here in Table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Working Week</th>
<th>YOUTHS</th>
<th>Girls at Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours up to 40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the respondents worked a maximum of 44 hours. Most of the youths who worked 40 hours or less were factory workers, and most of the girls who worked 40 hours or less were either factory or office workers. Of the youths who claimed to work over 48 hours a week basic (that is, excluding overtime) one was a lorry driver, one a butchers' shop manager, and 2 were in the Royal Navy (one a cook, the other as a mechanic). 54 youths and 42 girls worked a basic five-day week, although a few of the girls and rather more youths did occasional or regular overtime on Saturday mornings. 15 youths did shift-work regularly—they were mostly factory workers employed in steel and engineering, but some were drivers and others were 'bus conductors. The girls who did shift work were 'bus conductresses (2) and nurses (2).

48 Youths and 10 girls did overtime regularly. Mostly this amounted to a few hours a week only, but in some cases long hours of overtime were worked. A builder, for example, worked seven days one week and six the next. A labourer always worked on Sundays (when the rate was "double-time": he earned £4 on Sundays). Working overtime was in some cases done "to please the boss"—as with office girls who did just one or two hours overtime each week. In certain jobs, however, overtime was to all intents and purposes obligatory, if the person wished to remain in the employment—a wireman, for example, said that "eight hours overtime on Sundays are virtually compulsory." The respondents who did regular overtime were not, for
the most part, resentful of the fact—whether they earned merely an extra few shillings a week "to help out", or several £s which enabled them to live a more intense leisure time, they tended to welcome the opportunity of over-time. There were, indeed, clear signs of a preference for more money as opposed to more hours of leisure. Thus, one respondent recently started in his new job, said that he did not yet know about over-time "facilities". Such young workers, like their elders, appraised their jobs in terms of the opportunity for over-time earnings at increased rates of pay. A further illustration of the preference for more money as opposed to more hours of leisure (in order that the hours of leisure that they did have could be enjoyed more) is provided by the 7 youths and the girl who had spare-time jobs from which they derived a regular income. The girl, a florist, did flower arranging in the evenings and earned £4 a week. One of the youths, a painter and decorator, said that he "did fiddles in his spare time": that is, he availed himself of his firm's materials, and contacts with customers, to earn some extra money in the evenings. (The extent of "fiddles" could not be ascertained, but that it is institutionalised in some firms seems clear: this could be inferred from the statement of a brickyard labourer, who said that the boss had raised the wages, at first 1d, then 3d and finally 6d an hour, in an attempt to "stop the fiddling". The employer was well aware that labourers and drivers were able to load extra batches to sell off, sharing the profit between themselves).
Not all overtime was done with the motivation of indulging in material satisfaction in leisure time—some was made necessary because the basic wage was insufficient to meet unavoidable expenditure. One married youth complained, for example, that employers "should pay decent wages so that a working person should not have to work over in the week, and on Saturdays and Sundays."

In Table 25, take-home pay is compared with numbers of youths doing regular overtime, and those who normally worked basic hours only.

**TABLE 25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Take-Home Pay and Hours Worked—Youths.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does Regular Overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to £5 per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£5-£9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£10-£12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£13-£14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£15-£16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£17-£18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£19-£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£21+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is seen that most of the youths with a high regular take-home pay worked overtime in order to earn it. The youth with a take-home wage of £17-£18 who did not do overtime was the car salesman, referred to above, who received a high weekly bonus on sales. The 10 girls who did regular overtime were all in the higher wage categories.
Discussion in this Chapter has raised various issues in regard to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Relationships with other people at work are of obvious importance in this respect, whilst wages and hours worked are also fundamental. These and other elements of job satisfaction are considered further in Chapter VII, below.
CHAPTER VII
JOB SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION

It is important to distinguish between satisfaction in regard to work as such and satisfaction in regard to a particular job. The two are, of course, inter-related, but a person who feels that work is a necessary evil may nonetheless gain certain satisfactions within this orientation, in the particular job which he does.

Furthermore, there are factors associated with particular jobs which may exacerbate an already anti-pathetic approach to work, or which may induce an apathetic attitude in young workers who previously had looked forward to work as an exciting new experience. It can be argued that sociologists have tended to accord overmuch emphasis to factors intrinsic to the job, and given insufficient attention to the attitudes and motivations imported, as it were, into the work setting. With particular reference to the various studies of assembly-line workers, Goldthorpe has suggested that too much weight has been attached to "technology as a determinant of attitudes and behaviour in the work situation", and too little attention has been paid to
"the prior orientations which workers have towards employment and which in turn influence their choice of job, the meaning they give to work, and their definition of the work situation." More generally, it has been argued that an excessive concern with organisation theory has had the unfortunate consequence of divorcing the work setting from the structure of the society which provides its context.²

Certain elements, or ingredients, of job satisfaction have already been discussed in Chapter VI above, and others will be referred to in the analysis of reasons for job changing. In the following exposition I do not attempt to attach special degrees of importance to the various ingredients of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction but merely point to those factors most mentioned by respondents in reply to the question, "What do you like and dislike most about your job?"

Some respondents gained considerable satisfaction from performing the tasks associated with their jobs. A motor mechanic, for example, said that he "thoroughly enjoyed working with (his) hands and getting things to go properly". A centre-less grinder liked the fact that he was responsible for setting up his own machine, and that his job involved a variety of tasks using different techniques. An apprentice gauge-maker said of his work that "It's a job that demands more skill

---


² The point has been argued again recently in David Silverman, "Formal Organization or Industrial Sociology: Towards a Social Action Analysis of Organizations", Sociology, Vol.2, No.2, May, 1968, pp.221-238.
than most and it gives you a feeling of achievement." (The respondent added that "the pay is terrible, though"—it was a difficult decision for him to make, whether to stay and enjoy the work or move to a job paying a higher wage, but with the chance of less intrinsic satisfaction). Another apprentice steelworker said that his work was particularly rewarding "when something original comes along", and that he got satisfaction from the exacting nature of the job—"you have to be accurate to the last degree". A butcher liked his work because he was "interested in the beast-cutting, and so on", and a driver said that he "really liked driving, itself". Conversely, there was dissatisfaction in the job for some respondents if their expectations of intrinsic satisfaction in work were thwarted—whether because the work was of a routine nature, or, as in at least one case, because the employer expected the workers to "scimp" the job and turn out "shoddy" products. Some girls, too, gained considerable satisfaction in their jobs. A progress-chaser clerk, for example, enjoyed initiating a process and seeing it through to its completion—"the order is placed, I ensure that it goes through the various stages, such as getting the material to the workshop for hammering, then on to forging and treating. And then I have to make sure that the order is despatched and delivered to the customer on time". A supervisor in a multiple stores was responsible for the internal ordering of merchandise for eight counters, and had responsibility, too, for the counter assistants: she thoroughly enjoyed the work and the responsibility. Whilst many girls in routine work accepted their lot,
some did look for intrinsic satisfaction but were disappointed. A factory girl whose work consisted of inspecting products from a machine and picking out rejects, complained that it was "dead boring and there's nothing I really like about it".

It is argued by some sociologists that intrinsic satisfaction in work is a feature associated with only the higher grades of employment—professional, non-manual and skilled manual. E.Wight Bakke, for example, has written that "To the skilled worker, work has meant something of real importance, and interest, and he finds it hard to reconcile himself to the loss of it. For the unskilled worker, this is less difficult."¹ This theme recurs in the literature. It is, of course, true that the potential for intrinsic satisfaction tends to be greater in skilled work, but it is not exclusive to skilled work, and several semi-and unskilled youths as well as girls in Category B and Category C employment did gain considerable satisfaction from their work tasks. Indeed, for less able workers, the sense of accomplishment at being able to do something well—be it as a farm worker or as a routine machine operator—was the source of considerable satisfaction. After years of being told at school how inadequate they were, they were proud to demonstrate to themselves that they were competent at something, and reassured of their worth if employers expressed appreciation. At the same time, it

should be noted that employment as a skilled worker by no means ensured intrinsic satisfaction in the work—nor, indeed, did it necessarily imply the desire for such satisfaction. Related to intrinsic satisfaction in the work is satisfaction in the end-product: a youth whose tasks were buffing and finishing tankards said that he enjoyed "the sense of making something pleasant to look at". Similarly, a plasterer who liked the variation in his work and the associated different techniques, said that he felt particularly satisfied when he had finished something good.

Several youths gained satisfaction from their work because they felt that they were doing "a man's job"—this was true, particularly, of some of the steelworkers. The hard, physical labour represented, for them, a claim to strength and manliness, and distinguished them, they thought, from less strong workers and particularly from weakling pen-pushers. A forger thus said that he enjoyed the "fierce work", and a rolling mill operative said, "It's the heavy work that I like, you really think you're doing something worthwhile, something that not everyone can do." Doing a man's job is a different proposition from being required to work harder than one may reasonably anticipate, however, and there were complaints from youths and girls of "too much hard work"—a storeman said that he had "far too much lifting and carrying". He complained at the parsimony of the management in not buying more labour-saving machinery. A labourer, whose work was to dig trenches for pipe laying, referred to his work with a mixture of description and metaphor as "sewerage and sheer graft". And a
factory worker said that he did not like "being treated like a slave", just because he was unskilled. Too little work was also a source of dissatisfaction, as well as too much—a maintenance fitter said that he was "always used to being busy at school" and disliked the fact that in his work "you tend to hang around idle for long periods at a time". More crisply, a labourer on road repairs said, "What I dislike is spending hours doing fuck-all, waiting for materials to arrive."

There was a positive satisfaction for some in the ease of their work, however, in the fact that so little was expected of them that they could cope with what was required without undue effort. This was true particularly of some of the semi-and unskilled youths and of factory and warehouse girls. Given that they had to work, they could at least count their blessings. An inspector in an engineering factory accordingly said that she liked the fact that her job was "clean and simple". A cutlery packer referred with satisfaction to the fact that the work was "clean, easy to do and not at all complicated"—for, she explained, a more demanding job would "make me very nervous". A warehouse worker liked the fact that in her job she was able to please herself and "take my time". An apprentice in steel said that he liked his job because it was "a cushy number", not much being expected of him, whilst an apprentice sheet metal-worker said of his job, "It's good—it's easy. I like that, because I'm just not keen on work." Another example is that of a naval rating, who said, "It's a good, routine job": he could do it without
fear of going wrong, with a minimum of effort, and with others doing the thinking. There was satisfaction, even, in the fact that he was "not allowed to have complaints". And he did not have to "bother about the future"—for that, too, was fixed for him at least throughout the remainder of his seven-year engagement. With so little energy required of him, mentally or physically, he thought that he had "a really good job".

A feature of certain occupations is the sense of special status derived from involvement in the work: Caplow has referred to "a sort of subculture composed of the manners and norms and folkways peculiar to the calling, the legends grown up about it, and the symbols it displays". Coal mining is one such occupation, and the armed forces can be seen as another example. In Sheffield, the steel industry is "a sort of subculture" of the order described by Caplow: there are manners and norms associated with the work—capacities for hard work and hard drinking are examples—and these attributes are acquired by some young workers in the industry. The "occupational stereotype" is emphasised by the obvious importance of the steel industry to Sheffield: it is basic to the City's industry and commerce, so that involvement in it confers a special standing, especially involvement in the basic processes associated with furnace work and rolling. Furthermore, within the industry there are certain firms which, by virtue of their physical size, the size of their plant and

---

monetary capital, and their world-wide fame, have a special appeal to the young worker, such that to work for one of them, even as a labourer, is looked upon as conferring a superiority over persons employed in similar jobs by lesser concerns. The overalls and scarves worn by steel-workers, and the effects of the heavy and hot working conditions upon their skins, make for an appearance which is special to the steel industry. This can be regarded as a type of uniform—one which young workers are anxious to acquire, and which they do in fact soon acquire. This signalizes to themselves and to others their unity with workers in the same occupation, and their distinctiveness from those in other occupations. The same argument applies to other occupations of course; as S.M. Wood puts it, "Uniform demarcates the boundary between members and non-members."¹

Variety at work was also a source of satisfaction—variety, that is, in terms of actual tasks to be done, people met, or places visited during the course of work. A sailor said that he liked being in the Navy because of the variety in scenery and working conditions—"I've already travelled to the Far East". And a lorry driver liked the more modest variety involved in "driving all over Britain". A builder said that he liked the fact that in his job he "did a bit of everything"—an added advantage was that he was

"learning new things all the time" so that if he lost his job he could turn to building, plumbing, joinery, decorating, installing fireplaces, "the lot"—as he said, "There aren't many apprentices who learn so many trades as I do." A youth who worked on maintenance in a large factory liked the varied work, and the fact that it entailed "moving around"—"You're not stuck in one place all day, like people on the machines are." As a result, "you don't get the chance to be bored". A policeman said of his job, "It is interesting. You see all forms of life", and an estate agent's assistant said, "It is outside work, meeting all different sorts of people." Meeting different sorts of people was also a major part of the appeal of his job as a furniture removals worker for another respondent—combined with the fact that in this work "You never know what's going to happen during the day until you arrive there in the morning." This was in distinct contrast with a previous job as a semi-skilled machine operator, in which he performed the same routine tasks every day.

A butcher, too, liked meeting the different customers who came into the shop. A girl shop assistant referred to the same source of satisfaction, saying that "It is a job where you meet rich and poor, all different types of people." And a solicitor's secretary found her work absorbing because it introduced her to a range of people and their problems—"It is very interesting, taking statements from witnesses, and meeting clients. I didn't like the divorce work at first, but I've got used to it now." A progress clerk had established contact over the telephone with many customers during her
five years in the job, and she spoke of the satisfaction which she experienced when customers 'phoned up to thank her for "rushing an order through" or for securing delivery on time. If meeting people had its attractions for some respondents, it was also a source of dissatisfaction for others—for "people can be irritating, sometimes", as a shop assistant said. A 'bus conductor, too, voiced his dislike of "awkward passengers"—he said, "I sometimes find it difficult to control my temper with them."

Satisfaction derived from holding a position of responsibility at work has been touched upon already. This was a very important aspect for several respondents. The manager of a butcher's shop, for example, revelled in his work because it gave him the chance to organise the whole shop—he had control of several assistants, and of ordering supplies, overall supervision of accounts, and so on. The responsibility for him was combined with a strong sense of independence. The latter was important for several respondents. A shorthand typist said that she liked her work because there was "nobody telling (her) what to do all the time"—she was "left to work on (her) own initiative". At a more modest level, a girl who worked as a packer in a factory manufacturing lemonade crystals liked the fact that "You're given the right amount of work to do, and they don't nag you to finish it in any set period of time."

Whilst responsibility was welcomed, on the whole, by those who were able to exercise it, there were cases in which it was a source of dissatisfaction that the employer expected respondents to exercise
responsibility but without according them appropriate recognition in
terms of status. A chemist's shop assistant, for example, complained
that her boss was "never in" so that she had to do most of the dis-
pensing—even though she had no formal qualifications. Actually,
she enjoyed doing this "in a way" but resented the fact that she was
"only treated as a shop assistant, and only paid as one".

More generally, being treated as an adult, responsible person—
and as an individual—was an important aspect of job satisfaction.
A labourer said that what he liked most about his work was that he
was "not treated like a nit"—unlike when he was at school, it was
recognised at work that he had "some sense" and could exercise init-
itiative in some areas, however circumscribed they might be. It was,
indeed, a matter of grievance to apprentices that the persisting
traditions of apprenticeship were such that they were treated as less
than "grown up" until they had completed their apprenticeships—
not only did this mean suffering lower rates of pay, but it also
meant that they were regarded as "learners" and "treated as kids"
until the magic five years of their apprenticeship were completed.
They felt very severely the disadvantages of apprentices compared
with semi- and unskilled workers of the same age who were looked upon
at work as adults. Satisfaction at the independence conferred at work
was the obverse of the dislike of being "bossed about". The latter
has been discussed at length in the consideration of relationships
between employees and bosses, and there is no need to repeat the
points here, but only to emphasise the intensity of the distaste
which respondents had for "bossy" employers, and those who were "always hanging over you, watching and waiting to find fault".

Conditions at work were referred to by several respondents. A builder liked working in the fresh air— although in inclement weather this could be less of an attraction: as an apprentice bricklayer said, "I only regret having to work outside in bad weather— I often envy the white-faced office workers, then". With regard to facilities at work, a machine operator made a favourable comparison between his present firm and previous ones— "There's a good canteen and a toilet that works." ¹ A warehouse worker said that the conditions at his firm were "terrible— no heating, inadequate sanitation, and no canteen". An engineering draughtsman apprentice said, "The office is always cold, despite central heating. New offices were built last year, but they're no better than the old ones. The gaffers would be in trouble if the (Factory) Inspectors came around." There was a complaint from a printer that there was no extractor fan, and that the windows didn't open, in his factory. Office and shop workers were by no means free from bad conditions at work. One clerk said

¹There would seem, from the author's experience and observation in a good many factories, to be a widespread expectation and acceptance of dirty lavatory facilities—a feature which underlines or reinforces the lowly nature of the work done by shopfloor workers, and their presumed or implied unconcern for cleanliness and personal hygiene. Dirty toilets are not, of course, only the firm's fault— employees would seem to express their feelings about their employers and the work they are expected to do directly by means of carvings on the wall, indirectly by leaving the toilets filthy.
that at her firm it was "terrible—far too small a cloakroom, and one small toilet for all the employees. And there are only two small windows, so that you work in artificial light all day; and the ventilation is bad. There are hundreds of mice, too. The buildings just wouldn't stand up to a government inspection". Apart from specific deficiencies in terms of heat, lighting, toilet arrangements and so on, the atmosphere created by the physical conditions at work was referred to by several respondents. One shop assistant, for example, said that everything was gloomy at work—"it's an old type shop, full of dark oak cabinets and miserable curtains": it made her feel "right low". Complaints about conditions at work tended to have a realistic reference point—it was accepted that noise and dirt were associated with factory work, for example, and that these had to be "put up with" as part of the job. It was when noise or dirt were felt to be excessive, and when toilet facilities were obviously inadequate, and the employer did nothing to alleviate the situation, that complaints were made.

Only a few youths stated a particular like or dislike for the hours which they had to work. These were mainly shift workers (in steel or working on the 'buses); some of them disliked having to work shifts because it interfered with normal daily patterns of work, meals, leisure and sleep—whilst others liked shift work precisely because of the break in routine which it involved. One butcher's shop assistant disliked having to work all day on Saturdays. Hours were more important for girls in regard to satisfaction and dis-
satisfaction at work. One factory worker stated as her chief like
the fact that she finished work at 4-30 each day, and as her chief
dislike the fact that she had to start work at 7-30 a.m.—this
entailed getting up at 6-45 in the morning. Another factory worker
especially liked the fact that there was no work on Saturday—in
her previous jobs as shop assistant she had disliked having to work
all day on Saturdays. An early finish to the day, and no Saturday
work, assumed a special attraction for girls once they were married
and had taken on domestic responsibilities. Girls who did have to
work on Saturdays, or whose work involved "compulsory" overtime
(for example, a bottle labeller whose post was at the end of the
conveyor belt, so that she was amongst the last to finish work,
sometimes not until well after 6 o'clock) disliked this aspect of
their work.

Long hours of work were the subject of complaint by several girls.
A more general aspect in regard to hours worked had to do not with
the total time spent at work nor with the distribution over the work-
ing day or week. It was, rather, the feeling of constraint associated
with the expectation of employers that workers will be at their work—
day in and day out for the specified time. Girls, especially married
girls, felt that employers should be more liberal in regard to time
off, and take more cognisance of the domestic responsibilities of
married women. As it was, respondents experienced difficulty in
getting time off, even for some pressing matter such as tending a
husband or another relative if they were sick. As one girl said,
"They create hell if you ask them to let you leave work half an hour early."\(^1\)

The importance of relationships with other people at work—bosses, other workers, customers—has been referred to elsewhere, and not be dwelt upon again here. There is one aspect which does require further discussion, however, namely the satisfaction derived by some respondents from the sense of doing work which was of service to other people. This was a feature referred to by several youths in humble "service" jobs—a furniture removals worker, for example, pointed out that his work was essential, and that he liked to be helpful in settling people into a new home. But satisfaction of this order was most emphatic amongst the girls who were nurses: and, indeed, the barriers put in the way of giving service to patients was a source of dissatisfaction to several of these respondents. One nurse, for example, said that basically she enjoyed her work, and had entered it because of the wish to work with and for people, "rather than working for a machine in a factory". But she met with some disappointment—because of the "bureaucracy" which resulted in "lots of little niggling things, like badly organised shifts". What really annoyed this girl was that "the patient seemed to come last". And, instead of working with people as nurses should, they were "made to do maid's

\(^1\)The shortage of labour, together with liberal personnel policies, has resulted in special arrangements being made by some firms, by way of creches, shifts related to school hours, etc., to accommodate the domestic responsibilities of female labour. See, for example, A.P. Jephcott, B.N. Seear and J.H. Smith, Woman, Wife and Worker, Problems of Progress in Industry, No.10. B.S.I.R., London, H.M.S.O. 1960.
work". \(^1\) Another student nurse was similarly disaffected. She said that she liked the fact that she "could help the patients—do something for them": for "it brings satisfaction". However, she was disappointed that the scope for giving help was less than it should be. She blamed this upon the "tradition of nursing", and argued that a nurse "is meant to be overworked and underpaid" (one of the 7 nurses did say that the hours were "not as bad as people make out"). The particular aspect of nursing tradition that the respondent found reprehensible was that which involved a nurse being "pushed about by horrible matrons": for, she said, "I would rather spend my time talking to patients, but by tradition this is not permissible. You have to hustle about doing some job or other". Presumably the position varies considerably from one hospital to another. But nurses of eighteen or nineteen years of age seem to share some of the feelings of apprentices, referred to above. They not-too-willingly accepted relatively low wages compared with those which persons of their ability could command in other jobs—wages that were especially low in the initial years of training. But they feel it as an affront to be treated as "kids" instead of being

\(^{1}\) cf. The research by R.W. Revans, cited above, which suggests that morale of nurses may be understood in terms of structural relationships, such that nurses morale is low if the relationships between the nurses' superiors, notably the sisters and matrons, with their superiors are unsatisfactory, specifically if communications between them are poor.
accorded the dignity appropriate to a serious young woman. It is particularly ironic for matron and sisters to treat such nurses "like a group of school children", because the girls feel themselves to be particularly serious in their attitudes towards work, with a sense of responsibility to their fellows that is not to be readily discerned in girls in other occupations. Nurses feel that their sense of vocation and their desire to serve is over-much exploited. Four of the 7 nurses complained strongly about aspects of their work, and one, in particular, referred to the "terrible" conditions—"You work morning, noon and night, with just two hours off. There's no time to go home, or to go out anywhere to relax. There is a sitting room in the middle of the hospital which is depressing, and so dark—it has got lino floors and a dingy view from the windows. The cloakrooms are shocking as well, unbearably hot, with too few W.Cs, and just one mirror for all the nurses. The meals are poor, too, and sometimes they are terrible: it is a notorious hospital for spending least on food."

Such, then, were the varied ingredients of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction—the elements which made a job worth doing, at least given that one had to work anyway, or which accentuated the overall dislike of or apathy towards work of the type and level open to the secondary modern leaver. Most of the respondents could be said to be, on the whole, "satisfied" with their particular jobs, at least for the time being—the rate of job changing suggested that rapid changes of view occurred, however, and it should be noted that the relative importance to the young worker of the various sources of
satisfaction may change as he gets used to it, or from one time of year to another (e.g. summer and winter may affect heating conditions at work or the need or opportunity for overtime). And the overall "satisfaction", for many, must be seen in the light of the fact that they did not expect much from their jobs, anyway—either they had never done so, or their experience at work had lead them to this outlook. The ingredients of job satisfaction are mixed in different proportions for different people, and in regard to the various occupations in which they are employed at particular times—as Caplow has pointed out, and as the present study endorses, "There is no simple correlation between the objective conditions presented by an occupation and the relative satisfaction of its members." The ingredients of satisfaction were of the same order as those which obtained when respondents first entered employment. There was, over the years, a toning down in expectations as to what might be expected, in terms of praise or consideration from the boss for example, and there was more acceptance by

---

1 The Sociology of Work, op.cit., p.132


3 This general toning down in expectations can be reconciled with—or represents one facet of—the conclusion of Wyatt, Marriott et al, that job satisfaction appeared to increase with age—because the most dissatisfied left the particular jobs when young and because those who remained in them became resigned to them with age. This study of workers covered a much wider range (in age) than the present study, however. cf. S.Wyatt, R. Marriott et al, A Study of Attitudes to Factory Work, Special Report Series No.292, H.M.S.O., London, 1956.
youths and girls of hours of work—they had got used to them (although some did complain, as was noted above). There were two major changes of emphasis in regard to job satisfaction five years after leaving school compared with satisfaction during the first year at work. Firstly, fewer youths and girls expected, or got, intrinsic satisfaction from the tasks which they performed. The novelty had worn off and/or they now worked in occupations in which the opportunity for such satisfaction was very limited. But they were not dissatisfied on this score, because they no longer looked for such satisfaction. Secondly, married and engaged respondents applied different criteria in assessing their jobs—or, at least, applied the same criteria but with different emphases upon the particular components. Wages and the opportunity for overtime became more important, for example, for youths who needed more money for the home—but the change was more marked with girls, for whom short or convenient hours at work assumed a special importance, now that they had domestic responsibilities.

The importance of satisfaction only tangentially connected with the work task per se is well recognised in studies of job satisfaction, and the present study emphasises the point.¹ In the above analysis there may be distinguished various categories of satisfaction.

Firstly there are the *intrinsic* satisfactions derived from the work itself, including the actual tasks entailed, and pleasure and pride at the finished product. Intrinsic satisfaction includes the sense of vocation felt by nurses particularly, and also includes the satisfaction of giving service, whether to particular persons in need such as hospital patients, or more generally to customers of a shop, or, more generally still, to the community at large—one steel worker, for example, spoke of his satisfaction at being involved in an industry which was of basic importance to the nation's economy. There are, in addition, satisfactions which may, albeit rather clumsily, be called *extra-intrinsic*: these comprise the satisfactions (or dissatisfactions) based on the work situation but, as it were, incidental to the work task as such—for example, relationships with other people at work, including bosses, and general conditions of work such as heating, noise, and canteen facilities. Then there are direct *extrinsic* factors which have reference to criteria outwith the work situation. These are of a varied order—hours of work, which has a bearing upon leisure activities or domestic responsibilities is a straightforward example, and another is the time spent getting to work and the distance that has to be travelled. Finally, there are *indirect extrinsic* factors which include such matters as security of tenure, but have particular reference to aspects of social status. This category has received less emphasis in the foregoing analysis because it was usually implicit in respondents' attitudes rather than being explicit in their statements about sources of satisfaction. This aspect has
been discussed at length in various other contexts, in particular in regard to the moderately aspiring respondents, but there are a few specific points to be added here. Firstly, there is satisfaction to be gained from doing a job that is different from jobs done by most workers. It would seem that certain aspects of job satisfaction depend upon the reference group at work, or in regard to work, to which a person addresses himself. So that a young worker who feels himself to be doing work which relatively few of his peers do draws satisfaction from the fact—a refrigeration engineer, for example, was proud of the assumed "mystique" surrounding his work. And a wholesale shop assistant said that she liked her work because it was "a different kind of job"—she felt some superiority in being differentiated from the mass of girls working in "ordinary jobs", in office, shop or factory. Further to this, it has been suggested by one local authority Youth Employment Department, as indicated above, that the tendency for young workers to choose work, and derive satisfaction from it, by reference to the "up-to-date" image which it presents—"They think not only about the prospects and pay offered by a job but also whether it presents an up-to-date image in which they would wish to be involved"—the conclusion drawn was that in these circumstances it becomes part of the Youth Employment Officers' work to guide teenagers and their parents through

---

the maze created by modern techniques of publicity and the glamorous impression of jobs sometimes created in stories and plays.\(^1\)

The respondents in the present survey had not been involved in work which presented the sort of up-to-date image under discussion, however—except for the refrigeration engineer just referred to, and one girl who was an assistant at the record counter of a multiple stores. The latter did, indeed, gain satisfaction of this order, deriving from the "with-it" image associated with "pop" records. But few jobs with the up-to-date image are available for secondary modern youths; and opportunities for girls were few in 1959, when respondents left school—although they would seem to have expanded since (for example, record sales, "Wimpy-bar" attendants, uniformed receptionists). But, in any case, by the age of twenty the respondents applied criteria derived from hard experience at work, and would probably have thought the up-to-date image rather frivolous, and a feature of the immature younger generation; for themselves, they sought more tangible benefits from work, and had no illusions as to its nature. This is not to deny the importance of the image of a job in the wider sense, however; the discussion above of the image of the steel industry in Sheffield is relevant here. More generally still, the image presented by certain jobs is one which deters certain people from entering it, or makes them

embarrassed to be associated with it.

Certain sorts of dirty factory work for girls were looked down upon as being inferior even by girls who themselves worked in factories. One respondent felt it necessary to dissociate herself from her occupation, by pointing to special reasons (the need for a high wage to support her invalid mother) which made it necessary for her to do such work. She was particularly pre-occupied with the effects of her employment upon her neighbours, who, she said, "Don't seem to want to know me now": It was working class, terraced area, but the neighbours shared the adverse image that the respondent herself had of her job.¹

Young workers take with them into the work setting, in however vague and unformulated a way, certain expectations in regard to these intrinsic, extra-intrinsic, direct and indirect elements of job satisfactions, and they formulate new expectations and re-formulate old ones in the light of work experience. Given that there are the various

¹ More generally, dress is a social indicator, of course. Examples of people wearing clothes and other accoutrements to work which are deemed to suggest employment in a higher level of work, even though the clothes are unsuited to the actual occupation, are so widespread as to be a matter of folklore. The "sandwiches in the violin case" story has been heard by the author in several cities. In Dagenham, Wilmott reports that women "with airs" from neighbouring Romford are dismissed as "all fur coat and no drawers". Cf. The Evolution of a Community, op. cit., and see S. M. Wood, "Uniform—its Significance as a Factor in Role Relationships", op. cit.
elements of job satisfaction,\(^1\) it is clear that different individuals assign differing weight to the elements and the the various constituents comprising them. Attempts have been made to categorise workers in terms of these differences of emphasis—Miller and Form, for example, suggest six distinct types of career orientation amongst workers in the eighteen-year to thirty-four-year age span: (1) ambitious, (2) responsive, (3) fulfilled, (4) confused, (5) frustrated, and (6) defeated. Whilst there were signs of all these dispositions in the young workers in the present study, the appositeness of the typology is not obvious—in part, probably, because the number of respondents is small and their socio-economic backgrounds fairly homogeneous. The orientations would seem to derive from a combination of individual factors of personality, ability and disposition, and of social factors comprising a range of home, neighbourhood and sub-cultural influences. Miller and Form themselves point out that "only limited research has been done to trace the full social ramifications of

---

\(^1\) For other schemes of classification of job satisfaction, see E. Teresa Keil, D.S. Riddell and B.S.R. Green "Youth and Work: Problems and Perspectives", \textit{op.cit.}. The authors discuss "core attitudes" towards work, and distinguish "intrinsic or vocational", "extrinsic or instrumental", "career orientated" (associated with social mobility) and "the desire for security". An additional "core attitude" which they subsume under the intrinsic category is that of a "service" orientated attitude, as postulated by H.D. Schwarzkeller in "Values and Occupational Choice", \textit{Social Forces}, Vol.39, 1960-61, pp.126-135.
career histories" but that "it is well known that important social
effects can be observed to be associated with each type of career
orientation." The main point here is to draw attention to this
perspective and to point to the connection between career orientations
and the elements of satisfaction present or absent in particular jobs.

Whilst factors other than intrinsic elements of job satisfaction
are properly emphasised, however, much debate in regard to the job
satisfaction of young workers with a secondary modern type education
centres around the lack of intrinsic satisfaction in the tasks per-
formed—notably is this so in regard to semi-and unskilled factory
workers, and especially those employed on assembly line work. This
is taken to be a crucial factor—and of course, much discussion of
"alienation" is based upon it. Distinctions are often drawn in this
respect between contented craftsmen and the unhappy masses. Lewis
Lipsitz, for example, in a study of a New Jersey car factory, found
that skilled workers enjoyed their work and did not propose to leave
it. But assembly line workers were very dissatisfied. When asked
to explain Rousseau's dictum that "Man is born free, but everywhere
he is in chains", over three-quarters of the line workers referred

---

   New York, 1951, p.650.
to economic enslavement compared with only one-quarter of the skilled manual workers. Lipsitz puts the emphasis upon the work setting as being the root cause of these differing attitudes because both the skilled men and the line workers were from a similar socio-economic background, broadly defined. Other differences in terms of social and political outlooks were discerned— the line workers were more anti-pathetic or apathetic to Trade Unions for example.\(^1\) The point to be established here is that not only may routine factory work not offer positive satisfaction—it may, indeed, induce positive dissatisfaction which affects morale at work but which also spills over into wider aspects in the non-work context. Thus, Lipsitz writes that assembly-line workers "do not find their work interesting. They complain bitterly and consistently about monotony. In many respects, automobile assembly-line work reflects the most unhealthy characteristics of industrial work. Line workers have a sense of futility. They are frustrated and at the same time are seeking to undo their sense of inadequacy. Their frustrations are clearly reflected in their alienation, i.e., their feelings of powerlessness and its consequences. Their feelings of helplessness are reflected in their fatalistic acceptance of their lot and of the agonies of the great world."\(^2\) Whilst skilled men have a positive, self-confident attitude towards work and towards life in general,


\(^2\) Ibid.
assembly-line workers are cynical and fatalistic. Although the auto assembly-line might represent the extreme, other repetitive work may also have the same implications in terms of fatigue and boredom, and with regard to general attitudes towards work and society. Thus it has been argued that "The repeated performance of simple and uniform movements provides small opportunity for the exercise of thought and skill, and imposes restrictions on personal abilities and desires which favour the onset of boredom; it may have effects which extend even beyond the period of work." Of course, not all young workers react to repetitive work in such a way; some, as we have seen, welcome the fact of easy work and even derive satisfaction from their competence at it. But, accepting the caution, referred to earlier, that too much emphasis may be given to technology as a determinant of attitudes and behaviour, evidence from various studies does indicate that this is one important dimension. Numerous respondents in the present research could be said at least to have had prior dispositions and orientations reinforced by the experience of repetitive and boring work, whether in factory, shop or, indeed, office.

The response to such work may take various forms. It has been maintained, for example, that it may have a "brutalising effect".

---

Discussing workers in the printing industry, Doyle has said that "Some people might expect workers doing...undemanding jobs—one 60 year-old worker....has been pushing a pile of periodicals into position on a cutting table for the past 40 years—to have developed outside interests or creative outlets. The contrary is generally true; the work in all but a few cases has a brutalising effect. Many are racialists, antisemitic and intolerant of minority opinion. Most would like hanging brought back, many even flogging."¹

There was evidence of such "brutality" in the attitudes of certain respondents in routine employment—notably, denigratory and emotional charges made against coloured immigrants: one youth said, "There are far too many allowed in Britain: they take our own people's jobs. And they don't care about their homes; some of them are filthy. And so are their kids." Whether or not such attitudes were induced or reinforced by the nature of the work task is not possible to say from the present research, but this would seem to be a fruitful area for further research.

There was, too, evidence of the use of various devices to assuage the tedium of work—for example, day-dreaming, works football competitions, self-induced vicarious involvement in more responsible and demanding work (a machine operator imagining that his work

involves more skill than it in fact does, and playing out the part elaborately. Usually, however, the reaction of workers to repetitive routine work has been reported as being that of apathy—withdrawal of interest and a resigned acceptance of the situation. This response is often subsumed under the term "alienation". Blauner, for example, has identified four dimensions of this: powerlessness in regard to control of work; meaninglessness, in that the worker is unable to perceive the relevance of his tasks to the total enterprise; isolation in terms of lack of contact with other workers on an assembly-line and in terms of the impersonal organisation at work; and self-estrangement—the worker is unable to involve himself in the task and express himself through it. I do not propose to dwell upon the concept of alienation, or to enter arguments as to what Marx, or subsequent commentators, mean by the term. The material from the present research does not enable me to add anything significant to what has already been said on the question. It is pertinent, however, to point out certain attitudes prevalent amongst respondents which are similar to those which Blauner propounds. The meaninglessness of the


respondents' work in terms of the overall enterprise has already been discussed—the lack of knowledge about products and about the work organisation generally, which characterised a high proportion of young workers, was stressed. With regard to their general attitudes, a disenchantment was obvious in the comments of some respondents—a warehouse worker said that "At the moment my outlook towards work is to do the least as possible with a very high income." A steelworker, not jokingly, said his main dislike was "every time I go to work except Friday; that's pay day". A factory girl in her sixth job, said, "I only work to exist, nothing else": this was to explain that she had no particular likes or dislikes—work did not have sufficient meaning for her to have such strong emotions in regard to particular aspects of it. A labourer made the same point, saying, "I neither like it nor dislike it—I just go." Several other respondents underlined the theme—"Work is work", said a shop assistant: not, that is, to be thought about more than is necessary. And a machine operator said, "It's just a job".

A feature of the responses of many of these young workers was that, accepting they were not likely to get positive satisfaction from their jobs, their concern became rather that of reducing particular dissatisfactions: one outcome of the attempt at doing this was the high rate of job changing. The general approach to the fact of monotony at work was one of resignation and acceptance: respondents came to terms with their jobs by thinking about them as little as
possible, and by minimising expectations in regard to what work had to offer.¹

Because of the presumed deleterious effects of the work done by many manual workers not just upon themselves in the work context, but more broadly in society as a whole, some emphasis has been given in recent years to "job enlargement"—the objects of which are to eliminate, or at least reduce, boredom at work, and at the same time to provide the opportunity for workers to make use of their varied talents rather than requiring them to subserve their ability to the routine demands of the production process. It could be said, in general terms, to be concerned to eliminate the sources of alienation by promoting positive satisfaction. This is held to be worthwhile in relation to the work situation and it is thought to be likely that the greater satisfaction at work will spill over into the non-work sphere with advantageous implications for social harmony. Whilst job enlargement is most clearly applicable in factory work, it is possible also in other occupations, including shop work and clerical work.² Furthermore, it is not necessarily economically disadvantageous

¹Melvin Seeman found, in a study in Sweden, that alienation was most common amongst low paid manual workers but that it was not expressed in terms of feelings of frustration towards society. Seeman suggests that this may be because Sweden is a stable and democratic society and economically advanced relative to some other industrial countries. cf. Sociologie du Travail, 1967, No.2

and could, by permitting of greater adaptability at work in terms of speed, quality and effort, apart from any benefits accruing from improved morale in the labour force, be economically more profitable.\(^1\)

With reference to the broader implications that work experiences in particular jobs have in society, Lockwood has suggested that "the thought that, at the point of production, we produce, among other things, human beings, is worth keeping in mind."\(^2\) The analysis underlying the arguments used to support the case for job enlargement have been challenged by Bettelheim, who suggests that "The well-meant discussions and advice as to what industry should do to make factory work more meaningful has the problem all wrong....what is wrong is that more people do not strive to find meaning in their lives"—if they did, Bettelheim maintains, there would be radical changes in economy and in working conditions. He blames the older generation for not providing meaningful life for the younger.\(^3\)

Bettelheim simply seems to be saying that the attitudes or orientations imported into the work situation are prior to job satisfaction. The

---


\(^2\) David Lockwood, "Can We Cope With Social Change?", *New Society*, No. 61, 28th November, 1963.

Argument here is that the two are complementary, and feed back upon each other. The extent to which job enlargement may significantly amend attitudes and orientations of young workers in contexts other than that of work—in terms, that is, of broader social and political aspects—is, however, subject to speculation. It would seem to be a mistake to infer that a reduction of alienation in the work setting would radically and speedily transform the broader social setting: this would be to ignore the facets of social stratification. One could, perhaps, envisage a process of citizen enlargement parallel to and complementary to job enlargement, whereby opportunities and incentives for involvement in local and national affairs, and in political, cultural and economic affairs, would be expanded. But this would, indeed, be to attempt to engineer substantial amendments in the social structure and, in particular, in the class component within it. The Marxist analysis would seem to link freedom from alienation with just such grand scale amendment of the social structure.

