SOCIALISATION INTO A TRADE:

A STUDY OF CRAFT APPRENTICES

by

ALEXANDER C RYRIE

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of M.Litt in the Department of Sociology, University of Glasgow, April 1975.

Acknowledgements

In presenting this thesis I wish to express my thanks to Professor J E T Eldridge, Department of Sociology, University of Glasgow, for his guidance and encouragement; to The Scottish Council for Research in Education, and in particular to Mr A D Weir, Senior Research Officer, for providing opportunities and facilities for analysing data; to the managers of the three apprentice training centres for making arrangements for the interviews; to the apprentices themselves for their willing and frank answers to the interview questions; and to Mrs E Smail for her careful typing.

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

It is widely known that craftsmen in British industry tend to have distinctive attitudes amounting to an ideology. It is also widely assumed that new entrants to a trade acquire these attitudes during and as a result of the period of apprenticeship. Little attempt, however, has been made to look at apprenticeship as a socialisation process or the development of attitudes in the minds of apprentices. This study is designed to make a contribution in this field.

The first chapter contains a brief description of the traditional craft system in British industry, drawing on the literature of industrial relations and labour history, and serving as a background to the study. The craft system is summarised as a system by which craftsmen exercise control over the right to perform the work of their trade, the opportunity to perform the work of the trade, and the methods of performing the work of the trade.

This is followed in the next chapter by a description of the attitudes of craftsmen, in the form of an ideal type, with reference to the literature of industrial sociology and industrial relations. Ten points are made under three heads:

a) The nature of work:

1. A craftsman expects to be able to control his method of working, and to take pride in his work.
2. A craftsman is interested in his work and expects to get satisfaction from it.
3. A craftsman regards his work as part of the exclusive preserve of the members of his trade.

b) Social and industrial relations:

4. A craftsman maintains solidarity with his fellow-tradesmen, and gives loyal support to his trade union.
5. A craftsman regards his status as distinct from and superior to that of labourers and less-skilled workers.
6. A craftsman understands and accepts the importance of management, though he may also see himself as standing on the opposite side from management.
7. A craftsman legitimates the authority of supervisors on the grounds of job-knowledge and competence.

c) The future, security and change:

8. A craftsman is less concerned with job-security than with the security that comes from the transferability of skills, ('trade-security').
9. A craftsman is resistant to change if it threatens his trade-security, but in favour of change which promotes efficiency without threatening his trade-security.
10. A craftsman rejects the idea of a promotion-ladder based on seniority within a firm, but sees promotion as appropriate if it is related to experience and technical knowledge of the trade.

A summary of the findings of other research into the attitudes of school-leavers entering employment is presented in Chapter 3, to enable comparison with apprentices in this study. The findings are summarised under three heads - attitudes to work, attitudes to industrial organisation, and attitudes to the future. On all these topics the evidence about young people generally is mixed and points in different directions. But there is some reason to think that apprentices may represent a distinct group from other young people. This leads to a brief discussion of apprenticeship as a process of secondary socialisation, and to the suggestion that assumptions have been made about this process without research or enquiry being carried out. This provides reason for the following survey.

The second part of the thesis consists of a presentation of the results of a survey of three groups of apprentices. Selected apprentices in three industries were interviewed in training centres during the first few months of apprenticeship, before they commenced work in the industry, and again a year later after experience of work with tradesmen. The methodology of the survey is discussed briefly, under the headings of meanings, rapport, attitudes, and quantification.

The results of the interviews are presented in the next three chapters. Firstly, the apprentices' interest in their work and desire to take pride in it and control it seemed to be similar to craftsmen's attitudes, but this appeared in the first interviews. There was little apparent support for craftsmen's ideas about trade boundaries. Secondly, craftsman-like support for trade unions, awareness of the status difference between craftsmen and labourers, and acceptance of management functions and of authority based on knowledge and experience, seemed to be already present in the first year. In the second year there was an increased awareness of two-sides in industry and hostility to management,

but these are not typical craft attitudes. The apprentices also seemed to be remarkably able to understand the nature of industrial authority in their first year. Thirdly, with regard to the future, security and change, the apprentices' near-unanimous emphasis on 'trade-security' as the reason for wanting a trade seemed to reflect the attitudes of a traditional industrial community. But their widespread acceptance in both interviews of the idea of change and of the possible need for re-training, and their expectation of promotion (dropping only slightly in the second year) suggested an awareness of the realities and values of the modern world.

The general conclusion of the survey is that there is little to suggest the influence of tradesmen on the attitudes of apprentices up to this stage. The apprentices did have what seemed like craft attitudes, but most of these appeared in the first interviews before contact with tradesmen. It is suggested that the attitudes of the apprentices seem to have been acquired through a process of anticipatory socialisation. The source of the attitudes is attributed to two general influences in the community at large - the influence of a traditional industrial community where craft attitudes are common knowledge; and the influence of other general socialising agencies through which the boys have gained a perception of modern industrial society. These conclusions, it is suggested, lend support to those who emphasise the importance of the attitudes which people bring to their work from outside.

Throughout the development of British industry the skilled craftsman has had a distinctive place amongst industrial workers. Whether his craft is an ancient one whose roots go back to pre-industrial times, or a newer one which has arisen because of developing technology, the craftsman has seen himself, and been seen by others, as a person possessing special and jealously safeguarded skills, and occupying a superior position as a member of the 'labour aristocracy'. In our own day also, while social and technological changes have somewhat altered the position of the craftsman, there can be no doubt about the continued importance of the skilled man for modern industry.

The distinctive position of craftsmen in the community is reflected in their attitudes and values. Studies in industrial sociology have shown that craftsmen typically exhibit attitudes which differ from those of other workers at a number of points. These distinctive attitudes are in their turn generally assumed to be connected with the process by which craft skills and craft status are acquired - the process of apprenticeship.

Considerable research has been carried out in recent years into worker attitudes and factors which influence them, and there is a varied body of writing on this subject, some of which includes discussion of the attitudes of craftsmen. There does not, however, appear to be any major study devoted to craftsmen in modern industry and their distinctive attitudes and outlook. Again, considerable attention has been focussed recently on apprenticeship as a means of industrial training, and also on the problems, needs and attitudes of young people leaving school and starting work. There is also a certain amount of writing devoted to the theme of secondary socialisation. But there has not been any careful analysis of apprenticeship as a socialisation process, or the development of craft attitudes amongst apprentices. This thesis is an attempt to make a contribution to our understanding in these fields. It involves, firstly, a description of the distinctive position and attitudes of craftsmen in modern industry, drawn from a review of the relevant literature, and an outline of what is known about the attitudes of young people entering work. Secondly, it includes an account of an empirical investigation conducted amongst selected groups of apprentices entering certain trades in Central Scotland. The object of this

enquiry was to discover (a) the extent to which the expressed attitudes of the apprentices concerned conformed to those which appear in the literature to be typical of industrial craftsmen; (b) how the attitudes of the apprentices changed and developed during their early experience in industry; and (c) what differences emerged in the attitudes of the groups of apprentices in different industries.

Steps in the Research

In order to obtain a fairly wide view of apprentice attitudes and their development, it was decided to interview a small sample of boys entering three different industries. All of them were starting their training in off-the-job apprentice training centres. On the basis of a study of literature which referred to craftsmen, and literature of the subject of young people, together with the researcher's own experience of people in industry, an interview schedule was drawn up, and interviews were carried out during the first few months of the boys' apprenticeship, before they had had any experience of work in the industry itself. At the same time a summary was prepared of attitudes typical of craftsmen, to be used as a kind of ideal type, for purposes of comparison. The results of the interviews were then compared with this summary and with the attitudes revealed by young people in other research. A comparison was also made between the apprentices in different industries. This process was then repeated a year later. The same boys were interviewed after they had had some experience of working in the industry, and the same comparisons were made again, this time including comparison with the previous responses.

Outline of Chapters

The presentation which follows is divided into three main sections. Part I, following this Introduction, is entitled 'The Context of the Research'. It consists of, firstly, a description of the craft system as it has developed in British industry; secondly, a review of literature on the subject of craftsmen in industry and a summary of attitudes which appear to be typical of craftsmen; and thirdly, a discussion of writings on the theme of young people entering work and the process of secondary socialisation. In Part II, 'The Apprentice Survey', the results of the empirical enquiry are presented. It starts with a brief description of the three groups of apprentices and the situations in which they were placed at the time of interview.

This is followed by some points concerning the conduct of the interviews, and some comments on methodology. After this comes analysis of and comment on the responses in the two series of interviews. Part III is the 'Conclusion', and in it the main findings of the survey are related to the earlier account of what is known already about craftsmen's and young people's attitudes, and also to the wider debate about sources of worker attitudes.

PART I. THE CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

Chapter 1. The Craft System

In order to understand the attitudes of craftsmen it is necessary first to understand the craft system in British industry. This system, whose roots go back to the pre-industrial era, has evolved in its modern form since the time of the industrial revolution, and has had considerable influence on industrial organisation, industrial relations and on the nature and development of British Trade Unionism. In recent years changes in technology and in industrial administration have meant that the system no longer has the force and influence that it had in traditional craft industries in the past. Nevertheless it is important to look at its basic aspects.

The craft system is to be understood as primarily a system of control. It is a means by which workers who see themselves as skilled men or craftsmen exercise a measure of control over their work situation. This control is applied in particular to

a) the right to perform the work of the trade;

b) the opportunity to perform the work of the trade; and

c) the methods by which the work of the trade is done.

A few words may be said about each of these.

a) The right to perform the work of the trade.

The craft system involves an arrangement by which the tasks of a particular trade are performed only by the recognised members of the trade. A craft can in fact be defined as a social institution which exercises control over a section of the labour market. In Clegg's words:

> "A craft is a social institution based upon a set period and form of training, and the reservation of certain jobs for those who are undergoing or have completed that training".(1)

This is part of what is sometimes called the "Method of Autonomous Regulation" adopted by the craft unions in early years. This meant that instead of engaging in collective bargaining with the employers,

> "the great craft unions were mainly concerned to raise the individual worker's 'supply price' by creating a relative scarcity of labour."(2)

---

(1) Clegg (1970) p31.

(2) Turner (1962) p204; see also Bell (1954) and Flanders (1954) and the original description by S & B Webb of what they called the "Method of Mutual Insurance", Webb 1913, p152-172.

They did this by insisting and having it recognised (a) that only members of the trade were entitled to carry out tasks which pertained to the trade; and (b) that membership of the trade or craft was granted only to those who had served a recognised period of apprenticeship in the trade. In addition, craft unions were frequently able to impose limits on the numbers of apprentices engaged by employers.

In other words, the principle on which the craft unions operated was one of exclusiveness. As Phelps Brown succinctly puts it,

> "The craftsman felt he strengthened his union not by bringing men in but by keeping them out."(3)

This exclusiveness is not necessarily related to the level of skill of the craft. Turner observes that the distinction between 'skilled' and 'unskilled' workers arose not so much from the actual level of skill involved in their work, but from the restrictions imposed on membership of the occupation and the reservation of jobs for its members.

> "The sharp demarcation between skilled and unskilled workers in, say, the building and engineering industries is largely a product of the traditional apprenticeship system, by reference to which those who may perform 'skilled' tasks are distinguished from those who may not.... Of course, such demarcation may originally have derived from the possession of uncommon knowledge by a minority; but unless the latter's advantage is preserved by some artificial restriction, industrial skills usually spread all too easily from the point of view of their possessors - or are segmented into elements that can be readily communicated, or even reproduced mechanically."(4)

He goes on to point out that there are cases

> "in which a 'skill' has been quite artificially created, by the workers' gradual imposition of labour supply controls on a fairly unskilled occupation."

And he concludes

> "From the point of view of trade union development at least, workers are thus 'skilled' or 'unskilled' according to whether or not entry to their occupation is deliberately restricted, and not in the first place according to the nature of the occupation itself."(5)

Nevertheless, it is fundamental to the exclusive rights of craftsmen that what McCarthy(6) calls a 'skill gap' between craftsmen and other workers should be recognised, even if this gap is in a few

---

(3) Phelps Brown (1959) p119.
(4) Turner (1962) p111.
(5) ibid p114.
(6) McCarthy (1964) p134.

cases more nominal than real. Strictly speaking a craft union is one whose conditions of membership coincide with this skill gap, so that all its members are skilled and time-served men. It is then possible for the union to effect a 'craft qualification shop'(7), that is a shop where employment is open only to fully qualified craftsmen, as has normally been the practice in the printing and shipbuilding industries. But it is important to notice also that a skill gap can exist even where membership of a union is open to semi-skilled or unskilled as well as skilled workers. The engineering union decided as early as 1912 to admit semi-skilled workers to membership, but still preserved a special section which was open only to time-served craftsmen. Thus the exclusive right to perform the more highly skilled parts of the trade can be reserved for recognised craftsmen even in a situation where union membership is open to non-craftsmen as well.

b) The opportunity to perform the work of the trade.

In the second place, the craft system allows all the members of the trade to perform any of the tasks reserved for that trade. This has two important implications. It means, firstly, that a time-served craftsman can move from one employer to another, and even from one industry to another, taking his skills and his status with him. He has, in other words, what Stinchcombe calls 'permanent labour market status'(8). This is part of the tradition of crafts in the past. In the early nineteenth century 'tramping', or moving on from one place to another was very common among craftsmen(9). And of the typical craftsman towards the end of the century, Phelps Brown writes that

> "he would expect to change his employer from time to time, and not infrequently he moved from place to place, but always in the same craft."(10)

In our own time with the increased development of industry-specific technology, it is open to question whether a craftsman's skills will continue to be as transferable as in the past(11). But there can be no doubt that the transferability of skills is still regarded as an important aspect of the craft system.

Secondly, the craftsman's right to perform any of the tasks of

---

(7) ibid p19.
(8) Stinchcombe (1959) p167.
(9) Turner (1962) p213.
(10) Phelps Brown (1959) p118.
(11) See McKersie & Hunter (1973) pp368-9.

the trade carries with it the assumption that all members of the craft are equally able to perform those tasks. The traditional concern of the craft unions to establish a 'Standard Rate' for all members of the craft no matter by whom they are employed arises out of this assumption(12).

c) The methods of performing the work of the trade.

In the third place, the craft system involves a considerable measure of control by the craftsman over the tasks which he performs and the way they are carried out. This type of control is an integral part of the organisation of the work of those industries, such as building, engineering and shipbuilding, in which craftsmen have traditionally made up a large proportion of the labour force. Stinchcombe has drawn attention to the difference between craft administration which characterises the construction industry, and bureaucratic administration which is typical of mass production industries(13). One of the features of craft administration is that workers themselves have responsibility for many of the decisions about the performance of the work.

> "Decisions which in mass production were made outside the work milieu and communicated bureaucratically, in construction work were actually part of the craftsman's culture and socialisation, and were made at the level of the work crew(14).

McKersie and Hunter in their study of productivity bargaining also emphasise this point.

> "The essential feature of a craft-type occupational system is that each single craft maintains a considerable degree of autonomy in regulating the standards for the performance of particular tasks. The basis of this autonomy is the skill and specific knowledge required to perform the tasks(15).

And Blauner's study of a typical craft industry, printing, reaches the same conclusion.

> "The freedom to determine techniques of work, to choose one's tools, and to vary the sequence of operations is part of the nature and traditions of craftsmanship. Because each job is somewhat different from previous jobs, problems continually arise which require a craftsman to make decisions. Traditional skill thus involves the frequent use of judgment and initiative, aspects of a job which give the worker a feeling of control over his environment(16)."

---

(12) Turner (1962) p204. See also Clegg (1970) p50.
(13) Stinchcombe (1959) pp168-187.
(14) ibid p 180.
(15) McKersie & Hunter (1973) p345.
(16) Blauner (1964) p43.

In the early days of the industrial revolution, entrepreneurs attempting to organise production often had no means of doing so other than by engaging men of recognised skill and leaving the performance of the work largely in their hands(17). In recent times, however, managements have increasingly introduced administrative or bureaucratic systems, even to some extent in traditional craft industries(18). In such situations the measure of control by the craftsman or group of craftsmen over how the work is carried out is reduced. Nevertheless, as will be shown in the discussion of attitudes in a later chapter, the assumption still remains, even in those industries where craftsmen are engaged on maintenance rather than production work, that the men of any given trade, by virtue of their recognised skill, have the right to determine in some measure the way their work is to be carried out.

The determination of the craft to maintain control over their own work is one of the factors lying behind the traditional arrangement whereby craftsmen are supervised only by a member of their own trade union(19). It also leads, as will be shown later, to a particular type of attitude to supervisors.

Regulation of entry into the trade and control of the right to perform the tasks of the trade; transferability of skills from one employment to another and the right of any time-served man to perform any part of the work of the trade; and a large measure of responsibility over how the work of the craft is performed - these are the basic features of the craft system as it has traditionally existed in British industry. It should, of course, be stressed that in the changed conditions of modern industry this system does not operate to the same extent as it did at one time. Some aspects of craft control, for example the regulation of the numbers of apprentices employed, have been largely abandoned(20); and others, for example the control over the methods and quality of work, have become increasingly difficult to apply under some technological conditions.

---

(17) See Turner (1962) p194.
(18) See McKersie & Hunter (1973) p348, and also the discussion of changes in Fairfields shipyard in Alexander & Jenkins (1970).
(19) See especially the discussion in Flanders (1964) pp76ff and 108ff.
(20) See Liepmann (1960) p155.

The important thing to observe now, however, is that there has developed over the years, along with and in relation to the practical elements of the craft system, something which is of great importance for events and behaviour in industry, namely, a craft ideology, or tradition of beliefs and values. Flanders, in particular, draws attention to what he calls the

> "strongly-held traditional beliefs of craftsmen about the conditions under which they should exercise their craft."

In his study of the process of productivity bargaining at Esso's Fawley refinery he shows how much of this tradition or ideology is embodied in the rules and practices of the craft unions; and how any attempt, such as by productivity bargaining, to change existing working practices of craftsmen must reckon with the strength of these traditional beliefs(21). It is, of course, possible to argue that some elements of the tradition are out-of-date in the modern industrial environment. A tradition such as this, as Fox observes,

> "is likely to have been shaped by calculations of means to ends which, though producing success in the past, may have less relevance in the present."(22)

Nevertheless, it is important from our point of view to be clear that this ideology of strongly held beliefs, arising out of the craft system which has evolved in British industry, is still very much with us today. Any attempt to understand the attitudes of industrial craftsmen, therefore, must be done against the background of the craft system with its attendant tradition and ideology.

The key elements of this craft system and the strength of the craft ideology should, therefore, be borne in mind as we turn to a study of what has been discovered and written by industrial sociologists and other writers about the distinctive attitudes of craftsmen.

---

(21) Flanders (1964) p93, and see also his concluding discussion in pp212ff. See also Scott et al (1956) on the importance of 'tradition' in industrial sociology.

(22) Fox (1971) p128.

Chapter 2. The Attitudes of Craftsmen

As was mentioned earlier, there is no body of writing devoted especially to the subject of craftsmen and their attitudes. There are, however, various studies of workers' attitudes, undertaken for different purposes and in different places, and some of these include discussions of the distinctive attitudes exhibited by groups of craftsmen. Other material is available from writings in the field of industrial relations and labour history. From these sources it is possible to put together a summary of the attitudes which may be regarded as typical of craftsmen. This summary is presented three heads: the Nature of Work; Social Relations; and the Future, Security and Change.

a) The Nature of Work

A useful starting point is Blauner's influential study of the varying degrees of alienation and freedom experienced by workers in four industries dominated by four different types of technology. One of these industries, printing, is taken as typical of traditional craft industry. Blauner, following Seeman, defines alienation in terms of four concepts: (a) powerlessness, or the lack of opportunity to control one's work situation; (b) meaninglessness, or the inability to see one's work as part of a meaningful whole; (c) isolation, or the lack of meaningful contact with others or of belonging or loyalty to a specific community; and (d) self-estrangement, or the lack of opportunity for self-expressive work, or work which has any connection with one's other life-concerns(1).

Blauner sees printing in particular, and craft industry in general as typically non-alienating in terms of these concepts. We have already noted his emphasis on control as part of the craft system. We note now his conclusion that the measure of control and the other non-alienating factors in craft work mean that craftsmen typically take an interest in and derive intrinsic satisfaction from the nature of their work.

> "When work provides opportunities for control, meaning and self-expression, it becomes an end in itself, rather than simply a means to live. For printers, the job means much more than a weekly pay check. Their satisfactions are largely intrinsic, related to the nature of the work itself, rather than extrinsic, or concerned with aspects of the job beyond the actual work."(2)

(1) Blauner (1964) p32.
(2) ibid p53.

Blauner contrasts this interest in their work for its own sake on the part of printing craftsmen with the attitude of other workers, particularly automobile workers, whose interests are typically centred on the external rewards of work.

This leads us to the work of Goldthorpe and his colleagues. As is well known, one of the general conclusions which they reached in their major study of affluent workers in the Luton area was that these workers had what the authors call an 'instrumental orientation' to their work. Typically they worked for the sake of the extrinsic rewards, and did not derive any great satisfaction from working. This orientation was found amongst all groups of workers, including the craftsmen:

> "the instrumental aspect of employment is strongly emphasised by all groups of workers within our sample."(3)

Nevertheless, the craftsmen did express opinions about their work which differed from those of other workers. They tended to be more critical of inefficiency and they were keen on

> "changes which would lead to greater efficiency, and which would increase their own involvement in, and control over, the work processes with which they were concerned."(4)

The expectations of the craftsmen, the authors tell us, were not only related to economic returns, but were

> "also concerned with the degree to which the individual is allowed to exercise his skills in an autonomous way."(5)

The craftsmen seemed frequently to experience frustration,

> "notably in regard to their desire for autonomy and responsibility and for the conditions they believe essential for 'good workmanship'"

and they were

> "most obviously the group with important wants and expectations which are left inadequately fulfilled."(6)

It appears, then, that in the situations which this study was concerned, in which work was organised not on a craft basis but on a 'bureaucratic' basis (in Stinchcombe's sense), and in which the orientation of all groups of workers was largely instrumental, the

---

(3) Goldthorpe et al (1968) p37.
(4) ibid p21.
(5) ibid p25.
(6) ibid p37.

craftsmen showed signs of being dissatisfied. They expected more intrinsic satisfaction from their work than was possible in these circumstances. They wished for autonomy to be able to control their work and set their own standards of 'good workmanship'.

Following on, to some extent, from the Goldthorpe studies was the study by Wedderburn and Crompton of workers in a chemical plant in northern England(7). Once again this was not a special study of craftsmen. The researchers were mainly concerned, in the light of the work of Joan Woodward in particular, to investigate the relationship between workers' attitudes and technology, with special reference to the existence of different types of technology within one plant - a plant to which they gave the fictitious name 'Seagrass'. This study takes up a variety of issues connected with orientation or attitude to work, and here a good deal of attention is paid to the special position and distinctive attitudes of the craftsmen who were engaged on maintenance work in the plant. Their attitudes called for special comment.

> "There was one group of workers at Seagrass whose expectations did stand out as being markedly different. These were the tradesmen. Compared to the general workers they were far more concerned with the nature of the work they had to do and with their status. They emphasised the importance of having control over their work, and took it for granted that it should be interesting."(8)

The desire for interesting and inherently satisfying work was directly expressed by many of the craftsmen in response to an enquiry about what factors make for a good job. Of even more interest is

> "how frequently the tradesmen criticised their present employment in order to underline how highly they valued the opportunity to do a job well:-
>
> 'Being allowed to enjoy one's craft - enough time to do a good job - which you don't get here!' (Electrician)
>
> 'To practice your craft - which the bonus scheme doesn't allow.' (Plumber)"(9)

Once again, then, we encounter the craftsman's typical interest in his work and expectation that his work will be intrinsically satisfying, together with the frustration which craftsmen often feel when they find themselves employed in bureaucratically administered industry in which they have little autonomy or opportunity to regulate their own

---

(7) Wedderburn & Crompton (1972).
(8) ibid p23.
(9) ibid p98.

work methods and standards.

These points are supported by other studies which may be referred to more briefly. The same kind of interest in their work was shown by the selected groups of American craftsmen included in Mackenzie's study of the position of skilled craftsmen in the American class structure. He tells us that

> "these men really give the impression of identifying with and getting a lot of meaning out of their occupations."

And he concludes that

> "we must focus on the nature of the work itself in explaining... the relatively high level of satisfaction found amongst craft workers."(10)

The study by Scott and his colleagues of technical change and industrial relations in the steel industry drew attention to the 'dilemma' of craftsmen in that industry, torn between identification with the industry and with their craft. In spite of the craftsmen's problematic position, however, more of the craftsmen than other workers, when asked about likes and dislikes in their job, made reference to the nature of their work.(11)

Ingham's investigation of the relationship between plant size and worker behaviour found that workers who were more interested in non-economic rewards were more attracted to small firms. But he had to some extent to make an exception of the craftsman or skilled worker, who, he says, has a

> "high level of expectation with respect to highly rewarding work",

and therefore

> "in any type of firm will tend ... to subscribe to a system of norms that emphasise the expressive aspects of work."(12)

It appears from all these studies, then, that craftsmen tend to see their work as something over which they have or ought to have a large measure of control, and in which therefore they can take a real interest. This in turn is connected with another important element in craftsmen's attitude to work - their sense that their work in a special way belongs to them and to them alone. We have seen in the previous chapter that the craft unions were built up on the

---

(10) Mackenzie (1973) pp37, 41 (emphasis in original).
(11) Scott et al (1956) p191.
(12) Ingham (1970) pp108, 138.

principle of exclusiveness - of preserving for the members of the trade the exclusive right to perform the tasks of the trade. This principle is strongly present in the minds of craftsmen today. Of course, many workers feel that their jobs belong to them.(13) But with craftsmen there is a special consciousness that a range of tasks (some of which may not fall into the normal job-content of particular craftsmen) belong not to individuals or groups of workers but to the trade and its members. It is because of this sense of ownership of the right to perform certain tasks that demarcation issues, particularly in traditional craft industries, assume such importance, and attempts to negotiate inter-craft flexibility encounter such strong feelings.(14)

As will be noted later, other significant elements in the typical craftsman's attitude-set are bound up in these feelings. For the moment we must note that craftsmen's exclusiveness and resistance to flexibility are aspects of their view of their work as something over which they exercise control. They are also connected with the desire for quality or 'good workmanship' which was referred to above. Eldridge, for example, in his study of demarcation disputes in ship-building in north-east England observes that one aspect at least of

> "the problem as perceived by the unions was that to allow too much flexibility of labour might jeopardise standards of craftsmanship by making a man a jack-of-all-trades and master of none."(15)

In other words, control, exclusiveness and concern for good workmanship are all bound up together.

To sum up, then, the typical attitude of craftsmen in relation to the nature of their work, we may make three statements:

(i) A craftsman expects to be able to control his method of working and to take pride in the quality of his work. This applies most of all in traditional craft-administered industry. Bureaucratic administration, on the other hand, while it attempts not to sacrifice quality in its search for quantity(16), may result in a feeling of frustration on the part of craftsmen because they have no control over their methods of working, and are not able to work to their own standards.

---

(13) Wedderburn & Davies (1969) p2.
(14) For example, Fawley management were according to Flanders (1964, pp188-9) surprised and shocked by the strength of rank and file craftsman feeling on this point.
(15) Eldridge (1968) p118 (emphasis added).
(16) On this point see McKersie & Hunter (1973) p347.

(ii) A craftsman is interested in his work and expects to get satisfaction from it. Obviously the level of this interest will vary with different individuals and groups, but an ideal typical extreme form of it can be represented by the words of C Wright Mills:

> "If work, in some of its phases, has the taint of travail and vexation and mechanical drudgery, still the craftsman is carried over these junctures by keen anticipation. He may even gain positive satisfaction from encountering a resistance and conquering it, feeling his work and will as powerfully victorious over the recalcitrance of materials and the malice of things." (17)

(iii) A craftsman regards his work as part of the exclusive preserve of the members of his craft. It is for this reason that productivity bargaining is of particular importance in industries where craftsmen make up a large part of the labour force. Productivity bargaining involves an attempt by employers to achieve more flexibility of action, and the traditional exclusiveness of craftsmen stands in the way of such greater flexibility. Studies of productivity bargaining are therefore particularly revealing of the attitudes of craftsmen. (18)

b) Social and Industrial Relations

We turn now from craftsmen's attitudes to their work, and look at their attitude to the industrial structure and their relationship to people within it. In this connection four points can be made.

(i) Craft solidarity and trade union loyalty. The first point refers to the relationship of craftsmen to other members of their own trade. Typically this is characterised by a sense of solidarity and brotherhood with fellow-tradesmen, and by strong support for the trade union which represents the craft. This is indeed what one would expect because of the historical connections between crafts and trade unionism. As is well known, trade unionism in Britain began amongst craftsmen. Until towards the end of the nineteenth century, trade unionism was largely confined to skilled workers. (19) Not only that, but the separate existence of a particular craft depended to a considerable extent on

---

(17) Mills (1956) p221. See also Fox (1971) p7.

(18) See for example Hunter & Robertson (1969) pp294-5; Flanders (1964); McKersie & Hunter (1973); NPIB (1967); Royal Commission on Trade Unions & Employers' Association Research Paper No 4 (1967); Jones & Golding (1966); Smith (1971).

(19) See Phelps Brown (1959) p115; Hobsbawm (1964) p275; Briggs (1954) p21; Turner (1962, p109) shows how the cotton industry was exceptional in this regard.

the ability of the union to preserve the special rights of the craft. A craft can, in fact, be thought of as "a union-defended preserve of work".(20) And the craft unions' method of preserving their work - namely by trying to impose standard pay and conditions throughout the trade - made it necessary that all members of the craft must be members of the union.(21) From our knowledge of the historical development of crafts and trade unions, then, one would expect solidarity with their fellows and loyalty to their union to be characteristic of the attitudes of craftsmen today.

This is in fact what we do find. We find it first amongst craftsmen engaged in traditional craft industry. Cannon, in his unpublished study of compositors in London, showed that while these traditional craftsmen have not always had a sense of unity with the working class, they have always had a strong mutual solidarity. The first element in the compositor's ideology is that

> "the good compositor is a strong trade unionist".(22)

If we turn to evidence about workers in industries other than traditional craft industries, we find more support for their union amongst craftsmen than amongst other workers. The Luton study revealed that more of the craftsmen than of other workers were trade unionists before joining their present firm, believed in unionism in principle, attended their union branch meetings at least occasionally if not regularly, and talked with their workmates 'a good deal' or 'very often' about union affairs.(23) The Wedderburn and Crompton study of the chemical plant yielded a similar pattern of responses, showing that, in the authors' words,

> "the tradesmen at Seagrass were more involved with and committed to their union than the general workers".(24)

It is important to note that providing strong support for their union is not just a practical custom. It arises from what Fox calls the

> "occupational group consciousness among craftsmen",(25)

and is part of their traditional ideology. It is because craftsmen have "internalised" this traditional ideology that they

---

(20) Flanders (1964) p217.
(21) Clegg (1970) p50.
(22) Cannon (1961) p215.
(23) Goldthorpe et al (1968) pp95-105.
(24) Wedderburn & Crompton (1972) p101.
(25) Fox (1966) p31.

> "can maintain solidarity even when thinly scattered throughout a plant in a way which would defeat less motivated workers".(26)

(ii) Superiority of craft status. If craftsmen hold together in mutual solidarity and loyalty to their union, they also traditionally have an attitude of superiority to other workers who are unskilled or less skilled. We find this to be particularly true if we go back to the nineteenth century, when the craftsmen generally belonged to what is often called the 'labour aristocracy'. E J Hobsbawn, in his essay on this subject puts the point plainly:

> "An 'artisan' or 'craftsman' was not under any circumstances to be confused with a 'labourer'. 'The artisan creed with regard to labourers is that the latter are an inferior class and that they should be made to know this and kept in their place'."(27)

The craftsmen of the period were, in fact,

> "often snobbish and exclusive in their attitude towards the rest".(28)

And again, to quote another labour historian,

> "the craftsman in Britain had his status in the community, wore his top hat, (and) stood apart from the mob".(29)

In fact, unskilled labourers, far from being 'fellow-workers' to the craftsmen, represented a threat to their wage-superiority and to their security, and for this reason craftsmen were not in favour of the extension of trade unionism among unskilled workers, nor did they in general support radical political policies.(30) A similar statement is made by Weber, writing at the beginning of this century, about British workers.

> "In the lands of the Anglo-Saxon there is often not the slightest social contact between skilled trade unionists and lower classes of workers - it is well known that they sometimes find it hard to eat at the same table".(31)

Since that time there has been a number of forces which have eroded some of the difference in status between craftsmen and others - among them the decline in traditional craft industries, the increase in the amount

---

(26) Fox (1971) p103.
(27) Hobsbawn (1964) quoting Thomas Wright Our New Masters 1873.
(28) Perkin (1969) p44.
(29) Hobsbawn (1964) p300.
(30) See Turner (1962) p183.
(31) Quoted in Eldridge (1971) p110 from Weber.

of semi-skilled work, much of it well-paid, and the growth of the white-collar strata of society.(32) The erosion of the craftsman's financial superiority and increasing threats to his security have led him increasingly to identify himself with other members of the working class and to give his support to the labour movement as a whole.(33) There is now, therefore, less of a difference in status between craftsmen and others than there once was.

Nevertheless the distinction still exists and has a considerable hold on the minds of craftsmen, though it is not easy to document. Blauner writes of a "sense of superiority" on the part of printers in America, which is

> "more typical of the attitudes of craftsmen in the pre-industrial society",

but which still exists today.(34) And Dahrendorf believes that the "hierarchy of skill" among workmen

> "correlates with the hierarchy of prestige",

so that the skilled man is still seen as superior.(35) While this sense of superiority over other workers does not emerge openly in the studies of workers' attitudes to which reference has been made, it is natural to assume that it is one of the things lying behind the sense of frustration felt by many craftsmen employed particularly on maintenance work alongside production workers.(36) In the steel industry, for example, craftsmen complain that they are regarded as a 'necessary evil', and that they

> "have not been accorded the treatment to which their position entitles them".(37)

And Wedderburn and Crompton report that in the chemical works the craftsmen

> "were more sensitive than the general workers to gradations of status within the Company, and many felt that their own work contribution was undervalued".(38)

Part of the craftsman's dissatisfaction, in other words, arises from a feeling that as a maintenance worker he is not accorded a position of superiority over others which his tradition tells him he is due. All of

---

(32) Hobsbawm (1964) p300.
(33) See especially Cannon's (1961) account of how the compositors' attitude changed with changes in their 'market situation', p216.
(34) Blauner (1964) p55.
(35) Dahrendorf (1959) p50.
(36) See section on "Nature of Work" above.
(37) Scott et al (1956) p279 and p162.
(38) Wedderburn and Crompton (1969) p143.

this suggests that in spite of considerable changes in society and industry, the consciousness of a difference of status between themselves and unskilled workers is still definitely present in the minds of typical craftsmen today.

(iii) Acceptance of management functions. It would appear that the typical attitude of craftsmen to management is an ambiguous or two-sided one. A century ago, the clear division between skilled and unskilled workers meant that craftsmen, as the 'labour aristocrats', were closer to the social position of the managerial classes

> "and to the outlook of their employers than to that of many of the unskilled operatives".(39)

The craftsman, says Phelps Brown,

> "often identified himself with the actually governing classes sufficiently to join one or other of their camps".(40)

It was still quite possible, as Hobsbawm reminds us, for craftsmen to set themselves in business independently or to join the employing classes.(41) However, as we have already seen, the status of the craftsman was gradually reduced over the years, and he became more clearly a member of the working class.

Given this reduced status of the craftsman it is not surprising that such evidence as there is suggests that he is as likely as other workers to view industry as consisting of two sides rather than as one united team.(42) Their strong trade unionism no doubt also encourages them to think along these lines, Nevertheless, Wedderburn and Crompton are at pains to point out that alongside their direct responses to the question concerning two-sides or teamwork, the tradesmen in their study gave evidence that they were particularly conscious of the importance of their contribution to production. They felt they were

> "as essential to the production process as any manager".(43)

In other words, they see themselves as participants in the work process along with management. This would appear to be in line with the

---

(39) Perkin (1969) p395.
(40) Phelps Brown (1959) p117.
(41) Hobsbawm (1964) p297.
(42) This was the finding of Goldthorpe et al (1968) p73 and Wedderburn and Crompton (1969) p43. These results should, however, be interpreted with some caution in the light of the demonstration by W W Daniel (1973) of how responses to questions of this kind varied with the context.
(43) Wedderburn and Crompton (1969) p46.

observation of Scott et al that craftsmen in the steel industry were more interested in efficiency than other workers. They report,

> "One got the impression that efficiency for its own sake is more important to them than to any other group". (44)

It is worth recalling here Stinchcombe's observation that the system of craft administration in industry involves a greater degree of decision-making and planning on the part of craftsmen, together with fewer levels in the management hierarchy.(45) This means that in traditional craft industry craftsmen would be involved in decisions and processes which in bureaucratic type industry are the responsibility of management. Traditional craft work, in other words, has more of an affinity with management functions than has the work of unskilled or semi-skilled workers. The sense of frustration to which we referred before amongst craftsmen in bureaucratically organised industry can be interpreted as arising in part from the reduction of the decision-making and planning aspect of their work.

All this suggests that the typical attitude of craftsmen towards management is two-fold. On the one hand they tend to favour efficiency, to see themselves as participants with management in the work process to which they make an essential contribution, and they see the functions of management as legitimate and important. On the other hand, particularly under bureaucratic administration and in maintenance operations, they are aware of the dichotomy between the two-sides of industry and see themselves as sharing a place among the workers over against management.

(iv) Legitimation of authority. The question of how the authority of supervisors is legitimated by workers is an important one for industrial sociology.(46) In this context it is well known that there are different styles of supervision which are considered appropriate to different technologies and types of work organisation.(47) In traditional craft - administered industry, in which, as we have seen, craftsmen carry a lot of responsibility for planning the work and deciding the method of its performance, the foreman's task is not one of standing over men to see that the work is done. It is rather one of providing the necessary conditions in which the work can be done. As Alexander and Jenkins say about the foremen in the old Fairfields shipyard:

---

(44) Scott et al (1956) p182; see also Goldthorpe et al (1968) p21.
(45) Stinchcombe (1959) p180; see also McKersie and Hunter (1973) p346.
(46) See especially Fox (1971) pp34 ff.
(47) For a discussion of these see Argyle (1972) pp153-4.

> "Their jobs were regarded in a narrow technical sense - they dealt with, eg, the solution of problems arising from work, the allocation and supervision of work and the authorisation of material requisition for their men."(48)

The foremen, in other words, were assisters or enablers, and as such would have to be men with experience and knowledge of the jobs concerned.

Here it is worth taking up an important distinction between two types of authority, a distinction made by Talcott Parsons (commenting on Weber)(49), and elaborated by Gouldner in his study of industrial bureaucracy.(50) These writers distinguish between "authority which rests on incumbency of a legally defined office", and "that which is based on technical competence". It would appear from the quotation about the Fairfields foremen above, that the authority in traditional shipbuilding was of the latter type - authority based on technical competence. This is further supported by the finding of Alexander and Jenkins that the shipbuilding foremen they questioned ranked 'knowledge of the job' first among the factors which were of importance in the foreman's job.(51) It is interesting, then, to find that Wedderburn and Crompton in the chemical works study found the same distinction between two types of authority emerging from the responses of workers.(52) In particular it is important to notice their finding that the tradesmen put special emphasis on the need for technical competence on the part of a foreman.

> "All groups thought that it was important for a supervisor to know his job. But whereas about half of the general workers put this forward, no less than 70 per cent of the tradesmen named this quality. Because of their pride in their own competence, the tradesmen insisted that anyone who was to supervise them must be judged to be competent as well."(53)

This is further emphasised by writers about American industry. Mackenzie describes how craftsmen resent being given orders by people who know less than they do.(54) And Blauner says that

> "in craft industries the foreman is often the oldest and most experienced journeyman. He may be more respected, but he is not basically different from the others".(55)

All of this suggests, then, that another aspect of a typical craftsman's attitude is that he legitimates authority on the basis of knowledge of

---

(48) Alexander and Jenkins (1970) p65.
(49) Weber (1947) p59.
(50) Gouldner (1954) pp23-24.
(51) Alexander and Jenkins (1970) p240.
(52) Wedderburn and Crompton (1972) p129.
(53) ibid p50.
(54) Mackenzie (1973) p40.
(55) Blauner (1964) p43.

the job, rather than on incumbency in office.

This in turn points to another and well-known aspect of craftsmen's relationship with their foremen - the insistence that those who supervise them must be members of their own trade and of the appropriate union. The strength of feeling on the part of craftsmen on this point is evident from Flanders' description of the difficulties encountered by the Fawley management when they tried to persuade craftsmen to set aside this rule.(56) This traditional rule is no doubt a part of the general craft exclusiveness to which we have referred earlier, and it may also be connected, as Flanders suggests, with a desire to control promotion opportunities. But it is related also to the point under discussion in this section - the legitimation by craftsmen of the foremen's authority on the grounds of technical competence. If knowledge of the job is the basis or first essential of a foreman's authority, it follows that the foreman must be a member of the same trade as those whom he is supervising.