It might be argued on the more modest level that educational policies, especially that of comprehensive education, have precisely this in mind, apart from their pedagogic aims. This issue raises, too, themes posed by Durkheim with regard to the problem of securing moral consensus and co-operation, given the fragmentation of social experience consequent upon occupational specialisation.¹ The main

Point that is being made here, however, is that whilst distinctions may be made for analytical purposes between attitudes and orientations towards work as such; whilst distinctions may be made between factors intrinsic to and extrinsic to the job as such and to the work situation; and whilst the sources of certain attitudes and orientations may be located variously either in the job situation or in the extra-work setting (home and social background) there is, in fact, an interplay between all of these. Discussion in this Chapter has so far been centred mainly around satisfactions—or dissatisfactions— derivable from the job setting. I turn now to the consideration of orientations and attitudes to work brought to, or imported into, the work setting.

The argument being put forward here is that there is an interplay between influences within and outwith the work situation, and that both attitudes towards work and satisfaction in jobs are to be understood as a product of this interplay. Our concern now is with factors outwith the work situation which affect attitudes towards work (and thus, satisfaction or dissatisfaction with particular jobs). By virtue of his pre-work experiences, the young worker brings to the work situation certain pre-conceptions, expectations and dispositions. In Chapter III above, the nature of the influences of the home and school, Youth Employment Service and social background, were discussed.
With regard to specific elements of job satisfaction, it is reasonable to posit that the ingredients of potential satisfaction are likely to vary from one level of job to another, and that the constituents of satisfaction will accordingly be at least indirectly related to the social background and educational experience which determine level of work entered. As Elder argues, "With modern and grammar schools placing youth in primarily low—and high—status occupations respectively, it seems likely that former students from these two types of school would value different aspects of a job. Such qualities as good wages and working conditions are apt to be more common in manual work than jobs which are interesting, allow some autonomy, and offer good prospects for advancement." The potential range of satisfaction is thus likely to vary in accordance with different levels of work. But, in addition, the socio-economic background and educational experience are likely to "acculturate youth to different desires and expectations regarding work." Elder cites evidence from a Gallup Survey to support this argument, which shows, for example, that "former modern school students compared to boys with a grammar school background are more likely to desire good wages and are less inclined to favor intrinsic values such as advancement prospects." Similar reasoning might suggest that within the modern school/manual work sector a like discrimination would be found in regard to satisfactions sought in consequence, for example, of being

---

"A" stream and from an aspiring or traditional working class family as opposed to being in a "B" or "C" stream and from a "rough" working class background. This order of discrimination is commonly made in regard to the dimensions of skilled work as compared with unskilled work, and, of course, much of the foregoing argument, especially that in Chapter III above, supports this argument. However, the complexity of the influences affecting attitudes to work is such that, as the detailed discussion above has indicated, the connections between a particular level of employment and incumbents' attitudes towards work are by no means clear-cut—there were apprentices who were disaffected and money-seeking, just as there were unskilled routine workers with a sense of duty towards their employers and who enjoyed the satisfaction of performing work that was within their competence.

I attempt below to delineate certain clusters of attitudes and behaviour and to associate these with particular social backgrounds. The immediate concern here is to point to the main approaches to work which were manifested by the respondents and which, at least to some extent, cut across the skilled/semi-skilled categories and seemed to proceed, rather, from home and social background—although experience at work in many cases did reinforce the dispositions taken to it. These approaches, or attitudes, were consistent with respondents' political attitudes, which are discussed in detail below.

The first approach is that of deference to the virtues of hard work and the associated need for loyalty to the employer. This attitude
was particularly evident amongst apprentices and amongst Category "A" girls—although not exclusively and not comprehensively amongst them. It was associated with home backgrounds which advocated the importance of effort and duty, and, in many cases, the desirability of "getting on" at work. It also represents one facet of the tendency of young workers to turn their thoughts as they reached the age of twenty towards "settling down"—the married respondents could be said already to have "settled down": this was a process whereby respondents came to conform to the adult values of their home environment, or to something approximating to them. This attitude towards work came out most clearly in criticisms of the alleged feebleness of British workers. An apprentice instrument mechanic, for example, said, "the British workman does not put his back into the job, and seems to be happy just carrying on in the state we are in now". A cutler maintained that "too many men are getting paid for doing nothing": he thought that this was particularly obvious in regard to corporation workmen—"You see one man working and four men watching". It was argued that people "just don't take an interest in their work" (that is, as they should do—it was their motivation that was at fault, and they could and should do something about it). "Considering the wages they get", furthermore, "they ought to be prepared to work a bit harder for them: as it is, "there's too much idling about". A specific shortcoming was internecine strife stimulated by the Trades Unions—"workers are at each others' throats all the time": "if one lot gets a higher wage, the rest all want to
follow suit". As a consequence "the general public suffers, as usual". There were calls for "more discipline", to "put an end to the skiving", and it was argued that "the worker is too pampered nowadays". A factory worker thought that the situation was "getting out of hand" and said, "let us remember when at work that the employer is the boss. He's paying the wages". Such criticisms were often linked to a notion of the "national good", a notion that was not well defined but which was not viewed merely in economic terms— although this seemed to be its spring. The economic difficulties confronting the country were seen as deriving from "an all-round slackness" and "a complete lack of a sense of duty". The solution to the economic and social problems was thought to be simple—"If every man did a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, we would all be better off than we are today". The economic ills were thus extended to broader aspects of society, and sectors other than that of the ordinary working man were held up for equal blame—"From top management right down to cleaner, they all need a good shake-up". A secretary said that "most people seem to have a very negative attitude towards Britain's future. They just say, 'It'll all come out in the wash', or, 'It's no business of mine', or 'leave it to the politicians, they'll find an answer'. No-one seems to be prepared to put their own back into it". One of the postal respondents, a furniture salesman, summed up the position as follows, "There seems to be a horrible malaise over the whole of Britain, a complete 'I couldn't care less' attitude stretching from the top downwards."
'I'm alright Jack' is fast becoming the national slogan. Britain today appears to be a morally decaying nation with no drive or dynamism left. If this was any other country, we would be ripe for dictatorship without opposition". This attitude, then, held by some with moderation, by others in an extreme degree, comprised notions of harmony in society, and of people working together toward that end; there were notes of authoritarianism in the references to the duty of the worker to his employer and the desirability of imposing discipline; and there was, statedly and by implication, reference to the merits of traditional British institutions and the desirability of protecting them from the erosion that would occur or was occurring as a consequence of the loss of the will to work. There was, too, a strong strain of the Protestant ethos reflected in the condemnation of workers' alleged concern for material reward—"their constant demands for higher wages": what was needed, it was maintained, was "more attention to service and less to self". The positive aspects of this sort of approach were evident in the respondents' own concern to "do an honest day's work", not to "slack", to take care not to waste time or the employers' materials, to keep "good time" and not take days off unless ill, and to respect employers and immediate bosses. A particular source of anguish to respondents who were of this approach was when loyalty which they quietly, and in a dutiful and unassuming way, applied in their work met with a rebuff from employers—who appeared not to notice, or not to care, that other workers did not have this "responsible" attitude; did not care
about their work and put little effort into it. This represented a betrayal by the employers of the principles which they above all should enshrine. And it had the effect, as respondents saw it, of blurring the important distinction between "decent" workers and "the general rabble who couldn't care less". Apprentices, who made sacrifices in terms of wages and time spent studying, felt particularly aggrieved when their employers, seemingly, equated them with less able, less hard-working and less committed semi-and unskilled workers who had no such sense of responsibility towards their work.

In regard to those respondents of middle class background who were in non-manual employment, and to youths in such work or aspiring to it and aspiring girls in Category "A" from working class homes, emphasis upon the need for hard work represented not deference to the just demands of employers, but an identification with the employers, or immediate boss. They saw themselves as being actually or potentially of the "boss class"—or, at least, in the relatively superior levels of the occupational hierarchy. They expected to apply themselves to their work, and they thought it proper that others should do so.

In the aspiring respondents, too, there was evident a belief that the world of work today offers opportunities which can be taken advantage of by anyone who is prepared to make the effort: whereas in the past social class might have "held a person down", now, "it's entirely up to the individual". These tended to be respondents who had met with some measure of success, whether through luck, special ability
or effort; and they tended to disparage others who had not met with success as being without the will to succeed, and lacking in ambition. An apprentice plumber said, for example, that "anyone wishing to make progress has every opportunity in the Britain of today". And a steel worker said, "If you've got it in you, you can go as far as you want nowadays. In my view life is up to you, not up to your school teacher or your employer".

This confidence in the future, and in their ability to take advantage of opportunities opening up, was based upon the view that old social barriers were breaking down—the rapid rise of working class people to prosperity in consequence of success in the pop entertainment business was referred to as the extreme example, and the move towards comprehensive education was cited as evidence by one respondent. It had its roots, too, in a shift in emphasis from work as a necessary evil, undertaken in order to survive, to a recognition of work as an instrument for a high material standard of living—it was, that is, connected with the notion of affluence, and with the availability and accessibility of consumer goods on a scale not previously dreamed of by working class people. One or two apprentices were of the opinion that this was a time of innovation, which provided considerable scope for the person who applied himself to his work. They condemned and were even contemptuous of employers who were seemingly reluctant to change methods of production and adopt new techniques—these employers they saw as being behind the times, unimaginative drags upon progress. There was impatience with bad management on this ground:
one youth said that it "cost many thousands of pounds", and added, I am sure that a breaking up of the old-boy and school-tie amongst the bosses would do a lot of good."

We have so far identified two main types of orientation towards work. Firstly there were the respondents who stressed duty and deference, and secondly those who put emphasis upon the new opportunities which were opening up for the young person to avail himself of if he were so inclined. The third main orientation and the one which was most widespread (although evident in varying degrees of intensity in different respondents), posited an inherent difference of interests as between workers and employers—a dichotomy which may be broadened to "them" and "us" or the "haves" and "have-nots". Several respondents referred to the deprivations suffered by "ordinary working men", and of the deficiencies of an education which had resulted in them becoming ordinary working men. A milling machine operator, for example, maintained that "you don't get given a good chance in Britain to get off to a good start. If you go to secondary modern school you've had it". Employers, it was argued, ought to give a better chance of promotion to those who deserve it, instead of only to those "who have had a better upbringing". For, "there are a lot better people who have had a rougher life than those who have had it easy". It was felt that employers "only want cheap labour and don't give a damn about you as a person"—these were the words of a machine operator who added, for emphasis, "that's what I think and that's what most of my friends think."
alternatives to a dead-end job were seen to be the possession of wealth or of influence—"there's no advancement for people like me unless you know someone". Questions of social class affiliation and of class consciousness are discussed separately below in greater detail, but it is pertinent here to stress the importance of conceptions of the class structure in the specific context of orientations to work. The alleged bolstered size of management was seen as an example of the exploiting class helping out, in an obvious way, their "friends and hangers on"—"all these Directors! What do they do? Ride around in Silver Clouds." What more proof was necessary? There was, in some respondents, an acceptance of the managers and other bosses "getting what they can out of it", provided they worked hard ("After all, it's human nature, isn't it?). It was all the people "doing nothing and getting paid for it" who were the major source of grievance. But most respondents tended to a more simplistic line, seeing the workers on the one hand, with "next to nothing", and the employers on the other hand with "everything they want, and more". Between the two was an unbridgeable gap: the bosses were to be distrusted—as one semi-skilled worker said, "I dislike all gaffers)—well, that's natural, isn't it".

Lockwood has pointed to the importance of the work situation as a dimension of social stratification—work situation is distinct from market situation, and represents "the set of social relationships in which the individual is involved by virtue of his position in the division of labour". The work situation in which many

1David Lockwood, The Blackcoated Worker, op.cit., p.15
respondents found themselves was confirmatory of the dichotomous appraisal of society in terms of the haves and the have-nots—

with bosses having advantages in regard to hours, in matters of dress, cleanliness, facilities for washing, canteens, and so on. Even the lower ranks of office workers were segregated with management—several respondents, youths and girls, condemned the disparate rewards (in terms of conditions and status afforded) to office staff in comparison with manual workers. One semi-skilled machine operator, for example, complained that it was "wrong that the office staff should get three weeks holiday and workers only two weeks". One week's holiday, the respondent indicated, might not seem much to worry about; but its importance was that it symbolised the inequalities between staff and workers.

Not all respondents were employed in the sphere of private industry and commerce, of course. Caplow has pointed out that "a growing proportion of the labor force is employed in public or private bureaucracies which by their very structure set up other goals in the place of financial incentives". The most obvious examples amongst the present respondents are the girls who entered nursing because of a wish to serve other people, and what they referred to as "an interest in people". These nurses may be said to constitute a separate category in terms of their orientation towards work. (It should be noted, however, that the experience of work engendered in some of them, or

---

1 The Sociology of Work, op. cit., p. 148
brought out in them, what was latent in their orientation—an antipathy towards the authoritarian structure of their employment situation—which can be regarded as a special case of the "conflict" view of the work situation just discussed, in which "bosses" are deemed to be organising work for their own interests and aggrandisement, and with the object of "keeping their juniors down". The criticisms to this effect made by several nurses have already been noted. There are further examples in regard to occupations which do not have the humanitarian flavour of nursing. A girl who had worked her way up to the post of personal secretary in the National Coal Board clearly enjoyed the sense of contributing to the public service, and her satisfaction at work can be seen as the outcome of her pleasure in doing the actual tasks, her realisation that she was making progress and her involvement in a nationalised bureaucratic organisation which had, she felt, an important part to play on behalf of society, and which was not ridden through with the emphasis upon profits which was present to a greater or lesser degree in other sorts of work—as the girl said, "you feel that they are interested in you as people, not just for what they can get out of you". But working for a nationalised industry does not necessarily have such an effect. We have already referred to the disillusion of an apprentice engineer who, initially proud at working for a government enterprise which he expected to be more thorough than private industry and more concerned with the quality of its output, soon came to realise that, in industry, "it's the same wherever you go—scimped work and
bosses who couldn't care less about you". If anything, he thought, nationalised industry was worse than private enterprise because the former had so much "red tape". Hollowell's study of lorry drivers indicates the prevalence of a similar view amongst such workers—so far from feeling a sense of involvement in the enterprise as a consequence of its nationalisation, they feel rather, a deeper sense of frustration and loss of independence. Whether this represents the strength of the prior orientation of "Us" versus "Them", of worker versus bosses, persisting when, formally, the goals of the enterprise are represented as being above those of bosses and ordinary workers considered separately, or whether there is a special inefficiency which transforms a "deferential" or "service" orientation into one of conflict is a point which it is not possible to pursue at this stage.¹

The above analysis will be taken up again in the broader context of the images of society and of social stratification which the young workers had. The attempts will be made to refine somewhat the rather crude categorisation of orientations to work so far employed. It is important at this point to indicate one other perspective. In concentrating upon orientations towards work, it is possible to underestimate the significance of non-work attitudes and behaviour.

¹ As one driver said, "You get buggered about so much. You've more bosses now under nationalisation than ever you had under private enterprise". cf. Peter G. Hollowell, The Lorry Driver, op. cit.
Certain sociologists in recent years have questioned the assumption that leisure activities and interests, and values associated with them, represent the dependent variable, with values deriving from the work situation and/or embedded in position in the system of social stratification determining to a greater or lesser extent the meaning of leisure. It is argued, for example, that changing technology and rising standards of living create a situation in which leisure is no longer to be regarded as merely a compensation for work or as an escape from it—a formulation which posits that work is so boring and tiring that little energy is left for "serious" leisure activities, and all that workers seek in non-work hours is an assuagement of the wounds of work through immersion in "instant", "popular" entertainment. Now, the argument is, workers have the time and the mental and physical energy to gain positive satisfactions from leisure. And these satisfactions may be sufficiently powerful as to make for a re-orientation in attitudes to work, with leisure, or non-work, criteria assuming prior importance. The work of Dumazedier suggests that such a "profound transformation" has occurred or may occur—leisure displacing work as the central element in the lives of the masses.¹ The analysis of Crozier² and that of Touraine³ suggests, too, that exaggerated importance has been attached to work

as a determining factor, and that whilst individuals are subject to overall restraints by virtue of the fact of living within a particular society at a particular time, there remains open to them an element of choice such that they may elect for one particular style of life rather than another, within the theoretical range of those open to them—and the opportunity is thus afforded to them of applying a greater weight to the pursuit of non-work satisfactions, and of seeking correspondingly decreased satisfactions from work per se: they are accordingly not disappointed at work, because they do not look for much from it. Workers who regard their employment as instrumental—whether they be in search of affluence or merely of a sufficient income to permit them to follow the leisure activities in which they find their main satisfaction—could be viewed from this perspective. In the present study, a good example of the selection of criteria outwith the work situation is that of the young married couples who were aspiring to a somewhat higher standard of living, and to what they perceived as a superior style of life, compared with their parents. A steady job was necessary as a means towards that end, and their attitude towards work is to be understood in these terms: they were grateful for, and satisfied in, a secure job because this was the necessary instrument for obtaining what they really valued in life. It is not quite as simple as that, of course, since a "respectable job" was an intrinsic part of the style of life which was aspired to. But the substantive point remains that the attitude towards work was derived from criteria which related to non-work
NB. There is no page 333
ends—as opposed to the work occupying the central position and non-
work attitudes and orientations flowing from this fact such that be-
haviour outside the work context, and specifically leisure activities,
represent a process of making the best of a necessarily bad job. The
work of the sociologists referred to above, and general work in this
field, would seem to be of a speculative order—and much of it de-
pends upon assumptions as to the impact of technological change and
of mass media upon the nature of society, in terms of the content of
social bonds and also in terms of the freedom for leisure (time and
material resources) available. It may indeed be argued that the signs
of liberation from work which have been detected in Britain may well
be a temporary phenomenon, and that to infer fundamental changes in
regard to orientation to work is, at best, premature. Whilst workers
may indulge in an instrumental approach to work during a time of
affluence, for example, a depression or even a recession may induce
a rapid reversion to a sense of dependence upon work, and a recog-
nition of the opposition of employers’ and employees’ interests. The
conception of work as instrumental, or as a vehicle, in this analysis
represents a delusion, induced by prosperity, of a sharedness of inter-
ests as between employer and employee, or if not a sharedness of inter-
ests at least a supposition that it is to the mutual benefit to sustain
a smoothly operating enterprise in which employees seek no greater
satisfaction than high wages.¹

Certain of these points will be explored further, below. In Chapter 15, in which leisure activities of the young workers are discussed, specific relationships between work and leisure are pointed to; and in the consideration of respondents' images of society, issues associated with the view of work as instrumental are taken up again. At this stage it suffices to make one further point. Whether the nature of the work done, position in the class structure, or a combination of these two factors, exercises the dominant influence upon the content and quality of non-work behaviour and attitudes, there is evidence to suggest that work itself does not constitute a focal point for interest and involvement in the case of many, if not most, industrial workers. Dubin's study of American

¹Blackburn has argued along these lines, saying that Goldthorpe's analysis of the Luton car workers is faulty because, Blackburn alleges, it refers to a transitory situation. The fact of a major strike occurring subsequent to Goldthorpe's analysis is Blackburn's starting point—"Goldthorpe clearly over estimated the stability of both the company's operations and the workers' consciousness in an inescapably capitalist environment." Blackburn's stricture is that Goldthorpe informed himself of what the workers conceived their position to be at a time when expectations with regard to reciprocity and inter-dependence as between employers and employees were being met. But this was an aberrant period—however long it might have lasted: the real nature of the workers' condition "was only revealed when the expectations were no longer fulfilled, and the workers then reacted in response to the now obvious economic relationship as between employer and employee, that of coercion and exploitation". cf. The Incompatibles, op.cit., P.48, et seq. This argument is taken up again below.
workers, for example, led him to the conclusion that "the industrial workers' world is one in which work and the workplace are not central life interests for a vast majority. In particular, work is not a central life interest for industrial workers when we study the informal group experiences that have some affective value for them. Industrial man seems to perceive his life history as having its center outside of work for his intimate human relationships and for his feelings of enjoyment, happiness and worth." He sees work as necessary, but not all-important.

In the present study, this appraisal received substantiation from the rejection by respondents of excessive demands imposed by the work situation. They accepted that they had to work, but they were insistent that they had not sold all of their lives in exchange for wages—not only did they expect reasonable time for leisure, but they liked to keep work and leisure separate in their own minds: even though leisure time did represent the margin of hours left over when work was done, it was their own. They were accordingly resentful at any intrusion of work into leisure time, whether directly through "compulsory" overtime or through insistence by employers of attendance at further education classes (unless, of course, they were themselves committed to the goals which this led towards). It is this outlook, too, that helps to explain impatience with opposition to,

---

or mere indifference about Trade Unions—because the unions, by stressing the importance of work and of the work situation, are trying to extract a greater interest in work than young workers are inclined to give—trying to make of it a central life interest, when young workers would prefer to turn their thoughts to other matters. ¹

If they do what is expected of them by the employers within reasonable working hours, respondents thought, then they were entitled to forget about it outside such necessary limits of involvement.

¹See Chapter VIII, below.
CHAPTER VIII
TRADE UNION PARTICIPATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE UNIONS

At the end of their first year in employment, only one-third of the youths and less than one-sixth of the girls had had any contact with trade unions. The majority of their contacts had resulted from the informal efforts of ordinary members, rather than from the active interest of trade union officials. Amongst respondents who were members, as amongst the youths and girls as a whole, there was very little understanding of the organisation of unions—indeed, the indications were of lack of interest and knowledge. The conclusion, at that stage was that "unions are obviously not making much impact upon young people when they enter the world of work—the transition is made without their assistance".  

By the time of Interview No.4, after five years in employment, there was distinctly more knowledge about trade unions amongst the youths—although less evidently so amongst the girls. At this stage

---

1 Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 14
a majority of youths and well over one-third of the girls had fairly clearly formulated attitudes towards the unions. The unions now meant something to these respondents—in part, but by no means exclusively, because they recognised the direct relevance of the unions to their pay and conditions: some, indeed, had been involved in direct union action to secure improvements at work.

At the time of Interview No.4, then, 33 youths and 15 girls were paying members of unions. Four youths, but none of the girls, could be said to be active members in that they held office or attended meetings regularly, and followed the minutiae of decisions. An additional 10 youths and 7 girls who were not at this stage members had previously belonged to a union (in most cases whilst working in another job and/or occupation, or, with girls, prior to marriage and giving up work). So that a half of the youths and one-third of the girls at work were or had been members of a union. Rather more youths and somewhat more girls had strong, or fairly strong, views on unions, however, as will be seen below.

In terms of skill, a high proportion of apprentices were trade union members (16/29)—a reflection of the powerful union organisation amongst craftsmen. An analysis of union membership by level of skill is given in Table 26. Union members tended to have had few jobs—15/33 had had one job only, since leaving school; 8 had had two jobs, and the remaining 10 between three and six jobs. The high proportion of members who were apprentices and the relatively low job turnover amongst apprentices is an important factor here. But
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>T.U. Active</th>
<th>Totals in Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was some evidence to suggest that a higher proportion of union members took their work seriously, and the low job turnover is one indication of this. However, union membership not infrequently merely reflects the fact that a union is organised at the place of work, rather than being indicative of the positive will to join or of a particular attitude towards work as such. These points are developed below. As to the girls, 4 were in Category "A" jobs (all of them office workers); 3 were in Category "B" (all of them shop assistants); and the remaining 8 were in Category "C", most of them being factory/warehouse workers. Half of the girl members had had only one or two jobs since leaving school.

The interest in and knowledge about unions amongst the union members varied considerably. Some were well versed in union affairs, and supporters on ideological grounds as well as because of the direct material benefits which union action might give rise to. But many tended to be unthinking or unquestioning members, and approximately
one-third of both youths and girls who were members were equivocal in their support (they remained members because it was expected of them at work, or because they felt that on the whole the advantages outweighed the disadvantages). Two youths and one girl who were union members in fact disapproved of membership, but because of the closed shop principle, or because it was expected of them and they did not think it worth making an issue of the matter, they remained in their unions. Only a handful of members had been to any meetings: most were like the steel worker who said that he had "never been, and never intended to". A few had been to meetings from time to time, usually when there was some urgency about a particular matter. One youth who had attended meetings was distinctly impatient with the whole business: he observed that "there's too much talking and not enough decided at their meetings". On the other hand, the 4 youths who were active members were very enthusiastic—a printer, for example, said "I go to all the meetings I can, on the first Monday of every month—we discuss things, local affairs, and national matters". And an A.E.U. member, who had charge of the apprentices' union affairs in his workshop attended fortnightly meetings, at which there was discussion "of anything that has happened of union concern over the past week or so—including political matters, in so far as unions are affected".

Two of the 4 active members had fathers who were also keen union members and who held office in their branches. The father of one was treasurer of his union branch, and was instrumental in securing
the election of the respondent to the committee at the age of sixteen, as representative of the junior employees. There was some further evidence that keenness for unions "runs in the family", in the comments of several respondents about their fathers', husbands' or fiancés' interest. One girl, for example, said "No, I'm not a member—there isn't one in my shop. I wish there were. I'm my own union. I think unions are good. But then, I get all my ideas about it from my father and my brother; they're mad keen on it."

Failure to attend meetings is not necessarily an indication of lack of interest or involvement. There was, for example, a latent loyalty and support for unions evident in certain respondents, such that when it was felt necessary, active support was or would be preferred—support for unions in times of crisis is not merely a matter of hysteria or self-seeking, but represents the mobilising of this latent and normally unspoken loyalty. Furthermore, union affairs may be channelled through one individual's attendance at a meeting to a much larger section of the membership, through his informal report to his workmates—one factory worker, for example, said "No, I don't go to meetings, but one of my mates goes, and he tells us all what has happened.

An attempt was made to classify respondents in terms of the nature of their attitudes towards unions, and the result is shown in Table 27.
### Table 27

**Attitudes Towards Unions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinions</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports fairly or very strongly</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would accede to membership if required to join</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivocal in support</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against unions (at least in own occupation)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Not interested&quot;, &quot;Don't know&quot;, etc.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Support Unions Fairly or Very Strongly**

Ten of the 23 youths and 9 of the 15 girls in this category were members of unions. The remainder were not members mainly because there was no union organisation at their own place of work, or, as with several of the girls, because they had ceased working on marriage.

As has already been suggested, support was often unquestioning—but it was nonetheless real for that. A mill hand, for example, said that he was not sure of the name of his union "I just pay my two shillings a week—it's a closed shop; but I don't mind, because I believe in unions". Almost instinctively, but presumably as the outcome of a process of socialisation which may have included the pre-work years, especially home and neighbourhood influences, but which was probably concentrated in the early years in employment, such workers felt the union movement to be important to them—they "believed in" their union. They did not wish to know the details—it was enough that the principle counted (even though the principle was ill-defined in the minds of many, there tended to be some idea of the unity of
interests of the workers in confrontation with employers). Thus a T.G.W.U. member, working in the steel industry said, "I don't take much notice. I pay my shilling a week, and that's it: but I know they're behind me. They're behind all working men." He had no concern about the way in which the union was organised or how it set about its tasks—he was content to let others who were interested in such matters attend to those aspects. With scarcely any knowledge about unions, the youth was thus able to say with absolute conviction, "Trade Unions are essential to protect the working man". Like many other youths, this respondent placed his complete trust and loyalty (but not much of his time or effort) in the union.

Amongst supporters of the unions, there were two strands of argument, blended in most cases, but with emphasis being given to the one or the other. The first strand was in regard to the direct benefits of membership, deriving from wages and conditions, negotiations, welfare and legal support, and so on. The second strand related to the principle of workers' unity. Put rather differently, some respondents stressed the individual advantages, others thought more in terms of collective responsibilities and of the overall benefits to workers as a whole. The particular emphasis which was laid on the one or other of these seemed, in part, to be dependent upon home background—children from families in which there was pronounced union support stressing the "principle" of membership—and in part upon type of occupation and/or level of skill, apprentices, too, stressing the principle of collective benefits because of the threat which they
felt faced skilled men nowadays, confronted as they were by a situation in which their wages, conditions, and status no longer compared so favourably with non-skilled workers. But data on this is slight and these hypotheses are therefore very tentative.

Specific benefits were uppermost in the minds of many respondents, and particularly so with those in dangerous occupations—for example, certain jobs in the steel industry, in which injuries through industrial accidents are common. In such work union backing for claims was much valued. The worry and insecurity of the working man without capital, or much money at all, to fall back upon is reflected in this concern with union support in time of trouble. Thus a 'bus conductor said that he joined the union because he would be helped "if there was any trouble on the 'buses—if a passenger was injured, for example, he could claim from the 'bus conductor personally, but the union would be helpful if this happened". Unions were "a good thing", then, because they gave "help and security". Another aspect of this was the recognition by workers that they had not got the resources—the command of words, of procedures—to do themselves justice single-handed. So that a machine operator, for example, said that "unions are good at fighting causes, for putting over with the required weight the other side of a story if a man is sacked, for example."

Direct benefits in terms of pay rises were referred to by most union supporters. One respondent had changed his mind about membership on taking a new job—"when I was in my first job, I was influenced to thinking that unions were no good. But now I am a member—
it is a closed shop—I think unions are a good help, and that I have benefitted from membership. I've already had one pay rise through the union." But far more important than pay rises, generally, were matters of security such as those referred to above, and of general conditions at work. One non-member, for example, a warehouse worker, said, "it would be a good thing if there were a union at my firm—things would be remedied overnight: the conditions are so hard that I just can't understand how some people have spent their entire working lives in that terrible place—no heating, poor sanitation, and so on". Unfortunately, he said, "the bosses won't allow" a union in the works.

Help in personal matters was referred to by only a few respondents. One youth said, "they are good, they help you out. My mother is ill and I asked the boss if I could work on jobs in the city so that I could be on call. The boss refused, so I took it to the union, and they got permission straight away." And a van driver said that "the unions are good—they give you advice if you feel you are being put upon". But it is notable that in regard to matters of careers, for example, or to future plans and prospects, apprenticeship schemes or further education, respondents did not think of seeking guidance from the unions. This reflects the lack of concern shown by unions about such issues, at the branch and shop-floor level. (In the replies to the questions dealing with persons to whom respondents would turn for advice about work, one youth only referred to a union official).
The girls who positively favoured unions almost without exception referred to specific, practical advantages of membership. A clerk, for example, said that unions were "useful for getting you a rise"; whilst a secretary said, "It's done quite a lot since I've been there. A lot of people say they don't do much, but we have got a shorter week and a pay rise." A sales assistant, regretting that there was no union organisation at her firm, quoted the case of a girl who had been dismissed on the spot for being rude to a customer. The management had refused to go into the details of the case, and "there was nothing the rest of us could do about it". Several other respondents, for similar reasons, would have gladly joined a union had there been the opportunity to do so at their place of employment. One girl, a seamstress, made an unusual appraisal, saying of the union that it was "very good—we've never had to go to them" (that is, to complain to officials about conditions). This criterion was seldom applied, but represented a recognition of the fact that the mere existence of a union constitutes a power to which the employers must pay regard. Girls, on the whole, did not refer to the broader principle of union membership, then, but concentrated on the particular material advantages. This in accord with the different meaning that work has for them, which has already been discussed. But there were some signs amongst the girls of a recognition of the need for joint action and co-operation between workers as against employers. The signs were most pronounced amongst factory girls, whose work conditions most closely approximated those of the men, and who were more likely
to be subject to the influence of union organisation. Thus, one
factory girl said "you must have co-operation to get things done—a
single person won't achieve anything by herself": whilst a ware-
house girl stated, "even the lowest person has some sort of say
when you have a union" as a counter-weight to an economic system which
threatened to assign the less able and unskilled person to a position
of complete subjection. The fact of the union restored some dignity
to such people. But views on the general philosophy of unions, and
on matters of principle and social justice, were essentially associated
with the youths rather than with the girls.

The Principles of Trade Unions

For a few youths this dimension of union membership was all-
important—tangible benefits such as increased wages or better
working conditions were valued not so much in themselves, but as
symbols of the growth in dignity, honour and/or power of the working
man. Thus a painter/decorator observed that unions are "good for the
cause". The "cause" was seen as including the overall protection of
the working man and the furtherance of his welfare, but these were,
in a sense, the negative aspects: what was important, positively,
was the continued assertion of the workers' rights in society. The
"cause" was nothing so trivial as getting an extra ½d an hour on the
wages. It had to do with the nature of society and the working man's
place in it. And for some respondents, society was defined in terms of an opposition of interests as between employee and employer—with the latter always to be suspected, so that the former should always be on his guard. The matter was put concretely by a steel worker, who averred that "if there were no unions, you would have no defence against the employers: there is a kind of fear of directors. For example, if one comes into the workshop, everyone tries to look as if they were working twice as hard as they usually do". Afraid of the "boss", in awe of him because of his dress, bearing and power, or despising him for the same reasons, the individual comes before him less reluctantly because of the awareness that collectively, through the unions, he is standing up to the boss, ensuring that the boss doesn't get everything the way he wants it.

One respondent, a railway worker, saw the position more in terms of consensus and "common sense": he supported unions because their existence meant that "everyone"—employers, employees and other interested parties—"can get together and sort things out". Amongst those who firmly supported the unions in terms of "principles" there were, too, some who complained of the failure of many working men to recognise the true issues—an apprentice engineer, for example, thought that the unions were less effective than they should be because they "are fighting with their backs against the wall all the time: they don't get the support they need, and they don't call enough on the support they have" (by the latter remark he meant that ordinary members were not rallied enough—to many decisions were made by
officials who were necessarily to some extent removed from the everyday experience of being a worker). One respondent, too, was critical of union organisation at the local level: he said, "the unions are good on the whole, but it depends on the union man—some don't bother doing anything, but just take the dues each week, though others are very keen and active".

Would Accede to Membership if Requested to Join a Union

Eight youths were in this category: they recognised that the occasion could arise, in their present or in some future job, when they might be expected to join a union. They did not feel particularly strongly about the matter, and had not thought much about it—but they could see the merits, without wishing to go out of their way to avail themselves of them. Thus, a buffer in cutlery work said that most of those in his firm who were union members were married men who were "using the union as security against unemployment". The respondent was still single, and was "not bothered about joining but would probably do so if asked". It was less a recognition of positive advantages that led him to this attitude, however, than a policy of following the least line of resistance—it was not worth arguing about, or spending effort on thought: it was all too complicated and boring for that. For the sake of a few coppers a week, you might as well join and forget about it. His reason for joining, then, would be the same
as his reason for not yet belonging—that this was the easiest situation to be in, the one requiring least thought and effort. So, too, with an apprentice joiner, who said, "I suppose it's alright up to a point. I've not had much to do with them. I would join if I had to—I would fit in with the rest." Compliance and following the least line of resistance determined the moods of these respondents, then: there was no point, no advantage, in making a fuss, standing out against the tide—union membership was just one other fact of work, which might have to be accepted, or put up with.

Equivocal—Or Some Doubts

Twenty-five youths (including 12 union members) and 10 girls (5 members) were in this category. The doubts took a variety of forms, ranging from alleged inefficiency of the unions and their unconcern for young workers, to wider issues as to the proper limits of union activity industrially and in society generally.

The vested interests of particular unions, as displayed in demarcation disputes, were referred to by one respondent, a steel worker, who said that whilst he approved of unions in general, "it would be a disadvantage in my firm, where the men help each other and do each others' jobs, and it seems to work quite well"—all the workmen got good wages and a good bonus, and the respondent had no wish for the union to intervene and, perhaps, "spoil" everything. Approval of
unionism as such, together with dissatisfaction at their own particular union, marked the attitude of several other respondents. A telephonist, for example, remarked, "our's isn't much good—they don't do much". There was a clear note of resentment in the comments of these respondents, betokening a feeling of having been let down in comparison with other workers. A felt superiority over other manual workers explained the attitude of one respondent, a junior laboratory assistant, who said that whilst he could see the benefits of unions for people in other occupations, in his own case "there's not a lot of call for it"—his conditions, in terms of wages and security, were satisfactory—he was "on the staff side, you see". In fact, he was eligible for membership of A.Sc.W. and had resisted "numerous" attempts to persuade him to join. Indeed, he rejoiced in the fact of still being what he termed a "blackleg" (although it was not a "closed shop"). He positively valued non-membership as an indication (to himself at least) of his separateness from the ordinary mass of workers, for whom membership was necessary. It was in such terms that he perceived, and indeed defined, his work situation, for his own satisfaction.

Alleged inefficiency or lack of concern was at the basis of the reservations of certain respondents—"they are good if they are used correctly", said a wood-machinist, "but half the time the unions are not really interested—the top men are only out to make money for themselves" (it will be seen later that there was also criticism
of unions for involving themselves in politics—the charge that union officials were "in it for the money" was part of a broader charge that they manipulated union affairs for political ends, forgetting the "ordinary worker"). It was argued, too, that unions were subject to too much bureaucracy, "there's too much red tape with them. If there's a case of victimisation, for example, it's difficult to get anything done about it", with all the normal channels "to be gone through". An apprentice pointed out that the union was of limited help to apprentices until they had served their time—"in general, I think they're good, but they're not much use for apprentices, because union benefits are more suitable for older people, and apprentices aren't allowed to go on strike".

Many of the reservations had a broader frame of reference than the work situation as such. There was a feeling, for example, that unions nowadays "sometimes go a bit too far" in their demands or actions. An engineering machinist said that "they are good on the whole, but some are a bit irresponsible, particularly when they demand simultaneously more pay and a shorter working week—that is an attitude which I just cannot understand". It seemed obviously unreasonable to him. The point should be made here that, generally, there was little sophistication amongst these respondents as to economic matters and factors such as productivity. Rather, they tended to make a simple equation between hours worked and pay rewarded—with the idea that one might be able to secure concessions from employers in regard to one or the other but obviously (as they
saw it, as a matter of simple logic) not in regard to both. So that there was an uneasiness that the unions were going beyond the bounds of the reasonable and fair. An apprentice steel worker, for example, said of the unions that "they've done well in the past, but seem to have been overdoing it in recent years".

There was impatience, too, at the frequency of disputes—respondents felt that it would be pleasant to have some easing up in the constant squabbles between employers and unions. Bosses and union officials were said to be "worse than a lot of kids". And it becomes "more than tedious," for the "perpetual carping is ridiculous—it is carping for the sake of carping". For, "it stands to reason" however effective the unions are, they still cannot "get around the fact" that "work is work" and "certain things just have to be put up with". Unions might alleviate troubles, but they cannot remove them entirely. So why do they keep trying, why not be content, for a while, with what they have managed to do? Thus a painter remarked that "they are always complaining—although he went on to say that "there is something to be said for them", for "they are the people who get rises"

---

1 This could have reflected the influence of mass media in the run-up to the election in 1964; but, as will be indicated below in more detail, the signs are that respondents took little notice of political affairs, least of all as conveyed by newspapers, radio or television. Nor were strikes such a wide-spread phenomenon in 1964 as to give rise to special fears about the power of unions. The inference may therefore be drawn that the attitudes presently being cited are of a more deep-seated and permanent order.
for you, or at least, push up the minimum rates". An apprentice engineer took a similar view—"they get us more wages but they do cause a lot of unnecessary trouble for employers". And another apprentice argued that "on the whole their activities are fair; they help out workers when they are in real, legitimate trouble—but they do stir up trouble unnecessarily".

The disruption caused by strikes, particularly those which cause immediate and direct inconvenience to the public (including the respondents in their role as citizens and consumers, rather than as workers), was the basis of severe criticism of unions. A butcher said, "I don't know much about it—sometimes they operate alright, but sometimes they don't. Take the G.P.O. strike. That's just chaos. They should look for another way to resolve difficulties other than by ruthless action that just causes difficulties for others". "When it comes to refusing to load and unload in dockyards," said another youth, "and when sympathisers start coming out, this makes me really annoyed": he deeply mistrusted sympathisers—at best they were as ignorant and misled as the major strikers, and at worst they were seizing upon an excuse not to work.