In the light of this discussion of the social and industrial relationships of craftsmen, we can now add four more statements to those made earlier about typical craft attitudes:

(iv) A craftsman maintains solidarity with his fellow-tradesmen, and gives loyal support to his trade union.

(v) A craftsman regards his status as distinct from and superior to that of labourers and less-skilled workers.

(vi) A craftsman understands and accepts the importance of management, though he may also see himself as standing on the opposite side from management.

(vii) A craftsman legitimates the authority of supervisors on the grounds of job-knowledge and competence.

c) The Future, Security and Change.

The other significant characteristics of the attitudes of craftsmen have to do with security and the future, and they can be dealt with under three heads.

(i) The trade as a source of security. Anyone who is familiar with the outlook of industrial workers or with attempts to introduce change in industry knows the great emotional importance attached to questions of security. Clearly feelings on this subject run especially high in those

(56) Flanders (1964), see especially pp108-109.

parts of the country where there has been a long history of unemployment. But even when there has been full employment in an area for many years, fear of losing one's job still has great power to move men. The reason is well stated by Flanders:

> "Job security for the average worker means more than the economic loss he might sustain in having to change his job; it includes all his settled expectations - what he can rely upon in his life; a certain regular income, of course, but, no less, work that he can count on performing, and stable relationships surrounding it; above all, a feeling that his future is calculable, that he may arrange his life without fear of drastic upset." (57)

In order to achieve this condition in which he feels that his future is calculable, a worker may adopt one of two strategies. He may try to get a particular job which, because of the nature of the industry and the firm, seems likely to be a long-lasting one. He may well find that this strategy is successful as a means to long-term security. But on the other hand many workers have found that their security is threatened, in the past particularly, by the employer's right to hire and fire and by fluctuations of trade, or, particularly in more recent times, by rapid technological change. The other strategy he may adopt is to try to acquire particular skills which are relatively scarce and so are easily marketable, and which can be transferred from one employer to another, and possibly from one industry to another. The acquisition of such skills, while leaving him still vulnerable to some extent to changing technology, nevertheless gives him something like 'permanent labour market status'. His security is now vested not in a particular job but in the fact that he has a recognised skill.

We have seen (in Chapter 1) that craftsmen in the past made use of this second strategy. They developed the twin devices of making their labour scarce by restricting entry into their trade, and of insisting on the transferability of their skills between different employers in different parts of the country. The result was that, as Hobsbawm says,

> "in Victorian Britain there were always some groups under conditions of full employment, while a much larger mass lived virtually always in what was for employers a wonderful buyers' market". (58)

Since craftsmen developed this strategy to deal with the problem of security and used it with such success in the past, one would expect to find that the typical attitude of craftsmen today reflected this approach.

---

(57) Flanders (1964) p138, (emphasis added).
(58) Hobsbawm (1964) p291.

If we turn to the studies of workers' attitudes already referred to, this is what we do in fact find. Wedderburn and Crompton tell us that most of the workers at 'Seagrass' felt their employment was secure, but that

> "the tradesmen and the general workers, however, offered different reasons for feeling so secure. The tradesmen emphasised the importance of their own skills and competence and the fact that these were in short supply.... The implication was that as craftsmen they could get a job anywhere and that they knew the company was having difficulty in recruiting the skilled labour it required".(59)

In other words, the craftsmen felt secure not because they were strongly attached to their present employment. They were, in fact, "much less tied to Seagrass".

> "The tradesmen did not value highly the security of employment offered by the company. But this did not mean that they did not feel secure. The difference lay in the fact that their confidence was founded on the belief that their own skills earned them security, not that they were dependent upon a particular employer. Consequently, they were less committed to the company and expressed a willingness to move if 'something better turned up', and many were looking or had looked for other jobs."(60)

Likewise Scott et al, referring to craftsmen in the steel industry, speak of

> "an awareness on their part that they have a skill which makes them to a large extent independent of the fortunes of individual firms".(61)

The result was that while the craftsmen were well aware that they could lose their jobs in the same way as other workers, they were confident that their skill would give them the opportunity of other employment elsewhere.

This is further illustrated by Thomas and Madigan who found that when faced by actual redundancy, skilled men were less shocked than other workers. Many of them were comparatively indifferent to the closure of the factory, and started searching for new employment later than others - thus showing confidence in their ability to find other jobs.(62)

This awareness on the part of craftsmen that they have a skill which can find them a job somewhere else is presumably reflected in the finding of Goldthorpe and his colleagues in Luton that 70% of the craftsmen

---

(59) Wedderburn and Crompton (1972) p36.
(60) ibid p142.
(61) Scott et al (1956) p186.
(62) Thomas and Madigan (1974).

in their sample had considered leaving their present employment, compared with less than 40% of other workers. It is also in keeping with the old tradition of mobility on the part of craftsmen to which reference was made earlier. A craftsman may, of course, never change his employment throughout his working life. But the knowledge that he can move if need arises gives him that "feeling that his future is calculable" which is at the heart of security. As Hoggart says in his analysis of working class attitudes, the craftsman

> "may never seriously think of moving, but at the back of his mind is the idea that he is at liberty to pack his tools and go".(63)

On the basis of this evidence, then, we can speak of a distinct attitude to security which is typical of craftsmen. Men with recognised craft skills find their security not so much in the particular job which they hold, but in their trade with its transferable skills. We can perhaps express this by saying that they are not so much concerned with job-security as with trade-security. It may, of course, be added that when particular craft skills become to a large measure specific to one industry or to a small number of firms, the craftsman's trade-security is threatened. The finishing trades in shipbuilding, for example, have greater trade-security than have some of the metal-using trades whose skills are less marketable outside the shipbuilding industry.(64)

(ii) Trade-security and resistance to change. If security carries the importance in the minds and emotions of workers that Flanders and others have indicated, it is to be expected that anything which seriously threatens that security will meet with hostility or resistance. This is one reason why productivity negotiations can runinto difficulties in spite of the appeal to reason and in spite of monetary inducements.(65) On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that there is much more openness to change when it does not threaten security. Workers, for example, who have a high degree of job-security, may be prepared to accept considerable technological innovation without resistance, as is shown in Blauner's study of petro-chemical workers.(66) In the same way craftsmen, as we have seen, are more open to the possibility of changing jobs, since their security is not vested in particular jobs but in their trade skill.

---

(63) Hoggart (1957) p80.
(64) See McKersie and Hunter (1973) p129, Eldridge (1968) p99.
(65) Flanders (1964) p138.
(66) Blauner (1964) p153.

The converse of this, however, is that when craft skills are threatened by technological innovation or by economic change, craftsmen feel their security is at stake and can be expected to resist the changes concerned. It is in this context that craftsmen's resistance to flexibility should be understood. The point at issue is not so much that some men may lose their jobs, but that, as McKersie and Hunter point out, the erasing of craft boundaries may result in a loss of the labour market status on which the craftsmen's security depends.

> "Take, for example, the notion of the all-round mechanic, trained to perform a variety of tasks in operation and maintenance, perhaps in a refinery. From management's viewpoint the flexibility achieved is admirable. But what happens to those mechanics when the refinery is shut down or when they receive the 'golden handshake'? Craftsmen, trained in a traditional skill such as electricity or sheet-metal work, can seek employment in a larger labour market, but the 'jack-of-all-trades' may find himself 'master of none'."(67)

Craftsmen, in other words, are resistant to change in the form of flexibility when it threatens their trade-security. This point is of particular interest and importance in connection with shipbuilding. Roberts, in his brief study of demarcation in shipbuilding, argues, following the Webbs and Turner, that demarcation arises not so much from insecurity as from the attempt to control, which is part of the basic scarcity-strategy of the craft unions. He admits, however, that in shipbuilding the situation is also probably affected by insecurity, and further that relaxation agreements may not withstand periods of bad trade.(68) This seems to confuse the issue. The attempts on the part of craft unions to control the work of the trade by the scarcity-strategy is simply part of the method adopted by craftsmen to ensure their trade-security. The significance of what Roberts is saying about scarcity-strategy is that demarcation is connected not so much with job-security, but with the attempt on the part of craftsmen to ensure their trade-security. His admission that "insecurity" may affect the issue in shipbuilding highlights the point made earlier that in some of the shipbuilding crafts trade-security is weak because of the industry-specific character of the work. This means that the craftsmen concerned could find it hard to get work elsewhere, and an element of job-security enters. It is interesting to note, further, that in a situation like this where craftsmen's traditional trade-security is weak because of the industry-specific nature of their

---

(67) McKersie and Hunter (1973) pp20-21.
(68) Roberts (1967) pp12-13, 40.

skills and the economic climate, craftsmen may be persuaded to abandon some of the controls which are meant to ensure trade-security, in exchange for a greater measure of job-security. This would appear to be what happened during the Fairfields experiment. Alexander and Jenkins tell us that

> "acceptance of the (flexibility) agreements at Fairfields reflects a growing realisation that rigidity and stratification of a labour force at certain times can be a cause of unemployment".(69)

This suggests that in this particular situation the men concerned began to feel that job-security was more important than trade-security, and that it was worth abandoning some of the controls designed to ensure the latter for the sake of a no-redundancy promise which would ensure the former.

These points are related to one particular kind of change - relaxation of demarcation and flexibility - and to one particular industry. They show that the concept of trade-security may not always be relevant in today's conditions, and that resistance to change because of the threat to trade-security may in certain circumstances be overcome. But they also serve to illustrate the main point being presented here, namely that craftsmen are typically resistant to changes which threaten their traditional trade-security.

It remains to make one further point, which is that craftsmen are not necessarily resistant to changes which appear to carry no threat to their trade-security. We have seen (in (b)(iii) above) that craftsmen are typically interested in efficiency and are conscious of their contribution to production. Eldridge, writing again of shipbuilding, tells how the workers are frequently keen on technical innovation:

> "Indeed management were at some pains to point out that, to some extent, the outside world had a misleading picture of the workers' attitude to technical change. In some cases, it was noted, the workers themselves press for new equipment when the old is not working properly".(70)

And McCarthy makes the same point in connection with the shipbuilding unions.

> "The nature of the jobs performed by their members have changed extensively over the last fifty years. So long as they could retain their craft monopolies the unions have not resisted this, and have encouraged their members to acquire the new skills".(71)

---

(69) Alexander and Jenkins (1970) p147.
(70) Eldridge (1968) p122.
(71) McCarthy (1964) p140.

We may sum up the typical craftsman's position about change, therefore, by saying that he is highly resistant to changes which seem to threaten his trade-security, whether by eroding his skills or reducing the demand for them; but that at the same time he is interested in and in favour of technological change which does not carry such a threat. In terms of Touraine's typology of worker attitudes to technological change, the craftsman's attitude may be said to vary between the "pessimistic attitude", which is resistant to change because it destroys earlier occupational or cultural attitudes, and the "voluntaristic attitude" which is one of positive cooperation in technical change.(72)

(iii) Attitudes to promotion. Evidence from various sources suggests that British manual workers have hitherto not generally shown much enthusiasm for promotion to supervisory or management positions.(73) Those parts of this evidence which contain some reference to craftsmen(74), while they do not provide very much evidence, nevertheless give us no reason to think they are markedly different in aspirations of this kind. Three points, however, may be put forward in a general way in connection with craftsmen's attitudes to promotion.

Firstly, craftsmen do not normally accept any system of promotion by seniority within manual grades, such as applies amongst production workers in the steel industry or amongst railwaymen. These systems can provide an outlet for the aspirations of workers who wish to achieve something in the nature of a career development, and can take the edge off some of workers' frustrations and dissatisfactions.(75) Under the traditional craft system, however, the newly time-served craftsman can expect to be put on the same grade as his older fellow-tradesmen. This is not to say that the wages of all craftsmen are necessarily the same - even in earlier years the craft unions' Standard Rate was only a minimum. But craftsmen normally eschew the notion of a promotion ladder with a particular firm or establishment up which a person moves as his period of service with the firm lengthens. Such an arrangement would tend to bind an employee who has achieved some seniority to that particular employer, thus making it almost impossible for him to change his employment without financial loss. This would effectively reduce the trade-security of craftsmen, which, we have seen, is based on the possibility of moving

---

(72) Touraine (1965) p94.
(73) Goldthorpe et al (1968) p120 ff; Hoggart (1957) p74; Wedderburn and Crompton (1972) pp100-101; Dahrendorf (1959) p287; Sykes (1965).
(74) ie, Goldthorpe et al and Wedderburn and Crompton.
(75) See Phelps Brown (1962) p178; Knowles (1952) pp177-178.

relatively easily from one employer to another.

Secondly, craftsmen are open to the idea that one of their number should become a foreman. We have already had cause to refer to the craftsmen's insistence that their foremen should be members of their trade union, and experienced in the work of the trade. This in turn suggests that craftsmen may not be as inclined as some other workers to regard their foreman as being 'on the other side'. Becoming a foreman does not involve leaving the trade, and so is a legitimate thing for a craftsman to do.

Thirdly, since the first opening of trade schools and technical colleges, there have been increasing opportunities for apprentices and young craftsmen to take up studies connected with their trade, either by evening classes or, more recently, by day release. In this way it has become possible for young craftsmen to gain technical qualifications which open the way for some to move up to technical or managerial posts. This is making it possible for some craftsmen at least to think in terms of a career arising out of their trade.(76)

What this suggests is that while manual craftsmen generally may have no more interest in promotion than most British workers, and while they reject the idea of a promotion ladder based on seniority, their respect for the skills of their trade make it acceptable to them that some of their number will rise to the position of foreman within the trade, and others will rise to superior technical positions by achieving higher qualifications in the sphere of the trade.

From the points which have been discussed in the last section, we can now add a further three statements about typical craft attitudes.

(viii) A craftsman is less concerned about job-security than about 'trade-security'.

(ix) A craftsman is resistant to change if it threatens his trade-security, but is in favour of change which promotes efficiency without threatening his trade-security.

(x) A craftsman rejects the idea of a promotion ladder based on seniority within a firm, but sees promotion as appropriate if it is related to experience or technical knowledge of the trade.

---

(76) See Touraine (1965) p48.

Summary

The literature on the subject of the distinctive attitudes of craftsmen is not extensive. The relevant material has had to be gathered, not from major works devoted to the subject but from a variety of works in the field of industrial sociology, industrial relations and labour history. From our review of this material it has been possible to draw up a list of ten statements which summarise typical craftsman attitudes. It is important, however, to emphasise the nature or status of this summary. It is not suggested that all craftsmen share these attitudes, or that any individual craftsman adopts all, or for that matter any of them. Rather these statements taken together should be regarded as an ideal type. An ideal type in the Weberian sense, is an artificial construct. It is

> "the sum total of concepts which the specialist in the human sciences constructs purely for purposes of research".(77)

As an artificial construct it is of necessity somewhat exaggerated. As Weber says:

> "An ideal type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view.... In its conceptual purity this mental construct cannot be found anywhere in reality."(78)

The usefulness of an ideal type is not that it describes 'historical' or 'true' reality, but that it provides a tool for measuring and describing empirical reality. As Freund puts it:

> "Being unreal, the ideal type has the merit of offering us a conceptual device with which we can measure real development."(79)

In this sense our summary of craftsman attitudes can be regarded as an ideal type. It is an 'accentuation' of various points in order to facilitate comparison; but it is drawn from and based upon observations and writings of researchers and others who are familiar with the field. Our intention is to employ it as a potentially useful standard with which to compare the responses of apprentices entering skilled trades. For this purpose the ten statements of our ideal-type summary are listed here again.

(i) A craftsman expects to be able to control his method of working and to take pride in the quality of his work.

(ii) A craftsman is interested in his work and expects to get satisfaction from it.

---

(77) Freund (1968) p60.
(78) Weber (1949) p90.
(79) Freund (1968) p69.

(iii) A craftsman regards his work as part of the exclusive preserve of the members of his craft.

(iv) A craftsman maintains solidarity with his fellow-tradesmen, and gives loyal support to his trade union.

(v) A craftsman regards his status as distinct from and superior to that of labourers and less-skilled workers.

(vi) A craftsman understands and accepts the importance of management, though he may also see himself as standing on the opposite side from management.

(vii) A craftsman legitimates the authority of supervisors in the grounds of job-knowledge and competence.

(viii) A craftsman is less concerned about job-security than about trade-security.

(ix) A craftsman is resistant to change if it threatens his trade-security, but is in favour of change which promotes efficiency without threatening his trade-security.

(x) A craftsman rejects the idea of a promotion ladder based on seniority within a firm, but sees promotion as appropriate if it is related to experience or technical knowledge of the trade.

Chapter 3. Young People Starting Work

This study is concerned with the attitudes of craft apprentices. In so far as apprentices are in process of joining the ranks of skilled craftsmen, it has been important, for the sake of comparison, to look at the attitudes which appear to be typical of craftsmen in industry. But in so far as they are part of a larger body of young people who enter employment shortly after leaving school, it is also important to ask: how do such young people look on the world of work and their place within it? It should then be possible to make some assessment of the extent to which the apprentices involved in the empirical study differ from or are similar to other young people entering work.

In recent years considerable interest has been shown in school-leavers entering work, and there is a growing body of literature on this subject, and on the related one of occupational choice. Not all of this literature is relevant to this study, but it may be helpful to pick out and summarise those points which bear some relevance to the matters which emerged in our discussion of craftsmen's attitudes, as well as to the empirical study which follows.

(a) Attitudes to Work

Researchers in this field have reported varying findings about the attitude of school-leavers to work itself. Ferguson and Cunnison in their wide-ranging study of all the boys who left schools in Glasgow at age 14 in January 1947, discovered that most of the boys seemed to have considerable interest in work. A majority of them gave interest in the work itself as the reason for choosing or preferring certain jobs; and enquiries after the boys had started work indicated that over two-thirds of them had 'keen interest' in their work.(1) A very different form of enquiry was conducted by Thelma Veness a number of years later. She used a variety of measures and techniques to assess the aspirations, expectations and ambitions of 1300 school children in different types of schools in two counties of England. One device was to get them to write their own projected life-story. From these it emerged that work was a negligible theme in the life-stories of only a very small number of the boys, while a considerable number expressed satisfaction with their imagined work.(2) It would appear that few youngsters had a negative or hostile outlook towards work, and many hoped or expected to get satisfaction from it. Later, as a result of a follow-up study of

---

(1) Ferguson and Cunnison (1951) p82, 88.
(2) Veness (1962) p53, 55.

the same young people after they had started work, Veness reported that "the majority" of those undergoing training

> "gave the main reason for embarking on their training as the interest and content of the job it would lead into".(3)

Carter's study of 200 school leavers in Sheffield, however, revealed a somewhat different situation. On interviewing the young people soon after they had started work he found that

> "Just under one third of the boys and girls were enthusiastic about their jobs and had an earnest desire to do well.... For the remaining children work had no strong appeal, and for many it was simply accepted as something which had to be done.... Children did not understand the idea that work might be enjoyable.... Asked in what way his job interested him, one boy replied, 'Interest? You don't go to work for that.' It was a meaningless question, out of tune with his conception of what work was about."(4)

In the light of these different statements it does not appear possible to reach any overall and general conclusion about the attitudes of young people to work. This may be due in part to the difficulties inherent in any enquiry into job-satisfaction.(5) But we can plausibly assume that such attitudes vary considerably amongst different types of people in different situations.

If we turn from work itself to consider young people's attitudes to pay or money generally, however, we do not find the same variation in the evidence, but instead a remarkable unanimity. Ferguson and Cunnison reporting figures which suggested that only a small minority regarded wages as an important factor in job-choice, comment that,

> "Perhaps the most surprising result of this count is the comparative lack of stress laid upon wages."(6)

Another early study, conducted by Jahoda, showed that children at school rejected the idea of particular jobs for a variety of reasons, but that there was very little rejection on the grounds of poor money.(7) Carter in his Sheffield study found the same thing:

> "The large majority of children were <u>not</u> motivated by the desire for a high wage."(8)

---

(3) Veness (unpublished).
(4) Carter (1962) pp213-31. It appears as if Carter uses his finding in Sheffield as a basis for a generalisation on this point in his later work in which he discussed questions related to school-leavers generally - Carter (1966) p113. In the light of the other evidence discussed here, this generalisation may not be justified.
(5) On this point see Mackenzie (1973) p34, and the reference he gives.
(6) Ferguson and Cunnison (1951) p99.
(7) Jahoda (1952).
(8) Carter (1962) p113.

Again Veness, discussing the 'life-stories' of the school-leavers she studied, remarks that,

> "Altogether there is no great pre-occupation with money."

And later she feels it important to point out that

> "The frequency of mention of pay by no means implies that high pay is an important consideration."(9)

In a different kind of study, this time of the leisure pursuits and attitudes of young people in central Scotland, Pearl Jephcott reports that,

> "The youngsters gave the impression of being not all that concerned with money. They were oddly vague as to what in fact they earned and the what and when of their next rise."(10)

These general conclusions are further borne out by the results of investigations into the reasons for job-changes on the part of young people. Carter tells us that

> "only 4 boys and no girls left their jobs mainly because of dissatisfaction with wages,"

and concludes that

> "wages, then, are a necessary but by no means decisive element in job-satisfaction."(11)

Veness also enquired into reasons for job-changes in her follow-up study, and reports that

> "poor pay was mentioned only by a minority."(12)

Given that these investigations are spread over a number of years and involve different types of young people in different parts of the country, the measure of agreement on this point is remarkable. They all report a comparative lack of interest in money on the part of young people starting work.

(b) Attitudes to Industrial Organisation

Is there any evidence of predominant attitudes amongst young people starting work to such features of the industrial scene as management and trade unions? On these points there is not very much to go on, except that both Carter and Venables discovered negative or indifferent attitudes to both bosses and trade unions in the young people they studied. Carter reports that while many Sheffield school-leavers got on well with their

---

(9) Veness (1962) p43, 79.
(10) Jephcott (1967) p56.
(11) Carter (1962) p186. See also Carter (1966) p162.
(12) Veness (unpublished).

immediate supervisors at work, and respected the ability of management, many also resented the fact that

> "bosses were a class apart,"

and found it hard to conceive that they performed a useful function.(13) Similarly, Venables found that many apprentices saw the manager

> "as getting a fat salary for doing very little".(14)

With regard to trade unions, Venables writes of her discussion groups with apprentices at college that

> "the few who spoke up for the unions or took part in their activities were not given much of a hearing".(15)

Carter also found most of his young workers ignorant of trade unions and disinterested in membership.(16) He lays the blame for this largely at the door of the unions themselves, since they appeared to be

> "negligent.... in informing boys and girls what union membership implies".(17)

This is in keeping with Liepmann's description of the ambivalent attitude of trade unions to apprentices, and with the views of G D H Gole which she quotes:

> "The weakest spot of the Trade Union movement is its relatively scanty provision for the adolescent worker..... Most Trade Unions are in spirit adult bodies and do not accommodate themselves too easily to the ways of youth."(18)

Such evidence as there is, then, on these points, suggests that there is at least in some workers a prejudice against bosses or managers, and an attitude of indifference if not hostility to trade unions. It is impossible to say how widespread these attitudes are.

(c) View of the Future

Enquiries into the attitudes of young people towards their own future do not present us with any very clear picture. Certainly Thelma Veness's major study of the aspirations and expectations of school-leavers showed that the concepts of promotion and advancement were present in the minds of many boys and girls who wrote their 'life-stories'. And other parts of the

---

(13) Carter (1962) p223.
(14) Venables (1967) p60. Virginia Palmer (1964) reports more positive attitudes to bosses amongst a group of 15 year old school-leavers in Australia, but it is doubtful whether we can apply this to the British scene.
(15) Venables (1967) p62.
(16) Carter (1962) p267.
(17) Carter (1966) p157.
(18) Liepmann (1960) pp151-153, quoting G D H Cole, Introduction to Trade Unionism, p75.

enquiry indicated that 'good chances of promotion' was the most important feature of a job in the minds of many boys. This, however, suggests little more than a rather vague acceptance of the idea of promotion, whose implications have not been considered at this stage.(19) The follow-up study of the same young people later on after they had started work indicated that few of those who had been at secondary modern schools seemed to be thinking in terms of promotion.(20) By contrast with Veness's findings amongst the young people still at school, Carter found that only one fifth of the boys in his study thought that 'future prospects' were an important element of a good job.(21) He also found that those who did stress prospects were among those who hoped to be apprentices. 'Future prospects', however, can mean different things to different people. It is quite possible that many of Carter's prospective apprentices who mentioned prospects had no more in mind than the position of skilled man, which Ashton sees as the "height of their career" in the aspiration of most boys who hope for apprenticeships.(22) The ambiguity inherent in such phrases as 'getting on' is stressed by Venables, who found that most craft apprentices attending the college she was studying had no ambition beyond the level of craftsman, and no idea of a planned career.(23) On the other hand, a study by Richard Brown of shipbuilding apprentices on Tyneside suggests that over half of the apprentices in early stages of apprenticeship would like to become a foreman or manager, though not all of them rate their chances of this very highly.(24)

While this evidence appears rather conflicting, it seems to suggest that although many school-leavers who enter manual occupations may accept or assume that promotion is a desirable thing, most are realistic enough not to set their eyes on advancement for themselves.

A further question arises in connection with attitudes to the future. Do young people starting work seem to be interested in their future security? Veness found little evidence of such interest:

> "Striving for personal security is a need for which there is little evidence in the responses."(25)

There is evidence, however, that security is a consideration in the minds of boys seeking apprenticeships. Carter cites this as an

---

(19) Veness (1962) p96. See also pp76-77, 94.
(20) Veness (unpublished).
(21) Carter (1962) p113.
(22) Ashton (1973) p117.
(23) Venables (1967) p63.
(24) Brown (1973a).
(25) Veness (1962) p91.

"important reason for aiming at apprenticeship,"(26)

and both Venables and Ashton make similar references to security. It is interesting, however, in the light of our earlier discussion of craftsmen's attitudes to security, to note that these references are in terms of job-security, as opposed to what we have called 'trade-security'. Venables quotes a typical apprentice attitude:

"We'll be the last to go if there's a slump";(27)

while Ashton quotes an almost identical saying:

"Skilled men are always the last to go."(28)

Brown's shipbuilding apprentices also gave an important place to 'security' in their rating of job-characteristics and of advantages of having a trade, but there is no indication of what the boys understood by this term.(29)

What seems to emerge, then, is that boys seeking or taking up apprenticeships may have a greater interest in future security than other young people do. But there is no clear indication in the literature of any distinct concern with trade-security - the security which comes from having a skill which one can take from one employer to another.

(d) Are Apprentices Different?

Most of the studies referred to in this chapter, (with the particular exception of Venables' college study) have included both apprentices and other school-leavers or young workers in their investigations.(30) In order to be able later on to make reasonable comparisons of the attitudes of apprentices in this study with those of other young people, we need now to ask whether there is good reason to believe that apprentices as a whole form a different group in social background or in ability from other young people who start work at the same age.

Three points may be made in this connection. Firstly, it cannot be assumed that apprentices differ in social background from other young workers. There is widespread evidence that a very large proportion of male statutory school-leavers are keen to secure apprenticeships.(31) (What evidence there is to the contrary seems to be attributable to regional

(26) Carter (1962) p114.
(27) Venables (1967) p63.
(28) Ashton (1973) p116.
(29) Brown (1973a).
(30) The proportion of boys under the age of eighteen entering employment who have secured apprenticeships has varied between 35% and 43% in the years between 1950 and 1973 - though there are considerable regional variations. (Figures from the Department of Employment Gazette and its predecessors.) So any sizeable random sample of 15 or 16 year old school-leavers is bound to include a fair proportion of apprentices.
(31) See Jahoda (1952), Ferguson and Cunnison (1951) p78, Williams (1957) p131, Veness (1962) p64, Schools Council (1968) p140-41, Liepmann

variations due to employment opportunities in local labour markets.(32)) Ferguson and Cunnison found that the boys in their sample who aimed at apprenticeships were not confined to any one social grouping, but were found equally among the sons of unskilled, skilled and white-collar workers. They also noted, (as did Veness) that the large majority of those who sought apprenticeships eventually secured them. From this we must conclude that we have no grounds for assuming a division on the basis of social background between apprentices and other young workers.

Secondly, it cannot be assumed that apprentices differ to any great extent from the generality of other young workers in terms of ability. Until quite recently there has been little serious attempt to ensure that boys engaged as apprentices do in fact have abilities and aptitudes appropriate to the work of tradesmen. In other words, the selection of apprentices has in general been a fairly hap-hazard business.(33) It is true that in recent years things have been changing. Many employers, particularly in larger firms, and many Careers Officers are using increasingly sophisticated selection devices to test the abilities and aptitudes of applicants for apprenticeships. To the extent that this has taken place it means that a clearer line is being drawn between apprentices and non-apprentices in terms of ability. But even today the engagement of boys as apprentices with little or no real attempt to assess their abilities is still widespread. This means that we are not in a position to make clear distinction between apprentices and other young workers on the basis of ability.

In the third place (and of greater significance for this study), it is possible to argue that apprentices represent something of a self-conscious or even a self-selected group. Ashton's study of young male workers suggests that schools impart to young people a frame of reference which directs them into particular occupational types.(34) In other words, during the course of their schooling some boys come to look on themselves as potential apprentices, while others are encouraged to see themselves differently. It seems also (from the evidence of Ferguson and Cunnison and Veness referred to above) that many apprenticeships are secured by boys who deliberately set out to become apprentices rather than by those who are ready to take any kind of employment. This suggests that, while apprentices may not necessarily differ from other young people in social background or

---

(32) Carter (1962) p114, Langdale (1971) p228.
(33) Roberts (1971) p148, Maizels (1970) p275, Carter (1962) p141.
(34) Ashton (1973).

in ability, they may be marked off from others as something of a self-conscious group. If so, it could well be that their attitudes differ from those of other young workers at certain points.

While all this is no doubt somewhat speculative, nevertheless the increasing differentiation in terms of ability and the possibility of distinctive attitudes implied in self-selection make it of particular interest to look closely at a particular body of apprentices, and to make some comparison with the account given above of the attitudes of young people generally.

(e) Apprentice Socialisation

Before we turn to the survey, a word may be said about apprenticeship as a socialisation process. Berger and Luckman define secondary socialisation as

> "any subsequent process (ie, after primary socialisation) that inducts an already socialised individual into new sectors of the objective world of his society".(35)

On the basis of this, apprenticeship may be viewed as a process of secondary socialisation by which young people are inducted into the world of craftsmen and acquire their ideology. We have seen that craftsmen typically hold certain attitudes. From this it can be assumed that by the time apprentices have 'served their time' and taken up work as qualified tradesmen, they will tend to conform, to some extent at least, to the pattern of attitudes which are typical of craftsmen. What is not clear, however, is how and when these attitudes are acquired - how, in fact, this socialisation process takes place.

Many writers assume that the adoption of craftsman-type attitudes by entrants into a trade takes place during and because of the period of apprenticeship. Lucien Karpik writes that

> "as a result of the mechanisms of apprenticeship and socialisation the individual interiorises collective values so profoundly that they become an integral part of his personality".(36)

Ingham says that the tendency on the part of skilled men to subscribe to a particular system of norms is

> "due to a period of formal apprenticeship".(37)

Again, Wedderburn and Crompton tell us that

---

(35) Berger and Luckman (1967) p150.
(36) Karpik (1968) p348, emphasis added.
(37) Ingham (1970) p138.

> "a number of other studies support our conclusion that in the case of the tradesmen this expectation (ie, of interesting work) is central and is established during the period of apprenticeship".(38)

Other references to apprenticeship in connection with "learning occupational norms", "internalising shared norms", or acquiring other attitudes are to be found in a number of writers.(39)

It cannot simply be assumed, however, that because craftsmen tend to hold distinctive attitudes, and because apprenticeship can be viewed as a form of socialisation, therefore the attitudes in question are transmitted and acquired during the course of and as a result of the period of apprenticeship. A number of questions and other possibilities arise. Do boys entering apprenticeships bring craft-type attitudes with them, perhaps from their families or occupational communities? In so far as craft attitudes are taken on during apprenticeship, to what extent does this happen through the contact between apprentice and tradesman, and to what extent through the more subjective processes of 'identification with an occupation', as analysed for example, by Becker and Carper.(40)

It appears that very little investigation has been done of apprenticeship as a process of socialisation.(41) It was therefore felt that it would be useful to conduct an investigation with a sample of apprentices entering different trades, to see if some further light could be cast on this socialisation process. The intention was to compare the expressed attitudes of boys at the start of their apprenticeships before they had had any experience of work within their industry, with the attitudes of the same boys a year later after some time of working with tradesmen. It was hoped that by doing this it would be possible to indicate how the attitudes of the apprentices compared with typical craftsman attitudes at these two points in the apprenticeship process; and also whether the apprentices appeared to be different from other young people in this respect. In this way inferences might be drawn about the nature and influence of apprenticeship as a process of socialisation. To a description of this survey project we now turn.

---

(38) Wedderburn and Crompton (1972) p137, emphasis added. In fact the only reference they give is to the passage in Ingham cited above.

(39) Blauner (1964) p47. Venables (1967) p163. Brown et al (1972) p21, Eldridge (1968) p93.

(40) Becker and Carper (1971).

(41) R K Brown has investigated the developing attitudes of apprentices as part of his study of shipyard workers on Tyneside. Much of this is unpublished but see Brown (1973b). This study does not involve interviews with apprentices.

PART II. THE APPRENTICE SURVEY

Chapter 4. The Sample and the Interviews

The empirical work of this project consisted of an attempt to investigate the attitudes of groups of apprentices entering three different industries in central Scotland. The three industries concerned were electricity supply, shipbuilding and motor vehicle repair. They were selected because of the considerable dissimilarity between them, and because of the variety of trades for which they selected and trained apprentices.(1) In each case the boys concerned started their apprenticeship in August 1972 by undergoing a period of off-the-job training at an apprentice training centre, prior to work and on-the-job training in the industry itself. It was through the training centres that contact was made with the apprentices concerned. In each case a random sample consisting of half the total number of boys was selected for interview. Before we go on to a description of the interviews, a few words should be said about the industries concerned and the situation of apprentices entering them.

(a) The Apprentices in the Study

Electricity Supply. The first group of apprentices were employed by the South of Scotland Electricity Board, and were undergoing training as craftsmen to work in either the distribution or the generation side of the Board's work. The industry they were entering is, of course, a large nationalised corporation, employing thousands of people in various distribution districts and power stations throughout Central and South Scotland. It can be seen to be a basic and secure industry, an industry of the future, employing advanced technology. Because of the geographical spread of the Board's work, the boys were recruited from all parts of the area, and brought to the Board's residential training centre at Cumbernauld, Dunbartonshire, for the first part of their training. They underwent a period of basic engineering and electrical training during their first year, which was followed by a short period of work within their distribution districts or power stations during the summer. They then returned for a second year to the training centre, to be given separate training as electricians (on the distribution side), or instrument mechanics, electrical fitters or mechanical fitters (on the generation side).

(1) Two of the groups of apprentices consisted of boys with whom the writer already had contact in connection with a research project into apprentice education and training being carried out by the Scottish Council for Research in Education. The other group, namely the shipbuilding apprentices, were included to provide a better balance and greater diversity for the purposes of this research.

The seventy-four boys who entered the Training Centre in 1972 were chosen by means of a careful selection process out of a very large number of applicants. They were all engaged as craft apprentices, and all of them attended City and Guilds craft courses (as opposed to technical courses) at Technical College under the day-release system. At the end of their apprenticeship they would be offered employment as craftsmen in the industry. Nevertheless, since the industry is a large one involving increasingly advanced technology, it would be natural to assume that there would be opportunities for some who started their career as craft apprentices to rise to higher positions. Many of the boys concerned had stayed on at school till they were sixteen or more, and an unusually high number (55 out of 74) had sat SCE 'O' Grade examinations. In other words, they entered craft apprenticeships with a generally rather high level of academic achievement at school. In addition, a large number of the boys interviewed (12 out of 37) came from 'white-collar' homes, ie, where the father's occupation fell into the Registrar-General's Categories I or II. All in all, the Board could be said to attract a 'good quality' of apprentice in terms of background and ability.

Motor Vehicle Repair. The apprentices entering the motor vehicle repair industry were undergoing training at a group training centre in Lanarkshire. They were recruited for employment in private car garages and heavy vehicle repair workshops in different parts of the county or in Glasgow. Most of the 20 or so companies in the group are small firms, with workshops employing less than a dozen mechanics, but some are larger firms with branches in different places. Most of the apprentices were being trained as motor mechanics, but a few were to become auto-electricians, panel-beaters or partsmen. They underwent a period of five months basic training in motor vehicle work, followed by a full year of on-the-job training in their garages. Most of them (ie, all the motor mechanic apprentices but not those entering other trades) then returned for a further period at the training centre in the middle of their second year.

This training centre also operates a careful selection procedure. In this particular year there was a good body of applicants from whom eighty-six were selected for employment as craft apprentices. Most of them were studying for City and Guilds craft certificates in the educational aspect of their apprenticeship, but a few boys who seemed to be suited for it were on technician courses. The number of apprentices who had stayed on till aged sixteen at school and sat 'O' Grades, and the number who had 'white-collar' fathers were smaller than in the case of the electricity supply apprentices. (26 out of 86 had sat 'O' Grades; 8 out of 42 interviewed had 'white-

collar' fathers.) The garage industry, however, does not always succeed in attracting the 'best quality' of boys in terms of background and ability, and there is good reason to believe that the apprentices at this training centre were of a 'good quality' by the standards of the industry as a whole.

Shipbuilding. The final group of boys were starting their apprenticeship in a training centre of a shipbuilding company on Clydeside. They were entering one or other of the variety of trades involved in that industry. They spent the whole of their first year at the training centre, and later continued on-the-job training in the yards, supplemented by special courses from time to time. During the first year of their training all those who were entering the steel-working trades (plater/shipwright, welder, caulker/burner) were classified as 'metal-users' and given basic training in all these trades. Towards the end of their year at the training centre they were allocated to a particular trade. The apprentices entering the 'outfitting' trades (electrician, joiner, plumber, fitter) were trained in their own trades almost from the start. During the second and subsequent years they all worked with the appropriate tradesmen in the various shops and 'sheds' in the yards, or on the 'boats'.

The company concerned has a considerable interest in training. It also operates a systematic scheme for testing and selecting suitable apprentices, and on this occasion sixty-eight boys had entered the training centre for employment in the yards concerned, the larger number being metal-users. They attended Technical College under block release for a week at a time, nearly all of them being on craft courses, and only a very few on technician courses. In this case only a small minority of the boys interviewed (2 out of 34) came from 'white-collar' homes, while half of them (17 out of 34) had left school at the end of their third year, (ie, age 15).

Finally, it should be noted that the situation of the electricity supply apprentices in their second year was rather different from that of the other two groups. They had spent only a period of 5 - 7 weeks at their place of work before returning for further off-the-job training. This means they had had considerably less experience of working with craftsmen on-the-job than the others had had. This fact will have to be borne in mind in interpreting the interview data.

(b) The Interviews

The first series of interviews was conducted during the winter of 1972-73, within six months of the start of the boys' apprenticeship, and while they were all at training centres. The interviews were based on a

schedule of questions which covered the three main areas of: attitude to trade and work; industry, industrial relations and industrial authority; and the future, change and security.(2) Many of the questions were open-ended, and respondents were encouraged to express their views and feelings freely. Frequently their replies led to further probing questions, and sometimes to dialogue and discussion.

The second series of interviews was carried out a year later. Most of the questions in the schedule remained the same, but on this occasion there was less enquiry into the apprentices' thoughts about getting a trade, and more probing into their thoughts and feelings about the nature and content of their work.(3) In each series the interviews lasted about half an hour.

Records of the interviews were kept by hand, and much of what the boys said was taken down verbatim. Coding for computer analysis was done only after these records had been carefully studied and scrutinised with a view to keeping the inevitable distortion arising from coding to a minimum. The results of this analysis made it possible to make a quantified comparison between the responses of the boys in different industries and in different stages of apprenticeship. The nature of the interviews, however, meant that a lot depended on the interpretation of the interviewer. The account which follows, therefore, is basically an interpretation, figures being used largely as a means of presenting the material or of illustrating, clarifying or pin-pointing aspects of the subjects under discussion. Since clearly the conduct and presentation of such a piece of research raises many methodological questions, it is perhaps appropriate to refer to a few of them briefly before proceding to present the results of the enquiry.

(c) A Note on Methodology

The attempt to discover and assess attitudes by means of interview poses problems of method which have been discussed by many writers at great length. No attempt is made here to deal with the subject fully, but four points which seem important for this research may be briefly put.

Meanings. There is a great danger in this kind of enquiry that the interviewer will read his own meanings into the responses and fail to grasp the real meanings behind the language used by respondents. This danger is especially present when there is a gap of age, social class and occupation separating interviewer from interviewee. In such a situation it is important

(2) See Appendix A.
(3) See Appendix B.

for the interviewer to try to grasp the 'common-sense meanings' of the respondents. It was for this reason that a large number of open-ended questions were used, to allow the apprentices to use their own constructs, rather than having to choose between alternatives imposed by a researcher who may in fact be indulging in what Cicourel calls 'measurement by fiat'.(4) (It should, perhaps, be added that in this case the interviewer was helped in grasping the boys' meanings by having previously had considerable experience of discussions with boys of this type.)