Whilst reservations of a stringent order were made about strikes, however, the general feeling amongst respondents in this category was that they were a legitimate weapon, if used with discrimination. This reflects a recognition by youths that daily work is the basis of their existence and that of their families, and that the right to
work and to reasonable conditions must be defended—although in as "reasonable" a way as possible, and causing the minimum of hardship to innocent persons. Girls, on the other hand, were more extreme in their criticism of strikes, because they were differently orientated. They saw strikes not as a workers dependent upon the solidarity of all workers in maintaining their rights, but in more immediate terms, as consumers or housewives actual or prospective, and concerned with the inconveniences that strikes caused—shortage of food in the shops, for example, high prices, or an ill-tempered man at home all day getting in the way, or with more time on his hands than money in his pockets and building up debt in the local pub. Condemnation was often couched by girls in terms of principles at stake as well as the practical disadvantages, however. Thus a girl machinist said, "I don't believe in strikes. They solve no problems, but rather lead to more". And a nurse, who thought that unions were necessary, "disapproved strongly of strikes on principle", because they represent "a destructive way of acquiring something—it is blackmail". Not only were strikes "immoral", in the view of a warehouse worker, but they were "ridiculous"—"to have idle hands when there is so much work to be done". A comptometer operator reproved the strike policy also—"they cause a lot of trouble and unrest, with their philosophy of 'you stamp on my feet and I'll get revenge'."

Another reservation in regard to the unions, raised by several youths and echoed by some girls, was in regard to union involvement in political issues, that is, issues going beyond those of the
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immediate work situation and conditions of employment. Unions were said to be "a good thing if properly used": but they were thought to be "too frequently abused". A labourer, for example, said that they are "good for what they are meant for—to get higher wages" but that when they went beyond that, they were "going too far". Another respondent, a motor mechanic, said that unions "shouldn't meddle in politics". Underlying this view was a feeling made explicit by an electrician, that "they're a good thing, but they have got too much power in this country". (this was at a time prior to the General Election, when the Conservatives were still in office).

For entanglement in political activities, it was thought, implied stepping beyond the proper bounds, and thus represented an involvement of work matters in the non-work sphere—an involvement which made respondents uneasy, anxious as they were to confine matters of work to the hours when they were obliged to be at the work-place. In addition, it was asserted that union involvement in political matters reduced their efficiency in performing their true, industrial functions—for, "they can't get concerted action because they are always split among themselves". When involved in issues other than those directly concerned with employment, a nurse said, "unions get twisted and mixed, and are not sure what they are standing for". "When the unions enter politics, politics enter the union"—an apprentice engineer pointed the lesson, adding, "Look at the recent history of the E.T.U.—they're a bunch of Reds!"
One important qualification in support of unions had reference to the liberty of the individual, and took the form of objection to the "closed shop" principle. A motor mechanic, for example, said that he just does not like the idea of forced membership (although he added that he can't see a way round it, since non-members would receive the benefits for which members had worked and, perhaps made sacrifices). Doubts arising from the infringement of personal independence also took other forms. An apprentice joiner, who was very knowledgeable about his union, said "in practice, I suppose they are a good thing—the majority of workers would be in a bad way without them: but in principle I think they are rubbish—people should be able to work without unions". They should, that is, have the spirit and the know-how to stand up for themselves. The same approach, and the same fears, were evident in a machine operator who remarked that "unions are not bad really, but members tend to behave like sheep". Whatever benefits the unions bestowed, that is, they necessarily implied some detraction from the independence of the individual, and this was to be regretted. One youth, indeed, refused to join a union, despite pressure to do so, for this reason—"unions are a good idea for the majority of workers, I suppose, but, for myself, I don't like being part of a mass".
Against Trade Unions (At Least in their Particular Job)

Nine youths, including two reluctant members of unions who worked at firms where the "closed shop" principle obtained, and 7 girls (one a reluctant union member), were definitely "against" unions, and most of these were highly critical of union activity. In the cases of two youths and one girl, however, the objection was not a general one, but had reference to their particular occupations—the girl felt that there "was no place for unionism in nursing", and the youths said that conditions in their firms were in any case good. The reasons advanced for this anti-unionism echoed those discussed above in regard to the reservations of respondents who were equivocal in their support for unions—the same range of objections were evident but they were held with rather more vehemence, and without concessions to the possible value of unions.

Two respondents, a furniture removals driver and a girl wire-tester, indicated that their opposition to unions was based essentially upon their own immediate interests. The youth said that he was at present paid above union rates—so why should he join a union, and have to "pay for the pleasure of doing so?" Unions, as he saw them, were purely instrumental toward higher rewards: he had no need for such an instrument. The girl reproved the idea that she should contribute to union funds and activity, saying, "the boss looks after us well enough. We don't want a union poking its nose in".
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There was, too, opposition deriving from actual or alleged shortcomings of the unions—"they've never done nought for me"; and an apprentice engineer added, "they are a waste of time—we've made a number of complaints about a hole in the roof at work, but no one has taken any notice, management or unions". All the girls, apart from the two mentioned above, made reference to a specific shortcoming of the unions—a bottle-labeller, for example, said that she had "joined once, with the idea of getting union support for an afternoon tea-break. All the girls joined together: we were told a union man would come to the works, but nothing happened—so I chucked it in, and so did the other girls". Another girls was wrathful, especially since she had "been made to join the union"—"I don't know what they're supposed to do—they've not done much in this factory, anyway. They might do something for men, but they do nothing for women". This respondent explained the compulsion to join the union, saying, "the foreman said, 'the union men are checking round next week, so let's have you all paid up by then'"; and she commented, "I think its awful that you have to join—everyone has to be in it". A factory girl joined the union to support a wage claim "which didn't come off": so she left, and her view was that unions are "rubbish". A clerk similarly joined a union and remained a member for a year, with the idea of seeking improvements in office conditions, and notably in regard to poor heating. She left ultimately because the union "couldn't get anything done", despite the fact that she and her colleagues attended meetings to press the officials to do something.
All that happened was that the office was half-heartedly re-decorated—but this "had nothing to do with union efforts".

A line of criticism pursued by one youth, an A.E.U. member, was that unions are inefficient—"outdated in organisation, policy and structure"; he belonged only because he thought that a membership card would be helpful, if not essential, in finding a better job. There were allegations of intrigue and graft as well as of inefficiency—an engineering grinder maintained that "they don't really do you any good: you pay your contribution every week, but you never know what's going on. What do they do with the money? What's more, when they go on strike as often as not nothing happens—they don't get what they went on strike for". There was obvious contempt for unions in the minds of some respondents. A farm-worker, for example, said, "TUs are rubbish: they cause too much trouble, minding everyone else's business". A trainee quantity surveyor said of the unions that they were "bloody awful" and "Caused more trouble than they settle". Similarly, a car salesman observed, "they are useless—they shouldn't be allowed. They create trouble, and then try to settle it—but create more trouble in the process". And a policeman (a member of the Police Federation, which, he said, was "not really a trade union although you can take your quibbles about pay and time off and conditions to them") was equally forceful, laying emphasis upon the need for authority in the work-place: "Unions are a load of rot. A boss isn't his own boss if there is a union. A boss can't do what he wants with his own firm—it's ridiculous."
All of these respondents, with the exception of the farm worker whose emphasis upon personal independence was the key to his attitude, are comparable with the laboratory technician referred to above. Like him, they saw themselves as superior to union membership; but unlike him, they sought to justify their presumed superiority by castigating union members as not only inferior but dangerous to the corporate well-being. Of a different order were those respondents who were deferential towards their employers—and indeed to the status hierarchy in society more generally—and who thought that workers should accept their place as part of the rightful order of affairs. For these respondents strikes were "ridiculous", "unsettling", and "unnecessary": they interfered with the smooth routine of life and were therefore to be condemned.

The criticism of involvement by unions in political affairs which was noted as feature of respondents who had reservations about unions, was also pronounced amongst the "anti-union" respondents. One said, "It's all a load of politics—unions certainly aren't for workers—it's the leaders and the officials looking after themselves. They are all the same". In his view, the worker could only look to other ordinary workers for help and understanding—union officials and leaders had deserted the ranks, as it were, and like all politicians and other public men, were "in it for what they could get out of it for themselves". As another factory worker said, "when I want anything, I go it on my own—the only person worth trusting is yourself". The cynicism was not so much engendered by the work situation as confirmed
by it—home and neighbourhood, and school, set the scene, and work filled in the picture.

A final element in the condemnation of unions was of a different, though related, order. Antagonism to unions was but another dimension of a general antagonism towards work itself—employers and union bosses were seen as of a kind; both species hung around the worker's neck, or fastened on like leeches, oppressive in their presence—in the words of a cutlery worker, "If you're in a union you've got two lots of people telling you what to do—two lots who can make things difficult, rather than one." He added, "You can't avoid the employer, but you can avoid the union people—or you can at least try to."

Not Interested. State They Do Not Know About Trade Unions, etc.

One-quarter of the youths (21) and well over one-half of the girls (52) were in this category. They are to be distinguished from the category above, who indicated they they would succede to a request to join a union, by the fact that the latter had given a certain amount of thought, even if not much, to trades unions, and had some idea of their functions. The present category were even more lacking in knowledge and interest in regard to unions. It should be noted that apart from the different meaning of work for girls compared with youths,
the fact is that a higher proportion of them were no longer working, whilst a higher proportion of those who were working were in jobs in which unionism was weak and difficult to organise (small shops and offices, for example).

Several of the youths indicated that their lack of interest in and/or knowledge about unions was associated with the fact that in their particular job or occupation the unions were not strong. Having had little or no contact with unions, they could see no need to take an interest in the question of unions. So that a butcher, for example, dismissed the subject by saying "I'm not in it—it's not necessary in my job." The broader aspects of trade union activity in modern society did not enter into the thoughts of these respondents: not directly involved in union affairs, they did not perceive any indirect ways in which unions might affect them or be of relevance to socio-economic affairs generally. They had "no interest in the matter", then: the comment of a 'bus conductor was typical—he said, "I've never really bothered about them". They were like the labourer who stated, "I know nothing at all about them".

The lack of concern about unions was not infrequently associated with the withdrawal from, or refusal to enter into, a whole range of societal affairs and activity which extended beyond the bounds of the immediate locality and of immediate experience: thus a steelworks apprentice explained, "No, I'm not interested in anything like that." Other respondents, especially girls, said that they "didn't understand them"—meaning that they did not know what the aims and functions of
unions were, and implying, too, that the whole subject was far too
dull and removed from their own interests. There were several cases,
indeed, of respondents linking a disclaimer explicitly to their state-
ment of ignorance about unions—one girl, for example, saying, "I
don't understand them, and I don't want to". All that these respon-
dents wanted was to be left alone, not bothered by the responsibility
of involvement. "I leave well alone", said a warehouse worker, worried
at the possibility of encountering further claims upon his time or his
loyalty.

It was not only the less able respondents, in the lower prestige
and more routine jobs, who were of this disposition. The majority of
the skilled youths, in particular, were more knowledgeable and more
positive in their appraisal of the unions—whether the appraisal was
favourable or otherwise. But this was not so, with girls. One bright
and able girl, an office clerk, said, "I don't know much about them—
I have never really had any dealings with them". This is a further
indication of the different meaning which work has for a girl compared
with a youth. Another girl, indeed, (a shop assistant), said quite
plainly, "I don't have anything to do with them—that's my husband's
subject". Not that her husband was an active unionist; the point is
that in her view, and that of most other girl respondents who had
given any thought to the matter, unions are "a man's concern, rather
than a woman's".
Summary and Conclusions

The discussion of attitudes towards trade unions and involvement—or lack of involvement—in union activities is important not merely with reference to the unions as such, but for the light that it has thrown upon the respondents' approach to work—upon their perception of the nature of work, and the meaning that work has for them.

With regard to those who, on the whole, supported the unions, it is seen that many—and particularly was this so with the girls—were mainly concerned with the material conditions and support in the event of personal difficulty at work, which unions conferred upon their members. Unions were seen as a worthwhile vehicle, too, for extracting from the employer a somewhat larger and more just, reward for the expenditure of hours and energy in dull, routine work. There were also actual or potential members of unions, who were somewhat wearied or over-burdened by their lot, and whose concern was for a quiet life: they took the least line of resistance, accepting that work-life had little to offer, and wishing not to be pestered about it more than was necessary.

But there were some more enthusiastic supporters of unions, and these tended to take a broader view. They saw the unions, although in a rough and ready manner, as some sort of intermediary, or buffer, between the powerful employer and the individual employee who, by himself, was in a weak position. Unionism, for these, was a principle,
even a creed—and material benefits which might accrue as a consequence of union membership or union activity were valued not so much for their own sake, but as symbols of the success of the countervailing power of organised labour, and of the advances in security and dignity which this implied for the ordinary working man.

As opposed to the strong supporters of unions there were those who were ant-union. These consisted mainly of respondents who were scornful of the success or efficiency of unions either in general or in their particular job or occupation. But two other notable categories were included in this group. The first were those who were in occupations which held out better prospects in terms of life—chances and life-styles than obtained for the bulk of the respondents. From middle class or working class aspiring backgrounds, they saw themselves as superior to the mass of workers, having no need for union support, feeling themselves able to "make their own way, independently" and being somewhat scornful of those who were dependent upon unions, as well as of the unions themselves because of alleged inefficiency and their proneness to make trouble. And, secondly, there were the contrasting set of respondents, who had written off work and all to do with it as an imposition that could not be avoided: their view was that the lot of the ordinary worker could not be significantly improved by union activity or in any other way. They repudiated the attempts of unions, as being naive responses to an inevitable predicament. Their "solution" was to minimise thought about work, and involvement
in it—unions, as one facet of the work setting, were to be avoided as much as any other facet.

Many of the most thoughtful respondents in regard to union matters, were amongst those who were equivocal in their support, or who had some serious reservations about unions, whilst on the whole favouring them. There are several points to be emphasised in regard to these respondents. There was worry expressed at the extent of the power of the unions, and its possible or actual misuse. This was particularly marked in regard to the question of strike action, which some respondents thought was indefensible, and which others maintained should only be used as a last resort, and not, as seemed at times to be the case with some unions, as the first and major weapon. Respondents also expressed concern at the apparent insistence of unions upon arguing the relative merits of one set of workers against another—there was an impatience at inter-cine strife, as manifested in demarcation disputes: though doubtless the respondents' attitudes would be amended if they were directly involved in such a dispute, the complaint is notable because it was symptomatic of the feeling that unions are over-much bothered with minor—even petty—affairs, and not sufficiently concerned with the overall benefits of workers as a body.

Another important area of reservation was associated with respondents' ideas of "fair-play". The notion of fairness which was discussed above in relation to employer/employee relations is capable
of application to the relations between unions and their members. Respondents were concerned lest unions exceed in their demands what could reasonably be expected of members—put rather differently, there was a fear of over-much interference by unions in sectors of life which respondents regarded as being separate from "work" and, as such, not the proper province of unions. Specifically, union involvement in political matters was seen as over-stepping the mark not only in regard to members (who wanted a measure of freedom from employers and unions alike), but with reference to the society as a whole—this was not the proper domain of unions, it was felt. Furthermore, such union activity was held to detract from the efficiency and validity of the unions' actions in the fields in which they should be influential. Associated with the view that unions were involving themselves too much in "non-union" matters—especially political matters—was a cynicism about leaders who were at the forefront of such activities: what were they in it for if not to line their own pockets? Amongst many of the respondents with reservations, furthermore, there was evident a desire for some sort of harmony in society, not just a wish for "peace and quiet", but a more positive desire for an orderly society: they saw excessive union demands and activity as detrimental to this objective.

There remain several points to emphasise in conclusion. The first is that an appreciable proportion of the youths and the bulk of the girls were self-confessedly unknowledgeable about and uninterested in unions. Secondly, the different perspectives of youths compared
with girls in regard to work has been illustrated again. Thirdly, the attitudes towards trades unions appeared to be not dependent upon mass media—they did not amount merely to "received opinion", but were based, rather, upon five years of direct experience in the world of work. Finally, it should be pointed out that it was not possible, in the present study, to explore the special characteristics, or the "spirit", of particular unions. I.C. Cannon's study of compositors has indicated the special quality associated with their unions by men in such occupations—this is taken up in a different context below. And R.M. Blackburn has illustrated the "union character", associated with bank clerks' associations. Reference was made above to the better organisation of trade unions in some industries compared with others. The point here is that within the range of occupations in which unions are highly organised there are differences in regard to the meaning that union membership has for the worker, as Cannon and Blackburn show. The occupation stamps its impression on the union. Whilst this aspect was not pursued in the present research, there was sufficient evidence to suggest that on the whole, unions did not have an influence over their members which could be said to result in an approximation to Durkheim's prescription of a professional or


occupational ethic, making for consensus in specialised groups—the ethic which Durkheim saw as the necessary complement to the "group loyalties" which the educational system existed to inculcate, to complete the basis of social solidarity under the condition of a division of labour.¹ Unions made far too slight an impact upon the majority of young workers for them to serve as an agency for a function of that order.

CHAPTER IX
INDUSTRIAL TRAINING AND FURTHER EDUCATION

The deficiencies in apprenticeship training in Britain are now well documented; the work of Liepmann and of Lady Williams, for example, has indicated shortcomings in terms of length of apprenticeships, demarcation of skills, and quality in general of training and of further education\(^1\)—and the earlier report on the Sheffield study offered substantiation for these conclusions.\(^2\) As a response to such deficiencies and in pursuance of a policy of increasing the quantity and quality of skilled manpower, the Industrial Training Act was passed in 1964, and a series of Industrial Training Boards have in consequence been established with the function of ensuring adequate provision for training

---


\(^2\) cf. Home, School and Work, op. cit., especially Chapter 12.
over a wide range of occupations and industries. It is too early to make an assessment of the work of these Boards, and that is not, in any case, to the purpose here. It is sufficient to say that the constitution of the Boards and the philosophy informing the Act by which they were established give rise to certain doubts as to their appropriateness for the tasks which they have ostensibly to fulfil, and as to their likely efficacy in organisational terms. I have considered these points elsewhere.¹ The present respondents had completed their training by the time that the Act was passed: but their experiences are still pertinent to the state of industrial training in Britain today, and they are relevant, also, to the understanding of the respondents' attitudes towards and actions in regard to work in a more general sense.

Of the apprentices, a number both expected and received rigorous training throughout their five years in employment, and they were well satisfied: several of them were employed by large steel firms, but others were tradesmen (for example, a painter/decorator) working for small firms. They expressed their satisfaction with their training in various ways. A steel worker apprentice, for example, said "They are very fair, and show you how to do the jobs properly." And an apprentice engineer said that he "thought very highly" of the quality of his training: he was particularly pleased that his choice of specialism was still open to him, after having had experience in

¹cf. Into Work, op.cit., especially Chapter 4.
a wide range of engineering work. Appreciation by these apprentices at the "good fortune" of having "decent" training was the more marked because of their recognition that many apprentices were decidedly unfortunate in this respect. A painter/decorator said that some apprentices were "a lot worse off" than he, whilst a steelworker stated, "This has been a good apprenticeship—I feel I have learnt a lot more than apprentices in other Sheffield firms, though I have also probably worked harder than they."

Other respondents did not expect much training in their apprenticeships, and were not, therefore, surprised or disappointed that they received little, or no, training. As one draughtsman said, "They call it an apprenticeship, but it's not a real apprenticeship—it's more just learning by experience in the drawing office." However, 10 youths—one-third of the apprentices—considered that the training which they had received was unsatisfactory, and that they had not learnt as much as they ought to have done during their apprenticeships. Most blamed the firm for this, but one youth criticised the further education college for the deficiencies, whilst 3 youths recognised that they were themselves to blame in part, because they had not been sufficiently conscientious. An apprentice engineer, for example, who had passed examinations for the Ordinary National Certificate in Mechanical Engineering, said, "It's probably my fault, but there's blame on both sides. I don't think they're bothered to that extent, so you don't bother either, of course." An apprentice bricklayer was particularly resentful that his employer did not permit him to attend
Day Release classes, contrary to his expectations—"Apprentices," he said, "are put upon, and given the run-around. They work for the boss' own benefit." Similarly, a sheet-metal worker said, "The firm expects apprentices to abide by the rules, but it treats them just like ordinary workers—you learn only by getting the tricks of the trade from the older workers." Two respondents sought an explanation for the deficiencies in their training in the size of their firms—a motor mechanic saying that "You learn so much, and then there's no more progress. I reckon it's because the firm's so small and there isn't the diversity"; similarly, an apprentice lithographer said, "If this had been a bigger firm, I would have learnt more—this firm is neither small nor large. I've not learnt as much as I ought, though I could have learnt a lot less."

One outcome of the dissatisfaction with their apprenticeship training is that certain youths are reinforced in a cynicism towards work and life in general—their work experience confirms them in the view, already suspected whilst at school, that secondary modern children are the "left-over"; for even the "cream jobs" open to them, the apprenticeships, turn out sour. A further outcome is that worry about qualifications is added to the more general doubts as to whether an apprenticeship nowadays is worthwhile. Bitterness was engendered, some of it directed towards the unskilled and semi-skilled workers who, with less ability, seemed to command higher wages—although they have not had to struggle through evening school, depriving themselves of leisure hours. Morale amongst the skilled labour force would seem, then, to be severely taxed.
Twelve youths who were not apprentices had received training for their jobs. In most cases the training was of an informal nature, but two non-manual workers were undertaking lengthy courses in connection with their jobs. The remaining 10 youths who were receiving training were semi-skilled workers; some of them had attended short courses, of a few weeks duration at the most, and the remainder had received "on-the-job" instruction, over a somewhat longer period, from older men at work. A refrigeration engineer, for example, spent three months with each of the firm's two engineers when he joined the firm.

Of the 16 girls who had received training—other, that is, than a few days or hours of demonstration of what was required of them, and other than what they had "picked up" themselves on the job—14 were in Category "A" type employment. These included the typists, comptometer operators, nurses and hairdressers. The remaining 2 girls who had received significant training worked in shops—both of them in supervisory capacities. One nurse was particularly pleased with the training which she had received, and said that it was "very good—the scope for further education and training is excellent, with interesting lectures and opportunities for the person who has an enquiring mind to do really well."

Of the remaining respondents, 45 youths and 50 girls who were at work, 9 youths and 5 girls said that they had received a little formal instruction on their first day or two at work (how to operate the cash till, in the case of girl shop assistants, for example): but most of these respondents were in jobs that required little training or none.

- 376 -
whatsoever—and many of them were quite explicit that this was the case: a factory worker, for example, said "You just pick it up—it only takes a week or two—it's easy when you are in the way of it"; a matter, that is, of working oneself into a simple routine. So, too, with a warehouse packer, who commented, "I was shown how to do it a couple of times, and after that I had the hang of it."

17 youths and 10 girls had received a certain amount of training for occupations other than those in which they were employed five years after leaving school—they had undergone this training whilst in previous jobs, that is. Only 5 of these youths, and 3 girls, thought that there was a possibility that they might return to such employment in the future and thus make use of the training.

Further Education

Over one-half of the youths (49), and over one-quarter of the girls (28) had attended further education classes (mostly evening school) at some time during the course of their first five years in employment. Many had dropped out of classes, however, some of them during their first year at work.¹ There were various explanations for the drop-outs and they will be considered below. At the stage of Interview No. 4,

¹cf. Home, School and Work, op. cit., p. 238
the majority of those who were attending further education classes had been doing so regularly for a period of up to five years. During their fifth year in employment, 25 youths and 9 girls were attending further education classes. Of these, 12 youths and 2 girls attended both Day Release classes and evening classes, 7 youths attended Day release classes only, whilst 6 youths and 7 girls attended evening classes only.

Analysis by type of occupation shows that apprentices and non-manual workers, as might be expected, predominated amongst the youths (although by no means all apprentices were attending further education classes, and some had never done so). Amongst the girls, Category "A" type employment predominated (8/9) but one was a factory worker. This girl had attended domestic science classes whilst working as a cook—she had subsequently changed occupations, becoming a laundry worker, and had then stopped going to classes. Table 28 analyses further education attendance in terms of level of occupation for youths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At Interview No.4</th>
<th>Apprentices and Non-manual</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended further education classes at some time.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended further education classes during fifth year at work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 6 "others" who attended further education classes during their fifth year in employment, 2 were carpenters, 2 were laboratory assistants in the steel industry, 1 was a semi-skilled engineering worker, and 1 was a butcher. 16 of the 19 youths who attended Day Release classes were apprentices or non-manual workers; the 2 girls who attended Day Release classes were in Category "A" type employment, both of them being clerical workers. Viewed from a different perspective, one-third of the apprentices (10) and 3 of the 5 non-manual workers did not attend further education classes during their fifth year in employment—a fact which supports the criticism by apprentices of poor training which was referred to above.

Further analysis shows that those respondents who were attending further education classes during their fifth year at work (and who, as has been said, can be taken by-and-large to have attended fairly consistently throughout their years in employment) had certain other attributes. In terms of I.Q. Grades, for example, higher proportions than in the sample as a whole were in the top two Grades, as Table 29 indicates.

**TABLE 29**

FURTHER EDUCATION ATTENDANCE COMPARED WITH I.Q. GRADES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.Q.</th>
<th>Youths Attending further education classes</th>
<th>Totals in Grades</th>
<th>Girls Attending further education classes</th>
<th>Totals in Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This, of course, is a further expression of the relationship between level of ability and type of employment which was established above. Further dimensions fit in with the overall pattern—thus there is a distinctly lower rate of job-turnover amongst those attending further education classes, and high proportions come from families in which the father is a skilled or non-manual worker, and/or which have a member who had a selective education: these respondents are almost exclusively from small families, furthermore. The importance of school attended (and, by extension, of social background generally) is also suggested, although the evidence on this is by no means clear-cut. Table 30 summarises the position.

With the exception of one youth, all of the respondents who had continued further education into their fifth year in employment were pursuing vocational courses which were (or at least were intended to be) of direct relevance to their occupations. The exception was a policeman, who had attended classes with the intention of improving his general education in pursuance of his now achieved aim of changing from clerical work to the police force. Most of these respondents could see benefits deriving from their studies—although some were grudging and others highly critical, as will be seen: for many, it had been an ordeal, but they had, as they put it, "stuck it out". There are, indeed, many disincentives to the young worker who wishes to continue his studies—especially if he is deprived of attendance at Day Release and has to depend upon evening classes—even the very
**Table 30**

Further Education Attendance Compared With Various Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attending Further Education Classes</td>
<td>Totals in Categ.</td>
<td>Attending Further Education Classes</td>
<td>Totals in Categ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs since leaving school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in H/hold:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone in H/hold with Selective Education:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Attended:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'C'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'E'</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Girls at work.
keen often became disheartened. In such circumstances, encouragement from the home and/or the employer is often the determining factor in ensuring that courses are completed. Often such support was not forthcoming for respondents—hence the high rate of "dropout".

Criticism of classes by those who were still attending mainly centred around the alleged poor quality of staff and equipment. An apprentice mechanical engineer, for example, argued that "the equipment is old and inaccurate" and, more generally, that "not enough money is spent on colleges of further education as compared with universities and other such places". The other major criticism was of the asserted irrelevance of the work done at further education classes for the actual tasks performed at work. An apprentice engineer, for example, said that "most of it is more theoretical than what we ever need" and a painter/decorator said "If you can do the practical work, you're O.K.—a lot of what they tell us about isn't used today."

These two major types of criticism are the same as those made by many respondents at the start of Interview No. 3, when they had been at work for one year only. At least so far, the young workers were concerned, there was no improvement in teaching or facilities as they progressed in their courses—and nor did the courses assume more

---

1 For a fuller discussion of the national position, see Into Work, op.cit., Chapter 4.
relevance. Theory comes hard to the majority of young workers with a secondary modern background—but their aversion to it has other facets. Their emphasis upon the "practical" aspects of work is not just a matter of intrinsic interest and of competence, but a cultural phenomenon. It is a symbol of manliness, to be practical and to assert the preference for such activity, and it helps the young worker to differentiate himself from other "classes of worker" notably "brain workers", from whom he knows that he is different, against whom he knows he cannot compete, and for whom he develops, often, a protective contempt. In addition the lack of interest in theory is an indication of the lack of scope afforded young workers in their jobs—the theory, in fact, "doesn't come into it much".

Neither employer nor employee perceive that a sound theoretical knowledge is a firm basis for the adaptation within industry which it is presumed will become more and more necessary in consequence of technological changes. The dismissal of "theory" is therefore indicative of a failure to grasp the possibility, or probability, for this need for adaptation.

Twenty-four youths and 19 girls had attended further education classes at some stage during their first five years in employment, but had dropped out. In girls this was in many cases as a result of completing courses (e.g. for typing) or upon stopping work on marriage. But some respondents left as a consequence of changing jobs or occupations; and the attendance of many of these was of short duration—one session, perhaps, but more usually a
A few weeks or months only. The variety of reasons for ceasing to attend further education classes is illustrated in the following discussion.

At least one respondent stopped going to classes mainly because he resented the loss of earnings (through bonus and piece-work rates) which attendance at day release classes entailed—his employer paid only the basic rate whilst he was attending classes. Other respondents were deterred from going at all on these grounds—they would have had, in a sense, to pay for their studies. This may not be unreasonable, but many apprentices, who are most likely to be affected, are sometimes dependent upon such bonus payments to give them a wage comparable with semi- and unskilled workers, and to enable them to meet domestic responsibilities or to participate in the leisure pursuits which other workers of their age enjoy.¹

An apprentice lithographer had no alternative to stopping attendance at evening classes because, after he had reached a certain stage, there was no one qualified to teach the subject in Sheffield (or, at least, no one who was both qualified and available). One respondent left after eighteen months because he found that evening classes were "too much like being back at school"—and in any case he considered that "there's more valuable experience to be gained at work" (although

¹An apprentice in the Postal Survey wrote, "It is time that a law was enforced making employers pay for day release until at least 21 years old. Personally, it is costing me £100 a year to further my education, due to my firm not allowing time off with pay."
in this and several other cases, the latter reason was probably a rationalisation). A butcher "stuck" evening classes for twelve weeks but could tolerate it no longer: he "couldn't get interested in the theory—couldn't see the point of it—all about the structure of bones, and that". An apprentice joiner, whose work entailed travelling to various areas outside of Sheffield, left evening school after attending one term, because he was too tired to concentrate after a day at work and a long journey. Sheer dislike of studying was the explanation given by an apprentice electrician who, with attendances three nights a week, soon had a surfeit of further education, although he said at the stage of Interview No.4, with the wisdom of hindsight and also a note of regret, "you should go to further education—you owe it to yourself".

Intrusion upon leisure hours was another important reason for ceasing to attend. A sheet-metal worker continued attendance at evening school and day release school until the end of his fourth year at work, but then left because he was "so fed up"—especially with evening classes on Fridays. Friday night is the night out for many young workers, of course; they feel that they have earned their relaxation, and that they should not be "deprived" of it. And, when youths reach the age of eighteen and nineteen, and become interested in courting, Friday night assumes extra importance (some girls are inclined to think it "soft" for their young men to be "going to school still", and the youths react by leaving—although other girls, more calculating, perhaps, encourage their boy friends to continue their studies).
The importance of the influence of the peer group, at work and in leisure, was also reflected in further education attendance. A painter/decorator stopped going to evening school after two-and-a-half years, for example, because his "mates" were enjoying themselves in the evenings, whilst he was not. A motor mechanic, too, stopped attending eighteen months prior to Interview No.4 because he was required to go on four nights each week, and his friends commented upon his apparent enthusiasm for his books in a derogatory way—he did not wish to lose their friendship. One engineering apprentice never attended classes because he was influenced not to do so by other apprentices at his place of work—he had intended to go to both Day Release classes and evening school, but the "older lads" scorned the idea: of six apprentices who started at his firm at the same time as he, only one had attended classes. The respondent now regretted that he had not gone in the first place, realising that it was now too late. As a converse to this case, one respondent started to attend classes because his friends went (he left subsequently, because he failed an examination).

Other respondents left for a mixture of reasons, or for "no particular reason"—something trivial such as a cold night or a headache one evening was the decisive factor in putting an end to attendance, which had been reluctant in any case. In two cases, a difficult relationship with the teacher was the reason for respondents ceasing to attend classes. A painter/decorator, conscientious and interested in his work, said, "one particular teacher threw me off
my balance"—after attending classes for two years, there was "trouble" with the teacher: he did not resume until two years later when, at the age of nineteen, he made another attempt—but he found that it was "too late then", and gave up after three weeks. He could not make the necessary adjustment, that is. In the other case, the respondent reported that he had said to his day release teacher, "I can't be bothered with school", whereupon the teacher retorted, "And I can't be bothered with you" ("It was a friendly agreement, see!"). In part, this respondent's behaviour is understandable in that he, like so many other respondents, had never really been interested in further education classes. And in part it is a reflection of his poor performance in class—he remarked upon this himself, and suggested that "all the bright lads should be put into one school and all the dimmer ones, such as me, into another. The dim ones just can't keep up". A further aspect of this touches upon the general situation in regard to teacher-student relationships in the further education of young workers, however. Clearly teachers are faced with difficulties, especially when their classes contain truculent as well as uninterested and not-very-able young people. But the fact is that, given the indifference of many parents and employers, if the teachers do not give the lead and the encouragement, no one will.

Dissatisfaction with some aspect of the course was the reason given by several respondents for stopping attendance. An apprentice bricklayer found that he could not fit in with the programme offered. He was too old for the first years course, when he "got around to
starting" evening school, but was unable to keep up with the second year course, and so gave it up altogether. A girl clerk attended evening classes during the second year after leaving school, but she found that she "knew all the English already", and that the shorthand "nearly sent me barmy": she dropped both of these, therefore, and felt that there was no point in going for the typing alone. Another girl started a course in typing and book-keeping when aged about seventeen—but after a term she realised that she "hated" book-keeping, so she left.

Three youths and one girl stated that they stopped attending classes because they failed examinations. Probably other respondents who did not admit to this also stopped going for the same reason. Certainly, the failure rate in further education examinations is very high. Ethel Venables' study of further education students at a day release college in the Midlands led her to the conclusion that there is a very large measure of under-achievement amongst young workers, and that this "demonstrates the need for diagnostic procedures on the one hand, and a re-appraisal of examinations policy on the other".

The comments and experience of respondents in the present study support Venables' suggestion that the high failure rate, in examinations, and the high drop-out rate in general, is the result of a

---


range of factors, including lack of liaison between school and further education college; policy of first employer; occupation entered; size of firm (reflecting policy and possibility of competition and stimulation amongst young workers); and, of course, home and social background, together with the influence of the school attended.\footnote{See Home, School and Work, \textit{op.cit.}, Chapter 12.}

The reactions of the four respondents who stopped attending classes because of examination failure are interestingly different. The girl, a hairdresser, failed the City and Guilds Permanent Waving (Science) examination; she said that "if you fail one part, you can't go again, because there are too many waiting to take it". She accepted the situation—there being no alternative but to do so, as far as she could see: indeed, she was somewhat relieved not to have to face another lot of classes and examinations, her feeling being that it would be "nice" to pass "if it comes easily", but that, for a girl especially, it is no good making oneself miserable over it. Of the youths, an apprentice engineer passed the Year I examination, but failed Year II—he now regretted that he had not persevered, recognising the value that a qualification would have now that he was about to finish his apprenticeship. A butcher failed a Certificate examination after three years of attending classes, and therefore

\footnote{Ethel Venables, \textit{The Young Worker at College}, \textit{op.cit.}, p.171.}
stopped going. His attitude, now, was that "a piece of paper does not make much difference—it’s the work that counts". This seemed to represent a deliberate opting out of one life-course, and opting into (or acceptance of) another. He had made the attempt to qualify himself for a higher level of employment, that is, in management, perhaps, or as a meat inspector: having failed, he could not afford to think in terms of failure—this would be to carry over permanently into the work setting the sense of inferiority and failure which characterise many secondary modern children whilst at school. But where all are failures, all can think of themselves as successes. The reaction, therefore, was to discredit the value of "paper work" and "theory" and to "opt" (though there was no real choice) for the straightforward working man's life. The youth had decided, then, to treat necessity as a virtue, to withdraw from the attempt to "move" up and out of his occupational/social level and to consolidate himself amongst those who repudiated education; saw it for the chimera that he now perceived it to be. Rather similar, but with somewhat different nuances, was the reaction of an apprentice steel worker. He was keen on his work and, after attending evening classes during the first year of employment, he started day release classes, and continued until he was aged nineteen. He then failed a part of an examination and stopped attending—because, if he had continued, it would have been necessary to attend evening school three nights a week, the employers withdrawing the "privilege" of day release because of his failure. He thought that three evenings a week was
"too much for a person of nearly twenty". His feeling was that this was a one-sided bargain, that "they" (not just the employers, but those "in charge" of society generally), were expecting too much. "They" could lump it, henceforth, and he would not be too disappointed—he might, he thought, have some regrets, but he was protected by this recognition of the injustice of his position: in his view, he was, as it were, making a stand upon principle.

Many respondents who attended evening school, as has been stated earlier, were not keen to do so, and did not persevere. The requirement to attend, at the firm's insistence, for example, or the pressure to do so—from employer, parent or from some vague sense that one "ought" to go—was an irritation to these respondents in adjusting to the sort of work-life which they preferred, or which they felt that they could best tolerate. When they stopped attending classes, they felt a sense of liberation. It is significant that these, and the majority of other young workers, saw further education as an imposition, or at least as something nasty that had to be endured. Participation in further education was a narrow activity confined to attending classes and writing home-work. There was no sense of membership of a community of young workers. ¹

¹Although in some colleges there may be—but these are probably the exceptions. cf. Ethel Venables, The Young Worker at College, ibid.
Those who approach further education more positively, and in the hope of "doing well" may have their path into work smoothed by success—they know that they are making progress. But those that fail (and, for whatever reason—want of perseverance, employer's co-operation or parental encouragement, for example—do not try again) are faced with special problems of adjustment. Whether consciously or unconsciously, they have to re-focus their aspirations, to choose a "lesser" or at least a different horizon. And this re-focussing may represent not just a change in aims in regard to employment, but a restructuring of life styles, and a reformulation of life chances.

Some of the most consistent attenders at further education classes were enthusiastic and serious young workers, of course, confident in the advantages of pursuing studies. An apprentice draughtsman, for example, said of further education, "I am positive that it is useful at work—you can do the work better, and you can get further ahead with training." And a Valuer's assistant observed, "You might get along without it, but your chances of advancement would be nil. Nobody would touch an unqualified man for important valuations." These were respondents who aspired to a higher level of employment—they perceived further education as a means to that end.

Others, equally enthusiastic about further education and convinced as to its importance, were motivated to do well in the particular occupation which they presently had, rather than being concerned to rise to another level. An apprentice electrician, for example, said that in his work "you need the theory as well as the practical". And a painter/decorator said, "I'd advise any young person to take
classes—I've learned more there than anywhere else except for the more unorthodox dodges that you pick up on the job from other men: if you are to be any good, and tackle all jobs, you must go to school." A butcher, conscientious in his work, explained his support for further education by saying that "it teaches you to recognise disease and look after the public interest." Other respondents, including some apprentices, took the view that further education could be of some use in their occupations, but was not essential—and yet others were quite definite that further education was unnecessary, a "waste of time", indeed. These verdicts seem to be the outcome of an amalgam of personal disposition towards work (as shaped, in some cases, by disappointing experience, or thwarted expectations) and the actual work tasks which were required in particular jobs.

Rather than being regarded as essential, then, further education was seen as an asset by some, in reference to their own particular occupations—they did not necessarily avail themselves of the opportunity because they saw it as an asset: it was not always regarded as a sufficient asset, on their scale of values, to justify the effort entailed in pursuing courses. A laboratory assistant, for example, said in reply to the question, "Is further education necessary in your job?", "Not really, no—only for advancement and pay rises, but not for the actual work": he did not realise that further education could lay the foundation for future success in his employment even though it was not of obvious relevance as yet. Other respondents were more equivocal—for example, "Yes and no. Experience
is more important". The stress upon the superiority of practical experience over book-learning has already been remarked upon, and this was particularly evident in the context of further education—"you pick it up better on the job", was the argument. An apprentice printer said that he thought attendance at further education classes necessary only if, unlike in his own case, there was not a good trainer at the firm, who will "teach you the trade as you go along". A butcher suggested a possible disadvantage of further education—"too much knowledge too soon may bring you into conflict with your superior": his view was supported by a painter/decorator who spoke of the difficulties he had encountered with older men as a consequence of his superior knowledge, acquired at evening school, of certain aspects of the work—scientific principles in regard to colouring, for example.

Then there were respondents who were emphatic that there was no need, in their occupations, for any further education at all. Some were expressing, indirectly, resentment that their work was so routine; others were matter-of-fact; others were forcefully indicating that they wanted, and needed, nothing to do with further education—they had had enough of classrooms whilst at school. Many, again, pointed to the superiority of "learning on the job". And a few referred to skills required in their jobs which were of a different order from those which could be acquired at further education classes—for example, a warehouseman said, "My firm handles so many products that
quickly become obsolescent, that ability to learn fast is more desirable than actual qualifications."

One respondent took the line that "all this education" must be put into some sort of proportion: he thought it was getting out of hand—to "get down to brass tacks", his job required a certain skill, but, in all conscience, "you don't need to go to night school to learn how to move furniture". The respondent was manifesting a widespread suspicion of education and of persons who appeared to be advocating its extension—so that even a question in a research interview was looked upon as a threat. The springs of this suspicion are not easy to discern, but they have something to do with a recognition of having received an inferior education and/or of not having "done well" at school. This failure, or deprivation, has become accepted: and yet, at every turn it would seem, people are pestering young workers to participate in more education—to build up more failures for themselves, and to experience new flavours of deprivation, new tangs of inferiority. Such respondents come to a feeling of persecution in regard to education, which they see as not being relevant to their needs, given the work that they have ended up in: why can't people accept the situation? The same sort of feeling underlay the rather more succinct comment of one respondent, that "lorry drivers don't need it", and of another, who remarked, "No—anyone can labour".

A rather different reaction to the same phenomenon was forthcoming from another youth, who exclaimed in reply to the question on the need for further education, "What! To be a 'bus conductor!": a van
driver conveyed a similar emotion by simply swearing in response to the question, whilst a labourer asked, "Are you kidding?" (It may appropriately be noted at this point, however, that there are possibilities for further education, although not many, in some of what might be regarded as the least likely of occupations: a corporation labourer, for example, said that there was the opportunity of attending classes in road-making and other civil-engineering work, combined with classes in foremanship: he thought that he might start attending, the following year).

In many jobs, then, it was stated by respondents that "you can learn all you need to know in a few days" (or weeks or months) without any necessity for attending further education classes. In other jobs, it was stated with some pride and even a challenge that "brawn, not brain" is what is needed. As a complement to this, there was one clear example, and several others in which the situation was of the same order although less clear-cut, in which the experience of further education led to a dissatisfaction with the employment. An apprentice mechanic, for example, found that he enjoyed the course at further education college, especially the theory. But what was done there was in marked contrast with what he did, or could ever hope to do, at work. Taking what he thought was a realistic view, he therefore stopped attending classes, not wishing his appetite to be further whetted, and the dissatisfaction with his work further aggravated.
As an example of disillusionment, one wine-cellarman had seen his modest hopes and enthusiasm come to nothing. He said, "There is not much to know in this job. I thought at one time that there was, and I learnt the details about stocks and delivery time, and so on. I also read about wines and did a little tasting. I enjoyed learning; but no one was really interested, so I gave it up." This respondent was now anxious to undertake training for some form of social work—work in which he could be sure of involvement in the job, and confident of the value of the work. His lack of academic ability and qualifications would be a major obstacle in this ambition, however.

Those girls who said that further education was not necessary in their work almost exclusively accepted the position in a matter-of-fact way. They had no grievances, and did not envisage ever entering work in which further education would, or might be, desirable. They did not look upon work in that sort of way. As one of them, a packer, said, "This is just a straightforward job, with nothing to it"—the sort of job that most girls do, that is: as another factory girl explained in regard to further education, "a girl doesn't need it."

Employers' Attitudes Towards Further Education

I have discussed elsewhere the varying attitudes of employers towards further education of young workers, and I have pointed to the contrast which may often be discerned between the policy statements
of employers' confederations and the actual practices followed by particular firms (a contrast which is also clear in regard to Trades Unions as a collective body and actual union practices at the local and workshop level). I do not propose to go over the ground again here, therefore, but, merely to give the flavour of employers' attitudes—and the reactions which they produce—as perceived by the young workers.

Some respondents worked for firms in which there was strong and enthusiastic support from the employer—a motor mechanic, for example, said "they really believe in it, and you more or less have to go". In certain firms, attendance at further education classes was compulsory for apprentices, and the day release privilege was only granted to those apprentices who demonstrated their seriousness by attending evening school regularly. The estate valuer's assistant, indicating his firm's enthusiasm for further education, said of the senior partner that he was "a devil for exams": the firm allowed time off for attendance at classes and paid the 'bus fares. A steel works


2 Some studies have suggested a link between size of firm and success in further education—consequent upon better facilities, more competitiveness, and higher quality of recruits to the large, established firms—cf. Ethel Venables, The Young Worker at College, op.cit., and G.L. Ashton, British Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.3, No.1, 1965. For a study of the ways in which organisational factors affect employers' attitudes towards and students' performance in further education see D. J. Lee, A Study of Apprentice Training, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Birmingham University, 1964, as reported in Venables, op.cit.
apprentice, too, said of his firm, "it is excellent—they allow paid release, award prizes for good performance and also have special incentive schemes to encourage you to do well in your studies: they do all they can to help, and spend a lot of money on it."

Such keenness on the part of the employer was often, but by no means always, met by a like enthusiasm in the young worker. An apprentice joiner, for example, said that his employer asked him to go to evening classes, saying that it would be better for him if he did. When the employer received a report that the respondent had not been attending classes, he questioned him on the matter—"I told him I didn't get on with it. He looked very glum for an hour or so, but he has been alright since". A painter/decorator reported that his firm were "all for" young workers going to classes, but "owing to abuses" of day release (workers taking the day off, fully paid, instead of attending classes) they had "tightened up their demands".

Apart from the really keen employers, there were those who, whilst not giving the lead themselves, supported the young worker if he showed initiative and interest. An electrician, for example, said that his firm "didn't push" young workers if they did not want to go to classes but were "very co-operative" if they did want to go. The onus was on the individual—as in the case of the employers of another respondent, of whom the respondent said, "they encourage it if you want that kind of thing". Other employers were much more grudging in their support—an apprentice draughtsman said, "they do pay fees, but that's about all the interest they do show, and
they don't seem to like doing that, much". A steel works apprentice said of his firm, "they're not too keen; rather old-fashioned, really. I was the first to start going to day release school. Now there are a few others going, but the firm doesn't seem to realise fully that it will help them in the long run." Another hint of a change in employers' attitudes was provided by an apprentice draughtsman, who said his firm "didn't like you having the day off—though I think they are beginning to realise that this education will benefit them as well as me". It was not only in private industry that a less than enthusiastic attitude was reported of employers—an apprentice in a government engineering factory observed, "It is not as forward-looking as it should be. There is departmental stiffness. They're not concerned with production, so they don't want any bright lads." That, at least, was how he saw it. Finally, there were examples of firms which gave no encouragement at all—"you're joking!" was the comment of one apprentice, when asked about his employer's policy on further education—"all they're interested in is profit." A very ambitious apprentice steel-worker was distressed when his firm gave no recognition of the fact that he had obtained a first class pass in the City and Guilds examination, a success of which he was very proud. Loyal to the firm, he was unhappy because of the lack of reciprocity.

In the above discussion, attention has mainly been concentrated upon youths. This follows from the fact that relatively few girls at work are involved in further education, and those who are tend to be short-term students, mostly doing clerical subjects. Employers
tend to discount further education for girl workers, even though they may strongly support it for youths. Further education for youths can be seen as an investment—but, for girls, as a waste of money.¹

The discussion of participation in and attitudes towards further education leads to several conclusions which may be considered here in summary form. There is a widespread feeling amongst young workers that further education is neither necessary nor worthwhile. They do not expect it to be a successful endeavour—whether because of poor quality of instruction, lack of encouragement from employers, or the lack of ability of the individual. Respondents tended to the view that even if young workers were to start classes, "they would probably drop out half way"—observation of what had happened to their contemporaries provided much justification for such a view, of course. This disregard for further education can be seen as deriving in considerable measure from the previous educational experience in secondary modern school, however—the respondents do not expect education to be worthwhile or enjoyable in itself—and confirmed by the nature of the work which they now found themselves doing, in which further education seemed irrelevant, if not absurd.

It is clear that, save in a small minority of cases, further education does not represent a "second chance" for young workers. Willmott found this, too, in his study of East London adolescents.

¹See Home, School and Work, op. cit., Chapter 12.
concluding that, "on the whole, the failures of secondary schooling are not made good in further education": Willmott adds that "though the general tone from the boys is uncomplaining, the conclusion must surely be that the contact between them and the system is less fruitful than it could be." Other studies have led to the conclusion that further education is "often a reinforcement to previous education rather than a second chance for those who have not achieved success in secondary modern education". 2 Nevertheless, within this general setting there are opportunities for respondents with a measure of ability, interest and perseverance, to qualify themselves for "better" jobs. The above analysis has shown that some young workers make a calculated decision to withdraw from the attempt at striving for such qualifications, and the life-chances and style of life which they recognise go with them—or they decided not to make the attempt from the start. Apprentices would say, for example, that certificates were necessary for "the better jobs", but would indicate that they were not personally interested in these better jobs because further education was a prerequisite. This amounts


to the deliberate choice of one style of life rather than another—further education being described as "alright if you like that sort of thing", and "Alright if you want to get on". To the respondents concerned, then, the issue is, often, not so much one of the superiority of one type of job—or way of life—over another, but merely of difference: it is simply a matter of taste or preference what one elects for, rather than of merit or worthiness. Yet, implicit in the choice—and known to be—is a recognition that this is a once-and-for-all decision: there will not be another chance. Indeed, several respondents argued that because there was no second chance, all young workers should be compelled to attend further education classes—because they were too immature at the age of fifteen or sixteen to recognise the vital importance of continuing studies. When they did realise its value, at the age of nineteen or twenty—when they were thinking of settling down—it was too late. They perceived that the level and standard of life which they were to settle down to were at a lower level than could have been the case had they had the good sense or the parental encouragement—if they had been compelled, even—to attend further education classes.

One point remains in regard to further education. It will be raised below in the context of job changing, where it will be suggested that the further education college could provide an "anchor" or a "prop" for young workers in their teenage years. Patently, the college is not performing that function at present. Respondents and teachers at evening school and day release school were as strangers to the
young workers. Only one respondent made any reference to his further education teacher when asked whom he would approach for advice about his career, for example, as already noted. There are efforts, in various parts of Britain, to amend this situation: but whilst there are isolated successes, the problems have not yet been tackled seriously. The basic issues are, indeed, complex—they have to do with such questions as the nature and aims of secondary education and of further education, and the relationships of each to employment, and to occupational involvement, and participation in the wider society. They are such issues as Durkheim was concerned with when seeking to establish the nature of the social bonds in organic society—but they require resolution in the setting of modern industrial society.
CHAPTE R X
ANALYSIS OF JOB CHANGING

It is an accepted fact that in modern industrial societies there is a considerable amount of job changing, often involving changes of occupation, amongst the adult male working population.¹ In the U.S.A., at present, workers change their job on average every four or five years, although by no means all of these changes involve different occupations. The acceleration in technological change could well lead to an increase in this rate of job changing in the future, a point that has been referred to above.² With regard to the situation in Britain, it has been suggested in one Report that, over the long term, "probably only a minority of people stay in the


²cf. P.W. Musgrave, Technical Change, The Labour Force and Education. Musgrave is concerned to show the implications of such a high rate of job turnover for educational and training policy and practice.
occupation they go into on leaving school". ¹ The particular concern here is with the nature and extent of the job mobility obtaining in regard to fifteen-year-old school leavers during their first five years at work. There are no official statistics setting out the overall position, but a number of small-scale studies have been made and these suggest a very substantial amount of job changing amongst the 15-20 age group. Ferguson and Cunnison found from their postwar study in Glasgow that, on average, the 1300 boys in the sample had 2.77 different jobs during their first three years at work—or almost one job per year. Less than a quarter of the boys remained with the same employer (23 per cent); 2.9 per cent had two employers only. So that nearly one-half of the boys (48 per cent) had at least three employers, and, indeed, 14 per cent of the total had five or more employers during this first three years at work.² Further evidence of a high rate of job turnover in this age-group is provided by the Social Survey conducted for the Crowther Committee,³ which showed that 26 per cent of a sample of secondary modern school children had had four or more jobs in their first three years after

¹ *School and Life*, Central Advisory Council for Education (England), H.M.S.O., 1947; reprinted 1956, p.44.


leaving school. Other studies support this general picture, and further substantiation is provided by the original study in Sheffield, which showed that over one-third of both boys and girls changed jobs during their first year at work, 11 boys and 8 girls having at least three jobs during this time. The rate of job changing is likely to be higher during a period of full employment, of course, than in a period of economic stagnation or depression (ignoring, in the latter case, lay-offs and redundancies). On the one hand, there is greater demand for labour from employers, who may well offer special inducements to attract men from other jobs: and, on the other hand, employees are more likely to move when there is no threat of insecurity in employment. It is therefore important to stress that during the five-year period covering the respondents' first experience of employment, and, indeed, during the years preceding this and leading

---

up to the time when they left school, Sheffield enjoyed a period of full employment. There were times when the economic scene was threatening, and the bulge in the school leaving population during the late nineteen-fifties and the early nineteen-sixties was expected to cause special difficulties for boys and girls seeking their first jobs. But the anticipated juvenile unemployment did not, in fact, occur. The analysis of job changing must be seen within this context of overall full employment then—in Sheffield itself and in the industrial region of which it is a part.¹

The follow-up study confirms the picture already established in the earlier Sheffield research of a high rate of job turnover. Of the 86 youths, just over one-quarter (24) were in the same job at the time of Interview No. 4, five years after leaving school, that they had entered on first starting work. Rather more than one-quarter of the girls remained in the same job (26 out of 84)—although 5 of these had stopped work on assuming housewives' duties. Table 31 gives the position. It is seen that rather more than 60 per cent of both youths and girls had a maximum of two jobs. But of the remaining youths and girls, one-half had four or more jobs, one youth having a total of (at least) fourteen jobs. The average number of

¹cf. Ministry of Labour Gazettes, 1957-1964. Those respondents who had changed jobs for the most part had only a few days unemployment—and some of this was "voluntary". However, one youth was unemployed for six months and another for four months. Both were unskilled workers.
### TABLE 31
NUMBER OF JOBS HELD IN
FIRST FIVE YEARS AT WORK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs in Five Years</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Girls At Work</th>
<th>Housewives (Last Job)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One job only</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two jobs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three jobs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four jobs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six jobs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jobs held in the five-year period was 2.7 for youths and 2.4 for girls (but the 18 girls who withdrew from work for domestic reasons were not "at risk" in terms of job changing for the full five years, of course). These figures probably, if anything, under-estimate somewhat the position in regard to the number of jobs held by those respondents with a high turnover, because of the difficulty which some of them had in remembering the precise jobs held. The proclivity for job changing is further indicated by the fact that 15 youths and 10 girls had applied for jobs, apart from the one which they actually held at the time of Interview No.4, during the previous year—and another 19 youths and 13 girls had thought of doing so. Of the 14 youths whom it was not possible to trace for Interview No.4, or who refused to co-operate at that stage, it is known that 6 had changed.
jobs at least once during their first year in employment, some of them having had more than one job during this time: similarly with the girl non-respondents, 5 of the 16 had changed jobs at least once during their first year at work. Analysis of the Postal Survey responses, in so far as it can be relied upon, supports the general picture suggested by the main sample of a high rate of job turnover. This analysis, as was stressed above, does present many difficulties. With regard specifically to job changing, it should first be emphasized that the replies from respondents with long histories of job changing may well be inaccurate, because of difficulty in remembering, lethargy, and possibly, in some cases, a sense of shame. The problem of assessing how far the postal respondents are representative of the population is also acute. Whilst a preoccupation with employment difficulties might have induced a disproportionate number with high job mobility to respond, it is just as likely that the respondents are weighted also towards the "low job mobility" end of the scale, with a high proportion of the more seriously-minded young workers who tend to change not at all or to make only one ("sensible") move.

Whatever the limitations of the Postal Survey, however, and disregarding its undoubted lack of precision as an indicator of the overall position in regard to the population of young workers, the data can be said to offer some substantiation for the results cited in regard to the main sample. As Table 32 shows, only two-fifths of the youths were in the same job after five years in employment as they entered on first leaving school, and only just over one-quarter
of the girls. Many of those who changed jobs did so several times.

The initial research indicated that much of the job changing that occurred during the first year at work involved changes in occupation also—less than one-third (10) of the 36 youths who changed jobs were in the same occupation at the end of the year as that which they had entered on leaving school, and several of them had had intermediate jobs in yet other occupations. A substantially higher proportion of the girls (20 out of 36 changing jobs) remained in the same occupation but, even so, many of the new tasks performed—as a result, for example, of changing from one factory job to another—were substantially different from those done in the original jobs. The tendency of job changers also to change occupations persisted over the remainder of the first five years at work. Table 33 indicates that not more than one-quarter of the youths remained in the same occupation throughout. (Table 33 refers to employed status
TABLE 33
NUMBER OF OCCUPATIONS HELD IN FIRST FIVE YEARS AT WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations in Five Years</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One occupation only</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two occupations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three occupations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four occupations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five occupations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more occupations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—that is to say, "housewife" is not classified as an occupation).

The proportion of girls who remained in the same occupation is distinctly higher than that in regard to youths, 45 out of 84 girls. Twenty-six of these girls had remained in the same job (5 of them leaving to become housewives) and this means that 19 of the 58 girls who changed jobs remained in the same occupation. The range of occupations open to girls is much smaller than is the case with youths, as has already been pointed out, and it is difficult to move across the intermediate category of shop assistant, from factory/warehouse work to office work—whilst, in principle, it can be said that girls are disinclined to make the move in the opposite direction. The relative rigidity of this hierarchy of occupations is an important factor in explaining the lower numbers of occupations held by girls. It is seen, however, that substantial numbers of youths and girls had three or more occupations. Whether
by design or because of fortuitous factors (the point will be discussed further, below) 21 youths and 20 girls who had changed occupations had returned to the same occupation as they had first entered on leaving school, by the end of the five-year period—having had at least one, and in some cases a series of three, four or more occupations in the meanwhile. Two of these youths and two girls had returned not just to the same occupation but to the same employer, after a period away. Three youths remained with the same employer throughout, but changed occupations. The average number of occupations is just over 2.0 for youths and 1.6 for girls.

Job and Occupation Changes Compared With Level of Skill

There was a clear-cut tendency for youths who were in skilled and non-manual employment at the time of Interview No. 4 to have had fewer job and occupation changes than youths in semi-skilled employment, who in turn had fewer changes than unskilled workers. The pattern in regard to girls, whilst less distinct, is nonetheless similar, Category 'A' showing a relatively low rate and Category 'C' a relatively high rate.

1 The same pattern was evident amongst East London boys. cf. Peter Willmott, Adolescent Boys of East London, op.cit., pp.115-116.
The analysis of job changes amongst postal respondents in relationship to skill follows, broadly, the same pattern as that obtaining for the main sample, as Table 35 shows.

It is noticeable that nearly two-thirds of the apprentices in the main sample (Table 34) had had one job only, and only two of them had had more than two jobs. One of these had been the victim of redundancy from his employment as an electrician with small sub-contracting firms on two occasions, and had left another job because of very long hours of work. The other youth had "had no idea what job he wanted to
do" when he left school: after five months as a junior clerk and eighteen months as a shop assistant, he finally found an occupation to his liking, as an apprentice electrician. At the time of Interview No. 4 he had been in this job for well over two years. All except 4 of the 29 apprentices had had one occupation only. The requirement to serve time as an apprentice rules out the possibility of movement in this level of employment, for the most part, after a youth has passed the age of sixteen (the latter example, above, is one exception). This is reflected in the fact that of the 7 youths who were apprentices at Interview No. 4 (although they had not been apprentices in their first employment on leaving school) 5 had had two jobs only, one three jobs, and one four jobs. Twenty-two of the 29 had been apprentices in their first job on leaving school, but 4 of these had changed from one job to another. The steady falling-off in the number of apprentices over the five-year period has already been discussed, above; the decline in numbers was from a total of 39 in first jobs entered to 31 at the time of Interview No. 3 and 29 at Interview No. 4. The main reasons for leaving apprenticeships were dissatisfaction with pay, or the need for a higher wage implied by changing domestic circumstances, such as marriage or intended marriage, and dissatisfaction with the amount or quality of training.

The overall picture in regard to apprenticeships during the five-year period is given in Table 36.
TABLE 36
APPRENTICESHIPS AND JOB CHANGING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice in first job</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Apprenticeships</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained Apprentices</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Became Apprentices Subsequent to First Job*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*8 of these became apprentices during their first year in employment.

Of the 19 youths who had left apprenticeships at some stage during their first five years in employment, only one could be said to have moved to advantage—he was in non-manual employment at the time of Interview No. 4. Four of the others were in unskilled jobs, and the remaining 14 in semi-skilled.

A comparison between youths who had left apprenticeships and those who were still apprentices at the time of Interview No. 4 shows that a higher proportion of the former had fathers who were semi- or unskilled, came from larger families, and were of lower I.Q. Grades. The position is presented in Table 37. This Table also shows that a substantial proportion of the respondents who left apprenticeships came from families with experience of selective education, however. One of the youths concerned moved from an apprenticeship to a non-manual job. The conclusion in regard to this is that family experience of selective education seems definitely to be a factor associated with obtaining a skilled or non-manual job, 11 of 15 such youths holding this type of employment at some stage, 8 of them being in this level of employment five years after leaving school. So far as schools attended are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Apprentice at 5 years(29)</th>
<th>Left Apprenticeship(19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers' Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Child</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Children</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Children</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Education of family member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.Q. Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'C'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'E'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerned, Table 37 shows that all schools contributed to the apprenticeship "wastage", although the slum school, situated in the nick of iron and steelworks, accounted for as many as 6 of the youths. This largely reflects the haphazard way in which many apprenticeships in
the area were obtained. Youths were subsequently sorted out through a process of trial and error on the part of employer and employee alike.

The analysis of job and occupation changes amongst youths, then, indicates clearly an inverse relationship between level of skill and rate of turnover. The same relationship holds true, though less distinctly, in regard to girls' occupations, as Table 38 shows.

**Table 38**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job and Occupation Changes Compared with Level of Skill—Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 'A'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'C'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bulk of the girls with a high rate of job turnover were in Category 'C' jobs at the time of Interview No.4. The small number of occupation changes compared with youths is in part a reflection of the "barriers" already referred to between Category 'A' and

---

Category 'C', and partly indicates the narrower range of occupations open to girls (for purposes of assessing the number of occupational changes, the different occupations within the Categories were considered separately: thus a move from one occupation to another within the same Category has been counted as a change—in other words, intra, as well as inter, Category changes have been included; for example, a change within Category 'A' from Hairdresser to Clerk).

The girls in the Postal Survey followed the same general pattern as the main sample, as is seen in Table 39.

**TABLE 39**

**JOB CHANGES COMPARED WITH LEVEL OF OCCUPATION—POSTAL SURVEY: GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'C'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Changes in Relation to Family and Social Background

Table 40 compares job changes with level of fathers' skill. The comparison of children's job changing history with fathers' level of skill reveals no clear-cut picture. At Table 40 indicates, however,
there would seem to be some tendency for children of skilled and non-manual fathers to have a lower job turnover than children of semi- and unskilled fathers. This association is tied up, in the case of youths, with the fact, already established above, that a high proportion of apprentices, whose turnover we have seen to be relatively low, are the sons of skilled men.

Table 41 suggests, also, a connection between small families and a low rate of job changing, and again this is especially marked in the case of youths. With regard to the family's experience of selective education, this again would seem to be connected with proneness to job changing. Table 42 shows that a high proportion of youths and girls from families with experience of selective education have had only one or two jobs during their first five years in employment.
TABLE 41
JOB CHANGES COMPARED WITH SIZE OF FAMILY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children in Family</th>
<th>YOUTHS</th>
<th></th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Jobs</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Number of Jobs</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 10 2 1 - -</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6 7 2 2 - -</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>13 15 12 3 1 6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19 15 12 4 4 1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 1 2 2 - 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 - -</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>- 1 - 1 2 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 1 2 3 - 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24 27 16 7 3 9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26 25 17 10 4 2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 42
JOB CHANGES COMPARED WITH FAMILY'S EXPERIENCE OF SELECTIVE EDUCATION YOUTHS AND GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Experience of Selective Education</th>
<th>YOUTHS</th>
<th></th>
<th>GIRLS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Jobs</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Number of Jobs</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 7 2 1 - -</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 3 3 2 - -</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The associations between a low job changing rate on the one hand and, on the other, high level of father's occupation, small family and, in some cases, experience of selective education, is indicative of parental aspirations, and of their ability to give constructive advice about work and help in finding suitable employment. These may be regarded, then, as further indices of differential life chances and of varying styles of life.
Discussions About Job Changing With Parents, Relations and Others

Job changing during the first year at work was found to take place, often, with very little consultation by the respondent as to the advisability of the move and the suitability of the proposed new job. The same conclusion derives from the detailed study of job changing subsequent to Interview No. 3. The respondents were asked, if they intended to change jobs, thought that they might do so, or if they had in fact changed jobs—whether they would talk to anyone or had talked about the matter with anyone, and, if so, with whom. Fifty-five of the youths (about five-eighths) and fifty-six of the girls (rather a higher proportion) said that they would discuss the matter with someone, or that they had already done so. The detailed figures are given in Table 43.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 43</th>
<th>DISCUSSION ABOUT JOB CHANGING YOUTHS AND GIRLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would discuss with parents</strong></td>
<td><strong>YOUTHS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband/wife</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some other person</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone in authority at work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The figures add up to more than 55 youths and 56 girls because some respondents indicated that they would discuss with more than one person. It is important to recognise at the outset that the word "discuss" is misleading in many cases, since what transpired was often a rather aimless and uninformed exchange, which concentrated more on the availability of alternative employment than the suitability of it. It is worth noting, however, that as many as 31 youths and 28 girls did not envisage discussion at all, or had done nothing more than inform the parent that they had changed jobs. Thus, one youth, a labourer, said, "I would not consult anyone, but simply tell my mother what I had decided"; and, at the other end of the occupational hierarchy, an apprentice joiner said, "Possibly I would ask my mother and father, but more likely I would tell them when I had decided to go for a better job." A further point is that many of those who intimated that they would propose to discuss a change of job with their parents or with someone else had not in fact changed jobs—whilst a high proportion of those who had not discussed the matter and who would not propose to do so had in fact changed. Table 44 shows the position.

It is particularly notable that all but 2 of the 24 youths who had had one job only, indicated that if they were to consider a change they would discuss the matter with someone—usually they had a parent in mind. On the other hand, as many as 18 of the 35 youths who had had three or more jobs (and 12 of the 33 girls) would not propose to
discuss the matter with anyone, and had not done so, apart from merely informing parents of intentions or of a fait accompli. This tendency of non-changers to discuss and many changers not to discuss is a reflection of the different family and social backgrounds from which they had come, and indicative of different perceptions of the nature and significance of the world at work, and of attitudes towards it. These are matters to which we will return. The same factors may be seen in regard to level of skill, which is analysed in Table 45 for youths and Table 46 for girls.

The tendency for apprentices and non-manual workers to discuss a proposed or actual change is marked. Whilst the pattern is less clear with girls, the tendency for girls in Category 'A' jobs to discuss a job change is nonetheless evident: looking behind the present figure; indeed, it appears that most of the Category 'A' and 'B' girls concerned...
TABLE 45
DISCUSSION ABOUT JOB CHANGES
COMPARED WITH LEVEL OF SKILL—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Un-Skilled</th>
<th>Non-manual</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would discuss</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or had done so</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 46
DISCUSSION ABOUT JOB CHANGES
COMPARED WITH LEVEL OF OCCUPATION—GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Category 'A'</th>
<th>Category 'B'</th>
<th>Category 'C'</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would discuss</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or had done so</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would discuss with parents, whilst rather more Category 'C' girls would discuss with friends only.

The study of parents' attitudes towards and actions in regard to respondents' job changes during the first year at work showed that a minority of parents played a leading part in the matter, urging restraint and hard thinking before making a move, or perhaps encouraging a child to move to work with better prospects, more congenial
conditions and/or a higher social status. The majority of parents, however, took no special stand, and displayed acquiescence in their child's decision, or indifference to it. This pattern persisted during the subsequent four years; indeed, the tendency for parents to abstain from discussion or guidance, and for respondents to refrain from seeking parental advice or opinion, became more pronounced. Parents who during the child's first year at work felt a responsibility to see that they found suitable employment now tended to the view that since they were older, the children must bear the responsibility themselves. Reciprocally, children who previously would accept parental guidance now wished to assume independence, and tended to regard attempts at guidance as "interference". Thus, a warehouse girl in her fourth job—and now, of course, twenty years of age—said, "I'm on my own now, in things like that: even if I did ask my Mum, she'd just say, 'please yourself, love'."

Another important reason for not consulting parents, which was evident more particularly amongst the more serious-minded children, including some apprentices and girls in Category 'A' jobs, was that their parents were not familiar with the type and level of work in which the children were engaged. Children were aware, that is, of changes in technology and in organisation at work affecting prospects and job satisfaction, but knew that their parents, who were brought up under different conditions, could not properly appraise the situation today—there were so many changes in office procedures
and practices since a girl's mother had done that sort of work for example. And youths and girls who had been upwardly mobile in terms of occupation—even though to a modest extent—found that their parents were "lost" when it came to talking about work. The non-manual youth from a traditionally manual home, and the girl in a Category "A" job from a home in which shop assistant or factory work were previously the accepted level, knew that they were "on their own"—that for guidance it would be no use turning to the parents. One clerk said, "it would be no use to talk with my parents because they have not got all that experience to talk about jobs like mine". In these circumstances, some children turned to friends for discussion—the friends being people sharing the same outlooks, perspectives and experience of work. But most turned to no one. This fact of parental ignorance of technological/social change, together with the fact of upward mobility, points again to the institutional gap in terms of information and guidance which the Youth Employment Service fails to fill. An interesting point here, too, is that even within this range of occupations, there is scope for slight downward mobility. Much of the upward mobility would seem to be accounted for by changes in the overall occupational structure which make for a somewhat higher proportion of skilled and non-manual jobs, and of Category 'C' jobs, than was the case at the time when parents, particularly older parents, themselves started work. But some of it is associated with the trend for the more demanding jobs to be based on qualifications: this trend is very much evident at
the higher levels of the occupational hierarchy, outwith the secondary modern spectrum, but the traces of it within this spectrum are clear—even though employers' selection methods, as will be seen below, tend on the whole to be "inefficient" in this sense. To the extent that the "better" jobs are dependent on merit, and to the extent that other factors in obtaining such jobs are of decreasing importance—"influence", for example, being of less utility—less bright children from middle class homes may find themselves unable to obtain employment at the level which they and their parents view as appropriate. Such parents may not be able to comprehend the nature of the work which their children do enter, and may be unfamiliar with conditions and prospects in it. The child and parents are "lost" in such circumstances, and there were at least two cases amongst the respondents in which the outcome was severe strain in the home, and a complete lack of understanding between child and parents, and uncertainty as to "what to do for the best". The parents had no faith in the Youth Employment Service, which they saw merely as an accessory after the fact of channeling their children into low grade employment. 

Another reason for lack of discussion about job changing was that children perceived differences of values as between the younger and the older generation—it was pointless to discuss matters, then, because parents "wouldn't understand". In particular, they would in all likelihood manifest a conservative, authoritarian stance, just at a time when the child was impatient for change and adventure.
Thus, one girl said that she would talk to her friends, but not her parents, for "they would not discuss work, but give a lecture about being grateful for (her) present job": they would have no sympathy for her aspirations to something better than her present job as a factory worker. Similarly, too, with a nurse, who said that she would discuss the matter with her friend, also a nurse—"she would understand my position in a way that my parents would not. They might simply say, 'Don't be ridiculous! Change after five years training!' ".

With regard to discussion with people other than parents, husbands and wives were referred to by the married respondents (although by no means all of these contemplated discussion). One girl made it clear that she thought that on marriage a husband properly assumed the responsibility of advising the wife in such matters: work was basically a man's world, was her point, and it was appropriate to sensible and satisfactory husband/wife relationships that the man gave the lead, and be expected to do so, in such matters. On the other hand, 6 of the 11 married youths, and 23 of the 31 married girls did not anticipate discussion with their wives or husbands, save, in the case of girls, in regard to whether they should continue at work or give it up. But even this latter topic was not deliberated upon at any length by many: rather was the decision forced because of pregnancy. The need for money for the home was an important factor in girls continuing work after marriage, but decisions as to where to work and whether to change jobs tended to be left to the girl, as distinct from the basic decision to continue work (or not to do so).
Other people at work were referred to by a few youths and by rather more girls. A painter/decorator, for example, said that "painters are a closed circle, and this sort of thing (that is, giving advice and information) is frequently done"; the fraternity, as it were, acquired and exchanged knowledge about vacancies, "good" and "bad" employers, pending contracts, and so on. Girls had in mind others in the work group—particularly was this so in the case of factory and warehouse girls who often worked in groups. It was not unusual, indeed, for such girls to change jobs in twos or threes, leaving one employer together, and going as friends to another: and job changes at a friend's recommendation, or to join a friend, were not uncommon, again especially amongst Category 'C' girls.

It is noticeable that only six youths and five girls said that they would discuss a possible change of job with someone in authority at work. The girls had in mind an older woman in a minor position of responsibility—in charge of a small group of packers, for example, whom they might talk to informally: the woman would be regarded in the rôle of a mother, as it were, but one with special knowledge about the work situation. The youths, too, had in mind men such as chargehand or perhaps foreman who were "on their side" as opposed to being "on the boss's side", who were, that is, "ordinary blokes" like themselves. It is important to note, then, that no respondent thought in terms of discussion with a person at the management level: even apprentices in the large iron and steel works with personnel officers
did not conceive of approaching them. In part this situation is a reflection of the fact that many changes are made in consequence of factors other than the pursuance of a career—a reasoned discussion about prospects is not so relevant if one is leaving an apprenticeship because of the opportunity of a high wage as a labourer, because of boredom with the particular job, or as a mark of frustration at work itself. In part, too, it reflects the absence of any person in the smaller firms who is able or prepared to advise. And in part it indicates the lack of correspondence between the formal organisation, with channels of communication on paper, and the actual situation, in which young workers steer clear of the personnel office because it is associated with the "managerial side", and probably, physically located in offices separate from the factory. Beyond this, the failure of respondents to discuss possible job changes with the employer is to be understood in broad terms as a manifestation of the market situation in which workers are selling their labour for the highest return obtainable: this implies a contest between worker and employer, in which the worker, whilst being required to give statutory notice, will try to keep secret for as long as possible his intention to change jobs—lest the employer act first and dismiss him, or lest, in the event, he fails to obtain suitable alternative employment, and has to remain in his present job. Job changing for young workers, then, is seen by them and by the bulk of employers as part of the labour market mechanism. It is not seen as part of a process whereby young people are enabled
to experiment with different occupations and benefit from discussions about long-term advantages or disadvantages of a change of job. The Youth Employment Service is viewed officially as an agency in regard to the latter aspect—but it is not, as we have seen, viewed as such by young workers or by employers, on the whole: whilst there is evidence to suggest that it views itself—or many Officers do so—as a job-placing agency rather than in an advisory capacity, at least after children have first entered employment. Only one respondent mentioned the possibility of discussing a change of job with the Youth Employment Officer—she said that she might visit the Y.E.O. if she was "really pushed": if, that is, she was desperate for advice and could think of no one else. Other people who were referred to by respondents included the Salvation Army Captain (or, presumably in view of the importance of the step, "possibly the Major"); Youth Club Leaders (in just two cases); and the "landlord of the local". The latter was regarded by a labourer in his fifth job as being far more sensible in his advice and far more informed in his knowledge of vacancies than the Y.E.O. ever had been, or could be.

The general conclusion, then, is that for high proportions of youths and girls, the subject of job changing was not, obviously, one for discussion: the utility and possibility of it were in doubt—as a butcher said, "I couldn't talk to my boss, and my parents couldn't help, so I would use my own discretion"—and the decision was felt in any case to be private and an aspect of independence("It's my business, and no one else's. I'd make up my own mind").
Job Changing and Marriage

It has already been suggested that there are connections to be discerned between job changing and marriage. Examples have been cited of apprentices who found it necessary to change to more remunerative work because of marriage or in anticipation of it; equally, there were apprentices who renounced any involvement with the opposite sex because they thought that they could not afford it, and/or were afraid of the liaison "getting serious", with adverse effects on their further education studies and their career in general. In regard to girl respondents, a change of job, perhaps to a lower level in the hierarchy, was not infrequently associated with marriage and engagement. Table 47 compares the number of jobs held by married respondents with the number held by single respondents (the point should be reiterated that married girls who had stopped work were not "at risk").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 47</th>
<th>Marital Status and Job Changing Youths and Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Jobs Held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths—married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>3 2 1 4 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24 27 15 3 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls—Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>7 10 6 5 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>26 25 17 10 4 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first point to note is that married respondents include many wi th a low rate of job turnover as well as many with a high rate. This serves to illustrate the fact that marriage may reinforce the need for security in employment, especially in the case of youths, as well as representing in some cases a motive for a change of job, in accordance with the above analysis. Also important in regard to job changes for girls is the birth of a child. This will be discussed in more detail below, in the Chapter on marriage. Here it suffices to note that the birth of a child involved for the girls a change of jobs, if they returned to work: none of the girls, that is, went back to the same employer whom they had prior to the birth of the child. In regard to youths, also, there was some evidence (although only four youths had children) that some job changes were associated with the need for more money because of the increasing commitment at home—a child to feed and clothe, and the loss of the wife's income—rather than being connected with marriage as such.

Apart from the connections between marriage and other factors so far suggested, there is the wider question of the relationship between values associated with job stability or with a high rate of job turnover, and those associated with "early" marriage. Certain of the marriages, we will see below, appeared to have been entered into lightly, after but a short courtship and with little thought or planning for the future—in regard to housing, domestic finances, children and so on. This lack of "planning ahead" is a feature, also, with regard to many of the respondents with a high rate of job changing, whether married or single. On the other hand, some of the marriages were a consequence of a considerable amount of
planning ahead, of courtship over several years, and with well-thought-out savings programmes in regard to house purchase, and proposed time of starting children. A low rate of job turnover was associated with this approach to marriage. Viewed from this perspective, then, both level of job, job turnover and early marriage may be seen as but different dimensions or manifestations of a basic system of values and attitudes.

An analysis of the number of job changes in terms of school attended showed that differences between schools and areas were revealed less in the numbers concerned than in the reasons for job changes. In all schools, there were children with a high rate of changing as well as children with a low rate, as Table 48 indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>'C'</td>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>'E'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Job only</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jobs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jobs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Jobs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Job only</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jobs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Jobs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Jobs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Children from schools 'A' and 'E' generally changed jobs after more thought and to more purpose than most children from the other schools; and these two schools do, indeed, show a somewhat lower amount of job changing overall. This could be taken as an indication of parental influence, backed by the school, for children to think in terms of a "career" rather than merely of "getting a job". A high turnover is particularly marked amongst youths attending school 'C', the school in a slum neighbourhood. But because of the variation in social backgrounds within each school (despite the predominance of certain types) and because of the variety of reasons for changing jobs, the small numbers in this study do not present a clear-cut picture in terms of numerical indices in this matter.