On the other hand, when open-ended questions are asked, some respondents, especially young people of low educational attainment, find it very difficult to verbalise their meanings.(5) Here the interviewer must occasionally be prepared to try to assist the expression of his ideas while trying also not to distort or colour them. A further difficulty lies in the fact that a respondent's words may

"merely reflect the meanings culturally available to him."(6)

A boy may simply repeat the common and culturally approved view on a certain point. Whether this is due to a reluctance to think out and express his own ideas, or to an inability to think beyond what he hears others say, is something the interviewer has to decide in the course of the interview. In other words, there certainly are dangers and difficulties involved in trying to do justice to the respondents' meanings. Nevertheless, it was judged better to make the attempt rather than to pre-judge the issue of meanings by offering only fixed-choice questions.

Rapport. An older interviewer is bound to appear to young apprentices as an authority figure. This increases the ever-present danger that a respondent will give the 'right' answer - the answer he believes the interviewer will expect. There is no complete solution to this problem, and it is not claimed that the results of this enquiry are unaffected by it. Nevertheless, attempt was made to get onto good terms with the boys, and to give them a sense that the interviewer was 'on their side'. In addition, responses which appeared as if they might have been given to please the interviewer were probed into or questioned. On other occasions follow-up questions were put in a way designed to facilitate the less 'desirable' answer. It was encouraging to find that in many cases apprentices spoke frankly, for example about people in authority over them, in a way which showed that they trusted the interviewer.

---

(4) Cicourel (1964) p33.
(5) On this point see Silverman (1970) p226.
(6) Brown (1973b) p27.

The dangers of trying to establish rapport are obvious. The interviewer can never be completely sure that his 'objectivity' is not affected by his relationship with the respondent, with obvious implications for the reliability of his research. Nevertheless, the researcher in this situation must choose to some extent between the reliability and the validity of his work,(7) and in this case the loss of validity through lack of a real meeting between interviewer and interviewee was thought to be the greater danger.

Attitudes: causes and effects. Enquiries into attitudes raise a third problem. Even if it can be assumed that the respondent has spoken his whole mind to the interviewer, and that the interviewer has fully and clearly his meanings, what are the implications of the attitudes so expressed? Textbooks of social psychology will define attitudes, analyse their components and describe conditions under which they can be changed. But this still does not allow us, once we have discovered what we believe to be attitudes, to draw easy conclusions either about how such attitudes have arisen, or what their effect on behaviour will be.

Is it perhaps helpful to see attitudes as part of a dialectical relationship between man and his social world.(8) His attitudes help to construct and shape the social world about him, and they in turn are produced and shaped by the social world in which he finds himself. But is is difficult to go further than this. On the one hand it is no doubt fair to say that attitudes have some effect on the behaviour by which man acts in and upon his world.(9) But it is also clear that it is dangerous to make definite assumptions about future behaviour on the basis of discovered attitudes.(10) This danger does not arise in this case, however, as this study is not concerned with predictions of the future behaviour of the apprentices who were interviewed. On the other hand, while attitudes are doubtless products of the social world in a general sense, it is extremely difficult to isolate particular aspects of the social world which have 'produced' particular attitudes, especially as attitudes can be seen to vary considerably with different contexts.(11) This study is concerned with the process by which attitudes develop in the minds of apprentices. It is hoped that by comparison of expressed attitudes of boys in different industries and at different stages, some light may be cast on the process. Extreme care must be taken, however, in drawing from the observation of

(7) On this point see Cicourel (1964) pp76ff.
(8) This particular approach to the sociology of knowledge is taken by Berger and Luckmann (1967), see especially p78.
(9) See Cohen (1966) p33.
(10) On this point see the perceptive article by Irwin Deutscher (1971).
(11) See Daniel (1973)

this process any conclusions about what has caused or produced the attitudes.

Quantification. Finally, it must be recognised that any analysis of interviews by coding and quantifying the responses leads to further distortion of material which may already be a less than adequate representation of the respondents' meanings because of the hazards of the interview process. The attitudes being explored are likely to be complex and subtly shaded. Forcing the material into numbered boxes (even if, as here, the boxes are only determined as a result of a scrutiny of the material itself) represents at best a simplification. The result is something like a picture painted only in primary colours, in which an injustice is done to the many natural shades that fall in between the selected few colours. Even when there is no desire to 'exclude the middle'(12) by forcing respondents to choose between extremes for the sake of obtaining decisive results, it is inevitable that some middle ground between the numbered responses has to be sacrificed. In addition there is the further danger that number lends a false sense of facticity to the data, with the result that interpretations of attitudes may be

> "treated as positive findings which are fictitiously assumed to be replicable".(13)

These dangers are real and to some extent unavoidable if quantification is used. Nevertheless, without the use of numbers with data of this sort it would be extremely difficult if not impossible to understand and grasp the material, and in particular to make comparisons between different groups of respondents. It is possible to use quantification not in order to prove, but heuristically as an aid to ideas - both the generation and the explanation of ideas. In this case numbers are used to provide a framework and a means of broad comparison, while something of what we have called the subtler shades may be suggested by verbal description and direction quotation from the responses of apprentices themselves. Used in this way quantification can assist the interpretation of attitudes, even if, with Melville Dalton, we preserve a

> "preference for idea over number".(14)

In other words, the presentation of the survey results which follows should be regarded, as already indicated, as an interpretation, which, in spite of the use of numbers, depends for its validity on clear understanding and faithful representation on the part of the interviewer.

---

(12) Cicourel (1964) p32.
(13) Cicourel (1964) p224.
(14) Dalton (1964) p56.

With these brief comments on methods, it is now possible to turn to the results of the research.

Chapter 5. Attitude to Work

What attitude did the new apprentices have towards work? This was the first general question for which an answer was sought in the first interviews. In particular, did they appear to view work instrumentally - as a necessary means of earning a living and achieving other kinds of external rewards - or did they view work as something which had intrinsic interest and was enjoyable for its own sake? It was recognised that this is a very difficult area to enquire into. A simple direct enquiry may elicit a facile and unreal reply.(1) Because of this difficulty the issue was approached in this case by asking the boys whether they thought that most older people in fact enjoyed work, or whether they simply worked for money alone. It was hoped that by being asked such a question first, the apprentices would be forced in the following question to give a more critical and real response about their own feelings with regard to work.

The result of the first enquiry was that 53% of the boys indicated that they thought most older people worked only for money, while only 27% thought they enjoyed work. (See Table 1A.) The others

Table 1A (2)

Whether most people enjoy work

A First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Most enjoy	38	14	29	12	12	4	27	30
Mixed	19	7	17	7	18	6	18	20
Most don't enjoy	41	15	52	22	68	23	53	60
Don't know	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3
	101	37	100	42	101	34	101	113

(1) On the difficulty of conducting enquiries into job-satisfaction see Fox (1971) p76 and also Mackenzie (1973) p34, and the references he gives.

(2) In this and the subsequent tables the following abbreviations are used: ES = electricity supply apprentices; MV = motor vehicle apprentices; SB = shipbuilding apprentices.
Where the same question has been asked in the two series of interviews, the same number has been used for the tables of responses, with the letter A signifying the first interview responses and B the second interview responses.
The total number of apprentices amounted to 113 in the first year, but dropped to 107 in the second year, since 6 apprentices had left their employment. In some tables the N's amounted to less than these totals because some respondents failed to answer some questions for a variety of reasons.

gave qualified answers or did not know. This seemed to indicate that on starting work the boys as a whole were not 'starry-eyed' about what work means for older people. This question was followed by a direct enquiry about themselves. Were they just working for money, or did they enjoy it or get satisfaction from it. (Table 2A.) Here

Table 2A

Present and expected future enjoyment of work

A First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Enjoy and expect to continue	46	17	36	15	29	10	37	42
Enjoy but could well change	29	11	41	17	38	13	36	41
Enjoy but don't know about later	22	8	24	10	29	10	24	28
Don't enjoy now	3	1	0	0	3	1	2	2
	100	37	101	42	99	34	99	113

only 2 boys out of the 113 said they did not enjoy or get satisfaction from work. The almost universal response was, "Oh, I enjoy it". This was followed by a further enquiry as to whether they expected to continue to feel the same way about work when they were older, or whether they might change in later years. Here the result was interesting. Only 37% said they expected to continue to enjoy working. All the others who had said they enjoyed work now thought that later on it might be different. Some of them felt that work would get boring and tedious after they had done it a long time. "I suppose it'll end up like that", one boy acknowledged; "when you're older you get used to it and can't be bothered". Another said: "The time will come when I'll be working for money. Once I've been working for some years it'll get boring." Others recognised that money was more important to the man with family responsibilities and that later on they would need to work long hours to keep up the family income, or perhaps change to more lucrative but less interesting work. In either case, the enjoyment would go out of work. As one boy put it: "Once you've got a family you've got to work more hours. The enjoyment goes out of it and you're working mainly for money."

A certain number of boys volunteered the view that work was interesting and enjoyable now because they were learning, but later on when they had finished their training, work would become more routine

and less enjoyable. One or two also expressed the thought that work was more interesting for tradesmen than for others: "Tradesmen mostly like their work; labourers work just for money. I'm getting a trade so I'll probably like it."

Some more light can be shed on the new apprentices' attitude to work by the responses to the questions about trade-preference. They were asked which trade they would have liked most to enter, and then to give their reasons for choosing that trade. In reply a number of different reasons were given (see Table 3A), but replies categorised

Table 3A

Reasons for liking present or preferred trade

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Type of work	57	21	63	27	73	22	62	70
Money	16	6	10	4	15	5	13	15
Security	11	4	2	1	20	7	11	12
Prospects	22	8	5	1	9	3	11	12
Skill, knowledge	3	1	7	3	3	1	4	5
Chance to do own work	5	1	5	2	20	7	9	10
Variety	16	3	10	4	15	5	11	12
Easy work	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3
Good conditions	24	7	5	2	6	2	10	11

(Since some apprentices gave more than one response, totals are more than 100%.)

as "Type of work" were by far the most numerous. In fact it appeared from discussion with the boys that this answer, namely that they preferred a particular trade because of the kind of work which was done in that trade, seemed to be tacitly assumed by many of the boys who gave other responses. It seems that very few apprentices had thought of selecting a trade because of extrinsic advantages - for example, only 13% referred to money, and 11% to security, and even these may have been assuming that the kind of work was also important.

The first year apprentices, then, interviewed within six months of starting their apprenticeship, gave evidence of being really interested in the work they were learning to do, and that their choice of trade was based upon the kind of work which they found most interesting; though at the same time they realised that many older people do not in fact enjoy working, and that this might be true of themselves in later years.

The same questions were put again to the apprentices a year later. This time there was an increase in the number who thought that older

people do not enjoy work - 64% compared with 53% - and a drop in the numbers who thought most adults enjoy working, from 27% to 14% (Table 1B). Apparently closer contact with people at work, or perhaps

Table 1B

Whether most people enjoy work

Second Year	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Most enjoy	21	7	12	5	9	3	14	15
Mixed	30	10	7	3	24	8	20	21
Most don't enjoy	49	16	78	32	64	21	64	69
Don't know	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	2
	100	33	99	41	100	33	100	107

wider experience of the world generally, tended to increase the opinion that work for older folk is not usually something enjoyable in itself. The most marked change took place among the motor vehicle apprentices (possibly because they found the garage work to be not what they expected) while the shipbuilding apprentices showed practically no change. When asked about themselves, however, the boys did not show a very big change from the previous year (Table 2B) though some shift in

Table 2B

Present and expected future enjoyment of work

Second Year	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Enjoy and expect to continue	21	7	17	7	30	10	22	24
Enjoy to a limited extent	21	7	24	10	27	9	24	26
Enjoy but could well change	42	14	32	13	24	8	33	35
Enjoy but don't know about later	12	4	22	9	9	3	15	16
Don't enjoy now	0	0	5	2	9	3	5	5
Don't know	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	99	33	100	41	99	33	100	107

opinion was evident. It was necessary in analysing these responses to introduce a new category into the table to allow for those who now said they enjoyed their work to a limited extent, or who qualified their enjoyment in some way. For example:

"Some days I hate it, but other days it's OK; if things go well I enjoy working on cars."

"I enjoy it sometimes, when I get peace to do my work."

"I enjoy it - but sometimes I don't."

"It's OK once you start."

There was also a fall in the number who expected to go on enjoying their work in later years. In other words, the boys' replies showed that a number of them were not finding work as enjoyable as they had done the year before. But on the other hand the total number who said that they did not enjoy work rose only from two to five boys, and the majority still said they enjoyed working. Plainly there was still a reluctance on the part of the apprentices to see themselves as they saw most adults, doing their work only for money or external reward.

In the second year again, enquiry was made about the advnatages of the apprentices' preferred trade - ie, their present trade or some other in the case of those who indicated now that they would have preferred a different trade. Here it was found that the nature of the work was given by almost all the boys as the main criterion by which trades can be compared. This being so, Table 3B was drawn up in order

Table 3B

Reasons for liking present or preferred trade

Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Type of work alone	36	12	54	21	61	20	50	53
Work, and employment advantages	36	12	15	6	24	8	25	26
Work, and money, doing own work	27	9	28	11	12	4	23	24
Work, and status of trade	0	0	3	1	3	1	2	2
No clear advantages	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1

(Since one or two apprentices gave more than one response, totals come to slightly over 100%.)

to show simply the extent to which other criteria were also mentioned along with this main one. It shows that a certain number of apprentices were conscious of other advantages of their preferred trade in addition to the nature of the work. Labour market advantages - security or job-opportunities in some form - and external rewards in the form of money and the ability to carry out mechanical or electrical repairs for oneself or for others as a side line, these points

together received mention by nearly half the boys. Nevertheless, it was still the nature of the work that attracted the apprentices to particular trades, while the extrinsic rewards remained very clearly in second place.

Since by this time all the apprentices had had some experience of working at the trade in an actual production situation, it was possible in the second year to ask in some detail what they liked and disliked about the job. Their responses to this were considerably probed: for example, if no detailed answer was forthcoming, the apprentice was asked whether he did the same thing all the time or a variety of things; if a variety, which things did he like and dislike most; why did he like or dislike them, etc. The considerable variety of responses here is summarised in Tables 4 and 5. Once again the thing

Table 4

Things liked about job - Second Year

	ES		MV		SB	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
The work generally	27	9	24	10	18	6
The more skilled jobs	21	7	51	21	70	23
The easier jobs	0	0	12	5	3	1
Variety of work and people met	27	9	22	9	30	10
Working on own, doing it oneself, achievement	24	8	39	16	36	12
Not worked too hard	0	0	0	0	9	3
The people	27	9	48	20	39	13
Conditions	9	3	4	2	6	2
Money	0	0	17	7	15	5
Near home	3	1	10	4	6	2

that stands out is that the majority of the boys referred to the nature of the work when describing what they liked. Some of them simply said they liked the work generally:

"I like the work - rivetting, taking out dents." (Panel beater)

"I like it all, the work as a whole." (Shipbuilding plumber)

"I like everything - especially the electronics side." (Instrument mechanic)

Others spoke of aspects of the work which were more skilled:

"They let you get on with the job even in the first year - stripping engines, etc. I like engine work, because not everyone can really do it. If you can do it you're thought of as a good mechanic." (Motor mechanic)

"I like developing - it makes you proud of it when you've done it." (Sheet iron worker)

Table 5

Things disliked about job - Second Year

	ES		MV		SB	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Repetitive, unskilled, uninteresting work	18	6	36	15	52	17
Menial work	3	1	4	2	0	0
Heavy work	0	0	7	3	3	1
Tricky work	27	9	15	6	6	2
Work not capable of, don't understand	0	0	2	1	0	0
Bosses, gaffers	0	0	12	5	9	3
People at work	0	0	5	2	0	0
Not allowed to finish jobs, moved about, too many things at once	0	0	17	7	9	3
Not busy enough, standing about	0	0	7	3	18	6
Equipment inadequate	0	0	2	1	0	0
Not enough money	0	0	7	3	0	0
Work dirty	21	7	29	12	3	1
Conditions poor	6	2	22	9	21	7
Dangerous work	3	1	2	1	3	1
Hours of work, shifts, etc	6	2	0	0	3	1

(Some boys mentioned a number of things, so totals add up to more than 100%.)

"You know you're skilled and no one else can do the job." (Electrician)

In a number of cases apprentices referred particularly to enjoyment coming from a sense of achievement.

"I like seeing something getting built - it's part of you - you've done something to it ... I like the creative work ... You can see something being built." (Metal-user, SB)

"I get satisfaction from making things go and seeing it work." (Mechanical fitter, ES)

"When you strip down an engine and build it up again and you see it running and you think that you've built it." (Motor mechanic)

There were a few who admitted that they liked the easier jobs best: "I like services best, you never run into any difficulties - once you can do one you can do them all." But they were not typical. The majority seemed to feel that the harder tasks presented a challenge which they enjoyed facing. As one boy put it: "You lose interest if you don't have to think."

In the case of a number of boys the enjoyment of work was connected with being given the opportunity to do a job on their own, to do it

themselves in their own way, and to see the results of having done it themselves:

> "I like when I'm given the whole job." (Plater/shipwright)
>
> "I like to be left to get on with it - to get tore in. I like it when it's my job - when it's me that's done it." (Caulker/burner)
>
> "I like being given a job and left to do it in my way." (Electrical fitter, ES)

In addition, one or two made clear reference in other parts of the interviews to the understanding that a craftsman can decide for himself how to do his work; for example: "A foreman can tell a man what job to do but not how to do it." (See Chapter 6(d) below.)

The only other things which were mentioned by any considerable number of the apprentices as things they liked were the people they worked beside, ("I like the atmosphere with all the other welders - they're a happy family."): and the variety, both of tasks and of people whom they met, ("It's not the same thing over and over again - you're doing something different." - (electrician)). It should be noted that only a very few - twelve boys in all - referred to money or the pay-packet as something they liked. The general picture, therefore, is one of apprentices in their second year enjoying their work for its own sake, and in particular the more skilled and demanding aspects of it.

When we turn to the things which they disliked, we find some interesting points emerging. More than anything else the boys disliked the repetitive, unskilled and routine aspects of their work. This was most marked amongst the motor vehicle and shipbuilding apprentices. Motor mechanics disliked the routine servicing of cars: "There are too many services now, day in and day out." Welders got tired of long runs of flat-welding: "I don't like flat - you can turn your mind off - it's boring." A certain number in these two groups complained of being moved for one job to another before they had finished, and of being given more than one job to do at a time; or conversely of being left standing about and not being given enough to do. The boys in electricity supply, (who, it willbe remembered, had had less experience of work than the others) seemed to be less conscious of repetitive work or of badly organised work, but more aware that some of their tasks were difficult, tricky or unpleasant. The implication of these responses would seem to be that, at least in shipbuilding and motor vehicle repair, some of the apprentices were beginning to discover that their hopes and expectations that their work would be interesting and enjoyable

were not being wholly fulfilled; that the work even of craftsmen was at times repetitive and dull; and that the organisation of the work sometimes prevented them from getting on with their tasks in the way they would wish.

Apart from the nature of the work itself, a certain number of boys complained that their working conditions were poor and that their work was dirty (especially among motor mechanics). But very few boys - only three out of the total number - complained of not getting enough money.

The general impression arising from the responses in both sets of interviews is that (a) the majority of apprentices did not view work instrumentally at this stage. They were interested in the work itself, and they compared one trade with another on the basis of which had the more interesting work. They also gave almost no evidence that they attached much importance to money at this time, though most of them realised it would be important for them later in life. (b) They liked being allowed to do the more skilled and sometimes more difficult tasks which gave a sense of achievement. They appreciated the opportunity to get on with the job by themselves and took pride in achieving things on their own. But by their second year they were beginning to be disappointed that they were not being allowed to do this as fully as they would like. They were being given too many routine, repetitive tasks which involved little skill, and sometimes they were prevented from doing the work they wanted by being given too many tasks or too few.

If we relate this now to the typical attitudes of craftsmen as summarised in the ideal type, we immediately notice the similarity between the apprentices' responses and the typical attitude of craftsmen. A craftsman, we suggested in Chapter 2, is interested in his work and expects to get satisfaction from it, (Ideal Type, point (ii)). A craftsman expects to be able to control his method of working and to take pride in the quality of his work, (Ideal Type, (i)). The two points (a) and (b) in the last paragraph appear to correspond fairly closely with these points from the ideal type. This suggests that our apprentices' attitude to work was rather similar to that of typical craftsmen. We cannot, however, assume from this that the apprentices have been influenced by the craftsmen in their industry, for two reasons. Firstly, these attitudes to work are very clearly shown by the boys in their <u>first</u> year of apprenticeship, ie, before they started working with the tradesmen in the industry. By the second year, after work in

industry, the expectations of enjoyment of work seemed to diminish slightly. In other words, the attitudes could not have derived from the direct influence of older craftsmen. In fact, some of the evidence seems to suggest the opposite, namely that a few of the apprentices found the tradesmen less interested in the work than they themselves were: "Everybody's too lazy. There's not enough efficiency in this yard. The tolerances are too great ... The men have no pride in their work." "I don't like flat (welding) - you're just sitting. The men like flat because they're lazy." In these cases the apprentices seem to be more like 'typical' craftsmen than the craftsmen themselves! Secondly, there is evidence from elsewhere, discussed in Chapter 3, that some non-apprentice young people also expect to get enjoyment or satisfaction from work. This being so, we must bear in mind the possibility that such attitudes found among apprentices may have more to do with the process of leaving school and starting work than with the influence of craftsmen in the trade. What can be said at the moment is that by the time they have begun their apprenticeship the boys indicated an interest in work and a desire to do it themselves and take pride in it, which are similar to the typical attitudes of craftsmen, but that there is no indication that these attitudes derive from their experience of working beside the craftsmen themselves.

One further point remains to be discussed in this chapter, namely the apprentices' views on the exclusiveness of their trade. Originally it was not intended to make enquiry on this point because the great differences between practices in the three industries made definition of the issues and phrasing of relevant questions difficult. Later, however, the management of the training department in the shipbuilding firm expressed a particular interest in discovering boys' attitudes on this point, in the light of their attempt to change attitudes to demarcation through a certain amount of common training for apprentices. It was therefore decided to include a general question on the subject in the second interview: "Do you think it is a good thing for apprentices to be given some training in trades other than their own, or should they concentrate on their own?" In the case of the shipbuilding apprentices, they were further asked whether they thought tradesmen should or should not be allowed to <u>do</u> some of the work of other trades, and why. The responses are summarised in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6 shows that the large majority of boys felt it was a good thing to be taught something of other trades. It should be emphasised, however, that, as indicated below, this means different things in

Table 6

Value of learning about other trades - Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important	85	28	81	33	89	25	84	86
Important for some; qualified	6	2	7	3	11	3	8	8
Not important, concentrate on own	9	3	12	5	0	0	8	8
	100	33	100	41	100	28*	100	102

(* By error this and the following question were not put to a few SB apprentices.)

Table 7

Value of doing the work of other trades - Second Year SB only

	SB	
	%	N
Important for variety and interest	19	5
Important - saves wanting, gives independence	19	5
Important for production, efficiency etc	22	6
Mixed, doubtful, don't know	22	6
Not important	19	5
	101	27

different industries and different trades. For example, in the garage industry there are not normally any rigid boundaries between trades, and many mechanics are expected to do some electrical and welding work; amongst the generation apprentices in the electrical supply industry common basic engineering training in the first year was used as a means of deciding which trade they should enter, so that learning something of other trades was felt to be useful for this purpose; while in shipbuilding the boys were aware that demarcation rules traditionally prevailed in the industry. In view of these differences it would be a mistake to take too much from these responses. Nevertheless, it is of interest and perhaps of importance that 89% of the shipbuilding boys (if anything slightly more than in the other industries) felt that learning something of other trades was important, and none of them said they should concentrate only on the one trade.

The responses of the shipbuilding apprentices to the question about

flexibility between the trades in the doing of the work (as opposed to learning) are even more interesting (see Table 7). Here again most of the apprentices indicated that they were in favour of being able to do some parts of the work of other trades. Some of them gave rather vague or general reasons and some spoke in terms of efficiency and production. One can imagine that these boys may be expressing what they have been told or taught on this subject during their training. But other boys gave reasons which could well be their own - as is obviously the case in the first example below, since the boy clearly misunderstood the company's policy. Such reasons are twofold: first, flexibility would allow more variety and so make their work more interesting:

> "Doing it (ie, the work of other trades) would be good for you - it gives more variation. But the company wouldn't like it because they wouldn't get the same quality."
>
> "Metal-users should be all together doing each other's work - it's more interesting."

Secondly, and more specifically, it would save them from the boredom of standing around waiting for another tradesman to come and do a particular job:

> "I'm in favour of (flexibility) because you don't have to wait around, or run around and find a welder."
>
> "(Flexibility) is good because otherwise you can wait all day and never get your job done."

The interesting thing about these responses is that they show how craftsmen's exclusiveness about their work can have the effect of making the work less interesting and satisfying. The attitude of these apprentices raises the question of whether craftsmen and their unions have, in protecting their interests through insisting on the exclusiveness of their trades, perhaps done themselves a disservice at the same time by sacrificing some of the interest and satisfaction of the job.

However that may be, it seems clear that in this case, if we assume that the shipbuilding craftsmen in this firm hold typical craftsman attitudes in relation to the exclusiveness of their trade and the need for at least some measure of demarcation, then the apprentices in their second year showed at that time little conformity with the views and attitudes of the craftsmen amongst whom they worked. They were aware of the issues of demarcation and flexibility, but few of them gave expression to traditional craft attitudes on this point. And, along with the apprentices in the other two industries, they were in favour of a measure of training in the work of trades other than their own. In all, there was little to suggest that the apprentices had gone

very far towards adopting the attitude expressed in Ideal Type point (iii): A craftsman regards his work as part of the exclusive preserve of the members of his craft.

Conclusion. We may sum up the evidence about the apprentices' attitude to work in this way. They did exhibit a craftsman-like interest in their work and a desire to take a pride in it, but there is nothing to suggest that this arose through the experience of working beside craftsmen. They also showed little sign as yet of adopting a typical craftsman's concern to preserve exclusive trade boundaries. The question of the significance of these conclusions will be discussed in Chapter 8. Meanwhile we turn to the rest of the results of the enquiry.

Chapter 6. Relationships in Industry

In this chapter we turn to the apprentices' attitudes to trade unions, management and industrial relations.

(a) Attitude to Trade Unions

that craftsmen typically tend to be keen
very scanty evidence we have about other
some of them are ignorant of and indifferent
w ask, What attitude did the apprentices in
rade unions? Before the question is
necessary about the situation in the three
the motor repair industry there is little
he garages and workshops where the boys
le unions. (And we must therefore assume that
kshops are unlikely to hold typical craft
But it is important to point out that by
itices in their first year at the training
r or not there were unions in the garages.
ng apprentices certainly knew of the existence
ds. They had been given a talk about trade
ction week at the start of their apprenticeship.
ey had no doubt read in the press about events
the 'work-in' at Upper Clyde Shipbuilders,
very long before the interviews. The
re probably aware that there would be unions in a large nationalised industry such as theirs, but they would have had no contact with them. Against this background three questions were put to the apprentices, the same three questions being repeated in the second interviews a year later.

Would you join a union? The first question was whether or not they would join a trade union if they had an entirely free choice in the matter. They were also asked to give their reasons. A summary of their responses is given in Table 8A and B.

If we look at the first year responses we see that two-thirds of the total of all apprentices (67%) said they would join a union for one reason or another, and only 12% said they would not. The rest, (some 20%) were not sure. This is in itself quite an interesting result. It suggests that these apprentices were more in favour of union membership than the few groups of other young people about whom

Table 8A and B

Intention to join a trade union

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Would join for individual advantages	38	14	15	6	38	13	29	33
Would join for group advantages	16	6	12	5	41	14	21	25
Would join, other or no reason	16	6	22	9	12	4	17	19
Would join - Total	70	26	49	20	91	31	67	77
Would not join	8	3	20	8	6	2	12	13
Don't know	22	8	32	13	3	1	20	22
	100	37	101	41	100	34	99	112

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Would join for individual advantages	49	16	31	12	67	22	48	50
Would join for group advantages	15	5	28	11	18	6	21	22
Would join, other or no reason	27	9	3	1	9	3	12	13
Would join - Total	91	30	62	24	94	31	81	85
Would not join	3	1	23	9	0	0	10	10
Don't know	6	2	16	6	6	2	10	10
	100	33	101	39	100	33	101	105

we have evidence. But if we look at the responses from the boys in the three different industries we find there is a difference between them.(1) The shipbuilding apprentices were most clear about their intention to join a union. Only two said that if they had a free choice they would not join, and only one was uncertain; all the rest (31 boys, 91%) said they would join. This contrasts with the motor vehicle apprentices, of whom just under half (49%) said that if given a choice they would join a union, while just over half would not join or did not know. The electricity supply apprentices fell in between these two.

(1) Combining those who said they would join for any reason and setting them against those who said they would not or did not know, the differences between the three industrial groups, tested by the χ^2 test, are significant at the level $p < .001$.

When we turn to the second year responses we find that even more boys said they would join a union if they could choose, (81% compared with 67% the previous year). If we look at the different industrial groups we see that a number of the electricity supply and motor vehicle apprentices have moved from the 'don't know' position to saying that they would join, while the shipbuilding boys have largely retained their former positions. The interesting thing to note is that even after the motor vehicle boys have had the opportunity of discovering that in most garages there is no union, the movement is still in the direction of willingness to join a union if they had a choice. As there is no reason to believe that adult motor mechanics in small non-union garages are themselves expressing keen interest in unions, it is hard to see how this shift in the attitude of motor mechanic apprentices could have arisen from the direct influence of the adult craftsmen.

If we look more closely at the reasons given for intending to join a union, we notice that in each year the most frequently mentioned reasons have to do with individual advantages, and that the numbers giving this reason go up in each group in the second year. The most usual reference here was to the fact that the union protected the individual from unfair treatment, particularly unfair dismissal.

> "They can fight for you if you get the sack." (SB)
>
> "It'll be someone to back me up if I get laid off for a stupid reason." (MV)
>
> "If you're getting your books the union helps you to keep your job." (MV)

In so far as apprentices view unions in this way they may be said to regard them as 'service' organisations(2) - organisations which exist to provide a protecting or assisting service to their members. In the first year this was the predominant reason for joining a union in the minds of the electricity supply and motor vehicle apprentices. A good number (14, 41%) of the shipbuilding boys, however, gave more traditional solidarity type reasons, emphasising the workers' need to stand together and fight for better wages and conditions.

> "(The union is) for the workers - it's trying to negotiate better wages and conditions." (SB)
>
> "You can't go up for a rise yourself - you need backing." (SB)
>
> "If you're not in (the union) your fellow-workers would be fighting for you and you're sitting back - it's like living off someone else." (SB)

---

(2) This way of regarding trade unions is discussed at length in Goldthorpe (1971) pp166-170.

But by the second year there has been an apparent shift among the shipbuilding apprentices from emphasising these traditional solidarity-type reasons for joining a union, to emphasising individual advantages. This suggests if anything a move away from the typical craft position of solidarity, (ideal type, point (iv)).

To sum up these points, in the first year the large majority of all apprentices favoured joining a union. The shipbuilding apprentices were much more clear not only about their intention to join a trade union, but also about their reasons for doing so. The motor vehicle boys were the least clear about both these points. In the second year there was a further shift overall in favour of joining a union, with an increased emphasis on individual advantages.

Are unions important? Secondly, the apprentices were asked whether or not they thought it important for workers generally to have a trade union. Here the responses fell into a similar pattern (see Table 9A and B)

Table 9A and B

Importance of trade unions for workers generally

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important for settling particular problems	11	4	5	2	9	3	8	9
Important for protection against exploitation	32	12	19	8	41	14	30	34
Important for negotiation, wages, conditions	27	10	14	6	32	11	24	27
Important for other or general reasons	14	5	17	7	6	2	12	14
Important - Total	84	31	55	23	88	30	74	84
Qualified - some advantage	11	4	14	6	3	1	9	11
Not important	5	2	21	9	6	2	12	13
Don't know	0	0	10	4	3	1	4	5
	100	37	100	42	100	34	99	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important for settling particular problems	12	4	5	2	9	3	9	9
Important for protection against exploitation	21	7	23	9	15	5	20	21
Important for negotiation, wages, conditions	33	11	26	10	42	14	33	35
Important for other or general reasons	27	9	13	5	27	9	22	23
Important - Total	93	31	67	26	93	31	84	88
Qualified - some advantage	6	2	15	6	3	1	9	9
Not important	0	0	15	6	0	0	6	6
Don't know	0	0	3	1	3	1	2	2
	99	33	100	39	99	33	101	105

though the differences between the three industries are not so marked. The view that it is important for workers generally to have a union was supported by the great majority (74%) of the total, and by a majority in each industrial group. Once again the shipbuilding apprentices have the clearest views, especially in their support for the traditional reasons of protection against exploitation and securing better wages and conditions. By the second year there was some movement in that even fewer indicated that unions were not important or did not know, and there was a slight movement towards emphasising wages and conditions as the reason for trade unions being important.(3) But the general picture remains similar to that of the previous year, the large majority seeing trade unions as important for workers.

Do unions do a good job? It is possible, of course, to favour the existence of trade unions but to be critical of their current activities. So a third question dealt with whether the apprentices felt that trade unions generally were doing a good job or mainly causing trouble. The summary of results is given in Table 10A and B. Clearly the overall pattern of response to this question may be affected by particular

(3) Cross-tabulation of Tables 9A and 9B reveals that a larger number of apprentices changed their reasons for thinking trade unions important than is suggested by the simple frequency tables. This in turn suggests that perhaps the boys were aware of different reasons, and the choice of one in a response may not be very significant. Because of this possibility too much importance should not be attached to this particular point in itself. This does not, however, apply to the comment on Table 8B about the shift amongst shipbuilding apprentices towards individual reasons for joining a union. Cross-tabulation shows that most of the respondents retained their position but that 7 boys changed from mentioning group advantages to mentioning individual advantages.

Table 10A and B

General View of Trade Unions

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Doing a good job	38	14	28	11	62	21	42	46
Mixed	22	8	15	6	24	8	20	22
Mainly causing trouble	35	13	54	21	12	4	35	38
Don't know	5	2	3	1	3	1	4	4
	100	37	100	39	101	34	101	110

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Doing a good job	36	12	41	16	58	19	45	47
Mixed	42	14	23	9	39	13	34	36
Mainly causing trouble	18	6	31	12	3	1	18	19
Don't know	3	1	5	2	0	0	3	3
	99	33	100	39	100	33	100	105

events in the news at the time. But once again the shipbuilding apprentices' responses were different from the other two groups. In the first year only four shipbuilding boys thought that unions were mainly causing trouble, while a clear majority (62%) said they were doing a good job. The electricity supply boys were very evenly divided, but over half of the motor vehicle apprentices thought that unions were mainly causing trouble.(4) In the second year there was a drop in the number in all groups who thought trade unions were mainly causing trouble, and an increase in the middle 'qualified' group, while the number of those who thought trade unions were doing a good job remained about the same.(5)

This is a case, however, in which the quantified frequencies disguise the fact that a very large number of boys elaborated their replies, and frequently made qualifying comments. Clearly this was an area where there was something to be said on both sides, and 'excluding the middle' would do an injustice to the way many of the lads thought.

---

(4) If those who responded 'Doing a good job' are set against those who said 'Causing trouble', the difference between the three industrial groups is significant at $p < .001$, by the χ^2 test.

(5) Obviously the change in the responses in the second year would be due partly or wholly to current events in the news, but it is impossible to know what effect such events might have had.

Some, of course, had clear and strong views:

> "They're all for money, money, money - and going on strike." (SB)
>
> "They make mountains out of mole-hills. They're ignorant of the state of the country." (ES)

Or on the other side:

> "They're not causing trouble - there's always an injustice or something." (SB)
>
> "Most are doing a very good job. The press and television publicize the bad side." (MV)
>
> "I can't see how a trade union can really cause trouble - they're there to help people." (SB)

But many were ambiguous, especially amongst the electricity supply apprentices:

> "Quite a few are causing trouble and unrest, but some are genuinely trying to help the workers." (ES)
>
> "They do a good job in the eyes of the unions, but the onlooker who's not in a union won't like it if the train drivers are out." (ES)
>
> "The TV gives you one side. It's hard to say who's right." (ES)
>
> "Doing a good job for one group can cause trouble for others." (SB)

To sum up the responses about trade unionism, four points can be made. Firstly, there is a considerable and interesting variety of views and attitudes represented among the boys. Most of them gave intelligent answers and were able to give reasons for their views, reasons which were diverse and not stereotyped or easily categorised. It seemed, in fact, that the boys were thinking out and expressing their own views on these matters.

Secondly, there was a large measure of support for trade unions among the apprentices. Even in the first year the support was there, but it had increased by the second year. In their general support for trade unionism they can be said to be in line, even in the first year, with point (iv) of the Ideal Type of craft attitudes: 'A craftsman maintains solidarity with his fellow tradesmen and gives loyal support to his trade union.' They also appear to be different from the few groups of other young people about whom we have evidence on this point.

Thirdly, their reasons for intending to join a trade union were more instrumental (regarding trade unions as service organisations which offer protection or help to the individual in industry) than solidarist (regarding trade unions as collectivities of workers struggling to improve the wages and conditions of working people),

though some of them did recognise the importance of trade unions in this respect. As far as reasons for membership is concerned they seemd to have more in common with Goldthorpe's affluent workers than with typical craftsmen.

Fourthly, there were interesting differences between the industrial groups, even, or rather especially in the first year, before the apprentices had started working alongside craftsmen in their industry. Already in the first year the shipbuilding apprentices were taking a view of trade unions which seemed to be in line with the traditional solidarity of shipbuilding workers, while the motor vehicle apprentices, about to enter an industry which is largely non-unionised showed much less enthusiasm for trade unions. In the second year the differences between the industrial groups were less marked, since the motor vehicle and electricity supply apprentices had moved to some extent in the direction of greater support for trade unions.

We leave till later a full discussion of the implications of these findings; but two brief comments may be made for carrying on to that discussion. Firstly, the differences between the industrial groups in the first year could suggest that apprentices about to start work in an industry are beginning to adopt attitudes to trade unionism which they feel to be appropriate to that industry. Secondly, the movement in the second year of motor apprentices towards trade unionism when it is not usually found in their industry, and the movement of shipbuilding apprentices towards instrumental reasons for joining a trade union in spite of the solidarist traditions of that industry, might indicate that during their first spell of actual work in the industry these boys have been less influenced by the traditions of their industry and the views of craftsmen than by a general awareness of their own position as industrial manual workers. These points are put forward tentatively at this stage, and will be taken up again after the other findings have been reviewed.

(b) Superiority of Craft Status

It will be recalled that one of the points discussed in connection with typical craftsman attitudes had to do with the craftsman's sense of separation from and superiority over other workers. No direct questions were put to the apprentices on this point. Rather it was hoped that some indications of the boys' views on the matter would be gathered from their responses to the questions about work generally. The result is that no quantifiable data are available. But a careful study of the interview

records reveals that a good number of boys made an assumption that there is a dichotomy between two types of worker - the tradesman and the labourer - and that in fact the only alternative to being a tradesman is to be a labourer.

"If you've not got a trade you can only get a labouring job." (SB)

"I didn't want to be an ordinary labourer." (ES)

"If you've not got a trade you're just a labourer or something." (MV)

"I don't want to be a labourer all my life." (MV)

"I wouldn't like to be a labourer." (SB)

"It's better than being a labourer - he does heavy work, you do skilled work." (SB)

"You're not just a labourer." (ES)

"Those who are just labouring - they've got nothing." (MV)

Implied in this is of course the assumption that being a tradesman is better than being a labourer, because you have skill and status.

"You're one up on the boy who hasn't got a trade - it's a matter of pride." (SB)

"You feel more independent. You can say 'I'm a tradesman.' and take pride in being a tradesman." (ES)

"You're skilled - it's better than sweeping the streets." (SB)

"You're a skilled craftsman - that's your line of work. It's better than being nothing." (MV)

"It gives you a standing." (SB)

The reason for the craftsman's superiority over the labourer is of course his skill, but this results in his also having the advantage of security (a point to which we return in the next chapter).

"If you're a labourer you find it harder to get a job." (SB)

"It helps you to get a job, instead of being just a labourer or something." (MV)

"If you're put out of a job you can get another one as a skilled man; you're not just like a labourer." (ES)

"You could get a labourer's job without a trade, but you'd have no security." (SB)

(It should be emphasised that all the statements quoted above and other similar statements were made simply in reply to a general question about the importance of a trade. There was no reference by the interviewer to any division between tradesmen and labourers.)