Another facet of job changing in relation to the school has to do with children's attitudes towards various aspects of education and their job changing histories. Thus Willmott, in his study of East London boys, raises the question as to whether the "rebels" at school (meaning those who disliked it and could not settle) were also rebels at work. His conclusion is that "If job changing is taken as an index, it seems that there is an association.....Of the boys who were critical of the school regime, less than a third were in the job they had when they left, against half of those most sympathetic to the school. Similarly, nearly a third of the former, against just over a tenth of the latter, had been in five or more jobs. This is not simply a reflection of the relative instability of boys in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations: there was the same relationship
between attitudes to school and number of jobs amongst non-manual and skilled manual workers.\textsuperscript{1} In the present research, there was no single formulation in terms of "criticism of the school regime" such as to provide a category of "rebels". Certainly, there were boys and girls who were particularly feckless whilst at school, as indicated by such matters as truancy and attitudes to study, and who continued to be distinctly feckless at work, as manifested by the number of job changes and the reasons for them. And, in broad terms, relationships are clear between a high job turnover, boredom or indifference at school, and an unstimulating home background; similarly there are connections between a low turnover, keenness at school and interested parents. But the relationships are by no means valid universally within the sample. And in regard to such matters as whether respondents were glad or sorry to have left school at the age of fifteen, what they thought of the plan to raise the school leaving age, and their educational aspirations for their own children, it would seem that the experience of job changing had impressed upon numerous children the desirability of continuing education and making sure of the opportunity for schooling whilst it is there if a worthwhile career is to be followed. The connection, then, between job changing and attitudes towards or appraisal of the value of education is not just in terms of deep-seated

\textsuperscript{1}Peter Willmott, \textit{Adolescent Boys of East London}, op.cit.
attitudes and orientations persisting through school and into the work setting—although this undoubtedly is salient in many cases—but also in terms of attitudes being amended and reformulated in response to the experience of the world of work.

**TABLE 49**

**JOB CHANGING COMPARED WITH I.Q. GRADES**

**YOUTHS AND GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.Q.</th>
<th>Number of Jobs Held</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths Grade I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>10 8 1 - - -</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6 9 7 3 - - -</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6 8 5 4 1 - -</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2 2 3 - 2 3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24 27 16 7 3 9</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Girls Grade I |                   |        |
| I            | 12 11 2 4 1 -     | 26     |
| II           | 10 5 7 4 1 1      | 28     |
| III          | 4 9 6 4 1 1       | 25     |
| IV           | - - 2 2 1 -       | 5      |
| Totals       | 26 25 17 10 4 2   | 84     |

**Analysis of Job Changing in Relationship to I.Q. Grades**

There was a clear-cut tendency for youths and girls of the higher I.Q. Grades to change jobs less frequently than those in the lower grades as Table 49 above shows. The association between relatively high level of intelligence and low level of job changing is in line with Macpherson's finding in a study of a sample of Scottish children.1 A high proportion of the youths of Intelligence Grade I became apprentices, of course, and it has already been noted that this is conducive

---

to stability because of the requirements to serve five years in order to qualify. Of the children of Intelligence Grade I who did change jobs, most did so after serious thought and in order to improve their prospects—in contrast to the tendency to haphazard job changing which characterized many of the children from lower Intelligence Grades. Of course, not all of the less intelligent children had a high job turnover—some would have had difficulty in finding other employment, others were satisfied with the routine, undemanding jobs which they had, and did not wish to change to another job, which might demand more of them. The high rate of job changing amongst children of low intelligence has two further aspects. Firstly, it is indicative of a lack of sophistication in dealings with employers: because of the inability to register appropriate grievances and get them rectified, children leave the job in the hope of finding something better elsewhere. Secondly, and associated with this, it is further evidence of a lack of guidance from the Youth Employment Service, employers and parents, where guidance would appear to be particularly important.

**Relationship of Job Changes to Aims during Last Year at School**

It was noted in Chapter V above that many respondents entered occupations on leaving school which differed from those at which they had aimed; the various reasons for this include some lack of
realism of aspiration in terms of ability, lack of deep interest, which led to rapid changes of aspiration, lack of knowledge about the appropriate steps to find work, and inefficient selection arrangements by employers. But, as was suggested above, the logic of the occupational structure is an over-riding constraining factor. Analysis of relationships between job aims and jobs entered is difficult, in part because of the vagueness of many children about their aims, but also because of the problem of deciding whether the elements that appealed to a child in his choice of job are, or are not, present in the occupation which he enters. Despite these complications, the general position can be mapped out with some assurance. Table 50 shows the position.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 50</th>
<th>Job Aspirations and Attainments</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First job = precisely or in general category of 1st Choice at Interview No.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job at Interview No.3 (1 year)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job at Interview No.4 (5 years)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under one-half of the youths and approximately five-eighths of the girls entered occupations on leaving school which were

---

1As throughout, unless otherwise stated, housewives' last full-time occupation is referred to.
precisely the same as or in the general category of their first choice during their last term. The overall result of the many changes during the first year in employment was a distinct reduction in the number of children in their Interview No.1 first choice at the end of the year than at the beginning. And it is seen that this trend continued, so that by the time of Interview No.4, after five years at work, only about one-third of the youths and three-eighths of the girls were in occupations similar to those at which they had aimed.\(^1\) In the four-year period between Interview No.3 and Interview No.4, then, the net effect of the job changes was that 6 fewer youths and 6 fewer girls were in their Interview No.1 choice of occupation. In fact, 7 youths who were in their Interview No.1 choice at Interview No.3 subsequently changed their occupations, but another youth during this time moved from another occupation to his Interview No.1 choice, whilst two youths moved into their first choice.

Because of the indefiniteness of aim that characterised many children, and the associated lack of thought and knowledge about work, a further analysis was made of respondents included in the above figures, who were *obviously keen* on a particular occupation when interviewed during their last term at school, and had set their minds on such work. This analysis showed a distinct falling off in the numbers engaged in the work which they at one time were so keen to do—of 33 youths who had set their minds on their first choice of

\(^{1}\)For details relating to the first year in employment, see *Home, School and Work*, *op.cit.*, Chapter 6, especially pp.147-148 and 182-183.
work, 18 were in such an occupation one year after leaving school, but only 11 five years after leaving school. Of the 16 girls who had set their minds on a particular occupation, 11 were in such work one year after leaving school, but only 4 at the five year stage. Some of the reasons for these discrepancies have been suggested already, and further aspects will be considered below, in the discussion of reasons for job changing. A few comments are pertinent at this stage, however.

The obvious discrepancies between jobs aimed at and jobs obtained reflect, as has already been stated, the inadequate thought given by children to future work, so that some have unrealistic aspirations in terms of their ability (although they may be philosophic about this in the outcome, as with the respondent who remarked at Interview No.4 that he had wanted to be an electrical engineer, "but hadn't the brains"). Casual methods of seeking, and of being offered, work also resulted in children entering occupations other than those which they really wanted—this is exacerbated by a tendency of children to take the first job that comes along, even in times of full employment, though more so, of course, when work is scarce. In part this seems to represent a desire for the securing of a job of some sort—"a bird in the hand" philosophy—and in part is indicative of the fact that, for many, the particular type of employment is of less importance than acquiring the status of worker. 1 Reactions to the

1 Initial reactions to employment are considered in detail in Home, School and Work, op. cit., Chapters 9 and 10.
jobs held at Interview No. 4 in the light of their original aims showed considerable variation amongst the respondents. Most of those who were in the occupations which they had aimed at were well-satisfied, as with the youth who said that he had "always wanted to work on the land, and had no regrets at all". It should be noted, however, that some children who had entered and remained in the work of their choice registered disappointment. Notably was this so with several apprentices who were dissatisfied with their training. Their reservations were associated with the particular circumstances of their jobs, however, rather than with the content of the occupation as such. But there were a few cases of respondents who had been particularly keen on an occupation, but found it to be not to their liking in the event. Thus, one girl who had set her mind on clerical work found after a year in this type of employment that she was neither happy nor particularly competent in the work, and therefore changed jobs. But the respondents' reactions in certain cases is to be understood not in terms of a disjunction between what was expected in a job and what in fact the content of the job was, but rather in terms of changed aspirations consequent upon a broadening of the knowledge about the world of work and the variety of employment which exists and/or a shift in values associated with new leisure activities, a new circle of friends, or changing home circumstances. With regard to the latter, for example, a girl who had "always" wanted to be a nurse, and had had lingering hopes of this for over a year after leaving school and working as a shop assistant, eventually was
offered a post as trainee children's nurse. By this time, however, she was courting, and her parents told her that she should either give up her boy friend or give up her aspirations to be a nurse, since the two did not go together. She decided to remain a shop assistant, and soon afterwards she was married. At Interview No.4 she declared herself to be "very happy, and very content in the job".

Satisfaction with an occupation is by no means dependent upon a long standing, keen interest in the work. Some respondents who entered occupations by chance became very interested in them—thus an apprentice printer, who "had no idea about work" when he left school, said "I really feel this is the job for me": and an apprentice fitter said, "I didn't really know what I wanted when I left school, but now that I've done this for five years, I like it quite a lot." Some respondents, too, who had particularly wanted to enter a certain occupation, had become reconciled to the realities of the world of work, in terms of supply and demand, and, after five years in employment, were well content with their jobs—although they were different from the ones to which they aspired. An apprentice surface grinder for example, said, "Too many boys wanted to do motor mechanics work, and I was one of the unlucky ones, but I've no regrets now, really." But there were respondents who were deeply disappointed at their inability to get the work of their choice, and remained so throughout their first five years in employment.

A not uncommon reaction, once aspirations for a particular job were thwarted, was for a youth or a girl to renounce special interest
in any particular occupation as such, and to take "any" job—
criteria of learning a trade and of intrinsic satisfaction were
thrust aside, to be replaced by those of convenience of hours, ease
of work, and high wages. Thus a youth who had wanted to become an
apprentice plumber had a succession of skilled and semi-skilled jobs,
"not really caring" what he did, since his main objective was not to
be satisfied. An analogous pattern may be detected amongst certain
youths whose apprenticeships did not come up to expectations—they
left, and employed a distinctly different set of criteria in regard
to their subsequent employment.

Family circumstances prevented a few respondents from seeking the
occupation of their choice, and these youths and girls, whilst not
bitter, manifested a lingering sense of regret. A youth who had
wanted to be an electrician had to enter semi-skilled work with higher
wages than he could command as an apprentice, because the money was
needed at home. Another youth, who had had over six jobs in his first
five years in employment, all of them semi-or unskilled, pointed out
that it was unrealistic for him to employ any criteria other than that
of a high wage. His father was dead, and at the time when he left
school he was the eldest of five children remaining at home (older
siblings were married and living elsewhere, or were in prison): his
wage was urgently needed for the benefit of the home.

It should be stressed, however, that the bulk of youths and girls
were not so attracted to a particular occupation that their failure
to obtain such work embittered them: it did not much matter to them
what particular occupation they were in. Hence the high rate of changing from one job to another and one occupation to another, with little pattern to be detected in regard to the majority of those concerned. A few did experiment with different occupations, seeking one which they would enjoy; but most meandered, in the words of one respondent, "not really bothering" what the occupation was, and changing when they "got too bored". Changes, then, in many cases, were undirected in the sense that they did not constitute a reasoned step in a career, but rather reflected a response to conditions of work in which little satisfaction was expected or derived.

Relationships of Jobs at Five Years After Leaving School to Youth Employment Officers' Recommendation

Over one-half of the youths and over seven-eighths of the girls entered occupations on leaving school which were precisely those recommended by the Youth Employment Officer or in the general category of that recommendation. As a result of job changes during the first year in employment, the proportions of respondents at the end of the year whose occupations accorded with the Youth Employment Officer's recommendations fell substantially, to less than one-third of the youths and three-quarters of the girls. The proportions fell substantially again during the ensuing years, so that, by the time of Interview No.4, only just over one-quarter of the youths and one-half of the girls were in occupations recommended by the Youth Employment Service.
I have discussed at length elsewhere the shortcomings of the Youth Employment Service and the handicaps under which it works. It suffices here to say that the deficiencies in vocational guidance, placement and follow-up are reflected in the situation depicted above. There are several points which need to be noted in regard to the continuing move away from the sort of occupation recommended by the Youth Employment Officer, however. The employment situation, as has already been mentioned, remained at least reasonably healthy throughout the five year period, and the lack of coincidence between occupations held and the Officer's recommendations are not to be attributed to a chronic shortage of job opportunities, therefore. Some of the moves away from the Youth Employment Officer's recommended occupations are accounted for by the fact of new opportunities opening up (for example, 'bus conducting) for which the school leavers were not eligible to apply. The child's own interest is an important element in shaping the Youth Employment Officer's choice, furthermore; we have seen that respondents' interests may change significantly, and this would be an important factor for a Youth Employment Officer to bear in mind when giving counsel. "Late developers", too, are a possibility, and there were in fact at least three instances of such children amongst the respondents—two girls and one youth who applied themselves to evening studies so competently that they were able to reformulate

their aspirations and obtain employment at a higher level than the Youth Employment Officer could have easily envisaged as possible when the children were in their last year at school.

Vocational guidance, then, is properly regarded as a continuous process: the importance of the "follow-up" interview by the Youth Employment Officer lies in this premise, as does the principle of maintaining a "Betterment Register", for notifying children of superior opportunities when they become available. But although some of the moves away from the original recommendation of the Youth Employment Officer might well be in accord with what he would subsequently have recommended in the light of new circumstances and with more mature persons to counsel, the fact is that the Youth Employment Service played only a very small part indeed in counselling respondents after they had reached the age of sixteen and had been at work for one year (nor did the Service do much even in the respondents' first year at work). The Youth Employment Service is responsible for giving guidance to young people until they attain the age of eighteen. Only 16 youths and 4 girls had any contact with the Service between Interviews No. 3 and No. 4. In each case, the contact was the result of the respondent's initiative, and the visit to the Bureau was, in all except one case, directly concerned with the search for a job, other methods having been tried first in most cases. In only one case was there contact for purposes of counselling

\[\text{Cf. Home, School and Work, ibid.}\]
as such—that is, to reappraise the respondent's occupation after a number of years at work, to consider a future career and a possibly desirable change of occupation. The girl concerned was a typist, and not satisfied with her occupation. She could not decide upon an alternative and was disappointed with the reception she received at the Youth Employment Bureau—she said, "they weren't very helpful: I wouldn't recommend them to anyone—they didn't seem to care". Indeed, the general impression of those respondents who went seeking a change of occupation as distinct from simply wanting or needing another job, was that the Service was impatient about such discussions, and interested only in getting them into a job in their present occupation—or something similar—as soon as possible, and getting them off their books. Thus, one girl said, "When they know you have settled, they don't bother: they won't help you to leave what they think is a good job, even if it is getting you down."

Of the 16 youths, three expressed themselves as satisfied: one of them said that the Service had helped him to get only one of the six jobs that he had had since leaving school, but that even so the Youth Employment Officers were very helpful in their attempts to assist him; another had remained in the job obtained through the Service for one year, but had subsequently left it; and the third had been assisted in finding a light job, made necessary by two years of ill-health after leaving school. Five of the 16 youths were non-committal about the assistance that they had received: they had no complaints, but had not expected much. But 8 of the 16 did consider
that the Service could have done more to help. This was true also of 2 of the 4 girls, the other two having no complaints.

Criticism took various forms. Important was the feeling that not enough time and attention was given to the individual—several respondents made the point that the Youth Employment Officers are overworked, one saying, "They didn't seem bothered at first, so my Dad came and we forced them in the end. They could be more helpful, but they've got so many on the books, they just have to do the best they can." The alleged lack of interest was associated in the complaints of several respondents with the view that the Youth Employment Officer is concerned not with counselling but merely with job placement—"They put you in any job, regardless of conditions," said one youth, whilst another said, "All they want to do is push you in a job and then forget about you." The girls, too, made similar complaints, one saying, "They are a bit catty, and have a bit of a take-it-or-leave-it attitude." The other girl remarked, "I don't think much of their help—they have an off-hand manner. They seem to like to push you into a job rather than enquire what you really want."

A major difficulty for the Youth Employment Service is that relatively few employers make use of it when seeking young workers. And those employers who do seek juvenile labour tend to contact the Service only at the main school leaving times, and do not avail themselves of the Service's facilities for sixteen-seventeen-and-eighteen-year-old youths and girls. Those children who do seek the Service's help often find that the range and level of vacancies of which the
Youth Employment Officer has knowledge is disappointing to them, and tend to blame the Service in consequence. In addition, many of the children who seek help are of relatively low ability, and many, also, have a history of job changing. This may, indeed, reflect inadequacy of guidance, but also indicates that the Youth Employment Officer is turned to for help by young workers who are not attractive to an employer and not easy to place in a job. Of the 16 youths who had contact with the Youth Employment Officer since Interview No.3, one was an apprentice at the time of Interview No.4. He had had two jobs only, during his first five years of employment. Nine youths were in semi-skilled jobs at the time of Interview No.4 and six were in unskilled jobs. The picture in regard to number of jobs held is given in Table 51.

**TABLE 51**

**NUMBER OF JOBS HELD BY RESPONDENTS WHO HAD CONTACT WITH YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OFFICERS YOUTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th>Complained of The Service</th>
<th>Did Not Complain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Jobs in Five Years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six plus Jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high rate of job turnover and the predominance of semi-and unskilled workers are quite clear, then. The numbers for girls are small: 2 of the four were in Category 'A' jobs, and one in each of the other two categories. One girl had two jobs, two had had three
and one had had four. The fact that the Service tends to be used by children with a high job turnover, if it is used at all, reflects not just upon the abilities and qualifications of these particular children, but also the tendency of apprentices, and, indeed, girl office workers, to use their own initiative in finding new employment (if they do change—we have seen that there is a much lower rate of job changing amongst young workers in these categories), or to have the help and guidance of parents, other relations and friends. Many children, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled alike, preferred to avoid the Youth Employment Service because of the belief that it "only has the worst jobs to offer", and many, too, soon forgot all about the Service after leaving school, and did not think of contacting it even when their employment situation was desperate. These points, firmly established in the analysis of Interview No.3, remained true for the successive years in employment.

There are two broad conclusions to be drawn. The first is that the Youth Employment Service is not staffed or equipped to perform the tasks which it ostensibly has. The second is that there are barriers between the Service and significant segments of the young working population such that communication and understanding is difficult: the barriers are in terms of values and attitudes in regard to work. The problem is exacerbated by the conflicts inherent in the Officer's role. The attempt of the Youth Employment Officer to reconcile the often conflicting demands made upon him
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1 cf. Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 13
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by employer, teacher, parent and child frequently meets with failure. The further point may be made here that the Youth Employment Service is the only "official", in the sense of governmental, institution for assisting young workers: if it were as effective as it is intended to be, it could play a major part in the process of adjustment of young people to adult life in society. The ineffectiveness of the Service could, then, be said to have repercussions beyond those concerned immediately with matters of employment. There is an institutional "gap", which leaves room for the free play of all sorts of other influences upon young workers—at home and in the neighbourhood, in leisure and through the mass media, and at work itself. The concern in this study is to examine these influences, and it suffices here to suggest that much of the apparent fecklessness about employment and the "alienation" from work which characterises many young workers, can be attributed to the fact that they are subject to conflicting values without the benefit of an institutional "prop" to help guide them through the first years at work. It will be seen below that of the 148 jobs left by youths in the first five years of employment, 93 were made before the youths had passed the age of eighteen, when they came under the aegis of the Ministry of Labour. The corresponding figures for girls were 79—out of 133 jobs left. This provides a further indication of the lack of impact of the Youth Employment Service in regard to job changing of young workers.

1cf. Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 3
After the age of eighteen, then, young workers become the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour. The findings in regard to the Ministry, and the conclusions to be derived from them, echo those in regard to the Youth Employment Service. The same sorts of people sought help from the Ministry, and made the same sorts of complaints—a youth who had had four jobs, as warehouse worker, van boy, driver, and labourer said that he had "been to the Labour twelve times without getting any help" and protested that the officials "did not take a personal interest in clients"; another youth said that "they only want to get you into any job and are not interested in whether or not it suits you"; as a final example, a labourer in his sixth job said that when unemployed for six months the previous year he had been sent after two jobs only, one of which was intended for an Old Age Pensioner, with a wage of only £5 a week, whilst the other was already filled—his comment was that "you're better off getting a job of your own".

Of the 18 youths who had had contact with the Ministry of Labour, 6 complained about the lack of help, as did one of the 9 girls. All of the 18 youths were semi-skilled or unskilled: 11 of them had gone to the Ministry because of unemployment, in order to claim benefits and seek help in finding work, the remaining 7 were not unemployed, but wanted to change jobs—none of these found new employment through the Ministry, however. One of the 9 girls who had contact with the Ministry complained of the lack of assistance. Three of
the 9 girls were office workers, 3 were in Category 'B' and 3 in Category 'C' occupations: 6 made contact because of unemployment.

Seven of the 16 youths who had had contact with the Youth Employment Service had also had contact with the Ministry of Labour, and this was also the case in regard to 2 of the 4 girls. The overall position, then, is that 27 youths and all girls had contact with either the Youth Employment Service or the Ministry of Labour or both during the four years between Interview No.3 and Interview No.4: in the majority of cases, the contact was concerned with finding a job, and in only one or two cases was there any suggestion of counselling.

**Reasons For Job Change**

Various reasons for job changing have already been stated or hinted at: I now propose to examine this aspect more systematically. It should be borne in mind that reasons for leaving jobs are complex, and that whilst a main reason may be stated or inferred, there is usually not just a single reason but a whole series of inter-acting features—advantages of proximity to home have to be balanced with the disadvantages of a low wage or unfriendly people at work, for example. Furthermore, the decision to leave a particular job was often taken by respondents on the spur of the moment, in an emotional way, and as the culmination of a series of dissatisfactions. Reasons in particular
cases must be set against a general framework of attitudes to work, which made changing jobs normal in the case of many respondents—these attitudes will be explored below in some detail. Bearing in mind these reservations, the general picture can be seen in Table 52.

**TABLE 52**
**REASONS FOR LEAVING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Leaving</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally dissatisfied (no single reason)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied with wages or opportunity of higher wages</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost interest in apprenticeship/training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve prospects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed (&quot;sacked&quot;)</td>
<td>1†</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of redundancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement with &quot;boss&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement with other workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill-health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get original choice of job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliked hours</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of vacancy in a &quot;better&quot; job</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-job factors (e.g., parents moved)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drifters (3 youths)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition, 18 girls who were not working at the time of Interview No.4 had stopped work because of marriage/pregnancy.

The 62 youths who changed jobs left 148 jobs between them, and the 58 girls who changed left 133 jobs.

Of those who left more than one job during the course of their first five years in employment, "general dissatisfaction" featured at least once as the "main reason" with only a few exceptions. It should be noted, that the 11 "sackings" in regard to youths relate to only 5 individuals—one was dismissed from five jobs, another
from three. The girls' sackings all relate to different individuals. Consistency in the reasons for job changing also obtained very clearly in regard to one youth who left six jobs with the object of getting higher wages (an object which was not, in fact, always realised), and to one youth who left three jobs because of ill-health. The 3 youths who were "drifters" have been categorised separately—one of these had left 13 jobs, one had left 7 jobs and the other had left 6 jobs. Apart from the above cases, no individual featured more than once in any category other than "generally dissatisfied", and the smaller categories refer mostly to different individuals.

Over the years, there was an decreasing number of job changes made with the object of improving prospects—presumably as opportunities for jobs with prospects decreased, especially apprenticeships, most of which require entry before the age of sixteen. There was, too, an increasing amount of job changing mainly in pursuit of higher wages. Few job changes during the first year at work were attributable mainly to the wish for higher wages: this was in part because the proportion of jobs with relatively high wages which are open to sixteen-year-olds is small, and in part, also, because spending money allowed by parents was in many cases not dependent upon wages earned. But as respondents became older, jobs offering high wages did become open to them and, at the same time, independence
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from parents—signified by a change from handing over wages and receiving spending money, to payment of board and retention of the balance—implied that the more the young worker earned, the more he had to spend. Marriage and engagement, too, implied that a greater priority was attached to high wages than was the case when respondents had no such responsibilities, and when there was no urgency about saving for domestic purposes. Money featured more prominently in the young worker's assessment, also, when other features which could compensate for a low wage, such as a good training in a skill, were not present in a job. The low number of job changes made by girls because of dissatisfaction with wages is attributable to the fact that the range of girls' wages is lower than that for youths, so that the possibility of a substantial improvement is correspondingly smaller: furthermore, the higher wages tend to be associated with Category 'C' jobs which girls in Category 'B' and, particularly, girls in Category 'A' jobs were loath to enter. The main exception is secretarial work which can command a relatively high wage—but for this sort of work, of course, special qualifications and experience are necessary, and a girl cannot easily change to it from other occupations.

Some of the reasons for job changing require no further explanation, but certain of them may be examined in rather more detail.
Generally Dissatisfied

This is the largest category, covering a complex of factors making for unsettlement at work—it accounts for one-third of the job changes for youths and over two-fifths of those for girls. These jobs were left because the respondents "felt generally fed up", "couldn't settle", and, in the words of one girl, because the work "gets you down". In about one-third of these cases, the actual job done—as distinct from the "atmosphere" at work, other employees and general working conditions—seemed to be the core of dissatisfaction. The work was "boring and repetitive", performing the same routine job on a milling machine hour after hour and day after day, for example. One youth "stuck" this sort of work, as a centre-lathe turner, for as long as four years—and then decided that he could "stick it no longer". He left the job suddenly, without having other employment to go to. He was unemployed for five days, before finding work through the Ministry of Labour. He said that he "had no idea" what job he wanted when he went to the Ministry, however—he "just went along to see what they had available". He accordingly found himself in a job as a grinder, doing work of a similar nature, and in not dissimilar surroundings to that from which he had become so estranged. Indeed, a feature of a high proportion of job changes is that they have an element of movement out of the frying pan into the fire—even moves in pursuit of better wages often proved illusory in this respect. This reflects the widespread lack of knowledge about the tasks involved in particular occupations—even after three or four years in employment—and dependence upon word-of-mouth
information and upon advice from relations, friends and acquaintances who have no particular knowledge. It also indicates the general lack of thought and planning that characterised many, if not most, of the job changes. It reveals, too, as in the above cases, the way in which the Ministry of Labour, and, as I have argued above, the Youth Employment Service, operate as job placement agencies rather than in an advisory capacity to the individual. Examples of meandering from one job which is found boring to another of the same order, abound—a milling machine operator left his job after three years because he was bored, and took up employment elsewhere in precisely the same work: he had not sought advice on possible alternative occupations, or discussed it in any way with anyone—the idea of doing so had not occurred to him. Underlying this there would seem to be the hope that something better might turn up—that is, as a matter of luck rather than effort, thought or planning. But basically there was a fatalistic approach, such that any job open to young workers with a secondary modern education and a working class background was considered as likely to be boring to a greater or lesser extent.

There were many examples and signs of inability to settle in an occupation. A miner, after leaving employment as a shoe shop assistant because he wanted more money, and as a wire-drawer because he "got fed up", then left the pit because he had "had a basin-full of working down below". He became a cook in the Royal Navy—a move which he now regretted. A girl went through four jobs before becoming a housewife—shop assistant, warehouse worker, laundry worker and
'bus conductress: she left all of them except the last because she "didn't like the work itself—the work and the pay, usually a bit of each". Two years of packing jelly babies and gravy salt (alternating weeks) was as much as one girl could bear—though another doing the same work was still happy in it after five years. The former respondent went on to a succession of three jobs working on mineral-water bottle machines. The boredom of the latter work was made tolerable by the higher wages and more agreeable girls to work with and to talk to. Another girl fitted in six unskilled jobs between leaving school in July 1959 and getting married in mid-1961—she "got fed up" with them all in turn. After three months as an apprentice engineer on leaving school, a youth left because he "didn't like the indoor work, and they were too strict with you about times, and everything". He subsequently had two jobs, leaving one of them in pursuit of a higher wage. General dissatisfaction was in some cases associated with a sense of grievance, as with the semi-skilled steel worker who thought that he was given an unfair share of the work.

Several of those who changed jobs after a longish period—two, three or more years—said that they did so because they "felt like a change" and "wanted to try something else"—a girl shop assistant left after four years to become a wire-tester, whilst after three years as a wire-drawer a youth "felt like doing something different" and became a 'bus conductor. Such moves were to relieve the monotony rather than in anticipation of fresh stimulation or the opportunity
for using other talents in new employment. One job, it was recog-
nised, was basically much like another—"it's all hard work". But a change "helps you to put up with it".

There were a few examples of successful trial and error—albeit unplanned—amongst respondents who originally meandered from one job to another. This was so with a girl who left a job as a wait-
ness after one year because the money was poor, and then spent two months in a warehouse: she "could not endure" the latter because it was "so boring and filthy". She went on to become a clerk, and was still in this job at Interview No.4, after nearly four years in it.

**Wages**

11 youths and 3 girls left jobs because of dissatisfaction with what they regarded as low wages, and 13 youths and 3 girls changed jobs because of the prospect of higher wages (if the wages were re-
garded as high, other disadvantageous features of the work tended to be disregarded). In general, those respondents who left because of dissatisfaction with their wages were not receiving substantially less than others in similar jobs—usually only a few shillings a week less, if that. Their dissatisfaction derived from a comparison which they made with what their peers, especially their friends, re-
ceived: if the friend was in a higher paid occupation, or was a year or two older and receiving a higher wage in consequence, this could lead to dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction with wages also derived from the desire for more spending money arising out of courtship.
It was not, that is, necessarily a grievance based upon the intrinsic value of work done, but derived from factors external to the work dimension. A particular case was that of a respondent whose younger brother left school two years later than he, but entered a more highly paid occupation— which soon enabled him to equal his elder brother's income. The respondent felt this acutely as a depreciation of his standing in the family; but in this case, tempted as he was, the youth resisted the urge to move from his apprenticeship.

Dissatisfaction with wages was in some cases a result of a reasoned estimation of the relationship between reward and effort. Apprentices found it particularly irksome to be receiving apprenticeship pay whilst doing routine semi- or unskilled work. For added to the dissatisfaction of not receiving a proper training was the knowledge that other young workers who were not classified as apprentices, but who were doing similar work, were being paid much more—and, if on piece-work or bonus schemes, could earn twice as much as an apprentice at the age of seventeen or eighteen.

It has been noted above that "settling down" to married life could involve relinquishing a job with long-term prospects and security because of the immediate need for higher wages—this affected several respondents (and also the husbands of some of the respondents). One youth left his job as a railway lamp-man to become a 'bus conductor partly because he regarded the former work as dangerous, but also because "the money on the 'buses is better" and he wanted to save for his impending marriage.
The active pursuit of higher wages is well illustrated by one youth, who, satisfied with his trade as a butcher, set out to sell his labour to the highest bidder and negotiated his way through four jobs, gaining ten shillings more in one, a pound in another, and ten shillings in the next. Such single-minded application and shrewdness was not typical of job changers, however. Of the girls, who changed jobs primarily for financial reasons, one did so as a consequence of family misfortune. The death of her father left her with responsibility for her invalid mother, and the need for a higher income was urgent. The process of acquiring it involved a move from a Category 'A' job, with prospects, to a Category 'C' job which her friends regarded as inferior, as did she and her mother.

Whilst the wish for a higher wage was the major factor in job changing in only a minority of cases, it played a part in many more cases. And it would seem that once the decision to move had been made on other grounds, the criterion of money assumed more importance when seeking subsequent employment. Especially was this so if the move was in consequence of disappointment with a particular job about which there had originally been enthusiasm. Then, the only sensible criterion for the thwarted young worker to apply seemed to be that of high pay. Despite the haphazard way in which many subsequent jobs were found, it does emerge from the analysis that there is some tendency for youths with a higher rate of job changing.
to have the higher paid jobs: in part, but not entirely, this reflects the job stability of apprentices, who tend to be in the lower wage categories. The analysis of current gross average wages at the time of Interview No. 4, in terms of number of job changes is given in Table 53.

**Table 53**

GROSS WAGES AT INTERVIEW No. 4

Comparison with Number of Jobs Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Jobs</th>
<th>£5-9</th>
<th>£10-12</th>
<th>£13-14</th>
<th>£15-16</th>
<th>£17-18</th>
<th>£19-20</th>
<th>£21+</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All except 10 of the 66 girls who were employed at the time of Interview No. 4 received wages in the £5-9 category—only 7 girls received more than this amount. Of these, two had had four jobs, two had had three jobs and two had had two jobs; the remaining girl had had one job only.

Lost Interest in Apprenticeship/traineeship

Seven youths left jobs mainly for this reason—but this was also an important factor with reference to changes made by several others (furthermore, a number of apprentices who continued in the same employment, or "stuck it out", were far from satisfied with the
amount and quality of their training, as has been seen). As an example, an apprentice electrician left his first job after a little more than a year because he was "not getting enough work to do, and not learning enough". He went on to three other jobs as an electrician, leaving one because he was working out of town and this involved long hours travelling, and having to leave another firm when it closed down. A machine operator, similarly, left one of his three jobs (all broadly in the same sort of occupation) because there was "no future in the job". Another youth left his first job because it was "not a proper apprenticeship" and he was "kept on the same machine all the time"—he went on to have four other jobs, first as an electrician, where he was made redundant; then he had two jobs as a butcher, leaving both of them because he disliked the hours and the pay; he then arrived back as a machinist in an engineering factory, now no longer expecting much training or, indeed, much satisfaction of any sort, from the work.

An apprentice engineer left his job because the employer would not allow him to attend day release classes—this was after four years in the job, and he was, in fact, generally dissatisfied with the situation at work. He was now too old to move easily to another apprenticeship, however, and did not manage to do so. The point should be made here that whilst he resented the failure of his employer to grant him day release facilities, the respondent took no positive steps, during the whole of his four years in the job, to amend the situation. This is a feature common to most of those
respondents who complained about their apprenticeships. And most of those who left their jobs because of lack of prospects subsequently entered jobs with no better, and often worse prospects. They seemed to assume either that all apprenticeships would be similarly disappointing (and conversation with their peers would in fact provide plenty of evidence to that effect), or that they were now, at the age of 16, 17 or 18, too old or not sufficiently qualified to get a worthwhile apprenticeship.

It is not only employers who are culpable in respect of further education and training. There was one case of an apprentice radio mechanic who lost interest in his work: matters were brought to a head when the youth swore at the technical teacher at evening classes: the teacher swore back, there was an argument, and the respondent was asked to leave the class. Without the opportunity for further education, his apprenticeship lost much of its value, and he therefore handed in his notice. He became a 'bus conductor.

Although some respondents were sanguine or "philosophic" about lack of training, accepting it as "one of those things", others were deeply dismayed. A youth who became a wine cellarman at his father's suggestion (he did not know what he wanted to do when he left school) was acutely disappointed because he did not receive the training which he had been led to expect—rather, he was left to "pick the job up as best (he) could". The pent-up dissatisfaction, added to by the fact that there were no other workers of the same age, so that he was lonely at work, led him to leave the job after four-and-a-half years
in it. Following two months unemployment, he obtained a job as a labourer in a furniture firm—but he "could not stand" this, and two months later went back to the devil he knew, to become, once again, a wine cellar-man.

It is significant that only two girls left jobs primarily because of dissatisfaction over training—although four others did change jobs in order to improve their prospects. On the whole, girls did not expect long-term training in the same way and to the same extent as did the aspiring youths. Work did not, for the girls, have a lifelong perspective. Not expecting training, they did not miss it and were not disappointed at the lack of it.

**To Improve Prospects**

Four youths and 4 girls made job changes with the express intention of improving their career prospects: all of them did so in an informed way and after considered thought, and all of them did, in fact, improve their positions in consequence of the moves which they made. They were following conscious policies of improvement. Thus an apprentice painter/decorator left his first job to enter an apprenticeship in the same trade because the second job "afforded more scope". A butcher changed employers after three years in his first job because the shop was not doing too well, and there was no future there—whereas in his second job there were excellent prospects. (There was one particularly interesting example of job changing to improve prospects in the Postal Survey—after two years as a van
delivery boy, one year as a T.V. engineer's mate, and one year bagging coal, a youth launched into his own business as a scrap iron and steel merchant, with his wife, previously a clerk, as his "personal secretary": also notable was a girl postal respondent who became an office clerk on leaving school and then worked her way upwards through four jobs to her present post as secretary).

The important influence of family background is evident in the cases of respondents who successfully moved to jobs with better prospects. Just as middle class and working class aspiring families encouraged their children initially to find "good" jobs, and persuaded them to remain in them even if they were disappointed or impatient at their progress, so too did they encourage children in their aspirations for better jobs—by direct advice and also through the myriad more subtle but constant and powerful pressures that sustain certain norms and values which motivate children to strive for a particular level and type of employment. It may be noted that none of the respondents who changed jobs primarily in order to improve prospects sought or received assistance from the Youth Employment Service.

A special case is that of a girl who, during the latter years of her apprenticeship as a hairdresser, "got rather bored with doing just commercial work". She completed her apprenticeship and tried to find employment as a hospital hairdresser, but was unsuccessful because there was no vacancy. At this point, she "felt the vocation to be a nurse", and was accepted as a student. This is unusual because, whilst girls at the age of nineteen and twenty may hanker
after a new sort of work, "something better" perhaps, thoughts of impending marriage tended to rule out any consideration of a vacation at this stage.

Apart from the 8 respondents who changed jobs mainly in order to improve prospects (and it may be stressed that this is a markedly small number for the five year period under review), there were some others who would have liked to change to "better" jobs, but who were not equipped in terms of ability or "know-how" to do so. The problem of obtaining an apprenticeship after the age of sixteen has been referred to already. For girls, too, there are definite obstacles, especially the "barriers" between factory, shop and office work. One girl complained at the unreasonableness of the situation as it seemed to her. A machine operator in a factory, she was in her fourth job, having previously worked as a warehouse packer, a machine operator and a waitress. She said, "When you want to change your job and do something entirely different, the employers always say they want someone with experience—but how can you become experienced if they won't give you the chance to learn?" Indeed, it was the case that the older respondents became the more difficult it was for them to break out from their initial level of employment. This is probably a general rule: a sixteen-or seventeen-year-old might be given a modest chance, especially if labour is in short supply. But for someone older, the seal is soon set firm. Employers, of course, tend to be more concerned with securing a competent staff for immediate work tasks, rather than acting as benevolent training or career agencies for upwardly aspiring young workers. They accordingly
prefer to "play safe", even with fairly routine work. Here again it may be noted that the Youth Employment Service on the whole fails to act as a mediator in this situation—aspiring young workers do not, for the most part, seek its help, and they are disappointed if they do. And, seemingly, the Service fails to accommodate young workers who, within their first few years in employment, are keen to try another type of occupation, being less than satisfied with that which they first entered on leaving school.

Dismissed ("sacked").

Although 11 youths’ jobs were lost through sacking, only 5 individuals were involved, since one youth was dismissed from five jobs and another youth from three. It is, of course, not improbable that some respondents who stated that they had left their jobs for some other reason were in fact dismissed—it was not possible to check this with employers. One youth was dismissed at almost regular intervals over his first five years in employment, mainly, he said, for bad time-keeping. Another was discharged from the Army "for educational reasons" and then dismissed from his job as a hammer-driver (he had held two other jobs apart from his current one, leaving that of driver’s mate because he "got fed up", and being "paid off" from a job in a steel works because of lack of work). A storeman was dismissed after four years in the job because he was "too old"—that is, it was a boy’s work and could not command a man’s wage: the youth had come to the end of a dead-end job. Other
reasons for dismissal included inefficiency and unpunctuality; and a van driver was "sacked" after being involved in a collision. In only one case did dismissal result in rancour—at any rate of a lasting kind: rather was it accepted as "fair enough" and as "not worth worrying about", with the suggestion that "it was not much of a job, anyway". The details for the exception are not complete, but the youth was obviously displeased. He said that he had been "wrongfully dismissed" after three years in a steel works "for failing to comply with the regulations". This, he said, was a "vindictive charge"; but he lost his case (presumably the Trade Union had acted on his behalf) and he was therefore "disqualified from any benefits".

Poor workmanship and bad time-keeping accounted for the dismissals of 4 of the 5 girls involved—the other girl was given notice after taking a morning off to go on an outing against the express wishes of her employer.