It is true that a certain number of boys, particularly amongst the electricity supply apprentices, seemed to think more of clerical or other white-collar work as the alternative to being a craftsman. There were some who had sat SCE 'O' grades and had had the opportunity to continue

further study at school, but instead chose to serve an apprenticeship. Boys of this type in particular would not think so much in terms of the craftsman/labourer dichotomy. But the evidence of the responses suggests that in so far as boys were thinking in terms of manual work, their minds reflected the traditional division. There was very little suggestion that there could be semi-skilled work, or other jobs apart from the simple alternatives - craftsman or labourer. This is not to say that they did not know of other types of employment such as semi-skilled work. Some of them referred to these in other parts of the interview. But when it was a matter of thinking about the advantages of having a trade, they seemed to think in terms only, on the one hand of the labourer - a man who does heavy manual work and who is forced to live in fear of unemployment - and on the other of the craftsman - a person with superior status and security arising from his skill.

This outlook is in line with the typical attitude of craftsmen as outlined in the Ideal Type - point (v): 'A craftsman regards his status as distinct from and superior to that of labourers and less skilled workers.' In fact it seems to go further than that. It seems to reflect not simply the present position of craftsmen, but the old traditional image of the two grades of worker which we discussed in historical retrospect in Chapter 2 above. In other words, the way the apprentices spoke of the division between craftsmen and labourers[6] gives the impression that it is not something they have learned from the realities of the labour market. It seems to reflect an outlook which has been passed down to them out of an old tradition.

The interesting and important thing for us to note, therefore, is that this traditional idea of the division between superior craftsmen and inferior labourers emerges clearly in the <u>first</u> year interviews - before the boys had had any experience of working with the craftsmen in the indsutry(6). It would appear from this that some at least of the apprentices have acquired traditional ideas about the status of craftsmen from sources other than the craftsmen in their own industry. This is a point to which we will return in our fuller discussion of the significance of the interview results later on.

(c) <u>Management</u>

We have seen (in Chapter 3(b)) that there is evidence from elsewhere

---

(6) There are, in fact, more references to 'labourers' in the first year than in the second. This is probably due to the somewhat different line of questioning in the second year. However, the important point is that the idea <u>is</u> present in the first year.

that some young people come into industry with a dislike or distrust of bosses. What attitude did our apprentices take to management? Here it was thought that if there was any anti-management feeling amongst them it might well emerge in connection with the top managers. Young apprentices could scarcely be expected to have much idea about the different levels of management, but they might well have an image of or some pre-conceived ideas about the man at the top. For this reason two questions were asked about top managers. The first was what sort of thing they thought such a person would do, and whether he would be busy or not. If they thought he would be busy, they were asked what kinds of things he would be doing. And the second question was whether the top manager of a firm was important for keeping the work of the firm going, or whether the work could go on just as well without him. It was thought that these questions would give opportunity for anti-management or anti-boss feelings to emerge.

Table 11A and B gives a summary of the responses to the first of

Table 11A and B

View of top manager's work

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Busy	63	23	51	20	62	21	58	64
Not very busy	35	13	39	15	35	12	36	40
Does virtually nothing	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	1
Don't know	3	1	8	3	3	1	5	5
	101	37	101	39	99	34	100	110

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Busy	42	14	67	26	64	21	58	61
Not very busy	42	14	23	9	21	7	29	30
Does virtually nothing	3	1	0	0	6	2	3	3
It varies - qualified	6	2	8	3	9	3	8	8
Don't know	6	2	3	1	0	0	3	3
	99	33	101	39	100	33	101	105

these questions. It shows that very very few of the apprentices had the notion of the top manager as a man who lived in comfort with nothing of importance to do. It is true that one boy said:

> "He'll be out in his cabin-cruiser or something like that - he doesnae dae anything."

And another:

"He'll sit about in an office all day - he won't be busy at all."

But these opinions were quite unrepresentative. Most of the boys thought he would be busy. The numbers changed little between the first and second years, and there was not very much difference between the industrial groups - though it is hard to explain why in the second year there was a drop in the number of electricity supply apprentices who thought the top manager would be busy. Understandably, most of the apprentices had only rather vague ideas of what he would be busy doing. Some of them saw him as the head salesman - getting orders, doing deals with customers etc. Others saw him as being there to chase everybody up - going round and seeing that everyone is working. Others again could only suggest 'paper work'. Somewhere in the region of a third of the boys thought the top manager would be "not very busy". This did not usually seem to mean that they thought he was lazy or useless, but rather that they could not see someone in a large comfortable office with a lot of people under him being busy in the way working men could be. As one boy put it,

"He won't be breaking sweat."

After all, he has plenty of people to whom he could pass it on if he had too much to do.

As for the importance of the top manager's job, (Table 12A and B)

Table 12A and B

Whether top manager important

A: First year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important	76	28	69	29	77	26	74	83
Work could go on without him	22	8	26	11	15	5	21	24
Qualified	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	2
Don't know	3	1	2	1	6	2	4	4
	101	37	99	42	101	34	101	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important	46	15	74	29	76	25	66	69
Work could go on without him	30	10	18	7	9	3	19	20
Qualified	24	8	8	3	12	4	14	15
Don't know	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1
	100	33	100	39	100	33	100	105

again the majority thought he was important, though a minority of one-fifth in each year thought the work could go on without him. It should be added that some of those who thought the work could go on without the top manager were expressing no more than the idea that no person is indispensable, and that if he were not there some of his assistants would do his work for him. It is interesting, however, to notice that in the first year the shipbuilding apprentices, who at that time were expressing more support for trade unions than those in the other industrial groups were doing, showed every bit as much acceptance of the importance of the top manager as the others did. Again the puzzling thing in the second year responses is the drop in the number of the electricity supply apprentices who thought the top manager important.

Taken together the responses to these two questions indicate that very few of the apprentices had any strong feeling or prejudice against the man at the top. One got the impression that they had got the idea, possibly from the news media, that securing orders was important for a company (not least in the shipbuilding industry) and that the men at the top were involved in this. We may perhaps speculate that television had also given them an image of a busy business executive. Whatever its source might be, however, the idea was certainly present that the top manager is both busy and important.

This being so, it is interesting to look at the replies to the next question: whether in their view employers generally were fair to their employees or tried to hold them down (Table 13A and B). Table 13A shows that in the first year 70% of the apprentices thought most employers were fair, while only 13% thought they tried to hold workers down. There was a slight but hardly significant difference between the shipbuilding apprentices and the others. Apparently, then, the boys did not come into industry with any very general feeling of antipathy to employers. It is interesting, however, to note that there was a shift of opinion by the second year (Table 13B). The 70% who thought that employers were fair had dropped to 44%. The shift had taken place amongst all three industrial groups, leaving the shipbuilding group with still the fewest who held this view. Apparently something in their experience during the intervening year had led a number of the boys to change their view of employers as generally fair, and to see them now as holding the workers down, or at least to qualify their original view in some way.

Finally in this section, we have the apprentices' responses to

Table 13A and B

General view of employers

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Treat fairly	74	27	76	32	59	20	70	79
Mixed	16	6	12	5	15	5	15	16
Try to hold workers down	11	4	10	4	21	7	13	15
Don't know	0	0	2	1	6	2	3	3
	101	37	100	42	101	34	101	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Treat fairly	46	15	54	21	30	10	44	46
Mixed	21	7	18	7	36	12	24	26
Try to hold workers down	30	10	26	10	24	8	27	28
Don't know	3	1	3	1	9	3	5	5
	100	33	101	39	99	33	100	105

the question about whether industry is to be seen as something like a football team, with everyone on the same side and with good teamwork being to everyone's advantage, or whether management and workers were really on two different sides. This particular question, or some form of it, has been used in a number of industrial studies, and it was of interest to see how this sample of apprentices responded to it. The results are summarised in Table 14A and B. Given the nature of the interviews it was inevitable, in fact it was intended, that many respondents did not give a simple answer, but discussed the merits of the case to some extent. Some idea of the diversity of the replies may be gathered from some examples. Some boys were quite clear that all were together on one side:

> "The employer is on your side. The idea of working together is the idea of my place." (ES)
>
> "They're just one team. Management are working for the same thing as the workers." (MV)
>
> "They're all working to build ships. They're all on the same side. They've all got a part in it." (SB)
>
> "They're just the same - they're trying to help each other." (ES)

Others took the opposite view:

> "There's an awful gap between management and workers - a fantastic gap." (ES)
>
> "They're definitely on different sides. The employers are not doing as much as workers are doing." (MV)

Table 14A and B

Teamwork or two-sides in industry

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Teamwork - happens in practice	30	11	36	15	26	9	31	35
Usually teamwork - qualified	5	2	7	3	6	2	6	7
Mixed; half-in-half	8	3	5	2	12	4	8	9
Two sides - qualified - should be teamwork but usually isn't	22	8	17	7	12	4	17	19
Two-sides	35	13	33	14	44	15	37	42
Don't know	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1
	100	37	100	42	100	34	100	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Teamwork - happens in practice	12	4	15	6	18	6	15	16
Usually teamwork - qualified	12	4	5	2	3	1	7	7
Mixed; half-in-half	12	4	5	2	6	2	8	8
Two-sides qualified - should be teamwork but usually isn't	21	7	15	6	18	6	18	19
Two-sides	39	13	51	20	55	18	49	51
Don't know	3	1	8	3	0	0	4	4
	99	33	99	39	100	33	101	105

> "Two sides. At platers' meetings they say management are a shower of B's." (SB)

A number, particularly of electricity supply apprentices, felt that there ought to be teamwork, but usually it did not happen:

> "In most cases there's a division, but they should be a team." (ES)
>
> "They should work together, but they don't usually." (MV)
>
> "They should be all together. It happens in some places, but in most places it doesn't." (SB)

While yet others thought that generalising was impossible since relationships of this kind varied with other circumstances, particularly the size of the firm:

> "It depends on the size of the firm. In small firms they're on better terms, but in larger firms they're on different sides." (ES)

"In bigger firms it's one against the other. But you can have teamwork - in small firms it's a team." (MV)

"Sometimes one, sometimes the other. In wee places they're one big team." (SB)

"If they get a good wage they'll be on the same side." (ES)

In view of the variety of opinions expressed, it was necessary to divide the responses under at least five heads, and even then the responses were difficult to categorise. The table shows that in the first year opinion was fairly evenly divided, with the majority tending to think in terms of two sides. The differences between the three industrial groups were very slight. By the second year opinion had shifted clearly towards the view that there are two sides in industry. The number who thought that teamwork happens in practice fell by over a half, while the number taking the opposite view went up, except in the case of the electricity supply apprentices.

It is interesting that the pattern of responses to this question differs from the pattern which has appeared elsewhere when the same or a similar question has been asked.(7) The opinion that there are two sides in industry was stronger amongst these boys than amongst most other groups studied, and this opinion tended to increase as the boys' experience in industry grew. It may be important that the group which changed their opinion least was the electricity supply group, who had had the least experience of working in industry before the second interviews.

---

(7) Following Williner (1964) (who found that 69% of a sample of French workers disagreed with the statement that workers and management formed one team) this question, or a form of it, has been used by a number of researchers in Britain, almost all of whom report majority support for the 'teamwork' view. The groups studied include: affluent workers in Luton - teamwork 67%, 2-sides 28% (Goldthorpe 1968), process workers in NE England - teamwork 69%, 2-sides 23% (Wedderburn and Crompton 1972); petro-chemical workers involved in productivity bargaining - 58% for teamwork (Daniel 1973); process workers in five different parts of UK - teamwork 53-85%, 2-sides 9-45% (Cotgrove and Vamplew 1972). The responses of Brown's Tyneside shipyard workers seem to be similar, though the form of question and answer was somewhat different (Brown 1973). The only group who have been found to give majority support for the 'two-sides' view is the <u>older</u> apprentices in the Tyneside shipyard: over 60% of the sample in their third and fourth years disagreed with the 'teamwork' approach. But this was not the case with the younger (first and second year) apprentices, about 90% of whom agreed with the 'teamwork' idea. Our apprentices gave more support to 'two-sides' than any of these groups with the exception of the older Tyneside apprentice. Is this because most of the other groups were in process industries, or could it have something to do with attitudes in the Scottish industrial community? This point will be discussed later.

What emerges, then, from this discussion of the apprentices' view of management? Three points can be made. Firstly, the apprentices as a whole showed no sign of prejudice or hostility towards the man at the top. They believed he would be busy and his work was important. This view appears to be in keeping with the typical craftsman's attitude, (Ideal Type point (vi)): "A craftsman understands and accepts the importance of management, though he may also see himself as standing on the opposite side from management." Since this opinion, however, was present in the first interviews, and had scarcely changed in the second, it would appear that it was formed in the apprentices' minds not from contact with the craftsmen in the industry but from other influences - perhaps from the media or from general knowledge within an industrial community.

Secondly, there is some change during the course of the year in the apprentices' view of employers generally: more of them felt that industry was two-sided; fewer of them felt employers were fair. In this case the shift may be due to contact with craftsmen. But it will be recalled that the view that industry is two-sided does not appear to be more prevalent amongst craftsmen than amongst other workers. It may well be that the apprentices were conforming to this viewpoint as a result of contact with men in industry. But if so it is not a peculiar craft attitude which is being handed on, but one which is to be found amongst many manual workers generally. It is also possible that the boys may be picking up this attitude from other influences.

Thirdly, it is worth noting that since our boys' responses to the question about two sides or teamwork in industry contrast with the finding of other studies, all of which (with one small and partial exception)(8) were carried out south of the Border or elsewhere, it may be that the apprentices are reflecting opinion prevalent in the Scottish industrial community (or parts of it). The lack of any large investigation into the attitudes of Scottish workers makes it impossible to do more than speculate on this point.

All in all, an examination of the responses of the apprentices in first and second years on the question of managers and employers does

---

(8) The study by Cotgrove and Vamplew (1972) of process workers included groups from five industrial localities, some of which was in Grangemouth, Scotland. The percentage of the Grangemouth sample who adopted a 'teamwork' view of industry (75%) was greater than in three of the other areas. But it is impossible to base very much on this small finding.

reveal some shift of opinion or attitude, but not particularly in the direction of typical craft attitudes. In so far as anything resembling craft attitudes is present, it appears in the first year rather than after the apprentices' contact with craftsmen in their industry.

(d) Legitimation of Industrial Authority

The questions in the interview about authority were asked for two reasons. Firstly, to try to discover whether the apprentices showed, at either the first year or the second year stage, any sign of viewing industrial authority in the way craftsmen seem to do. We have noticed that many craftsmen see the authority of supervisors as based on their greater knowledge or experience of the trade. Does anything of this attitude appear among the apprentices? Secondly, the questions were asked in order to discover more about how young people leaving school and entering industrial institutions viewed and legitimated industrial authority. Little is known on this latter point from other studies, and sometimes assumptions are made about the ability of young people entering work to grasp at once the difference between adult authority in the industrial world and the authority they have been used to in home and school.(9) When the interviews were planned it seemed a doubtful issue whether the new apprentices would be able to understand rather abstract questions about authority, and to give reasoned and meaningful answers. It turned out, in fact, that their responses were far clearer on this subject than might have been expected. Because of this the questions were repeated in the same form in the second interviews.

The first question was: 'You know how in a place of work a foreman has the right to tell workers what to do. What gives him that right?' The responses were of course varied; but it seemed clear that they could be divided under five heads, (Table 15A and B). The tables show that the categories of 'knowledge and experience' and 'position in the structure' account for the large majority of the responses in each group in both interviews. These categories were adopted because they appeared the most natural and useful ones by which to summarise what the boys seemed to be saying. Some examples, all of them drawn from the first interviews, will illustrate this.

---

(9) Eg, Fox (1971) p46, says: "As children we are urged to obey parents, teachers, policemen and public officials simply because they are parents, teachers, policemen and public officials ... So far as the majority are concerned ... by the time they take up employment... they ... come under a generalized expectation that they will accept the orders of persons appointed to govern them ... These expectations ... are likely, for many people, to be only vaguely conceived, and to have the status of traditional rather than rationally evaluated behaviours."

Table 15A and B

Basis of Foreman's Authority

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Knowledge, experience	51	19	36	15	27	9	38	43
Position in the structure	35	13	33	14	41	14	36	41
Need to organize, explain, keep work going	5	2	7	3	6	2	6	7
Need to control, chase men up	5	2	17	7	21	7	14	16
Others, mixed	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3
Don't know	0	0	5	2	3	1	3	3
	99	37	100	42	101	34	100	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Knowledge, experience	61	20	44	18	33	11	46	49
Position in the Structure	33	11	24	10	39	13	32	34
Need to organize, explain, keep work going	3	1	15	6	0	0	7	7
Need to control, chase men up	0	0	12	5	18	6	10	11
Others, mixed	3	1	2	1	9	3	5	5
Don't know	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1
	100	33	99	41	99	33	101	107

Knowledge and experience:

"He has more experience in doing the job. He knows how a job's got to be done." (SB)

"The foreman knows all about the garage and this gives him the right." (MV)

"He knows the job and knows the best way of doing it." (ES)

"He's got more experience and brains - he's got something you haven't got." (MV)

"They're more skilled and know what's to be done." (ES)

Position in the structure:

"He's been employed by the firm to give you orders." (SB)

"He's higher up in the firm than you." (MV)

"He's been installed in a higher position than the rest, to take charge." (ES)

"He's been appointed to do it and paid to do it." (SB)

"The management put the foreman there and he tries to do what the management want done." (MV)

Two interesting things emerge here. The first is that these two categories of 'knowledge and experience' and 'position in the structure' are very similar to the two types of authority identified by Weber/ Parsons and Alvin Gouldner (see Chapter 2(b) (iv) above): authority which is based on 'technical competence', and authority which is based on 'incumbency of a legally defined office'. It appears that even in their first year, before they have had any experience of working under a foreman, the apprentices were not only able to give rational responses to a question about the basis of his authority, (there were very few 'don't know's'), but also to use in a common sense way concepts which are broadly similar to those employed by sociological theorists.

Secondly, it is interesting to compare these responses with the attitudes of craftsmen. We noted that craftsmen typically legitimate the authority of supervisors on the basis of job-knowledge and experience (Ideal Type point (vii)). We can now see that a good number of apprentices seemed to adopt this position: 38% of the total in the first year referred to 'knowledge and experience' in their statement of why a foreman has the right to tell workers what to do; and the number giving this type of response rises to 46% by the second year. It is impossible to say just how significant this is, since there is no way of telling whether other groups of young people starting work would give similar or different patterns of response. But it is at least clear that (a) the attitude of many of these apprentices on the question of the legitimation of authority is similar to the attitude which we have taken to be typical of craftsmen; (b) that this is true even before the apprentices started actual work in the industry; and (c) that the number taking this view increases slightly by the time of the second interview. These points will be taken up again when the overall results of the survey are discussed.

The second question about authority dealt with the difference between authority in industry and the authority of home and school. Apprentices were asked to say whether they thought that the kind of authority a foreman has is much the same as the kind of authority that parents and teachers have or whether it is different. If they thought it was different they were asked to try and explain in what way it was different. The responses were sufficiently varied to make it difficult to present them in the form of a table. An attempt at classification is given in Table 16A and B, where it will be seen that the first year responses were more varied and harder to classify than the second year ones which required fewer categories. Those who said that home or school

Table 16A and B

Industrial Authority compared with Home or School Authority

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Narrower scope: only to do with work	8	3	14	6	3	1	9	10
Stronger sanctions: power to discuss	3	1	5	2	12	4	6	7
Home more relaxed: can disobey parents	8	3	2	1	3	1	5	5
Weaker sanctions: employment voluntary	8	3	10	4	3	1	7	8
Work more relaxed, easy going	5	2	10	4	6	2	7	8
More respect for parents	8	3	5	2	6	2	6	7
Different in other ways; d.k. how	8	3	10	5	12	4	11	12
No difference	51	19	43	18	56	19	50	56
	99	37	99	42	101	34	101	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Narrower scope: only to do with work	9	3	20	8	21	7	17	18
Stronger sanctions	3	1	12	5	12	4	9	10
Work more relaxed, easy going	24	8	15	6	12	4	17	18
Different in other ways; d.k. how	30	10	22	9	12	4	21	23
No difference	33	11	32	13	39	13	35	37
Don't know	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1
	99	33	101	41	99	33	100	107

authority and work authority were 'much the same' numbered a half of the total in the first year, and the number fell to just over a third in the second year. The drop is understandable since at the time of the first interviews the apprentices had not experienced the authority of a foreman about which they were being asked. What is interesting is that half the boys were aware at the first year stage of a difference between the kinds of authority, and most of these were able to give a rational explanation of the difference. The question they were asked was, of course, ambiguous, and some of the variety in the responses arises from the fact that some were comparing work authority with school authority, and some with home authority. Nevertheless, it is possible from a study of the actual words spoken by the apprentices to trace

three lines of thought on the subject.