Redundancy

Seven youths' jobs, and the same number of girls', were lost in consequence of redundancy (and one railway worker found fresh employment in anticipation of redundancy). The redundancy in most cases resulted from a falling off of work (for example, a small building concern in winter time): but in one case bankruptcy was the cause. An apprentice electrician, whose firm was wound up after he had worked there for three years, was found another apprenticeship by his employer. The other respondents were left to their own resources.
Disagreement with "the boss"

One youth left his job in consequence of a disagreement with his "boss", and 7 girls' jobs were lost for the same reason. The youth left an apprenticeship after two years, but moved on to another apprenticeship. One of the girls stayed in her job as a warehouse packer for four years before moving to a similar job because she "had a row with one of the gaffers". In this case, and in several others, the root cause seemed to be akin to that analysed by Gouldner. Long service had induced in the employee notions of rights which were not shared by the employer, and the dispute arose over different definitions as between employer and employee of the area of indulgence outwith the formal terms of employment. A further example of this is the case of a children's nanny who left her job when the employer objected to her having so much time off from work. Two girls left their jobs because they objected to the advances of their bosses—a clerk referred to "personal trouble", and a shop assistant changed jobs because, as she put it, the manager was "fly".

Disagreement With Other Workers

Unhappy personal relationships at work accounted for a further 4 job changes—one youth's and three girls' jobs being involved. The youth, a travelling shop assistant and a practising Christian, was "desperate" to leave his job, and finally made the break after

---

¹ A. Gouldner, Wildcat Strike, op. cit.
two years, because he "didn't get on with the other man" who was "always fiddling the till".

In the case of one of the girls, the position was simply that the other female employees were much older than her, and "had different ways", different interests and different topics of conversation from hers: but in the other two cases there was a positive animosity. Thus, one girl left her job with a cutlery firm because she "couldn't stand it any longer"—the girls "all talked to the manager behind each other's backs", and the manager was "always watching over you". The other girl, who had left a job as a waitress after eighteen months because the confined conditions "made me ill", and also left a factory job after eight months because it was "too cold and put me in my bad health", left a warehouse job after eight months because the girls were "too rough", and she objected to their "bad language".

Difficulty over personal relationships was an important subsidiary factor in regard to several other girls who left jobs because of "general dissatisfaction". This aspect was of much less importance in regard to youths—it has been seen that girls attach much more importance to personal relationships as an element of job satisfaction than do youths.

**Ill-health**

Illness and/or unhealthy working conditions accounted for six jobs changed by youths and for seven changed by girls. Three of the youths'
changes related to one individual, whose story was unfortunate indeed. His first job after leaving school was as an apprentice painter/decorator. He had to leave this after four months because of an allergy to paint. A spell as a driver's mate on bread delivery ended when he had to have a heart operation. This was followed by a period doing light work in a warehouse. Then, after two years working for a builder, he fell off a roof, broke a leg, and spent nine months in hospital. He had other misfortunes, too, in that a move of home involved higher travel expenses to work, so that he had to leave another job as a builder. At the time of Interview No. 4 he was in his sixth job, as a labourer in the City Engineering Department. In the space of five years, then, he had moved, through misfortune, from the level of potentially skilled man (as an apprentice), with all that that can imply in terms of life style, to that of labourer on the roads, with all that that can imply.

The three other youths left their jobs because their health did not enable them to do the heavy work involved (two cases) or because the atmosphere in the work place, a factory, induced a chest complaint (one case). Of the seven girls' jobs left for health reasons, most were associated with particular working conditions—cardboard dust affecting a packer's lungs, for example. One girl, after a series of jobs—as a packer, a sewing machinist, a cutlery worker and a shop assistant—gave up work altogether. In each case, her poor state of health had contributed to her leaving the job. She and her mother then decided that since the mother could make more money,
probably, and work more permanently, the daughter might as well do the housework and look after the four smaller children whilst her mother went out to work.

Disliked Hours

This was the primary reason in the case of five girls' job changes. Three shop assistants disliked having to work on Saturday afternoons, because it interfered with their leisure activities, especially when friends (notably boy friends) had the time free. A cinema usherette, for similar reasons, disliked the fact that she "couldn't get off at night". Whilst a packer left her job because the employer wanted her to work very long hours, from 6 a.m. until 6 p.m., when she was aged only sixteen.

Knowledge of Vacancy in a "Better" Job

This was the basic reason in the case of eight girls' job changes. Newspaper advertisements sparked off the moves in the cases of four girls. Quite a lot of respondents, who vaguely felt that they would "like a change", regularly looked at newspaper advertisements and read exciting prospects into them. It has already been noted that apart from actual job changes, there was a substantial number of unsuccessful applications made by respondents. Many of these were triggered off as a consequence of browsing through newspaper advertisements.
Four girls moved to "better" jobs as a direct consequence of a suggestion from friends or relations. These girls had no positive wish to leave their previous employer, but did so because the idea was put to them. The ingredients which made the new job better were in some cases financial, and in others had to do with hours of work or proximity to home. But in the present four cases, the idea of working with friends or relatives was in itself an important factor. One case, for example, is of a girl who worked as a hairdresser: she was quite content, but the lady with whom she worked was rather elderly. She met some girls from a local warehouse each lunch time in a café, and a friendship developed. As a result, the respondent was introduced to the warehouse foreman, who offered her a job as a packer—a job which she still held four-and-a-half years later, at the time of Interview No.4.

**Marriage/Pregnancy**

Five girls who were working at the time of Interview No.4 had previously left jobs because of pregnancy, and subsequently returned to work. One of them had had three factory jobs interspersed with two babies. In addition, 18 girls who were not working at the time of Interview No.4 had stopped work because of marriage or pregnancy.

**Extra-job Factors**

Extrinsic factors accounted for two job changes and two girls'. These had to do with household moves, within or outwith Sheffield.
In one case the position was rather less straightforward. A farm worker living some fifty miles away from his home changed jobs in order to be nearer his parents. This respondent had not liked the fact that the farm was "out in the wilds", and had been "very lonely, couped up with the same people all the time". In the case of one girl, too, apart from the fact that her family moved home, so that her journey to work was in consequence prolonged, there was a complication in that she broke up a friendship with a boy friend—but the latter was "awkward", and kept pestering her at work. So on these grounds, too, she thought it best to leave.

"Drifters"

Three youths, who between them left twenty-six jobs during their first five years in employment, are best described as "drifters". One of them had returned by the time of Interview No. 4, and after a series of six other jobs, to the same employment, with the same firm, that he first entered on leaving school. There was no obvious rhyme or reason about his moves—none was readily discernable, and he could enunciate none. A youth with fourteen labouring and other semi-skilled jobs, pointed out that his memory might be faulty, and that he might well have had more than that number of jobs.

It is relevant to note here two examples from the Postal Survey. A youth who was currently working as a wire-drawer and who had had numerous other jobs, including six months as a warehouse labourer and three months as a press-operator, wrote, "I'm deeply sorry, but
I can't remember my next. You see, I have never been settled in one job for more than a couple of months or weeks. Small wonder that, in reply to the question "What job do you expect to be doing in ten years time?" he wrote, "That's a hard and unpredictable question, which I'm sorry I can't answer." He, like some other "drifters", was "lost"—he could not explain even to himself why it was that he could not stay in a job, did not know what it was that he wanted and could not find. The other example from the postal respondents is a girl, whose occupational history was as follows:—warehouse packer, 1 month; packer then supervisor of packing department, 1½ years; factory machinist, 9 months; shop assistant, 6 months; supervisor of packing department, 6 months; shop assistant, 1 month; shop assistant, 1½ months, etc. The daughter of a labourer, she wrote, "I have never been very ambitious. When I left school I didn't really know what I wanted to do, and for the past few years I've just drifted from one job to another, and I'm still not settled."

Caplow has referred to a category of persons with high job mobility in terms of "pathological mobility"—"The 'floater' or the 'drifter' who moves from job to job under the pressure of his own restlessness is a familiar figure everywhere."¹ The extreme cases of pathological mobility are represented for Caplow by rural migrants who have never taken root in the city, and by alcoholics and persons

¹Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work, op.cit., p.83
of no fixed abode—"marginal" people, in short. No such pathological features were discernable in regard to the respondents under discussion. There may have been certain personality traits in the youths concerned which prohibited them from remaining for long in any one job, but these were not apparent. Rather would it seem that the explanation is more to be found in terms of the respondents' place in the occupational and social structure, and the attitudes towards work consequentially induced. For, apart from the three "drifters" identified in the main sample, many other respondents who changed jobs exhibited similar characteristics, of apparent aimlessness and lack of involvement in any particular employment.

Caplow himself refers to one structural aspect which may be of some relevance in the present context. He refers to "the vast number of employments which are usually called semi-skilled", and says, "As a matter of fact, most of them cannot be readily evaluated in terms of skill. Their common characteristic is that no lengthy experience is required to perform the work, and that movement from one occupation to another is easy and frequent. Indeed, the mark of a semi-skilled occupation is its vagueness."¹ Semi-skilled jobs are characterised, then, by a " fluidity" which does not typify either skilled or unskilled employment. Caplow's analysis throws some light on the problem of "drifting" as revealed in the present study—the existence of this intermediate, indecisive range of semi-skilled

¹Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work, op.cit., p. 84
employment within which girls and youths move readily has been suggested in the above analysis. But it has also been noted that there was substantial job changing affecting both skilled and unskilled jobs, in addition to that involving semi-skilled employment. The suggestion here is that the bulk of occupations within the broad band open to secondary modern school leavers (some apprenticeships and non-manual jobs being the main exceptions) represent or manifest a position in the social structure, for the persons engaged in such work, which is such as to induce attitudes to work, and to life in general, in which "drifting" is a normal response. The ostensible or stated immediate reasons for job changing must then be seen, as has already been suggested, as but surface indicators of attitudes towards work. In this light, what may appear to be moves for fairly straightforward and obvious reasons, may in fact be but facets of a general tendency to "drift" in the face of the opportunities open to the secondary modern leaver.

Analysis of Job Changes in Terms of Times at Which Changes Were Made

Despite the variety of reasons for job changing, and the impetuous or casual way in which decisions to change jobs were often taken, there remains the possibility that patterns may be discerned in regard to the times at which job changes are made, and to the duration for
which jobs are held—the question arises, for example, are there peak years in which the bulk of job changes occur? Put rather differently, if a high rate of job changing is to be taken as indicative of a "floundering period", which young workers undergo as part of the process of adjusting to employment, can limits be set upon the duration of such a period? Further, are there relationships between the number of jobs held and the length of time in the first job—do those young workers who exhibit a high rate of job turnover start changing jobs early on in their work career? It is to such questions that we turn in this Section.

Tables 54 and 55 set out, for youths and girls respectively, the times at which jobs were changed, in comparison with total numbers of jobs held.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 54</th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS AND TIMES OF CHANGING—YOUTHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Jobs Held</strong></td>
<td><strong>1st Year at Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tables demonstrate that there is no clear-cut peak for job changing, in regard to either youths or girls. The pattern for youths' changes, indeed, shows a remarkable constancy in the number of job
### Table 55
**Number of Jobs and Times of Changing—Girls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Jobs Held</th>
<th>1st Year at Work</th>
<th>2nd Year at Work</th>
<th>3rd Year at Work</th>
<th>4th Year at Work</th>
<th>5th Year at Work</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This includes the 18 girls who had stopped work on marriage or pregnancy.

Changes each year over the first four years in employment, although there is a distinct drop in the fifth year. The pattern for girls is less uniform. Certainly in the case of youths, then, job changing cannot be regarded as merely, or even in large measure, a response to the immediate problems of adjustment to employment. In regard to the girls, it may be inferred from the relatively high proportion of changes in the first year that this factor of early adjustment is rather more important—however, although the second year at work is more settled, the rate of changing is again high in the third and fourth years at work and, indeed, in the fifth year, when fewer girls are "at risk" since some have stopped work on assuming domestic duties.
The highest number of changes for youths occurred during the fourth year in employment, and it is to be noted that a high proportion of youths who had had only two or three jobs during their first five years in employment made the change at this time. The explanation seems to lie in the fact that it is at this time, when youths reach the age of eighteen and nineteen, that new occupations are opened up to them, for example, 'bus conductor or driver; and at about this age new prospects within the same occupation may occur. After three years experience as a butcher, for example, one respondent was able to command a higher wage and a position of more responsibility in the same occupation, but with a different firm. The subsequent falling off in the number of job changes by youths would seem to indicate the complementary fact that few fresh opportunities occur of a comparable nature to those which are opened up at the age of about eighteen. But it also represents in some measure the tendency for youths to start thinking about "settling down" at this age; marriage, engagement or courtship lead thoughts towards the merits of a "steady" job. This aspect is taken up again later. Amongst youths with a high number of job changes, there are substantial numbers of moves during each of the five years—but, to anticipate more detailed analysis below, it may be observed that these youths in fact account for relatively few of the total changes made within the first year at work.

With regard to the girls, a high rate of job changing in the first year is followed by a low rate in the second year. But there is a
distinct rise again in the third and fourth years, representing the opening up of new opportunities (as in the case of youths): it is at about this age, furthermore, that significant differences in wages and opportunities for piece-work and overtime occur for girls, and induce them to consider the possibility of changing. A further factor of importance is the developing sophistication of girls at about this age, which results in them taking decisions of their own, whereas previously, in some cases, they might have followed parental advice to remain in the same job, or not dared to have suggested changing. The increasing sophistication may be manifested, too, in changing patterns of leisure activities and of interests generally, which involves mixing with different people than hitherto—the consequence may be a re-orientation of aspirations and an ensuing change of job or occupation.

The numbers of girls' job changes in the fourth and fifth years are boosted by the inclusion of girls who, at these times, left work upon marriage or pregnancy—the bulk of the girls in this category appear in the figures for these years. Furthermore, the fact of marriage or engagement, as has already been noted, led directly to job changes in certain cases. Whereas marriage or the prospect of it might tend to make youths "settle down" at work, in the case of girls it sometimes resulted in an acceleration of job changing. It should be noted that the amount of job changing in the fourth and fifth years is affected in another way, in the fact that married women who are not working are no longer potential job changers.
The number of changes in these years relates, that is, to a smaller number of girls at work. This accounts in part for the apparent falling-off in job changing amongst girls with a high number of jobs, during the fourth and fifth years.

The evidence suggests, then, that neither in regard to youths nor to girls is there a short-lived "floundering period" during which young people seek to find their feet in the world of employment. On the contrary, whilst there are indications that some young workers do flounder, reasons other than this may be adduced for most of the changes which occur, fairly consistently, over the first five years in employment.

Another perspective is provided if job changes are analysed in terms of length of time spent in first job. Table 56 shows the position in regard to youths and Table 57 in regard to girls.

**TABLE 56**

LENGTH OF TIME SPENT IN FIRST JOB—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Jobs</th>
<th>3 Jobs</th>
<th>4 Jobs</th>
<th>5 Jobs</th>
<th>6 Jobs</th>
<th>7+ Jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 1st Job up to 1 year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the majority of youths and girls with a history of several job changes remained in their first jobs for less than one year, many of the job changers, including some of these with a high
rate of changing, remained "stable" in their first jobs for more than a year. A high proportion of youths and girls who had two jobs only remained in their first jobs for two or more years, for reasons discussed above—namely, that they changed only when new opportunities, better prospects, or (especially in the case of girls) impending marriage gave rise to a change. On the other hand, a substantial minority of youths (5/27)—but only 2 girls—who had had two jobs only left their first employment within six months of starting work—but, after this false start, remained stable subsequently.

Of the 14 youths with two jobs only and who remained in their first job for over two years, 10 moved to the same occupation when they changed jobs—another indication of the stability of these respondents. Three of the remaining 4 moved to occupations not open to them before they had attained a certain age (wire-drawer—'bus conductor; laboratory technician—car sales representative; clerk accountant—police force). The fourth youth left a job as carpet fitter, with low pay and prospects, to become a grinder in an
engineering factory, where wages were higher—the move corresponding with his marriage. Similarly with the girls—of the 15 girls with two jobs only who remained in their first jobs for over two years, 10 moved to employment at the same occupational level, one moved "down" in the scale on marriage (from shop assistant to wire-tester in a factory), and the remaining 4 moved "up" in the occupational hierarchy, 2 to higher levels within the same occupation and 2 from shop assistants to office work level.

Overall, the evidence suggests that there is a tendency for youths and girls with a high rate of job turnover to leave their first jobs fairly soon after leaving school—although appreciable numbers do not change before giving their first jobs a trial of over one year. There is some evidence, although it is slight, that "downward" moves—from one level in the occupational hierarchy to a lower level, occur early on in the five year period, whilst "upward" moves occur later in the period.

The shortness of the tenure in some jobs is in part explained by false starts on first leaving school. But it is mainly associated with a high rate of job changing and reflects faklessness rather than trial and error. 81 of the 148 jobs left by youths were held for less than one year—well over one-half: of these 6 were held by youths with two jobs only and a further 10 by youths with three jobs only. The bulk, that is, are accounted for by youths with a high rate of job changing. Similarly with girls—70 of the 133 jobs left by girls were held for less than one year, and all but
25 of these were held by girls with four or more jobs during their first five years at work.

Tables 58 and 59 analyse the Postal Respondents in terms of times at which first jobs were changed. The analysis broadly supports the conclusions deriving from the main sample.

TABLE 58
LENGTH OF TIME SPENT IN FIRST JOB
POSTAL SURVEY: YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Jobs</th>
<th>3 Jobs</th>
<th>4 Jobs</th>
<th>5 Jobs</th>
<th>6+ Jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 1st Job up to 1 year</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 59
LENGTH OF TIME SPENT IN FIRST JOB
POSTAL SURVEY: GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Jobs</th>
<th>3 Jobs</th>
<th>4 Jobs</th>
<th>5 Jobs</th>
<th>6+ Jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In 1st Job up to 1 year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further aspect of duration in jobs as compared with number of jobs held is that relating to length of time in the job held five years after leaving school, at the time of Interview No.4. Tables 60 and 61 show the position for youths and girls respectively.
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Table 60
LENGTH OF TIME IN JOB AT FIVE YEARS
COMPAIRED WITH NUMBER OF JOBS HELD—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Job at Five Years</th>
<th>2 Jobs</th>
<th>3 Jobs</th>
<th>4 Jobs</th>
<th>5 Jobs</th>
<th>6 Jobs</th>
<th>7+ Jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 61
LENGTH OF TIME IN JOB AT FIVE YEARS
COMPAIRED WITH NUMBER OF JOBS HELD—GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Job at Five Years</th>
<th>2 Jobs</th>
<th>3 Jobs</th>
<th>4 Jobs</th>
<th>5 Jobs</th>
<th>6 Jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tables refer to the 62 youths who had had more than one job, and to the 45 girls who had had more than one job and who were still in employment at the time of Interview No. 4.
As already noted, a high proportion of youths with two jobs only had been established for a long time in the jobs to which they had subsequently moved, but this was not such an obvious feature in regard to girls. It is notable that one youth who was in his fourth job had held it for over four years, after three short-term jobs in his first year in employment. Two girls, similarly, had been in their current employment for over two years despite the fact that they had had three and four earlier jobs respectively.

The tables indicate, however, that appreciable numbers of both youths and girls had held their jobs at the time of Interview No. 4 for less than six months, and substantial numbers in addition for between six months and one year. Some of them had made deliberate moves in connection with career prospects or marriage and domestic circumstances, as has already been noted—and this is reflected in the fact that respondents with an absolutely or relatively low rate of job changing account for a substantial proportion of the total whose tenure of the current job was short. But the conclusion must also be drawn that there remains, at the end of the first five years of employment, considerable job instability.

There is some support for this conclusion from data relating to future plans. The likelihood of marriage and of having children complicates analysis in regard to girls, but 41 of the 66 who were at work at the time of Interview No. 4 envisaged remaining in the same job in the foreseeable future, provided that they did not leave for domestic reasons. The remainder were uncertain about their plans,
but 10 girls, all of whom had already had more than one job, had definite plans to change within the next few years. With regard to the youths, 14 were definitely planning to change jobs in the near future: 4 of these had been in the same job since leaving school, 2 had had only one job, and the remaining 8 had had more than two jobs. Further aspects of future plans are discussed below.

Analysis of the Postal Respondents, again, supports the above conclusions generally, as Tables 62 and 63 show.

**Table 62**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Job at Five Years</th>
<th>Jobs 2</th>
<th>Jobs 3</th>
<th>Jobs 4</th>
<th>Jobs 5</th>
<th>Jobs 6</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months - 1 year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 63**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Job at Five Years</th>
<th>Jobs 2</th>
<th>Jobs 3</th>
<th>Jobs 4</th>
<th>Jobs 5</th>
<th>Jobs 6</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months - 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>135*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes 15 job changers who had stopped work on marriage
Methods of Finding Jobs in Comparison With Numbers of Jobs Held

Before drawing together the conclusions of this Chapter dealing with job changes, and relating them to theories which have been propounded in regard to the initial work phase, there remains one further aspect for discussion, namely the relationships between the number of jobs held and methods of finding jobs. And it is necessary to preface this by a digression, in order to consider the overall picture in regard to methods of job finding. This aspect has been discussed in detail elsewhere with reference to the first year in employment, \(^1\) and may therefore be dealt with fairly briefly here.

Table 64 shows the methods by which youths had found the jobs which they held at the time of Interview No.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Finding Jobs Held at Five Years—Youths</th>
<th>1 Job Only</th>
<th>More Than 1 Job</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help From School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertisement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called on &quot;Off-chance&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 3 jobs obtained through Ministry of Labour.

The relative unimportance of the Youth Employment Service and of the Ministry of Labour is clearly indicated—whilst the considerable importance of "informal" help, from relations, friends, newspaper advertisements and calling on the "off-chance" is obvious. The lack of "know-how" and sophistication in seeking employment, and the casualness of the methods employed, which were discerned as obtaining in regard to first employment entered upon leaving school and subsequent changes during the first year at work, persist throughout the whole of the first five years in employment. An analysis of methods by which youths who were apprentices at the time of Interview No.4 obtained their jobs indicates that "informal" and casual methods apply in regard to skilled employment almost to the same extent as to semi-and unskilled work: however, many youths who obtained apprenticeships through such methods remained in them throughout the whole of the five years. Table 65 shows the position.

**Table 65**

**METHODS OF FINDING APPRENTICESHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Apprentices With 1 job only</th>
<th>Apprentices With 1 or more previous jobs</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertisement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called on &quot;off-chance&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve youths were placed in apprenticeships in their first jobs by the Youth Employment Service. Of these, 1 only remained in the apprenticeship, but 2 others were apprentices again by the time of Interview No. 4, having had other jobs in between. Of the 11 youths who left the apprenticeships in which the Youth Employment Officer placed them, 3 had one subsequent job, 3 had three subsequent jobs, 1 had four and 4 had six or more subsequent jobs. The full analysis of youths' job changes in relation to method of finding first job is given in Table 66.

TABLE 66
JOB CHANGES RELATED TO METHOD OF FINDING FIRST JOB—YOUTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NUMBER OF JOBS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbour</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertisement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called on &quot;off-chance&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the methods used for obtaining first jobs are seen to have a high "failure" rate. It may be noted, however, that help from parents, other relations, friends and neighbours, and, indeed, jobs obtained by calling on the "off-chance" are all relatively successful, and in some cases outstandingly so, compared with the Youth Employment Service—if, that is, a small number of subsequent jobs, or none at all is taken as an index of successful
placement. There are several explanations for this. Parents, friends and relatives, and the neighbours, tended to have the same norms and values and aspirations of the same order as the respondents themselves and the employment which they helped the young person to obtain was in accord with this fact. The use of "influence", too, is relevant here, in that it may enable a youth to get a more rewarding job than would otherwise be the case. With regard to jobs obtained on the "off-chance", the apparent success of this method in several cases would seem to suggest that the "off-chance" calls are not always casual or haphazard and, indeed, there were clear examples of youths who called systematically at particular firms in which a vacancy in the desired occupation might be available.

But the outstanding fact reflected in Table 66 is the failure of the Youth Employment Service as a placement agency—only 2 of the 31 youths originally placed in employment by the Service remained in their first jobs; and many of the remainder were amongst the youths with a very high rate of job changing subsequently. Explanations have already been suggested. ¹ It is necessary here only to point out that this is further evidence of three facts—that many of those youths whom the Service finds itself helping are less easily placed in satisfactory employment because of deficiencies in home background or in personal qualities; that a high proportion of the jobs which are notified to the Service have limited

¹ See above, and also Home, School and Work, op.cit., Chapter 7.
prospects and are unattractive to young workers; but also that the
guidance and placement functions of the Service are largely inade-
quate. Willmott similarly found in his study of adolescent boys
in East London that there was a high job turnover amongst boys
whose first jobs were secured through the Youth Employment Service.¹

The general position in regard to girls reflected, broadly, that
which obtained at Interview No. 4 for youths. Table 67 shows the
methods by which the jobs held at Interview No. 4 were obtained
(last job held in the case of married girls who were not working
at that stage). The special importance of newspaper advertisements
is apparent, but calls on the "off-chance" were important, as with
youths, and the Youth Employment Service was similarly unimportant
in comparison with other methods.

**Table 67**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>1 Job Only</th>
<th>More Than 1 Job</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father/Mother</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister/Brother</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbour</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from School</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertisement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called on &quot;off-chance&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 2 who obtained jobs through the Ministry of Labour.

+In 4 cases the help was from the proprietor of the Comptometer
Operator School at which the respondents had taken a short course.

¹Peter Willmott, *Adolescent Boys of East London*, op. cit.,
Table 68 analyses the number of jobs held by girls in comparison with the method of finding the first job on leaving school. The results echo those obtaining for youths, and, specifically, demonstrate again the low success rate of Youth Employment Service placements. In contrast with youths, however, other methods employed by girls in finding their first jobs show significant failures—particularly is this so with first jobs found on the "off-chance".

The final comparison to be made is between methods of finding jobs at Interview No. 4 and methods of finding first jobs obtained. This data is abstracted from the above Tables and presented, for youths and girls, in Table 69.

Table 69 shows clearly the declining influence of the Youth Employment Service over the years—a feature also found by Willmott. In Willmott's study, however, the relative importance of parents and other relatives increased over the course of the years—whereas in
TABLE 69
METHODS OF FINDING JOBS
COMPARSED WITH JOBS AT FIVE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Youths 1st Job</th>
<th>Job at 5 yrs.</th>
<th>Girls 1st Job</th>
<th>Job at 5 yrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Employment Service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Relation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Neighbour</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Advertisement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called on &quot;off-chance&quot;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Proprietor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the present study, with the exception of help to youths from "other relations", the contrary is the case.\(^1\) Willmott's sample is not strictly comparable, for the present purpose, with the sample with which we are here concerned, in that it contained a cross-section of youths aged fourteen to twenty years. The earlier Sheffield study showed that for youths, though less markedly for girls, there was a distinct increase in help from relations in finding jobs subsequent to leaving the first job. Probably Willmott's figures reflect this earlier shift to dependence upon near relations, especially parents. But subsequently, as the Sheffield research shows, when youths and girls reach a more mature age they tend to assume independence from parents. This tendency to independence is reflected clearly in the increase in importance, in some cases marked, of newspaper advertisements and "off-chance" enquiries. A study of methods used in finding intermediate

---

\(^1\) _Ibid., p.105._
jobs over the course of the five years provides some confirmation of the validity of the thesis presented here—but the data on methods used for obtaining intermediate jobs is not exhaustive.

The Significance of Job Changing in the Process of Adjustment to Employment

The variety in the "immediate" reasons and motivations for job changes has been explored above, and it has been indicated, too, that there are relationships between methods of obtaining employment and subsequent occupational history—the mechanism of these relationships, it would seem, is to be largely understood in terms of the home and social setting which provides, for example, in one extreme case encouragement to the school leaver and parental "know-how" in seeking a job, and, as another extreme case, lack of interest by parents and ignorance as to the appropriate procedures for securing a particular type of job. Despite the complexity, certain patterns have emerged from the analysis—indicating, for example, that there are "types" to be discerned within the broad mass of job changers—"drifters" who are constantly on the move, "early movers" who, after perhaps two or three jobs in the first year at work, then settle down in one job, and, the reverse of this, young workers who remain in their first job for three or four years and then become "unstable" as measured by rate of job changing. The intention now is to discuss job changing in the context of the broad process of the transition from school to work.
The evidence of the present study suggests that it is not sufficient, or even particularly apposite, to pose the situation in terms of an all-embracing formulation such as a "floundering period" or a "trial work" period. There are several reasons for questioning the validity of such an analysis. The first is the very variety in the motivation and the patterns of job changing which have been identified; the second is that such conceptions seem to imply that job changing is in some sense abnormal, aberrant, or a temporary phenomenon; and the third important reason is that there is undue emphasis placed, in such attempted explanations, upon the work setting in isolation from the wider social context in which the young worker is placed. The multiplicity of social relationships in which young workers in modern industrial societies are involved, and the complexity of the social influences which play upon them, other than those which obtain in the work place, are such as to command an important place in any explanation of attitudes and actions during the process of adjustment to employment. I do not propose to dwell further upon the variations and diversities in regard to individual job patterns and to motivations governing job changing. The concern here is, firstly, with the issue as to whether, and in what sense, job changing is to be regarded as indicative of a


failure to adjust—representing the teething troubles of youths and girls newly entering employment. And, secondly, the concern is with the complexity of the social factors affecting job changing, bearing in mind that many of these factors are to be regarded, in some sense, as extra to the work situation or setting per se. The first of these two aspects will be dealt with fairly briefly, the second at somewhat greater length.

There tend to be undertones in discussions of "floundering" which imply that it is somehow wrong for a person to change jobs—although it may perhaps be more understandable, even forgivable, in the case of the young worker than in regard to adults. This would seem to betray either the influence of an excessively active Protestant ethic or too firm adherence to a functionalist-type analysis of the socio-economic structure such that job changing is deemed to make the smooth running of society more complicated, and is therefore, as it were, untidy. Thus Musgrave, invoking Goffman in support, writes that "failure is permitted to the young since they are considered as 'not-yet-persons', but adults are not allowed to fail and so must not change jobs too often. From the point of view of the employer, the young worker may be a 'not-yet-worker' and some floundering permitted, yet frequent job changing does not lend to an efficient economy or the growth of a stable personality".¹ As to the question

of the growth of a "stable personality", whatever that may be, I do not propose to pursue the matter at this point, save to remark that the implied direct correlation between stability in employment and stability of personality would seem, except perhaps in chronic cases, on a priori grounds to be facile, not to say naive.\footnote{Young workers may remain in jobs because of a fear of changing—there were examples in the present study. For these, job stability represented instability of personality.} But with regard to the efficiency of the economy, it may be argued that frequent job changes can indeed be a contribution to the efficiency of the economy—in the short term if the result is to sift young workers in accordance with ability and disposition to appropriate levels within the conspectus open to them (the analysis above suggested that there was some indication of such a process in regard to apprentices, the less able youths being weeded out, or weeding themselves out—and the net effect of job changing being that a high proportion of apprentices at the stage of Interview No. 4 were, by objective criteria, well qualified for such work, compared with non-apprentices). Furthermore, at certain levels of the occupational hierarchy, the economy may require fairly frequent shifts of manpower in and out of particular types of employment—Caplow's analysis of this factor was referred to above.

Indeed, whether or not job changing is to be regarded as "good" or "bad", "functional" or "dysfunctional", such evidence as there is (and it is indeed sparse, especially in regard to Britain) suggests that there is a high rate of job turnover amongst the adult labour
force, more particularly in manual employment, especially semi-
and unskilled, but including skilled workers also. Turnover of
women workers, indeed, consequent upon the need to gear their
employment activities with domestic constraints is notoriously high.
One might thus argue, contra the suggestion that job changing is
inhibiting the process of socialisation of young workers for involve-
ment in the work situation,¹ that it is, rather, an appropriate part
of the process. Specifically for young workers, the occupational
structure, as we have seen, is such as to imply a certain amount of
job changing consequent upon the fact that certain occupations are
opened to young workers only after they have attained the age of
eighteen years or more: whilst other occupations may be said to be
restricted to the younger category of youths and girls aged fifteen
to, say, seventeen: van boy is an example. Viewed from a somewhat
different angle, the young worker of fifteen and sixteen years,
male or female, is in a different market from the young worker of
nineteen or twenty years. Some job changing is to be expected in
consequence of this fact, and regardless of any question of "floun-
dering" or of "trial and error". Of course, there undoubtedly is a
considerable amount of job changing which could reasonably be said
to be economically inefficient, because it wastes employers' time
and resources, whilst not contributing in any way to the qualifi-
cations of the young worker—and the detailed analysis above has
provided examples of this. But the fact remains that the economy

¹P.W. Musgrave, ibid.
of a modern industrial society requires—or at least seems to imply—a high rate of job changing amongst workers, old and young alike.

Caplow, in 1954, writes with reference to the U.S.A. that "No one has ever computed a national employment turnover rate, but the available statistics are suggestive. Turnover rates as high as 200 per cent per year are not uncommon in heavy industry. The monthly separation rates for all manufacturing industries, as computed by the Bureau of Labour Statistics, have ranged in recent years from a high of 17.9 per cent in August 1965 to a low of 2.8 per cent in April 1950. In the long run, the number of voluntary terminations is slightly greater than the number of lay offs. In 1950, which had the lowest turnover rates in many years, the cumulative total percentage of separations for manufacturing industries was 41.6 per cent, of which 13.1 per cent were lay offs."¹ Indeed, Musgrave has himself pointed out, in another context, that "The worker in the U.S.A. now changes his job on average every four or five years, though the move may be to a somewhat similar job."² Many such changes may represent fecklessness, desire to escape monotony or some other such individual attribute (or, "shortcoming", as some would seemingly argue). But many, too, represent a necessary adjustment imposed


on the occupational structure by socio-technological change, and, as a complement, a response of individuals to the new situation, whether in terms of aspirations to new opportunities, or mere compliance with the phasing out of the type of employment previously held.

In Britain, over the past decade or so, the whole tenor in the employment context has been in terms of job changing—negatively as a consequence of lay-offs and redundancies, positively in terms of governmental plans for the adaptability of labour, accompanied by training schemes and advisory services to facilitate changes not just from one job to another, but from one occupation to another—often involving, indeed, a move from one part of the country to another. The structural needs for job changing have always been present in industrial society, then; whilst hitherto they may have been more apparent in inter-generational comparisons, the acceleration of social and technological change is now such that within a man's working life it may be necessary—in the sense of economically efficient, but also in the sense that the alternative might be unemployment—for him to have several jobs, and occupations (for example, as old occupations become obsolescent and give way to new or as small firms give way to larger ones or close down in one area to concentrate in another). These matters have, of course, already been treated above. Here it remains but to remark that to regard job changing as unfortunate or even reprehensible, and to analyse it as in some way reflecting the malfunctioning of society
is to overlook the extent of job changing that has always occurred in industrial society and which is occurring at an even greater rate nowadays—and which may, indeed, be regarded as "functional" to the efficient running of the economy. This, of course, is not to deny that the actual job changing that occurs may not be in close harmony with the changes that the economy might be said to require—and readiness or inclination to change jobs may stem not only from a positive identification with the changing manpower needs and opportunities, but from an attitude of not being "bothered", particularly, about whether or not one changes jobs, or what jobs are changed to—an attitude induced by a social and economic background in which low status occupations are the normal employment, and sustained by an educational system which prepares the bulk of children for the more routine and less satisfying jobs. What is being said here, then, is that there is a long-standing background of job changing amongst manual workers, especially semi-and unskilled workers: this fact might be expected to give rise to an outlook amongst young manual workers that job changing is "normal", the more so in the social climate which presently obtains in all industrial societies, and not least in Britain, in which lay-offs and redundancies are emphatically part of the scene, (this is scarcely conducive to ideas of the sanctity of one particular occupation or the merits of remaining permanently in one job), and in which public policy is, indeed, concerned to stimulate an acceptance of the merits and virtues of mobility in regard to jobs, occupations, and, indeed, associated geographical movement.
In summary, the argument being put forward here is that it does make sense to think in terms of a notional optimum degree and direction of job changing, in terms of numbers of changes and personnel concerned within the overall changes, as qualified in regard to skills, ability, age, sex, geographical distribution, and so on. This degree of job changing, and its character, will be subject, however, to constant amendment in accordance with developments in technology and in society generally (directly, for example, through social policy decisions such as those relating to the school leaving age or to age of retirement). The actual amount and direction of job changing will approximate only more or less to the notional optimum. Furthermore, and this fact is very important, the notional optimum should properly have reference not just to criteria of efficiency and productivity taken in vacuo, but should take cognisance of the ameliorative function which job changing may have, particularly upon routine manual workers, in alleviating monotony and despair, by relieving the boredom of being confined to one particular job, and thereby, possibly forestalling the development of "active alienation" in the sense of rebelliousness, or complete indifference to the task in hand—as Caplow says, among the reasons why the semi-skilled worker is "predisposed to change jobs on slight provocation or none at all" is the fact that "much of the work he does is overpoweringly monotonous so that a change of scene is welcomed."¹

¹Op.cit., p.87
A considerable amount of job changing (amongst young and older workers) can be viewed from this theoretical perspective, as representing a response to the (changing) opportunities afforded by the occupational structure and the content of the work in particular occupations, with special reference to the limits of toleration of certain of the more routine jobs. But beyond this, it seems reasonable to posit that there are concomitant influences, associated, that is, with the meaning of work as experienced by manual workers as a whole, and specifically the semi- and unskilled segments of this category, which may be viewed as affecting job changing in a quasi-independent way—quasi-independent, that is, of both the overall occupational structure (although implicitly subject to or confined within it) and of the responses of individuals qua individuals, to it. I have in mind here the play-back upon attitudes towards and actions in regard to work which involvement in other spheres of society may have—notably, for example, the effect which marriage or starting a family may have upon decisions as to whether or not to change jobs. Miller and Form discuss certain of these factors in terms of "occupational goals"—marriage, courtship, children leaving home on reaching maturity, for example, may lead to a re-definition of occupational goals by the worker.\footnote{Op.cit., p.74 et seq.} Miller and Form seem to view this redefinition as being a feature of what they refer to as the "stable work period", which they, avowedly arbitrarily,
associate with the age span thirty-five years to sixty years. It will be suggested below that such factors—or factors of an analogous order—are in fact operative within the age range fifteen to twenty-years, covered in the present enquiry.

There is a further addendum to the previously enunciated explanations of job changing, that has special reference to young people in modern industrial society. Again one may conceive of social influences acting upon young workers which have a quasi-objectivity and independence of the occupational involvement of the young worker per se. Values associated with what can for the moment be loosely referred to as a "youth culture" for example, may be conceived as having, or being likely to have, an effect upon certain youths and girls in their decisions to change or not to change, jobs. Furthermore, the strength of the inter-generational conflict or harmony in regard to norms and values may reinforce or accelerate the amendment of traditional standards and patterns of behaviour, in regard to work as to other facets of life in society. And, regardless of whether there is or is not something which may appropriately be called a youth culture, it is to be accepted that there are special features associated with being a teenager in modern industrial society compared with the transition from childhood to adulthood in non-literate society, and that adjustment in the broad sense to adult society may therefore present special problems, or, at least, give rise to special questioning in the young person's appraisal of society and of his place in it.
We have already departed from the relatively straightforward "economic" aspects of job changing, and anticipated the discussion of the complexity of social influences affecting job changing. It is to this latter aspect that we now turn in detail. And it is appropriate at this point to remark that analysis of the process of adjustment from school to work has tended to be in terms of the male worker— theories of occupational choice and selection are almost exclusively posed by reference to career patterns obtaining or deemed to be obtaining for youths and men. It has been suggested in various places above, and notably in regard to "immediate" reasons for job changing, that significant differences may be detected in regard to attitudes towards work and decisions in regard to work, as between youths and girls. This fact has pertinence for various themes touched upon in the following discussion.

The theory that school leavers on entering employment necessarily pass through a "floundering period" during which they strive to adjust to the new set of norms and values which obtain at work has been propounded by various students in this field, notably, as we have seen, by Ginsberg, et al. The amount and character of job changing, in accordance with this theory, may be taken to represent the difficulties inherent in the process of adjustment. Undoubtedly, there are young workers who are ill-at-ease on first entering employment, and one mark of this is a rapid succession of job changes:

---

examples have been given from the present study. But probably this explanation accounts for only a minority of job changes and is apposite to only a minority of young workers concerned in job changing. The basis of the "floundering" theory would seem to me to be inadequate. It rests, as has been indicated, upon the assumption that the transition from school to work involves a drastic change for young people from one set of norms and values to another, and the implication is that the bulk of young workers are ill-equipped and unprepared for the transition. That there is some validity in the latter assertion is undoubtedly true, and I have elsewhere cited evidence in confirmation of the fact. But as to the main argument, I would maintain that this is based upon a misapprehension of the true nature of the social forces playing upon young people coming from working class backgrounds and attending secondary modern schools. Specifically, it is under-estimating the similarity of the norms and values obtaining on the one hand in home and neighbourhood, and on the other hand in the world of work. And it over-estimates the success that the school has in imbuing a different set of norms and values. I have discussed this at some length in *Home, School and Work,* and I do not propose to do more than refer to the outline of the argument here—the fact of the matter, as reported earlier,

---

1 And see *Home, School and Work, op. cit.*, for further discussion.
3 *cf. Chapter 9 especially.*
was that "Neither school nor work meant a great deal to a large number of children: work was no more of a challenge to them than school had been. The "gap" (between school and work) was to them no more than a moderate change in routine. At the same time, most of the changes were welcome to all but a few children—improved status, more independence, better treatment at home, more spending money. Beside these, the transitory problems of shyness and nervousness at starting work counted but little." Indeed, so far from giving rise to different horizons and aspirations, the school, by virtue of the dullness of its approach and the irrelevance of its activities, could be said to be a smooth cog in the socialising process by which the secondary modern child from a working class home is prepared for the world of work in which he will be involved as a routine manual worker. On this view, too, job changing could even be regarded as a sign of ready adaptation to the world of work as it actually is, as opposed to representing a floundering in a new-found and bewildering situation.

Nor does the "trial work" theory, as set out by Miller and Form, represent a convincing explanation of job changing amongst young workers. In the first place, Miller and Form's analysis refers to a much longer period than the present enquiry, and would seem to imply that there are no special features in regard to job changing discernable amongst teenage youths and girls during the first five

---

1 Ibid., p. 211
years at work—their definition of trial work is that it is the period of transition beginning when the worker seeks his first full-time job and continuing until he has secured a work position in which he remains more or less permanently. "More or less permanently" is qualified as being three years or more. This period of transition might well extend beyond the first five years in employment: empirical data to test the theory, as has been said, is not available, certainly not in regard to the British scene. But disregarding the question of the time span, and the apparent neglect of special factors associated with the age, relative immaturity, and lack of experience of young workers up to the age of about twenty years, or during the first five years at work, the Miller and Form diagnosis implies that such moves as are made are on a "trial and error" basis—"the worker is trying to find and secure that job which satisfies his needs for expression, for security and for recognition....the trial work period commonly represents the personal struggles to find an occupation and a work plant where the worker feels these wants may be gratified". Now it has been indicated above that certain job changes are made with this "trial and error", "experimental" aspect to them—and the point will be returned to again shortly. But a high proportion of job changes in the present study could not be said to be associated with such an intention. It might, of course, be argued that despite appearances, and notwithstanding the patent unsucces amongst many young workers in finding a better job on leaving their first, they are nonetheless
seeking, at a subconscious level and albeit inefficiently, to
gratify the wants that Miller and Form declare them to have.
And there could be some truth in this. But such an analysis
would appear to be over-much dependent upon matters of individual
psychology, and to take as a datum that the desired satisfactions
can be obtained at work—at which point, workers will settle down
into the stable work period. The point being reiterated here is
that job changing may well represent, in many cases, a desire to
relieve boredom rather than to satisfy positive needs—since the
conviction amongst many young workers is that they will always be
doomed to work which is bereft of positive satisfaction. And that,
further, the world of work to which young people have to accommodate
is one—as has already been suggested—in which job changing is
normal.

Beyond this, however, there are the social factors associated
with the domestic cycle and possibly with a "youth culture", which
the "trial work" explanation seems to overlook: Miller and Form do
take cognisance of such factors in reference to the stable work
period, as has just been remarked. There would seem to be no
logical reason why similar factors should not also influence the
situation in the early years at work, and the evidence of the
present study is that they do indeed help to account for a sub-
stantial amount of the job changing that occurs. Before coming
on to consider these matters in rather more detail, it is important
to indicate certain aspects of job changing that can be said to be
of a "trial and error" character, especially since I have laboured
the point that so many job changes are not of this order.
Given that the employment opportunities open to secondary modern school leavers are restricted in the sense that they are comprised for the most part of skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled work, with a small minority entering non-manual work (girls in non-manual work being restricted, on the whole, to the lower level jobs in the hierarchy), it remains a fact that there is some variety in the nature of the work within this spectrum—furthermore, certain of the occupations are more sought-after than others by the socially aspiring child or his parents. Some job changing that occurs is, then, a consequence of the young person's desire to "better" himself within the seemingly narrow range of possibilities open to him. And it is appropriate at this point to remark that an apparently small rise in the occupational hierarchy within this spectrum may represent or result in a significant difference in life style, norms and values. Changes may, then, manifest a desire to rise within the occupational/social hierarchy as perceived. Job changing could then be regarded as a consequence of a reappraisal of the advantages of another job compared with the one at present held, and having regard to the availability of alternative employment. The "values" operating in the individual's particular case, or the motivations which spring from or are inherent in them, may then be said to give rise to job changing in pursuit of greater fulfilment or satisfaction (or, the values themselves may change) as a consequence of greater experience of the world of work, or of changed involvement in other aspects
of life—domestic, leisure, etc.: this again anticipates discussion below.¹

Venness has argued that much job changing amongst girls in the early years of employment is of this positive order—significantly more than the present study would suggest: this could well be a result of the fact that Venness² sample included girls who had attended technical and grammar schools as well as secondary modern leavers.² (The girls were first interviewed in 1956, and subsequently on various occasions—Venness' present conclusions derive from interviews conducted in 1966, when the girls were aged up to twenty-three

---

¹Ford and Box formulate a theory of occupational choice in such terms—"1. In choosing between alternative occupations, a person will rank the occupations in terms of the relation between his valued and the perceived characteristics of the occupations; 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." In "positive" job changing, this formulation appears to be unexceptionable and concise: although it is not clear where it leads. It may still hold in regard to other sorts of job changing, but its helpfulness seems to the present author to be negligible in such cases—at any rate without more elaboration of choice, "values", "perceived characteristics" and the persistence or otherwise of these over time and in changing social and individual circumstances.


²It could also reflect an apparent over-reliance upon the girls' stated reasons for changes, reasons which tended to be of the "immediate" sort as described above—the argument above, it will be recalled, was that such immediate reasons are of limited import unless they are viewed in the perspective of the wider values and the broader work situations in which they are, in fact, embedded.
years). Veness writes that "There were a few people still in the jobs that they had entered on leaving school, but most had changed jobs. The average rate of job changing was much the same for all groups over the time worked to date: a new job every two years was the average rate. Job changing is important for the present argument because in describing their various jobs and reasons for changing, they made it obvious that definite preferences, satisfactions and distastes were being expressed. Jobs were not taken up or abandoned chiefly because of their incompatibility with home and marriage, even with the married women." Later, Veness argues that "It is evident that women are today obtaining satisfactions other than monetary ones from their jobs. Most are not on leaving school doing mere routine jobs until the wedding bells ring." Apart from the arguments being advanced in regard to the present study, which suggests other important facts in job changing than the attempt to obtain a more satisfying job, it may be suggested that the amount of job changing would be substantially less if such a high proportion of changes are made in pursuance of positive goals, clearly formulated by the young workers. Whilst the character of the job changes, it might also be expected, would be such as to lead to significantly higher degree of success, in terms of movement from an inferior

---

1 But N.B., Grammar and Technical girls had had less time at work in which to change jobs.

to a superior job as measured by the young workers' own criteria. But the main point here is to draw attention to the fact that there is evidence from studies other than the present which indicates, like the present enquiry, that some of the changing during the initial work phase is of this positive order, and represents, in some sense, a process of "trial work". A further more specific point on this matter is that there is some evidence from the present study that, at about the age of eighteen-twenty, young workers who have hitherto changed jobs in a haphazard manner, and others who have remained in the same employment since leaving school, may change jobs, or seek to do so, for "positive" reasons: this may take the form of a change, or an attempted change, to a completely different occupation, which is deemed to offer more security, better prospects, or which is thought to have some other positive attribute which is in tune with a newly evolved or evolving set of criteria—or it may take the form of renewed application within the present occupation but with the same objectives. The wish is for a "second start", and it appears to spring, often, from a recognition by the young worker that, after three or more years at work, he is in a rut, and that if he does not get out now, he never will. The tendency in modern society towards professionalism, and also towards bureaucratisation in terms of required qualifications for particular occupations, means that it is increasingly difficult for such "second starts" to be made (and "late developers" may find, increasingly, that they have started to develop too late). An ameliorative factor
in this situation would be a more effective system of further and part-time education than that which obtains at present—it was seen above in the discussion of further education the provisions at present afford little encouragement and little substantive teaching for young workers.  

The main weakness in such theories of the adjustment to employment as have been proposed in the rather sparse literature on the subject—apart from the fact that they are based on such limited field work data—is that they concentrate unduly, and in some cases exclusively, on the work setting, not recognising that the process of adjustment of young people to employment is part of a wider adjustment to adult society—a society which is constantly undergoing change—and seemingly not taking cognisance of the interplay between work and "non-work" values, attitudes and actions. The present research suggests that adjustment—and more specifically here, job changing—cannot be properly understood by reference only, or even mainly, to the work situation; and that whilst aspects of the work situation are usually of some importance, and sometimes of paramount importance, extra-work factors such as leisure contacts with peers, and being a teenager in modern "mass" society, and

domestic and marital involvement are of considerable relevance to actions and attitudes in regard to the work setting. The matter has already been touched on, and it is to this proposition that we now return.

It has been argued by many commentators that adolescence in modern industrial societies represents a time of unsettlement—that physical and accompanying mental and/or psychological changes in the youth and girl give rise to behaviour which is seemingly odd, inconsistent, arbitrary or of a contrary nature. The changes which the individual is undergoing may give rise to what Erikson terms "the discontented search of youth". The search, in Erikson's assessment, is displayed most obviously in "the craving for locomotion"—"Whether expressed in a general 'being on the go', tearing after something, or 'running around'; or in locomotion proper, as in vigorous work, in absorbing sports, in rapt dancing, in shiftless Wanderschaft, and in the employment and misuse of speedy animals and machines.....in no other stage of the life cycle, then, are the promise of finding oneself and the threat of losing oneself so closely allied." Modern society

---

1 Miller and Form do refer briefly to certain aspects of relevance in this context, in the discussion leading up to their Chapter on the "Trial Work Period"—and they make further references passim. But although their approach is a "rounded" one, it appears to the present author that they give insufficient attention and emphasis to "non-work" factors.

offers a vast range of opportunities for such locomotion, Erikson suggests. But, as the young person enters the later teenage years, he gradually narrows his range of activities and affiliations, and he disciplines his range of thoughts, becomes more consistent and conforming in his ideological attachments or sympathies—"the cognitive gifts* developing during the first half of the second decade add a powerful tool to the tasks of youth. J.Piaget calls the gains in cognition made toward the middle teens, the achievement of "formal operations". This means that youth can now operate on hypothetical propositions, can think of possible variables and potential relations, and think of them in thought alone, independent of certain concrete checks previously necessary. As Jerome S. Bruner puts it, the child now can conjure up systematically the full range of alternative possibilities, that could exist at any given time. Such cognitive orientation forms not a contrast but a complement to the need of the young person to develop a sense of identity, for, from among all possible and imaginable relations, he must make a series of ever narrowing selections of personal occupational, sexual and ideological commitments.1 It is not necessary to accept the full analysis of Erikson in recognising that his general approach is suggestive. The argument, drawn from Piaget and Bruner, that young people

are subject to a super-efficient process of "cognitive orientation", would not stand if measured against the displayed attributes of many secondary modern school leavers in Britain—whose appreciation of the range of possible alternatives open to them is narrow indeed. But the main theme does have pertinence and would seem to help to explain some at least of the job changing that occurs during the first year at work: initially, changes (though by no means all) may be seen as part of the disposition of the young person towards locomotion—a testing-out of the territory open to him and of the properties of various sectors of it. The emphasis is, then, upon experiment and new experience rather than upon trial and error in the pursuit of already established goals. And job changing in the later stages of the teenage years might then be seen as part of the "narrowing selection" which could be regarded as a necessary process whereby adjustment to a particular set of values and to a lifestyle is effected. The argument could, indeed, be extended by reference to the development of communications and the mass media, which, it might be argued, enlarge the area for experiment and provide greater impetus as well as opportunity for "locomotion": the development of the consumer situation, in which teenagers constitute a substantial market of their own right, and have, by virtue of high spending power, considerable choice in their expenditure, could be seen as a further extension of this area for "locomotion", a further bolstering of the disposition to move, to be "on the go", of which changing jobs is at once a manifestation, and a symbol.
Erikson's argument places much emphasis upon the individual psychology of the young person—albeit as reacting in response to the conditions, constraints and opportunities of modern society. In recent years it has become fashionable to think of youth behaviour by reference to the involvement of young people with their peers in a "youth culture" the characteristics of which may, indeed, be largely or in part determined by mass media and mass advertising, in inculcating a sense of identity and common values around particular activities such as dancing to "pop" music, wearing idiosyncratic dress, etc. A feature of this youth culture, in the estimation of many parents and some sociologists (though in rather different meanings of the term) is its irresponsibility. Talcott Parsons, with special but not exclusive reference to American society thus writes, "It is at this point of emergence into adolescence that there first begins to develop a set of patterns and behaviour phenomena which involve a highly complex combination of age grading and sex rôle elements. These may be referred to together as the phenomena of the 'youth culture'. Certain of its elements are present in pre-adolescence and others in the adult culture.... Perhaps the best single point of reference for characterising the youth culture lies in its contrast with the dominant pattern of the adult male rôle. By contrast with the emphasis on responsibility in this rôle, the orientation of the youth culture is more or less specifically irresponsible. One of its dominant themes is 'having a good time' in relation to which is a particularly strong emphasis on social
activities in company with the opposite sex.'

Caplow, in echoing Talcott Parsons' analysis, also touched upon problems of inter-generational misunderstandings which are the product of the different orientations, activities, and interests as between parents and children in their teenage years—"The significant effect of the youth culture and its typical involvements is to neutralise decisions (about education and occupation) almost completely." In other terms, "the adolescent—faced simultaneously with the necessity for adjusting to adult sexual roles and for deciding on a vocational career—is seen to devote most of his attention to the problems which touch his ego and his emotions more immediately. His first steps towards an adult job are taken without excessive concern, and often without much interest".

"The interposition of this special culture between childhood and maturity further weakens the primitive continuity of generations from the occupational standpoint. In the typical case, the boy or girl is emotionally isolated from his parents for a considerable time, during which identification with them is consistently rejected.... Whatever occupational decisions are necessary are likely to be taken without seeking parental approval or in opposition to adult judgement. Finally, the first serious employment is likely to occur toward the end of this vaguely defined period. The family is not invited to

---

participate in the experience, or kept well enough informed to exert much influence upon it."^1

Again, it is not necessary to accept in full the analysis of either Parsons or Caplow in regard to the existence and characteristics of a youth culture,^2 nor is it proposed to attempt to make a precise appraisal of the applicability of their analysis to British society. But there are aspects of these analyses which seem to have reference to the situation of the young worker in Britain, and specifically, which may help to account for some job changing. Parsons' suggestion of "irresponsibility", which I take to mean repudiation of the prevailing norms, and the substitution of more acceptable norms, represents a complement to the Erikson analysis: where Erikson, argues in terms of locomotion, the pursuit of new experiences and exploration of what the society can offer, Parsons, as I read him, directs attention to the sheer self-indulgence and "carefree" character of the teenager, at a time when responsibilities upon him—domestic, civic—are minimal. A sudden, apparently unthinking and pointless change of job could be interpreted in these terms as an example of joie de vivre, or, less rapturously, of the sentiment "What the hell!" As Parsons intimates, the meaning of work for the young person is of a different order from the meaning for an adult. Why not change jobs? Why stay in a particular job? What does it

---

^1 Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work, op.cit., p.277

^2 Scepticism as to the notion of a youth culture is expatiated upon in Chapter XVI below.
matter anyhow? For main concerns at this stage lie elsewhere, and are of a different order. This sort of analysis is endorsed by Caplow, and makes some sense when applied to the young workers involved in the present study. More directly, Parsons' reference to the concern with social activities in company with the opposite sex is important. It was indicated above that whilst desire for a higher wage was not the primary reason for many job changes, it nonetheless had some general influence; and that it assumed special importance when other criteria or satisfaction were disappointed—as, for example, when an apprentice was discontented with the amount of training he was receiving. In so far as increased wages are of importance in job changing, the fact may be largely understood—especially in the years before marriage—in terms of the desire to participate more fully in the affluent teenage consumer market, of which a special feature is social activities with girl friends, with the concomitant wish to "treat" the girl, and thereby illustrate one's independence and unconcern with trivial matters of money—the girl, for her part, spending her money on dresses and accoutrements in conformity with teenage fashions, and as her claim to independence and affluence.

With regard to Caplow's remarks on inter-generational strife, it may be added that it not just a question of adolescents passing through a phase in relation to adults in the context of a static set of values. The values themselves are changing constantly, and perhaps, with more rapid changes in communications and technology,
in an accelerated way nowadays. The failure of adults and children to "connect" may be seen, then, as in part an outcome of the more ready assumption by young people of "modern" or "new" values—which come to them fresh, whereas the adult has to digest them and subsume them in another set of values already entrenched within him. To make a plausible link between such factors and job changing—or at least to demonstrate such a link—is not easy. I seek here merely to suggest the possibility of such a link, and to remark that certain job changes in the present research appeared to have been made out of pique at a parent's "interference" or as a sign to parents of the young person's repudiation of his elders' scheme of values. On the other hand, it is appropriate to remark here, as has been mentioned above, that many parents accorded their children such "free-will" as they cared to assume: but, then again, this was often as a consequence of a parental appraisal that young people will go their own way, so it is as well to save time and effort by accepting the fact.

A further point in regard to Caplow's analysis has to do with his suggestion that the "first serious employment" is likely to be made towards the end of the period of involvement in the youth culture, the period characterised, too, by this potential or actual clash between parents and child. Whilst in the American situation this entry to "serious" employment may be possible, in regard to secondary modern school leavers in Britain it may, by that time, be too late—especially in view of the inadequacies of the further education programme already discussed. But we have seen, too, that certain
young workers do, indeed, reorientate themselves towards "serious" employment, proceeding from a "serious" appraisal of their future, as they come towards the end of the teenage years.

I have suggested elsewhere that the quasi-independent or autonomous influence of the "youth culture," and the special "problems" or attributes associated with teenage years and adolescence, including the complications at the time of parental-child relationships, and inter-generational discord generally, are in part a consequence of the failure of British society to provide appropriate social apparatus for young people. At least, the force of these influences could be modified, and their direction channelled, perhaps, in a more positive way, if society were to provide more institutional "props" for the young worker. For "the interplay of the various factors that affect children in their attitudes towards and behaviour in school and at work are of vital importance to an industrial society. The whole process of socialisation is involved. In Britain today the evidence is that many children are subject to powerful conflicting influences: the implications for the adjustment of the individual to his environment and for the stability of society are extensive. They are revealed in individual and collective distress, resignation and cynicism.  

What I have in mind here is that, without supposing that it would be possible, or desirable if possible, to neutralise the quasi-independent influences upon young people associated with the individual's response

---

1 cf. Into Work, op.cit., pp. 219-222
to adolescence, occurring within the context of a "youth culture" which is in some sense autonomous, it is nonetheless the case that society could provide institutionally—by means of a further education and counselling service, for example—a point for reference and advice to such young people as feel "lost" or caught up in social circumstances which they cannot comprehend, and who do not wish to turn to parents for help, and/or would not receive it if they did seek it. There is, in other words, a tendency in the analysis of the position of the teenager in society to suppose that there is something imperative and unavoidable about the process of adolescence and inherent in a youth culture: my point is that there are features of an industrial society which are capable of modification through the operation of appropriate social machinery. This is not to suggest that all job changing consequent upon or representing off-shoots of the process of maturation (vide Erikson) or inherent in a youth culture (vide Parsons and Caplow) is "bad" or "wrong", and to be avoided: it is to suggest that certain job changing is symptomatic rather of a confusion resulting from the conflicting values playing upon young workers, at home, in the neighbourhood, at work itself, via the mass media, through the youth culture, and in consequence of individual psychological development during adolescence and the teenage years. Where such confusion prevails, apparatus for counselling would have an ameliorative effect in regard to matters of employment as in other spheres—of delinquency, for example, personal relationships, and behaviour generally.
Having spent some time on the arguments to the effect that there are special factors associated with the status of being young in modern society, I wish to make two qualifications, not as to the existence of such influences, but as to their strength and their salience in regard to the secondary modern school leavers who are the subjects of the present study. The first is that, although it was suggested above that the mass media may extend the range for experimentation, opening up the paths for further "locomotion", as it were, it would seem from the evidence of the present study that the powerful influences of the neighbourhood and home, especially considered in the light of the failure of the school to stimulate imaginative thought, neutralise much of the potential influence of television, radio, cinema and journal. The outcome is that such media do not extend horizons in a manner which it might be assumed on a priori grounds that they would: rather, the process would seem to be that young workers extract from the mass media those aspects which are familiar to them, which are more readily digested, and which are trivial or transient in their theme ("pop" music shows, variety programmes, cowboy serials, detective story episodes). The net effect is not an extension of the field of experience as much as a reinforcement of an already limited field. Paradoxically, then, the fact of mass media may represent a limitation of opportunity or inclination to explore new experiences, and, to this extent, the mass media would not help to explain job changing by reference to the "locomotion"
theory. On the other hand, the fact of mass media catering for the special needs and assumed interests of teenagers could well be said to intensify the influence of the "youth culture", and, by focussing attention upon, and, as it were, legitimising "living for the moment" and "having a fling", divert attention even more from the "serious", but quite separate, issues as to work. The second qualification is less speculative. In Chapter 16 below, I will be discussing the applicability of the notion of a youth culture to the respondents in the present study, and I will be suggesting that participation in such a culture, as conceived by Parsons and other students in the field, is very limited—although this is not to deny that there is an influence. What does emerge, to anticipate this discussion, is, rather, the early conformity of the respondents to the norms and values of adult society—possibly modified but only slightly so in comparison with their own parents and other adults with whose way of life they are familiar. So far from indulging in several years of experiment and "irresponsibility" a substantial proportion of the respondents displayed indications of having, at the age of eighteen or nineteen, elected to settle down into the assumed contentment and quietness of adult life. The matter will be returned to later in the discussion on marriage and on leisure. But it is pertinent to mention here again, although it is repetitive, that one aspect of this is preparation for marriage or marriage itself—and that job changing occurred in consequence of this in an appreciable number of cases. Courtship and marriage
may give rise to a re-orientation of goals in regard to work—which may take a different form for the husband compared with the wife: the husband may now seek a higher wage or more security, for example—the wife may cast aside previous concern with interest in the job, or prospects, or nice people to work with, in consequence of a shift of values from work and leisure to the domestic setting: now, proximity of work to home, short hours, or no Saturday work may be the decisive criteria in selecting a job. The shifts in goals may be thought-out and opted for—thus a skilled youth may deliberately enter semi-skilled work because the higher income will enable him to pay the mortgage on the "nice" house in a "nice" area that he and his wife set up as a symbol of their future happiness in the new status of married couple. Rather than a shift of goals, this situation is in some cases best regarded as an overall re-orientation of values, the young couple consciously setting-out to lead a different way of life from that of their parents, and making decisions in regard to work (and associated decisions as to length of engagement, and spacing of children, for example) in conformity with this re-orientation. Or the shifts in goals may be induced—by the sheer need for more money to make ends meet, when one room and use-of-bathroom at £3.3s a week, with a wife and baby to keep, are not untypical circumstances of young husbands and fathers.

The object of this section has been to argue that job changing—its amount and character—can only be understood by reference to a broader context than the work situation alone, and that not just
individual motivation but social constraints play a part in determining when, why and to what effect changes are made. The whole discussion must be seen in the broader context of the nature of the work done by young people, the meaning of the work to them, and their adaptation to it, as discussed earlier in this Chapter, of course. In seeking to understand job changing within the secondary modern range of employment, then, it is necessary to distinguish immediate, stated reasons for particular moves—for increased wages or to be with friends, for example—from the underlying factors which make for a readiness to change jobs. The former may reveal aspects of the latter, but, often, stated reasons throw only a little light upon the more fundamental aspects. In some cases, however, respondents may state their reasons for changing jobs in terms which suggest a shrewd appraisal of their position in society, and of the bearing of this upon their actions in regard to work—that is of the fundamental aspects to which attention is being directed here: thus, one youth remarked, "What's the use of work to people like me? We'll never get anywhere, but there's no point in sticking in one job all your life; you might as well have some variety."

It has been demonstrated that there is a considerable amount of job changing in the first five years of employment, and the suggestion here is that notwithstanding apparently valid and "sensible" immediate reasons for such changes, the nature of the changes can best be understood in terms of "drifting" in the face
of the socio/economic position which the particular occupations open to secondary modern school leavers imply. The young workers' appraisals of their position may be in terms of a comparison with the opportunities, life styles and life chances, open to others with superior education and superior level jobs: their drifting could then be viewed as representing discontent at their lot, and, possibly conscious or subconscious attempts to improve it: more usually, the perception of these respondents is not formulated in this way. Their attitudes to work and the drifting implicit in the attitudes represent, rather, a lack of involvement in work and in most facets of life in society in general. They drift because there is no special reason for not doing so.
CHAPTER XI

FUTURE JOBS—INTENTIONS, HOPES AND POSSIBILITIES

Experience gained from Research Interviews Nos. 2 and 3 indicated the unreliability of the stated intentions of some respondents in regard to their work plans. Thus, youths and girls who declared their anxiety and intention to change jobs as soon as possible remained in the same job for months or years, whether because of a change of circumstances at work, or inability or lack of will to find themselves alternative employment; whilst others who expressed their complete satisfaction with their jobs left, or were dismissed, within a week or so. This was less a matter of lack of rapport at the Interviews than of the tendency for respondents to make spur-of-the-moment decisions. And, in general, to talk about job plans in regard to many respondents is to imply a greater degree of forward thinking than in fact did characterise many of them. However, some respondents did have plans, and others had hopes and ambitions. A consideration of their job intentions for the future is of value, then, on two grounds. In the first place, it adumbrates possible
future developments in broad outline. And, in the second place, it is indicative of their present attitudes and orientations, and their perceptions of actual or possible opportunities.

The respondents' job intentions for the year or two following Research Interview No.4 are analysed in Table 7b.

**TABLE 7b**

**PLANS FOR THE FUTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Youths</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plans to stay in present job for 1+ years</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisages possibility of change, but plans to stay in same occupation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisages possibility of change of job and occupation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plans to change job and/or occupation in near future</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*18 were housewives and not working.

(The Postal Survey also showed a high proportion of respondents to be planning to change jobs, or considering doing so. Figures were as follows:— definitely plans to stay in present job for 1+ years, 162 youths and 143 girls; definitely plans to change job and/or occupation soon, 55 youths and 43 girls; envisages possibility of change of job and/or occupation soon, 18 youths and 32 girls; the total number of Postal Respondents being 235 youths and 208 girls).

It is seen, from Table 7b, that less than one half of the youths, but approaching two-thirds of the girls at work definitely planned to stay in their present occupations for a year or two—or, put another
way, they had no intention of changing jobs in the short run. As many as 14 youths—one sixth—definitely planned to change jobs and/or occupations soon, as did 10 girls. A further 33—well over one-third—and 15 girls—one-fifth of those at work—were undecided about remaining in their present jobs and/or occupations.

**TABLE 71**

**JOB PLANS AND LEVEL OF SKILL—YOUTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apprentices</th>
<th>Semi-Skilled</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Non-Manual</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plans to stay in present job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May change job: not occupation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May change job and/or occupation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to change job and/or occupation soon.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is seen that the possibility of changing jobs, or the definite intention to change, obtains in regard to youths of all levels of occupation. It is particularly noticeable that over half of the apprentices envisaged, or planned, a change of jobs—although they proposed to finish their apprenticeships first. As many as 8 apprentices thought that they might change their occupations as well as their jobs.
TABLE 72
JOB PLANS AND LEVEL OF OCCUPATION—GIRLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>'A'</th>
<th>'B'</th>
<th>'C'</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely plans to stay in present job.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May change job: not occupation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May change job and/or occupation.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to change job and/or occupation soon.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the youths, the definite intention to change jobs or the possibility of doing so is marked in all the girls' occupational categories. Of the 13 married girls who were at work, 6 definitely planned to change jobs soon, but the remaining 7 had no intention of leaving their present jobs for at least a year or two.

Respondents were also asked what job they expected to be doing in ten years time. From their answers it appeared that 51/86 youths expected to be in the same occupation, although some of them thought that they might have changed jobs, of course. The prospects of continued job changing over the next decade appeared very real to many youths, then. Only 6 girls of the total of 84 expected to be doing the same occupation—this was because those who were married expected to be housewives, as did those who were not yet married—or even engaged to be or going steady.¹

¹In the Postal Survey, 142/235 youths said they expected to be in the same occupation, but only 29/208 girls.
A detailed analysis of immediate job plans in terms of previous job history is given for youths in Table 73 and for girls in Table 74.

**Table 73**

**JOB PLANS AND JOB HISTORY—YOUTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definite plans to stay</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Definite plans to change</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In same job as when left school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In present job up to 1 year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has had 1 job since leaving school</th>
<th>Definite plans to stay</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Definite plans to change</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 job since leaving school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 jobs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 jobs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ jobs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 74**

**JOB PLANS AND JOB HISTORY—GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definite plans to stay</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Definite plans to change</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In same job as when left school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In present job up to 1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has had 1 job since leaving school</th>
<th>Definite plans to stay</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Definite plans to change</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 job since leaving school</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 jobs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 jobs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 jobs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is seen from the *Tables* that intended or possible movement was by no means confined to respondents with a previous history of job changing. There were cores of youths and girls who were in the same job as when they left school, and who proposed to continue in them for at least a year or two—11/24 youths and 12/21 girls who had had only one job since leaving school intended to stay in their jobs. But the other side of the picture is that 4/24 youths who had had only one job definitely intended to change soon, whilst the remaining 9 youths were uncertain. And although 1/21 girls who had one job definitely intended to change, 8 were undecided. There were, too, respondents who seemed to be settled, at least for the time being, after a succession of changes, or after recent changes. But there were also respondents who had been unsettled at work and who envisaged further changes. What is clear is that a good deal of job changing remains to be done, and that participants in this job changing are likely to be drawn from all levels of occupation and to include those who have been relatively stable previously as well as those who have a history of job changing.

Definitely plans to Stay in Same Job for Next Year or Two

Less than half of the youths (39/86) but approaching two-thirds

---

1 The Postal Survey showed a similar pattern: 73/103 youths who had had 1 job only since leaving school definitely intended to remain in their jobs at least for the next year or two, but 18 proposed soon to change and 12 were undecided. Of 58 girls with 1 job only since leaving school, 36 proposed to remain, 7 definitely intended to change and 19 were undecided.
of the girls at work (41/66) intended to remain in their jobs at least for the next year or so. It should be said that job intentions for girls were contingent upon the possibility of marriage and leaving employment in order to set up a home or start a family, although some girls who were engaged or married indicated that their intention of remaining in their jobs was related to their wish to save up, for marriage or for house purchase they had definite plans to remain at work for a year or more, that is.

The positive attractions of their jobs explained the wish of some respondents to remain in them. They did not envisage leaving because they were well satisfied with their jobs and considered that their employers were, if not very good, at least "as good as you are likely to get". Several of these respondents, indeed, had hopes of progressing to higher positions within their firms, as chargehands or foremen, for example—and several shorthand typists hoped to become secretaries. A sense of vocation was also revealed, in some cases, and notably by several of the nurses, so that one of them, for example, said, "Yes, I want to stay here and get as far ahead in my profession as I can." She thought that there was "definitely" scope for promotion—although "You need plenty of stamina". If not a housewife in 10 years time, she hoped that she would be a nursing sister. A married woman, too, was enthusiastic about her work as a senior sales assistant in a department store, and said, "I want to start a family, but not for about three years—I want to work my section up to a tip-top department." Work, for her, clearly had
positive attractions which complemented her involvement in her domestic duties as a wife. She had, indeed, given serious thought to changing her job on marriage even though she had been in it since leaving school. For factory work, as has been noted, has attractions for the married women—"I had thought of going into the works, inspecting small tools. It was more money, you only work mornings on Saturdays, and you finish at 4 o'clock in the week. But I decided I was better off in the long run where I am, with better prospects—and the conditions are better than in a factory." A further, long-term, attraction that she had taken into account was that her present firm "will have you back when you have had a family, if you're not too old". This careful thought, especially of the long-term issues, was untypical of girls, however—and scarcely more typical of youths. Some apprentices did recognise that there were long-term benefits in remaining with their present employers, however, and some saw excellent prospects of betterment in their status at work.

But other respondents who intended staying were less positively attracted to their particular jobs or employers. Thus a student nurse, who started on the course when she was seventeen years of age, pointed out that she could not change jobs for the next two years, much as she would like to do so, because her training would not finish until then.

And others who had become accustomed to their work could see no special advantages in leaving it—a youth said that he would "rather
stay in store-work now I'm used to it": why bother to change, when you know how to do a job, when it is not too demanding, and when there are plenty of worse ones and many no better? A painter/decorator had considered joining the Merchant Navy at one time, but took the view that since painting was the only job he knew properly, he "would always wind up in that work anyway"—so why move? The die was cast, as it were, and might as well be accepted. Some who had aspired to different occupations were now reconciled to the work which they had. So that a comptometer operator who referred to her lingering wish to be a hairdresser, recognised that it was "too late for this now". Although not really satisfied with the wage, she could see little point in leaving her present job and thereby "wasting" the training which she had undergone for it. There were signs, too, that respondents who had previously aimed at higher level jobs than they had were now reconciled to the fact that they were unlikely to do better by changing: low achievement in relation to their aspirations had over the course of their five years in employment, and despite some disappointment or bitterness in the early stages, resulted in lower aspirations—although, as has been already noted, some respondents retained original aspirations with a stubbornness in the face of their achievements thus far.

Another attitude prevalent amongst some respondents who did not propose to change their jobs was that life was a "chancey business anyhow", and that, this being so, it was best not to meddle or make plans. Some of them were likely to change jobs of course, if the mood took them, or if what they perceived as a good opportunity came along—if, that is, chances intervened.
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Girls in particular saw the next step for themselves as marriage, and thought that they might as well stay in their jobs until then—so that a seamstress proposed to "carry on until I get married". More particularly was this so with girls who were engaged and some others who were "going steady". Work for them had become essentially a vehicle for accumulating money for marriage and a house, and was tolerated, even, perhaps, looked on with positive pleasure, because it afforded the opportunity of making marriage financially possible. For many girls marriage was not far off—a year or two perhaps. 25/52 girls were engaged and another 8 were "going steady" (in the Postal Survey, 73 out of 142 unmarried girls were engaged, and 34 more were "going steady"). This factor is not unimportant for youths, furthermore. It has been noted that a few youths changed jobs on marriage or in anticipation of marriage—to make more money. Having changed, they proposed to remain in their new jobs because of the steadiness of their employment and because they considered their prospects to be good. They applied new criteria to their jobs, that is, criteria deriving from the expectation of assuming domestic responsibilities. 13 of the 75 unmarried youths were engaged, and another 9 were "going steady". (In the Postal Survey 66/205 unmarried youths were engaged and 62 were "going steady").

The intention of continuing in their jobs in order to save for a home was evident, too, in most of the married respondents. For example a factory worker, married, and with two children, said that she would stay in the present job and stop working "only when we have our own
house". And another married woman said that she would stop working at her job as a file-cutter only when "we have a good bank balance".

**Definitely Plan to Change Jobs Soon**

Fourteen youths and 10 girls intended to change their jobs—and in some cases their occupations, for example, on entering H.M. Forces—within the next year or two. Others, although determined to leave their present jobs, had not definitely decided (or in a few cases even thought about it) whether or not to remain in the same occupation. And some who intended to change proposed to remain in the same occupation, but to seek better conditions in regard to wages, hours, or prospects—or to obtain wider experience. The reasons for proposed job changing, and indeed, the factors weighing with the respondents who were undecided whether or not to change, were similar to those which were given by respondents to explain previous job moves—save that there was more emphasis, by girls especially but by youths, too, upon domestic considerations, actual or anticipated. But whilst some of the intended moves were planned in accordance with the criterion of settling down, others had reference to discontents at work or sheer boredom. And there was also a core of habitual or frequent job changers who envisaged further moves in the near future.

The wish to widen experiences and consolidate their skills was uppermost in the minds of several youths. A joiner intended, on completing his apprenticeship within the next year, to "move around
to other jobs—probably in shop-fitting" with the aim of broadening his experience. He "felt like a change after five years with the same firm": furthermore, he had a feeling that his training had not been as good as it might have been—mild resentment with his firm was thus mixed with the positive intention of making good his deficiencies by gaining experience elsewhere.

The wish for a higher wage was the decisive factor in other cases. An apprentice maintenance fitter proposed to change firms on completing his apprenticeship because "the management think that maintenance is just a necessary evil": as a consequence, they were reluctant to permit shift work for maintenance men, whereas "the job's only really valuable if you can work shifts". The wage for the basic week alone was not sufficient, in the respondent's view. An apprentice engineer also intended to change his job soon because he knew that he could command a higher salary elsewhere.

An apprentice electrician hoped to become a Sales Representative when he completed his apprenticeship, because of the better prospects which the occupation offered (he had been "more or less offered" a post). He intended to complete his apprenticeship as an "insurance" and a "stand-by". And a factory worker intended, on reaching the required age of twenty-one years, to become a long-distance lorry driver.

The importance of domestic considerations in job plans has already been discussed. As an example, one married girl wanted to move to a part-time job and also to find employment nearer home because of the
need to devote more time to housework. A newly married respondent proposed to continue for one year in her job as a warehouse packer, which she had held for four-and-a-half years, and then become a "full-time housewife". Dislike of present conditions weighed with some girls as well as with youths, however. A factory worker remarked indignantly that she did not want "to stay in this job for all my life" for "it plays havoc with your hands and nails, and the acid ruins your clothes". Health considerations were the decisive factor in the case of another factory worker: she would have liked to remain in her job, because of the high wage (over £10 net)—but "health comes first", and her doctor had said that she should definitely change her job within six months. One girl who expected a baby in January proposed to stop work in November. And another married girl, who had worked part-time for the previous year, intended to stop working in September, by which time she hoped that the family finances would, through her efforts, have "got straightened out a little".

A few girls intended to change jobs because of the chance of a "better position"—thus a girl with experience in a wall-paper shop followed by two-and-a-half years in a clerical job had strong hopes of being appointed, through the help of a friend, to the post of sales assistant in a city-centre departmental stores. And another girl, after five years as a secretary, felt the vocation to become a domestic science teacher, and was in process of taking City and Guilds examinations in cookery with a view to gaining admission to a College of Education Course. One girl, from a middle class home, was about
to go overseas for a few months to teach English to the children of a friend of her father's (she had previously had a responsible clerical/administrative job). She took the view that she had reached the age when she should be more adventurous—and she wanted to avoid "getting into a rut," like most of her contemporaries had done, in her estimation. She said, "It would do me good to leave home and stand on my own feet". She did not want to marry and have children yet awhile—there was too much to life that she wanted to explore before becoming "tied down".

Envisage Possibility of Change of Job and/or Occupation Within the Next Year or Two

Thirty-three youths and 15 girls were in this category. Their reasons for considering a change of jobs were varied, but included those just referred to with reference to respondents who had definitely decided to leave their present jobs. A milling machine operator said that he was "not planning to stay in this job for long"—if he could get a job offering more money he would change (his present job gave him above average take-home pay for his age, at £12). He had no particular occupation in mind—indeed, although he had applied for two jobs in the previous year or so, he could not remember precisely what the occupations were: occupation was of less importance to him than size of wage. His decision was dependent upon finding another job that was superior on this criterion.
Other respondents were more circumspect. An apprentice draughtsman, for example, said that he would like to stay with his present firm, for several reasons: it was a small company, which he liked; the people there were "a decent lot"; and it was a secure job. But he was tempted to move because the wage was low—only £7 net compared with the "standard rate" of £8 net elsewhere. He was weighing the position carefully. So, too, but according to different criteria, was an apprentice builder. He definitely wanted to stay in the same trade, but thought that a change of firm might be a good thing, because he would learn new methods. One apprentice engineer was keen to "take up cartoon drawing", but hesitated because of the uncertainty of such a career, and because it "would mean chucking up the apprenticeship, and starting all over again": he was very much tempted. Other respondents, as has been indicated above, retained long cherished hopes. A girl who, after becoming a waitress on leaving school had had three factory jobs subsequently, had still not abandoned the hope of "getting a job in an office". She recognised the difficulty of breaking into such work at the age of twenty, but had attended evening classes in shorthand and typing over the years and made several attempts at the examination. She was optimistic and saw the possibility of succeeding in her ambition, soon.

A substantial number of these respondents spoke of there being "nothing definite" so far as changing jobs was concerned, but said that the idea was "always in the back of their minds". A labourer in his sixth job, for example, whilst currently not planning a change of jobs, had thought of applying to join the Merchant Navy (for "money, travel") and the Fire Service (for "money, pension") during the
previous year, and had gone so far as to get the application forms.

The approach of some respondents was that they would "stick their present jobs out for the time being, unless something else crops up." Boredom was an important factor. A labourer, in his third job, said that when he was bored at work, a not unusual condition, he thought about changing jobs—"just any other job would do, any occupation". With regard to his present job, overall he "neither likes nor dislikes it"—it "just goes". He would seek and expect no more from his next job, but it would be "a change".

Expectations in Regard to Jobs in 10 Years Time

There was some scepticism about thinking ahead that far, on several grounds. The world situation was mentioned by several respondents—"I don't look to ten years time: one never knows what might happen with these new bombs and rockets"; the general "chanciness" of life was referred to, also; and respondents who had had several jobs already were, whether worriedly, smilingly or simply in a matter-of-fact-way disinclined to be held to prophesies on such doubtful matters. Nonetheless, the question did have meaning, and the responses suggest various conclusions, or, at least, inspire several hypotheses.

There was a distinct difference as between youths and girls, as has already been noted, in respect to expectations in regard to occupation ten years hence. 51/86 youths expected to be in the
same occupation that they were in at Research No.4 ten years later—that is, when they would have reached the age of thirty years, (142/235) in the Postal Survey). But only 6/84 girls expected to be in the same occupation (29/208 in the Postal Survey). The explanation, of course, is that the girls expected, or at least hoped, to be housewives by then—the few exceptions who did not, at this stage, envisage marriage did not propose to have children, or they intended to continue in employment or resume it soon after having children.

Most of the youths who thought that they would change occupations, or who definitely intended to do so, during the ensuing ten years expected to stay at the same level of occupation (exceptions will be discussed below). Some of the youths who intended to remain in the same occupation nonetheless envisaged the possibility, or the likelihood, of a change of job during the ten years period. A high proportion of the apprentices (21/29) and 4 of the 5 non-manual workers expected to be in the same occupations compared with only 24/40 semi-skilled workers and as few as 2/12 unskilled workers.

Changes of occupation were accepted by some respondents as a normal feature of the work situation—we have seen that there was a substantial amount of occupation changing during the first five

---

1Half of the youths in Willmott's East London study said that they "expected to be doing the same kind of work" in ten years time—and that they would "choose" to be doing so. cf. Adolescent Boys of East London, op.cit., p.108
years at work. So that a milling machine operator, for example, said that he had "no idea" what he would be doing in ten years time, but that he would be surprised if he were in the same occupation—after all, he had already had three occupations, and he was not entirely satisfied with his present job. It seemed quite likely to him that he would change jobs again, and in doing so that he might well change occupations. There were, too, several respondents who felt that they had assumed the role of drifters—and that it was inevitable that they would continue to change jobs: a 'bus conductor accordingly explained, with genuine unknowingness, "I can't say, really". With others, the emphasis was upon the precariousness of working class life—with unemployment, dismissal or redundancy always a possibility: some respondents had suffered these already, as we have seen. When questioned about the meaning of the term "redundancy" (as part of an attempt to assess general knowledge about factors affecting the overall economic/employment scene) almost one-quarter of the youths (21/86) had a good understanding of what the term involved and implied. Whilst most of the respondents did not expect to be affected by redundancy—because they were in occupations that were less likely to be affected by automation, for example, or because they simply did not relate the possibility to themselves—a few saw redundancy as a likelihood. A steelworker, for example, argued that "chemicals will soon replace steel in building construction, and the iron and steel industry will rapidly decline." There was every likelihood, in his view, that he would
have to find another occupation within ten years. A machine grinder was of the same view, saying, "I expect automation will step in, and that will be the end of the job—it's happening already in some places." Even a butcher argued that his occupation in ten years time "depended on the meat trade," since "it might be all frozen by then." The possibility was, that is, that the "pre-pack supermarkets" would take over.

The expectation of a change in occupation during the course of the next ten years was of a more positive order in regard to certain respondents, who were ambitious to "get on" by changing to a different sort of work, by progressing to a higher position in their present occupation, or one associated with it, or by "running" their own businesses. 6 youths aspired to rise to a higher level through a change of occupation. An apprentice engineer hoped to become a "high level" draughtsman: to underline his ambition, he said that he certainly wouldn't be doing the work he was at present employed in—he was "determined to do better than that". A laboratory assistant, whilst not sure precisely what occupation to aim at, confided, "I've got ideas—I hope to do research. I'm studying for G.C.E. and that". A draughtsman said that he hoped to be "in an executive position", and a steelworker said that he intended to take a management course and hoped to be an assistant manager in ten years time. A driver with an engineering firm hoped to be taken into the management of a small firm owned by a cousin. Finally, a woodwork machinist said that he hoped to be a school teacher,
a manager or a representative, and remarked, "you won't find me on the shop floor then". He had definite plans to achieve his aim, including the intention of spending several years abroad, to improve upon his qualifications and broaden his experience.

Nine youths hoped to progress to a higher ranking position within the firms for which they at present worked, and thought that they had a realistic chance of accomplishing this during the course of the next ten years. An apprentice draughtsman hoped to be transferred to the design staff. A plasterer hoped that his cousin, a Director of the firm for which he worked, would promote him to managerial level. A driver salesman, successfully thrustful in his job, aspired to become transport manager for the firm. And an apprentice motor mechanic said that if, as he expected, he passed his examinations, he would "go for" a job as insurance assessor in four or five years time. A car salesman hoped, in ten years, to be "with the same firm, but higher up". And a valuer's assistant saw the possibility of a junior partnership in the estate agents' firm for which he worked. A policeman thought that his chances of promotion were good—he was enthusiastic about his prospects, saying, "The job doesn't let you get into a rut, and the pension at the end is terrific (two-thirds of your pay). I might possibly transfer to a bigger and better force, a force where there are better facilities for promotion, and with a better name. I might try the Metropolitan Police—they pay more, but the cost of living is higher in London. It's an easier life, though—the City (of London) police are the
élite—but it's dead difficult to get in." An N.C.O. in the Army
said that he hoped to extend his engagement and "obtain as high a
rank as possible". Finally, a clerk in the G.P.O. (he had previously
been a messenger boy and then a postman) said that he wanted to "go
as far as possible in the Post Office". He recognised that "it takes
time", because seniority and long service seem to be the main aids
to progress up a very fixed scale. But he had already made some
progress, felt that he was well launched, and was optimistic about
the next ten years.

The 15 youths who aspired to substantial promotion, either within
their present firms or by a change of occupation, had certain charac-
teristics in common. Six of them were from middle class families—
their ambitions to progress at work were induced and supported by
their parents, who had been, or were likely to be in at least three
cases, instrumental in securing for their sons the jobs to which
they aspired, or something approximating to them. All of the re-
main ing 9 youths were from small families (none had more than one
sibling, and 4 were only children)—their homes could be described
as "working class aspirant". Furthermore, 3 of them had been helped
in finding the jobs in which they hoped for advancement by parents
or other relations. Several of them had girl friends from middle
class or aspiring working class backgrounds who consolidated the
pressure on them to "get on". None of these respondents were lower
than Intelligence Grade II. All of them, it would seem, had a
reasonable chance of attaining their ambition, whether through hard
work, family encouragement and "influence", or a combination of these.

There were three "special cases" of respondents planning to change occupations which, incidentally to their motivations, could result in upward mobility. A wine cellarman, tired of the meaningless routine and lack of prospects for training in his job, sought a purpose in life and was attracted to social work: he hoped, not very realistically, to be accepted for a training course. A girl who had entered nursing after serving five years as a hairdressing apprentice, said that she would like to do something "in the missionary field". And a recent convert to the Plymouth Brethren, a factory girl, said that if Jesus had not returned to earth in ten years time she would expect to be a Bible instructor. She was saving with the intention of taking a College course towards this end.

Eight youths aspired to have their own businesses in ten years time—most in the same occupations, the two main exceptions being labourers who hoped to start window cleaning businesses. A farm worker said that he thought that there was a chance that he would have his own small farm, and two builders hoped to have their own business (one of them looked forward to "going to work in a suit and really getting somewhere"). A butcher said that he might, "with a bit of luck", have his own business. And an apprentice joiner said, "I don't want to stop here. I hope by the time I am twenty-seven to be qualified and to enter a profession such as designing, estimating and building: if I've got enough capital I'll be running
my own business. The youth was working hard and enthusiastically at further education courses. Finally, a motor mechanic said that he hoped, with a friend, to be joint owner of a garage by the time he was thirty. He was saving £2.10s a week towards this end—he said that he occasionally broke into his savings, but didn't like doing so. His friend and he had formulated plans—because there were "too many garages in Sheffield", they intended to look for a site in the countryside, "somewhere small, that is obviously growing".

The chance of more than two or three of these respondents succeeding in their ambition of owning their own business would seem to be slight. The general situation in industrial societies is unfavourable to the establishment of small businesses,¹ and there is a high failure rate amongst such small businesses as are established. The fact was recognised by one respondent at least—a painter/decorator who said, "You could end up running your own business, but this is more difficult nowadays because the large concerns are taking over. Many little businesses go bankrupt now, so I think my best chance is to notch up a responsible position in a large firm, rather

¹cf. J. Goldthorpe, "Social Stratification in Industrial Societies", op. cit.
than try to launch out by myself in a small firm." (Painting/decorating is an occupation in which young people are tempted to set up on their own—thinking that all they need, to do so, are a few ladders and brushes). The difficulty in accumulating sufficient capital is particularly acute in the working class—all of the youths, except the agricultural worker, were from such homes. (One of the labourers who hoped to have his own window cleaning business was basing his plans upon the accident compensation which he was due to collect at the age of twenty-one, as a result of breaking a leg whilst at work some years earlier). Another factor which probably accounts for the lack of success in starting up business, and for the high failure rate if set up, is that respondents tended to assume that, even if capital was hard to accumulate, that was all that was necessary—indeed, it was in large measure as a consequence of their lack of success at work, in several cases, that they aspired to own their business. They tended not to realise, that is, that business competence, technical skill and capital were necessary.

This strength of the desire to have their own business resulted in part from the positive wish to be their "own boss". It was, too, in large measure a response to the wish to escape from the occupational level at which they recognised they were in danger of being fixed. They turned to the possibility of having their own business when they realised that all other routes, depending as they seemed to do
upon qualifications and/or "influence", were closed to them.¹

Most respondents did not envisage the possibility of rising substantially in the occupational scale, whether through promotion, a change of occupation, or through starting their own business. The contrast was made, by several youths, between the situation which they believed to have existed in the past, in this respect, and the situation that obtained nowadays. A 'bus conductor, for example, pointed out that the Transport Manager had once been a tram driver, and said that "you wouldn't stand an earthly chance today" of rising in this way. Indeed, he realised that even in the past it required a person of exceptional ability to "get right to the top" in such manner: and only a few, indeed, could hope even to move a short distance up the city transport hierarchy—for "there are old conductors still working on the Transport who have been there since the tram days". (He said that young workers "don't stick it out for long on the 'buses now"—he proposed to change jobs himself, soon). A labourer, too, referred to a "high up" in the City Engineer's Department who had "started right from the bottom": he argued that

¹On the basis of the 1949-50 Oakland Labour Mobility study of the University of California, Berkley, California, Lipset and Malm found that "movement into higher echelon positions (executive and upper white collar) within the bureaucracy of industry is related to having started in non-manual positions (either lower white collar or semi-professional), while movement into self-employment tends to be the predominant pattern of upwardly mobile men who began in sales or manual work", cf. Seymour Martin Lipset and F. Theodore Malm, "First Jobs and Career Patterns", American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol.14, p.252.
it is not possible to do that nowadays, because "you need to go to College, and that". There was recognition that promotion beyond foreman and chargehand level, in large firms, especially, is more and more dependent upon paper qualifications.\footnote{cf. D.J. Lee, "A study of Apprentice Training", Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Birmingham University, quoted in Ethel Venables, \textit{The Young Worker at College}, \textit{op.cit.}, pp.92-99.} Apprentices and others who were attending further education classes were, with only one or two exceptions, concerned to consolidate their position as skilled men, rather than to lay the foundations for further study— they had deferred other satisfactions in the pursuit of qualifications for long enough, they felt. And most respondents, of course, did not pursue further education and had no hopes of obtaining qualifications. Respondents saw themselves as being out of the hunt as far as the top level jobs were concerned—as a cutlery worker said, "foreman is about as far as I could get", and a factory labourer said, "I can't get any higher—I would have had to have started in the office". For workers in large firms, particularly, the distinction between staff and shop floor workers was obvious enough, indeed. As a steel-works apprentice said, "The top position for people such as myself is foreman. Managers and people like that work up from the office side—they are different from us." The staff are, of course, different in dress, appearance, bearing and behaviour. Respondents
were inclined to put it down to "brains", "influence" or, in some cases, "breeding"—"some men are made to be gaffers, some are made to be workers": it was as simple as that. A cutlery worker put the same point in a matter-of-fact way, saying "there is not a top for people such as me to get to—the manager and under-manager are both gentlemen". One apprentice referred to a difference in orientation between ordinary workers and managers, remarking that "oddly enough skilled men never seem to get the top jobs—what counts is your attitude to work, how you think and set about things." His words expressed an idea implicit in the comments of many others. So far from encouraging aspirations to a higher level job, often work situations, by emphasising the differences between shop floor and management, stressed the obstacles to promotion. There were some respondents who at one time had had vague dreams of a major change of fortunes—their experience at work had suggested avenues not previously perceived. A motor mechanic, for example, had thought of trying to become a car salesman. But the ambition had passed: he recognised that it was not just technical know-how that was required for such a job, but also special skills in dress, general appearance and speech: and he knew that he did not possess such skills, and was unlikely to be able to acquire them—as he said, "I'm not really cut out for that sort of work, am I?"

Just as the home and neighbourhood background were such as to encourage aspirations to progress at work in some respondents, so too did they operate against their formulation in others. The idea
of "going to work in a suit", for example, was a matter for ridicule rather than congratulation: at the least, it was not the normal thing for a man to do.

The alternative to qualifications were seen to be wealth and/or influence—and these paths, too, were closed to the respondents. One youth put the matter starkly, by saying that "the only way up would be to shoot the gaffers". An alternative, which respondents did not see as applying to them or likely to do so, was "to be on good terms with the bosses" and "to know the right people". As one youth said, "what you need is relations at the top"—and an apprentice engineer commented, "I agree with what the foreman once said to me, 'unless you're in at the beginning, know all the big wigs, and your father knows them personally, you don't stand a chance'." This view was strongly held by many respondents—there was no chance of a "break-through" to the top jobs unless you had influence: and you have, as one youth put it, to be a "greaser".

Some youths, as has been indicated, did hope for modest promotion, for example to foreman or chargehand level. They knew it to be possible—and apprentice machinist, for example, said that his uncle started at the same firm as an apprentice and had recently been appointed foreman; the respondent had hopes of emulating him. A plasterer, too, said that some foremen in his trade were very young—only twenty-five or so—and he therefore held his own chances to be good. A builder/property repairer said, "I'm nearly there myself—the gaffer's opening another site and says he'll
perhaps put me in charge of it." And a joiner said, "promotion in this job is only a matter of time". A girl, too, a senior sales assistant, observed, "I always said you couldn't get to the top. I thought I would never stand a chance. Then this job was sprung on me, which is as high as you can get at my age." In fact, 3 youths already held positions of responsibility at work as chargehands or foremen, and one as manager of a butchers' shop. Whilst 7 girls had special responsibilities—chargehands in warehouse work, supervisors in shops, or secretaries in offices.

Some other respondents saw the possibility of limited promotion, provided certain conditions were fulfilled: "if you have someone pushing you all the time", for example, or "if you are prepared to work hard". A steel-works apprentice said, "I could get promotion if I did a lot more work, but I don't want to". Another possibility was to "crawl" and "creep" to the bosses—but respondents tended not to relish this route to the top, either. The only other possibility was luck—as one youth put it, "it's mainly through luck, such as someone leaving at the right time". So that even limited promotion seemed out of reach. There was, indeed, some pessimism on this score, a feeling of the futility of it all—"you don't stand a chance".

Older workers, too, were seen as stumbling blocks to promotion—an apprentice engineer said, "you have to wait for all the old ones to die off", and a rolling-mill worker said, "you have to wait until you are about sixty in this job—you don't get a move up until you are ready to drop".
Whilst some youths retained ambitions to make a major move up the occupational scale, and others saw the possibility of some modest promotion, well over one-half of them were of the view that they, at the age of twenty, would reach the highest level that they were likely to reach: save that the apprentices, of course, would be recognised as fully skilled men on completing five years of apprenticeship at the age of twenty-one, and some other youths expected, at that age, to receive small increments of wages on going onto the "full man's rate". Some saw themselves as being at a dead-end: but most merely accepted the position as a fact of life—what could be done about it, after all? Most of those who saw the possibility of modest promotion were not personally interested in it, not wishing to "bother"—that is, to interfere, to however small an extent, in their own routine, and not being sufficiently interested in work to undertake responsibility. They were satisfied as they were—"taking the rough with the smooth". A property repairer said, "the job's not so bad": in any case all one can do is "plod on".

**Girls**

It has been noted that all save 6 girls expected to be housewives in ten years time. Of the 31 married girls, 18 had already stopped work; these and the 13 who were still working expected to be looking after children—some had plans for starting a family at a given time, others assumed that the probability was that by that time they would
have children. As one said, "I hope not to be working—I would be very happy as a mother and housewife". The possibility that they would have returned to work in ten years time, after bearing children, had occurred to a few of these married respondents, and some indicated their intention of returning to work when the children were old enough to be left. But the whole business was hypothetical, and these girls saw their primary functions in ten years time as being those of wife and mother, rather than worker. Those who envisaged a return to work mostly referred to the likely need for extra money for domestic expenditure. But a few mentioned companionship at work, and the possible boredom of housework ("you sometimes get a bit fed up with being a housewife and want to be out and doing things"). Two girls—a nurse and a secretary—referred to the intrinsic interest of their work and said that they would like to return to it because they enjoyed doing it.

The engaged girls all expected to be married and looking after children in ten years time, as did those who were "going steady" and, indeed, those without regular boy friends. As one of the latter said, "I hope I'm not working in ten years time. I hope I'll be looking after a husband!" Several of the engaged girls had clear plans for the future in respect of stopping work—they proposed, for example, to marry in two years, stop work a year after that, and then start a family: the precise number of children hoped for was stated by some of these girls, who had obviously spent time considering their future as wives and mothers.
Whether or not a return to work after bearing children is envisaged, the bulk of the girls obviously in no way regarded looking after the home, husband and children as demeaning; on the contrary, at the age of twenty, they looked forward to it. Some married girls, it is true, were already weighed down with work and responsibilities, and resigned to a struggle. The main point here, however, is that there was no wish to compete with men at work—no perception of a woman's right to go out to work, and to assume independence from her husband. In this, as in many other aspects, the respondents persisted in the traditional attitudes which their parents held.

Although they expected not to be at work in ten years time, many girls did expect to remain in employment for at least two or three more years. There were one or two girls with ambitions to rise significantly in the occupational scale—these have been referred to already. But most either expected no promotion at all—and most of these did not seek it—or saw the possibility of only very modest promotion. For girls, especially, it was argued, "there is not much of a top to get to"—the highest position a girl can get to is first hand, but a boy can become a manager", one shop assistant said. With most girls this was not a matter for complaint—after all, work was properly a man's world, primarily. But there were some girls who would have liked promotion and who were grieved at the obstacles to it—they had spent five years in employment and expected to spend several more years, so that it was galling,
for the ambitious ones, to make little progress, and to be doing much the same work as they did when they first left school. A shorthand typist, for example, said that "age is a barrier"—the better posts go to old and middle-aged women—not necessarily because their ability or knowledge better fitted them for the work but because employers knew them to be more stable, in the sense that they would not be wanting to leave the job, or take time off to have babies or look after the home. The aggrieved girls, not expecting babies, and perhaps not even courting, did not see the position in the same light as the employers, of course. Thus a progress clerk complained, "I've been there five years, but older people who started later have been pushed up before us younger ones, although they know less. It's age that counts. I've got more experience, but they say I can't tell a forty-year-old what to do. I should be able to—it's not fair. It should go on the length of time you've been there."

Her views were echoed by a warehouse worker who also had been in her job since leaving school. She said, "the attitude is that a young person doesn't have the ability and cannot take the same responsibilities as an older woman. I don't agree with this—I feel that young people are equally capable and that they also have more modern ideas". The latter theme was taken up by several other girls. A comptometer operator said, "you might get to the top after years and years, but really it's a matter of waiting for dead men's shoes. You should be able to get to the top if you've the right
temperament. The more young people at the top, the better—you need new and younger ideas. Ideas count, not experience, in this sort of work, at least. "The point is," a factory girl said, "that you need younger people as bosses, because the older ones get stale in their ideas after a while."

It was noted above that the reaction of some youths to the possibility of promotion was one of scorn—they did not want it, had no wish, as it were, to enter further into the enemy's camp than need be. With some girls, the same outlook was evident, and with factory and warehouse girls this took the form of expressions of solidarity. The importance for girls of companionship at work has already been discussed—the repudiation of promotion was one further aspect of this, as well as representing a recognition of the interests of workers as opposed to that of employers, an opposition which would be compromised by assuming a managerial role, however slight. Thus a bottle labourer said that there were few opportunities for promotion, and that, in any case, "no one wants promotion"—"we're all satisfied as we are". A factory girl said that "really everyone's on the same level, more or less, and that's the way we like it—there are enough bosses without having your own friends bossing you". A warehouse packer recognised and accepted the "needs" of the organisation, saying that "everyone here is on the same level. Competition to be promoted to a higher level would upset the factory system, especially amongst the cutlery packers." She added that the absence of competition made for a "pleasant atmosphere at work amongst the girls."
It remains to stress that with girls to an even greater extent than with youths, the prospects of promotion were not a live issue. They had thought little about the matter. As one girl said, "After I've left work, that's it—I don't let it worry me". She meant that she recognised that she had to work, to make a living, and that she was unable to command a post that would be intrinsically interesting: these were facts of life, as was the small likelihood of even modest promotion. She accepted the position, did not "fret herself over it" but made the best of it, tried to enjoy herself in leisure time, and looked forward to the time, not far hence she hoped, when she could find satisfaction in her work as a wife and mother.

Attachment to Sheffield

Some of the respondents had already left Sheffield, to live elsewhere—because their parents moved, in order to take employment, or to join a wife or husband. (Several of the original respondents could not be traced because they had left Sheffield, furthermore). Most of the remaining respondents had not previously given thought to the possibility of leaving Sheffield—the exceptions will be discussed below. When asked whether they would move, these respondents indicated unwillingness to do so. It was clear that they would be reluctant to leave Sheffield even if they were faced with unemployment—and even if the job prospects offered elsewhere were superior to those in their present employment. A 'bus conductor,
for example, said that he would leave "only as a last ditch remedy". And an apprentice carpenter said that rather than leave Sheffield if he became unemployed, he would "chuck in" his apprenticeship and go labouring. Girls were of the same view—one said that if she became unemployed she would bring forward her marriage rather than leave Sheffield, and another said that she would "live off" her parents.

The attachment to Sheffield was clearly very strong in many cases. And reluctance to leave was associated, too, with worry about the unfamiliar—an apprentice joiner, for example, said, "you might be better paid in London, but there's no one I know there, and I just don't know my way about". Involvement with friends, and the welcome familiarity of the neighbourhood and associations with the football teams were also important factors which respondents saw as binding them to Sheffield. Relations, of course, were important, especially in the case of married couples, who were double-anchored, as it were. For even those who sought to "improve" their social status compared with their parents tended to value and maintain connections with them—although there were, as will be seen, some young couples who had broken away from their parents. Those with fiancés or steady boy or girl friends felt bound to Sheffield because of this connection, too. A few girls did envisage leaving Sheffield if their husbands or fiancés did so—and it was presumed that this would be for reasons connected with work. Possibly more respondents would be receptive to the idea of leaving Sheffield in five or ten years time, when,
with young families, housing and, perhaps, financial troubles might cause them to look further afield. But at the age of twenty, their orientation was shaped within Sheffield and as one youth said, "after twenty years of it, I can't see any point in leaving".

By contrast, a very few respondents said that they were keen to leave Sheffield, and some had plans to do so. As a factory girl in her fourth job said, "it's not exactly sparkling"—certainly this would scarcely be the appropriate word to describe the physical characteristics of the housing estate where she resided. A comptometer operator said that she would move out of Sheffield at the first possible opportunity, because it was too dirty: and she had discussed with her boy friend the possibility of him getting a job, as a lorry driver, in the south of England. A married youth, living in what he called a "hovel," and with a low wage, said that he would "move heaven and earth to get out of this place" (his house)—and if that meant leaving Sheffield, "so what!" One or two respondents had thought rather vaguely about moving to the supposedly more pleasant south of England—its attractions were "better weather" and a "higher standard of living".

There were, too, several girls—six in all—who said that they would like to leave Sheffield for a short while—a few months, or a year or two. They "felt like a change" and thought it would make a break before returning to Sheffield, marrying, and settling down. One girl in her fifth job—all of them factory worker or shop
assistant—said that she would "like to get away for a while", but that "it is a difficult thing to do, to leave friends and a home". A girl friend of hers was in the Army, and the respondent sometimes thought of joining up. A student nurse, who had previously worked as a sales assistant and, for a while, as an au pair girl in France, said that she would like to work with children, preferably abroad—she wanted "to see what's happening in other parts of the world". And a shop assistant said that she would like to go away—a friend of hers worked for six months in Jersey as a cashier in the summer and returned to Sheffield for the winter months. But none of these girls had in mind the possibility of a permanent move away from Sheffield.

Eleven youths and 9 girls thought that there were better opportunities in their occupations in other parts of the country, but only 3 of these, all youths, seriously contemplated moving to take advantage of these. One was an apprentice lithographer: very keen on his work, he had been unable to continue further education in Sheffield because there were no qualified instructors. He had very much in mind the possibility of moving to a place where he would have more scope—especially of a technical order—in his work. In Sheffield, his work was largely a matter of "turning out football programmes"—a routine job that he despised. A Post Office clerk was soon to move to Lincoln, on promotion. He said that he did not "in the least" mind leaving Sheffield, because he knew that his career prospects were enhanced by his being prepared to move, and because it would give him more independence from home (an only child,
he had been rather sheltered by his parents). The final case is of a milling-machine operator, in his second job, who said that he would leave Sheffield if he had the opportunity of work with more pay and greater interest. He had thought of going to London; but his father was against the idea, so he changed his mind. But he still "fancied going around the country a bit."

**Emigration**

Two youths had definite plans to emigrate in the near future. A joiner said that he wanted to "escape" from England—"get out of it as soon as possible, because the overcrowding is chronic". The "overcrowding" which he had in mind was in his home—a small council house, with two adults and 3 children, of whom he was the eldest—and in Britain as a country: he thought that there were too many people competing for the "decent" jobs. He planned to go to Australia, hoping to become a salesman, when he was twenty-one years of age. The second youth was an engineering worker, in his fourth job. He was to be made redundant in three weeks time. He hoped to continue in an apprenticeship until he had served his time and then proposed to emigrate to Canada: this youth was married, but had no children. His concern was to find security.
In addition, two youths were seriously considering emigrating: one, an apprentice bricklayer, said that he would be keen to go to Australia if he could find a friend to accompany him. He said that there would be "plenty of scope for a skilled tradesman"—he had looked at advertisements about emigration in the newspapers. He thought that there were "more opportunities for getting on than there will ever be for such as me in England". The other youth was an apprentice joiner. Keen on his work, he had attended further education classes regularly since leaving school. He argued that the more one moves about, the more opportunities arise. Accordingly, he thought that when he was qualified (that is, when he had completed his apprenticeship and passed the related examinations) he might well emigrate to New Zealand or to Canada: the latter, he explained, is "coming into its own now".

A fifth respondent, a wood machinist who said that he was "really keen to get on" planned to spend two years in Canada followed by two years in Australia. This was in order to get as much experience as he could, in pursuance of his ambition to achieve a higher occupational level on his return to England. He had in mind teaching or management. This youth saw geographical mobility as the way out of his present occupational level—he was keen not just on upward social mobility, but also enthusiastic to find more satisfying work. The jobs which he aimed at were not regarded by him merely as being instrumental to a higher social position or a better standard of living. He was optimistic, and proposed to work hard, remarking,
"the opportunities are there—everywhere: it's up to me to get out and find them".

Three other respondents had considered emigration but rejected the idea—in most cases reluctantly. In each case, the fiancées had refused to leave Sheffield because they would not part from their parents—one of the girls concerned was an only child. An apprentice fitter said that his girl friend wanted them to emigrate to Australia, but that he wouldn't go, for family reasons. And a girl respondent said that her husband wanted to emigrate to Australia but that she refused because of her wish to remain near her family, and because she thought it would be too hot.

The importance of the family, and especially of wives, fiancées and girl friends in making decisions about emigration is obvious from the above account. Are there any further characteristics of those who propose to emigrate? A more detailed analysis was made of the two respondents who had definite plans to emigrate, the two who were seriously considering it, and the one who proposed to spend at least four years overseas. This showed that the one respondent who was married was supported by his wife in the proposal to consider emigration: they had no children, but did have a housing problem. The other 4 respondents were neither engaged nor "going steady". All 5 were from families in which there were 2-3 children: 4 were the eldest children in their families and one was the second child. All were from working class backgrounds (the fathers* of two were skilled, two were semi-skilled and one was unskilled) and they thought of themselves as working class—two of them said that
they would like to rise in the social scale, however. So far as voting was concerned, one said that he would not vote, one supported the Liberal Party and the other three supported the Labour Party. They were earning average or above average wages at the time of Interview No. 4—4 received £10-12 a week gross and 1 received £13-14. It has been noted that 2 were apprentices: one of these was of I.Q. Grade I and the other of I.Q. Grade 3—and all three of the semi-skilled workers were of I.Q. Grade 3. This suggests the possibility that, in four cases, ability did not match aspirations—and the respondents may have attributed their failure to get on in Britain to the conditions in the country rather than to themselves.

Numbers are very small, of course, but a few tentative conclusions are possible. Firstly, these respondents were free from romantic ties with girls save in the one case in which the wife was disposed to accede to the husband's intention of exploring the possibility of emigration. Secondly, none of them were only children—and 4 were the eldest in the family: it was possible for them to leave home but feel that parents were not left alone or lonely, that the family would continue. This undoubtedly weighed in the decision of at least two of the respondents. Additionally, in the case of one youth and of the married couple, the desire to escape from overcrowded home circumstances was important.

Important, too, in two cases at least, was the concern to improve career prospects and to rise in the social scale. Emigration was seen as a vehicle toward that end. With regard to the other three
respondents there was less emphasis upon a marked rise in socio-economic level, and more upon the concern for security, combined perhaps with a modest rise in the occupational level.

**Vertical Occupational Mobility**

The home and general social background and the school influence in varied ways (which have been discussed above) the level of employment entered by school leavers. There is evidence that these influences continue to have a bearing upon subsequent job history—this was the conclusion that Lipset and Malm came to in their Oakland Mobility study: they write that "if we study the relation between the first job and present job for men 31 years of age or older, it is clear that the two factors which affect first job placement (education and father's occupation) continue to exert influence throughout the career. That is, men whose fathers had high occupational status or received a good education are more likely to move up, and less likely to move down than are men who did not receive as good an education, or came from a working class family."¹

The level and type of work entered also affect subsequent occupational and social mobility in a quasi-independent way, however,

---

¹"First Jobs and Career Patterns", op.cit., p.260
by suggesting new horizons or by further restricting old ones.¹ For example, a motor mechanic may perceive, through observation at work, the possibility of becoming a car salesman, or a girl clerk may become motivated to aim at work as a secretary.² The experience of work may also make respondents more aware of the nature of power in industry, and this may result in some cases in aspirations to attain positions of power by seeking promotion or by starting a business of their own. Furthermore, association with peers from a different style of life may prompt job changes towards this end. The above discussion has indicated ways in which such influences have played upon respondents and led to changes.

¹ In a study in Sheffield, Kemeryn found that clerical youths were less certain than professional trainees as to the existence of social mobility, and one conclusion to be inferred is that this reflects not just family and social origin, but attitudes to work and perceptions of opportunity induced by the experience of work. In clerical work, generally, there was little expectation of significant upward moves, occupationally or socially, and this ethos rubbed off onto the individuals entering such employment. Cf. P.J. Kemery, "The Secondary Technical School Leaver: Attitudes to Work and its Correlates." Unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of Sheffield, 1966.

² Boulit, in a study of social mobility in Stockholm, refers to the greater "visibility" in regard to choice of occupation in urban as compared with rural settings. The argument here is that the experience of work may itself increase visibility—although it may reduce the expectation of upward mobility also.
in their plans and motivations in regard to work. But the con-
verse also obtains in regard to the above possibilities. Work
may narrow horizons, curtail aspirations by high-lighting the
barriers between manual and non-manual employment, for example,
and by immersing young people in a labour force which is cynical
or uninterested about promotion, whether of a major or a modest
order. The above analysis has suggested the power of such in-
fluences towards occupational and social immobility.

The opportunities for upward mobility for the respondents in the
present study have been indicated as slight. Only a few could be
said by the age of twenty to have risen significantly in occupatio-
nal level above their fathers, or to be in jobs which would lead them in
time to a higher level. And whilst some had hopes and plans for the
next ten years, it has been suggested that the chance of marked
success of many of them was not considerable. The main opportuni-
ties for secondary modern leavers to rise occupationally would seem to be
provided by types of employment which were previously filled mostly
by sixteen-year-old grammar school leavers: with more of the latter
continuing their education beyond the age of sixteen, and aiming at
correspondingly higher level employment when they do start work, the
way is left open for at least some secondary modern leavers. The two
most clear cases of respondents who were upwardly mobile, on the
criterion of a comparison between their occupation and that of their
fathers, had entered or risen to such employment——one as G.P.U.
clerk (his father was a postman-driver), and one as an estate
valuer's assistant (his father was a minor clerk). A further possibility for upward mobility, which is however very uncertain, is through starting up a business of one's own—and we have seen that several respondents had this in mind, but that their chances of success were for the most part slender: some might, however, succeed in ten year's time. (The respondent in the Postal Survey who had had a succession of unskilled jobs before starting up his own business as a scrap merchant has already been referred to—he now had a lorry, headed note-paper and his wife as secretary: it is not known whether, or for how long, the business remained viable). Given that there are possibilities for mobility, there remain questions as to how secondary modern children become acquainted with them, who, of those who are acquainted, are motivated to seek them, and who, amongst these, are successful. Interested parents were instrumental in regard to the G.P.O. clerk and the Youth Employment Officer and the school in regard to the estate valuer's assistant, as well as interested parents. (Parents, too, encouraged several girls who made modest rises in the occupational hierarchy to positions of responsibility, and who could be said to have risen slightly above the level of their fathers' occupation). The personality, disposition and the determination of the individual—whatever the sources of these characteristics may be—are an important factor, too.¹ Special

qualities of this order were to be discerned in those respondents who were ambitious for the future, and hopeful of rising significantly in the social scale during the next ten years. For some girls, there was the possibility of upward mobility through marriage.

Most of the occupational mobility that occurs in Britain is modest in scope—as Lockwood has pointed out, "The great mass of occupational mobility is of a relatively short-range kind. In the nature of the job structure of the country, most mobility represents either a change within manual employment itself (which may not perhaps be regarded as social mobility at all) or between manual and lower non-manual work."1 In the present study, we have seen that there was a substantial amount of shifting between the various levels of employment, although few girls made the move, in either direction, between Category 'A' and Category 'C' type of employment. And most of the moves did not, apparently, involve significant changes in respect of social mobility: at least they were not seen by respondents as doing so. However, occupational mobility within manual employment, and social mobility within the working class, did have important implications for some respondents—who wanted to improve modestly on their parents' standard of living, and who sought to pursue a different style of life. This slight, but to the persons concerned very important, upward mobility tended to be associated more with a determined

---

1 David Lockwood, "Can We Cope With Social Change?" op. cit., p.11
exercise of control in regard to style of life—particularly in terms of control of expenditure, through saving for a house deposit, constraints upon purchase of clothes, and spending on holidays, and through deferring marriage and starting a family. However, there was normally a work component in the plans and aspirations of such respondents—certain sorts of work—which would not be in accord with the style of life envisaged, for example: whilst security of income was a prerequisite for long-term planning.

Reference has already been made to the young couples who were "inward looking", and it has been suggested that an element of upward social mobility was involved—that their concern with their homes and privacy was not merely a facet of early married life. This is in accord with an argument advanced by John Madge in a different context, to the effect that upwardly mobile families prefer privacy in the home—Madge writes in connection with the preference, for example, for two small rooms rather than one large one, that "there is a sociological component which varies strongly with the social group, so that individuated middle class, or upwardly mobile family, sets great store by personal seclusion in the home, whereas the idea of withdrawal from the family can be repugnant to a traditional working class family."\(^1\) Goldthorpe, et al, have argued on the basis of their

study of the affluent worker that the direction of change away from a traditional working class pattern is not towards enbourseoisement, because although they are home-centred, the newly affluent workers are not "middle class" in relational terms (they don’t mix with middle class people socially) or in normative terms. The suggestion is that the affluent worker is "privatised"—and some of the young married couples could perhaps be appropriately viewed from this perspective, rather than that of mobility into the middle class. This point is taken up again below.

Apart from those who were keen to rise somewhat, there were other respondents whose concern was not to be downwardly mobile occupation-ally, or socially. They valued their apprenticeships, or, in the case of girls, their Category 'A' type employment, because they regarded such work as conferring superiority on them. Within the working class, they were at the top level. In terms of style of life, they were very concerned not to sink to the low level of the "rough" working class. However, this was, emphatically, less a matter of occupation than of style of life in terms of area lived in, persons mixed with in leisure time, behaviour in the family and neighbourhood, and personal standards in regard to dress, appearance, and speech. There were, in addition, cases of respondents who were more disposed to semi-and unskilled work and who wanted to spend their spare time in leisure activities rather than at evening school, who had a short flirtation with the higher level manual occupations—as apprentices—but who soon left or were dismissed, not being prepared to suffer
the constraints which were implied, and not wishing to adopt the
serious and involved attitudes towards work which seemed to be
associated with such employment.

The majority of respondents were not significantly mobile, then,
either occupationally (except horizontally, of course) or socially,
even within the limits of manual employment and working class life.
Some were resentful, others just disappointed; most accepted it as
a fact of life—as one respondent said, "For secondary modern
children, there's not much you can do—so far as work is concerned,
you can only like it or lump it. There's no way out." The themes
raised in the latter half of this Chapter will be taken up again
and developed in Part IV below, in which the attempt is made to
draw together the analysis in terms of relationships between the
"objective" socio-economic structure and the perceptions by young
workers of it and of their place in it. Before turning to this,
however, there is a prior task, namely, that of discussing the
large 'non-work' area, which has so far been referred to but not
described in detail. It is to this that we now turn, in Part III.