Firstly, some boys saw a difference in scope between the authority of parents and teachers and the authority of foremen. The former have an authority which covers a large part of life. It is a personal and moral authority, exercised for the good of the child, to teach him the right ways. The authority of the foreman is limited to the workplace and to matters connected with work.

> "Parents have got to have more authority. They're the ones that teach you what to do and what not to do. The foreman just tells you if you're doing it right." (MV)
>
> He doesn't deal with personal things, only with work things." (ES)
>
> "Parents have authority over everything you do. They (foremen) only have authority over your conduct at work." (MV)
>
> "It's at the place of work that his authority lies - he has no authority outside." (MV)

The second and third lines of thought have to do with the relative strength of the sanctions available to those in authority. Some see the foreman as a person who has to be obeyed because of his power to sack or suspend, while the commands of parents or teachers can be more easily ignored.

> "If the foreman tells you, you've got to do it. With parents you don't need to do it so much." (ES)
>
> "You can argue with parents, but with managers - they can suspend you." (SB)
>
> "If they (foremen) tell you to do something and you don't do it you can lose your job." (MV)
>
> "Parental authority is made to appear more, but with the foreman you could lose your job." (SB)

But other boys felt the reverse to be true. Parents and teachers are strict and can be expected to punish. They have got to be obeyed. At work things are more relaxed, and you can get away with more. And in the last analysis employment is voluntary:

> "In a work it's a lot more free. You can tell him you're not doing things. You wouldn't say that to parents or teachers." (ES)
>
> "A foreman can't hit you; he can just tell you and it's up to you to decide if it's right or wrong. If he tells you, you can say either 'yes' or 'no'." (MV)
>
> "Parents and teachers are stricter." (ES)
>
> "There's a large difference. If your dad tells you to do something you do it right away. If a foreman tells you, you do it grudgingly or not at all." (ES)

"If parents say do this or that, you do it. But the foreman can't force you - he's just the foreman. You can go to your shop steward." (SB)

(All these quotations are from the first year interviews.)

From these and the other responses it seems clear that many of the apprentices even in the first year stage, and more of them in the second year, had a fairly clear idea of how the authority of work differed from the authority of school and home. This being so it is of interest to see how they responded to the last of the three questions on authority. This was an attempt to get a clearer picture of the apprentices' understanding of industrial authority by asking them to point out some of the limits or boundaries to that authority. They were asked quite simply to give an example of something a foreman would have no right to tell a person to do. The responses were, of course, very varied, as will be evident from Tables 17A and B - tables which themselves represent a somewhat arbitrary and artificial categorisation of the replies. Since each boy was asked for only one example - the first thing that occurred to him - too much weight should not be attached to the numbers in each category. The value of this analysis is not in the figures but in the representation it offers of the concepts in the minds of apprentices at that time. Four of these seem worthy of comment.

(a) One of the clearest concepts was that a foreman's authority is limited to matters connected with work, the workplace and working hours. He has no authority to give orders connected with personal or out of work matters.(10)

"He can't tell you what to do outside working hours." (ES)

"He has no right to tell a boy to get his hair cut." (MV)

And similarly, he has no right to use his authority for personal advantage:

"They can't tell you to do something for them personally." (ES)

"He has no right to send him to get his tools and do a job for him personally." (ES)

(b) The foreman's authority is limited by his position in a hierarchy of authority. There are some decisions, notably the decision to dismiss

---

(10) Dahrendorf (1959, p167) discussing authority relations refers to the fact that "they always involve specification ... of the spheres within which control is permissible". And he adds in a footnote that "this element in the definition of authority is crucial. It implies that the manager who tries to control people outside his firm or the private lives of people inside his firm, trespasses the borderline between authority and power." It is interesting that the apprentices express the same basic point with some clarity.

Table 17A and B

Limits to Foreman's Authority

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Foreman's authority limited-								
to things connected with work	27	10	19	8	12	4	19	22
by his position in the structure	14	5	12	5	3	1	10	11
by boundaries between the trades	0	0	0	0	18	6	5	6
by tradesman/labourer boundary	5	2	14	6	12	4	11	12
by other work rules and organisation	3	1	12	5	6	2	7	8
by tradesmen's right to decide method of work	5	2	7	3	6	2	6	7
by need to consider safety, welfare of individual	27	10	12	5	18	6	19	21
Other responses	14	5	5	2	9	3	9	10
Don't know; can't think of example	5	2	19	8	18	6	14	16
	100	37	100	42	102	34	100	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Foreman's authority limited-								
to things connected with work	33	11	24	10	12	4	23	25
by his position in the structure	9	3	10	4	0	0	7	7
by boundaries between the trades	3	1	5	2	3	1	4	4
by tradesman/labourer boundary	9	3	7	3	0	0	6	6
by other work rules and organisation	3	1	17	7	9	3	10	11
by tradesmen's right to decide method of work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
by need to consider safety, welfare of individual	18	6	5	2	58	19	25	27
Other responses	12	4	5	2	15	5	10	11
Don't know; can't think of example	12	4	27	11	3	1	15	16
	99	33	100	41	100	33	100	107

an employee, which he cannot take, but must refer to someone higher up.

"He can't just go to some one and say 'You're fired.'. Some things have to go to higher authority." (MV)

"He has no right to sack them - that has to be a higher authority." (ES)

"He has no right to sack you. He should get in touch with the manager." (MV)

(c) The foreman's authority is bounded by certain agreements, conventions or rules in relation to the organisation of work. One of these is the recognised division of labour between tradesmen and unskilled labourers:

"He has no right to tell you to clean toilets and sweep floors if you're a tradesman." (MV)

"He can't say to a qualified welder to clean out toilets." (SB)

"He has no right to tell a tradesman to dig ditches - that's labourer's work." (ES)

Another is the division or demarcation of tasks between the different trades - something which is mentioned only by shipbuilding apprentices in the first year, though it is referred to by three others in the second year:

"He has no right to tell him to do something that's not in his trade." (SB)

"If it's not his job. If he was a welder and he chose him to do a burner's job." (SB)

"To tell him something against union rules - to tell a welder to do a bit of plating." (SB) (11)

A further point under this head is the limit put on the foreman's authority by the recognition that a tradesman should have the right to decide how to do a particular job. The fact that seven apprentices in their first year referred to this is of interest in the light of our earlier discussion of craftsmen's views on this subject, (Chapter 2).

"He's no right to tell you how to do a job if you're a skilled man." (MV)

"If a tradesman wants to do a job his way, he's no right to tell him to do it another way." (SB)

---

(11) The six responses along these lines from first year shipbuilding apprentices were rather surprising in view of the facts mentioned earlier, namely, (a) that the shipbuilding training centre was deliberately attempting to foster new attitudes to demarcation; and (b) that the apprentices in the second year were generally keen on flexibility. Further investigation revealed that 5 out of the 6 untypically had fathers or other relatives in shipbuilding, and that 4 out of the 6, again untypically, had made shipbuilding the industry of their choice on leaving school. This would appear to give sufficient reason to believe that the boys' references to the demarcation issue arose from influences outside the training centre environment.

"If you can do a job your own way a foreman has no right to tell you to do it in his way." (ES)

In addition, there were other references to the foreman being bound by various work rules, eg, concerning overtime etc.

(d) Finally, the authority of the foreman is seen as limited by the moral obligation to consider the personal needs, welfare and safety of the individuals under him. One boy gave a general statement of this point:

"A worker is a human being: you can't drive him on and on when he's used all his energy." (MV)

Others referred particularly to safety and health:

"He's no right to tell a man who is not well to do heavy things." (MV)

"To tell you to use a faulty ladder." (ES)

"If a man's got bad lungs and the foreman knows it, and the foreman tells him to go down the double bottoms (in a ship)." (SB)

References to the limitations imposed by safety requirements were particularly frequent amongst the responses of the shipbuilding apprentices in the second year. Presumably their experience of work in the yards had made them particularly aware of this point.

The examples quoted are all from first year interviews. Similar examples could be drawn from the second series. The reason for limiting the examples to the first series is in order to emphasise that even in the first few months of apprenticeship, before the boys had had any experience of working under a foreman, they were able to illustrate so clearly the limits within which a foreman has authority.

These responses to the questions about authority are of interest because they indicate that the apprentices, even when they were at training centres in their first year, had a remarkably clear grasp of the nature of industrial authority. Most of them were able to give a clear reason why a foreman has the right to tell workers what to do. Many of them saw it as different from home and school authority, because of its different scope and because of the difference in sanctions employed. They were also able on the whole to outline the limits of the foreman's authority: it is limited to the workplace and matters connected with work; and it is limited by the position of the foreman in the hierarchy of authority, by agreements, conventions and rules regarding work organisation, and by the need to consider the safety, health and personal welfare of workers.

While it is not a part of the central argument of this thesis, it is of interest to note in passing the implications of these responses. We have already referred to the opinion that young people entering work look on authority as simply a traditional right of certain kinds of people to expect obedience, since this is what they have learned in the home and at school.(12) What has emerged from this enquiry is that these apprentices were not in fact limited in their understanding of authority to what they had experienced at home or school. Beyond the personal or traditional type of authority exercised by parents and teachers they were aware of a different type, which is appropriate within bureaucratic organisations. If we follow Weber's model of bureaucratic organisation, this involves, among other things, a separation of impersonal official activity from personal or private concerns; a ranked or hierarchical system of authority; and systematic rules which define procedure to be followed in different circumstances.(13) A glance at the first three points - (a), (b) and (c) above - in the discussion of the boys' responses concerning the limits of a foreman's authority, will show that these correspond closely to these aspects of bureaucratic organisation according to Weber's model. It is apparent that the new apprentices already had in their minds some idea of how bureaucratic organisations function, and of how authority is exercised within them - without of course thinking in these abstract terms.

The question obviously arises: Where does this idea come from? Presumably the apprentices' experience of authority in home and school cannot lead them to think of authority in this way. Although perhaps modern schools may be undergoing some change in their authority relations, nevertheless the authority of school as of home is still basically Weber's 'traditional' authority, which rests on "an established belief in ... the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority."(14) It can only be surmised that the more general agents of socialisation within our society, including such things as the mass media and interpersonal contacts within the community, are imparting to young people an understanding of how organisations work, and how authority is exercised within them. While this may not be directly relevant to the discussion of apprentice socialisation, it is nevertheless a point to which it will be useful to return in drawing conclusions from the apprentice survey later on.

---

(12) See the quotation from Fox, footnote (9) above.
(13) See Weber (1964) pp329-333.
(14) Weber (1964) p328.

In concluding this chapter it is worth noting that in each of the areas discussed in it - the attitude of apprentices to trade unions, to the status of craftsmen, to the position and function of management, and to the nature of industrial authority - some evidence was found to suggest that many of the apprentices had attitudes similar to typical craftsman attitudes before they had experienced working alongside craftsmen in their industry. There was also evidence of the development of some attitudes, particularly in connection with employers and managers, which do not appear to be typical of craftsmen. The implication of these points will be considered after the discussion of the apprentices towards the future, change and security, in the next chapter.

Chapter 7. The Future, Change and Security

The third main line of enquiry in the apprentice interviews had to do with the boys' attitudes to their own future and the future of their trade. We have observed earlier that one of the most distinctive features of craftsmen's attitudes has to do with security. A useful starting point, then, is to consider what the apprentices had to say on this subject.

a) Trade-security

The first references in the interviews emerged spontaneously in the responses to an early question, namely, why did the apprentices feel it was important to have a trade. The question was discussed fairly fully in the first interviews, as it was not long since the boys had chosen and started an apprenticeship. An attempt at summarising their responses is made in Table 18A by taking two responses (if offered) from each boy. A similar question was asked a year later (Table 18B), but

Table 18A and B

Reasons for regarding a trade as important

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important for trade-security	84	31	88	37	92	31	88	99
Important for job-security	11	4	14	6	3	1	10	11
Important for other reasons, money, status, knowledge, etc	58	22	29	12	68	23	50	57
Doesn't matter	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Important for trade-security	59	20	75	31	73	24	70	75
Important for job-security	12	4	5	2	3	1	7	7
Important for other reasons	42	14	12	5	12	4	21	23
Not necessarily important but helps with trade-security	12	4	12	5	12	4	12	13
Doesn't matter	3	1	2	1	6	2	4	4

(Some apprentices gave more than one response, so percentages are greater than 100.)

on this occasion less time was taken for probing or discussion, with the result that fewer boys offered more than one response, and the total number of responses is less. It would be a mistake, therefore,

to take too much from a comparison of the tables. (The only interesting point arising from such a comparison is that a few boys had begun to feel that a trade was perhaps not as important as they had thought at first.) From both tables it is clear that 'trade-security' is by far the most important reason for wanting a trade. (It will be recalled that 'trade-security' as opposed to 'job-security' was the term used in Chapter 2 to describe that particular type of security which comes from knowing that if one needs or wishes to change employment one can find a job in one's trade somewhere else.) But of greater importance than the numerical evidence here is the manner in which the boys replied to this question. Most of them did not use the word 'security' at all. Very frequently they used common short conventional phrases such as: 'It's something to fall back on.' 'You've always got it behind you.' 'You've a better chance of a job.' 'You can get a job anywhere.' A good number of them did of course spell it out in more detail:

> "If I had a trade and was made redundant I could go somewhere else." (MV)
>
> "You always have a trade behind you. If the firm goes bankrupt you can get another job." (ES)
>
> "If you get put out of a job you can get another easier." (SB)
>
> "In case you move or get the sack you can more easily find another job." (ES)

Statements of this kind, expressing the same thought in the same kind of language, were repeated over and over again in successive interviews.

Others spoke not so much of redundancy situations as of the opportunity to change jobs to suit oneself. In particular the idea was present that one did not need to stay in one's trade. One could always move to other kinds of work, (for variety or more money, perhaps) and feel secure in the knowledge that if need be one could always 'fall back on one's trade'.

> "Once your time is out you can get another job outside your trade, and you've got your trade to fall back on." (MV)
>
> "If you get sick of a job you can take a different job, such as a labourer for a change, and then go back to your trade." (ES)
>
> "You can always leave it and have something to fall back on." (SB)

All of these quotations show how the importance of trade-security was clearly present in the minds of the apprentices. Very few of them spoke of job-security (having a job which one is unlikely to lose). In fact, in the course of discussion many first year apprentices declared that having a trade did not help you to keep a job - you could get put out just as easily. Two things, however, should be noted about

their responses concerning trade-security. The first is that the importance of trade-security was stressed in the first interviews just as much as (perhaps more than) in the second series. This means that the boys had got this idea not from tradesmen in the industry, but from some other source. Secondly, the remarkable similarity of the responses and the repeated use of conventional phrases ('something to fall back on', 'something behind you', etc), suggests that the apprentices were giving expression to an idea that is widely known and accepted in the community. This is a point to which we will have to return later on.

In the light of this strong indication of the awareness of trade-security, it is worth looking at the apprentices' replies about possible future unemployment. They were asked whether or not they thought it likely that they would ever be unemployed later on when they were qualified tradesmen. (See Table 19A and B.) It will be seen that in

Table 19A and B

Likelihood of unemployment in the future

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Unemployment unlikely	32	12	34	14	15	5	28	31
Unemployment quite possible	68	25	64	26	70	24	67	75
Don't know	0	0	2	1	15	5	6	6
	100	37	100	41	100	34	101	112

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Unemployment unlikely	58	19	46	19	36	12	47	50
Unemployment quite possible	30	10	39	16	61	20	43	46
Qualified, 'it depends'	6	2	7	3	0	0	5	5
Don't know	6	2	7	3	3	1	6	6
	100	33	99	41	100	33	101	107

the first year two-thirds of the boys thought that unemployment in the future was quite possible, while only a little over a quarter thought it unlikely. There was little difference between the three industrial groups - fewer of the shipbuilding apprentices thought unemployment unlikely, but the differences are not statistically significant. By the second year there had been a slight shift in every group towards thinking unemployment unlikely.

These figures may seem surprising. How is it that so many boys

who know that having a trade gives them trade-security think they may be unemployed in the future even with a trade 'behind them'? Two explanations seem possible. It could be argued that those boys who thought they might well be unemployed in the future felt that unemployment was such a widespread and common thing that even having a trade could not completely guard against it. In other words, a trade was a help in finding a job, but it could not guarantee complete security. Or secondly, if we recall the conventional, almost folklore-like nature of the replies about the importance of having a trade, it may be that the apprentices have taken over this piece of conventional wisdom with part of their minds, without considering its implications, or applying them to their other thoughts about the future, and that the responses about possible future unemployment derive from a different source, such as their own perception of the current state of affairs in society today. This possibility that attitudes derive from different sources is a further point to which we will return later.

However that may be, we are still faced with the fact that when we come to the second year considerably more of the apprentices now thought unemployment unlikely. This may be due to the influence of craftsmen who have led the boys to understand that with a trade behind them they will always be able to find a job. But in view of the fact that the biggest change between the first and second interviews is amongst the electricity supply apprentices who had had the least experience of working with craftsmen, and in view of the fact that the boys themselves clearly were familiar with the nature of trade-security in the first year (as indicated above), the possibility that the change during these twelve months is due to the craftsmen's sense of trade-security rubbing off on the apprentices seems to be unlikely. It seems far more likely that the change is due to the fact that unemployment levels in the community as a whole had fallen by the time of the second interview, and the apprentices would no doubt be aware of this.

A further indication of the apprentices' attitude to security is to be found in their responses to the question whether they preferred the idea of securing a settled job, after they had served their time, and staying in it, or the idea of moving around for a while from one job to another. The responses are summarised in Table 20A and B. More than half of the boys in the first year said they would prefer to settle down in one job, while only about a quarter said they preferred the idea of moving around for the sake of variety or experience. It will be seen, however, that the overwhelming majority of the electricity

Table 20A and B

Desire for a settled job

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Prefer settled job	84	31	62	26	29	10	59	67
Might move if advantageous	11	4	5	2	29	10	14	16
Prefer moving around	3	1	31	13	38	13	24	27
Don't know and other responses	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3
	101	37	100	42	99	34	100	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Prefer settled job	39	13	39	16	33	11	37	40
Might move a bit and then settle	6	2	12	5	3	1	7	8
Might move if advantageous	24	8	20	8	15	5	20	21
Prefer moving around	27	9	27	11	46	15	33	35
Don't know	3	1	2	1	3	1	3	3
	99	33	100	41	100	33	100	107

supply apprentices favoured settling in one job, while there was considerably more opinion in favour of moving around to be found amongst the shipbuilding boys.(1) The motor vehicle apprentices fell in between the other two groups. By the second year the differences between the groups had been greatly reduced owing to the fact that a large number of the electricity supply apprentices, and to a lesser extent the motor vehicle apprentices, had changed their minds about preferring to settle in one job, while there is little change amongst the shipbuilding boys.

In themselves these figures do not tell us very much, but taken together with the other responses discussed in this section they do indicate that the idea of being able to move around and take different jobs in different places was present in the minds of the apprentices. Not all apprentices, of course, would want to do this, just as not all tradesmen would. But that some, (amounting to about a third in the second year) preferred this to the idea of a settled job is, perhaps, an indication that the implications of trade-security had not been lost on the boys. With a trade they could if they wished move around for

(1) Combining the last three rows and setting them against those who clearly preferred a steady job the differences between the three industrial groups are significant at the level $p < .01$ by the chi-squared test.

the sake of variety or greater experience. The change between the first year and second year may simply be due to the fact that in the first year they had not long commenced their apprenticeship, whereas by the second year some might be beginning to be restless. The fact that once again the biggest change was amongst the electricity supply apprentices who had had the least contact with craftsmen in the industry makes it look unlikely that the change can be attributed directly to the influence of craftsmen, though of course some such influence cannot be ruled out. Other possibilities will be discussed in the last chapter.

We can now sum up this discussion of trade-security. The overwhelming majority of all the apprentices indicated that the advantage of having a trade was that it provided trade-security - a means of securing another job somewhere else if need be. Most of them expressed this in a manner which suggested they had learned and accepted it as part of the generally understood knowledge of the community in which they lived. Such an awareness of trade-security is also suggested by the number who indicated their preference for 'moving around' once they had served their time. On the other hand, it is not clear why many apprentices thought that a period of unemployment in the future was quite possible; but a reduction in the numbers who thought this by the time of the second interviews does not seem to be due to the influence of craftsmen.

b) Trade-security and Resistance to Change

In view of the fact that people's attitudes to change are often connected with their sense of security, the apprentices' responses on the subject of change should be considered along with what has just been said about their attitudes to security. The first point to consider, however, was whether the boys did in fact expect a lot of change in the technology or practice of their trade in the coming years. They were asked, therefore, whether they thought there would be a lot of change in their trade or whether what they learned now would last all their lives. The pattern of response in the two successive years is very similar (see Table 21A and B). Just over half the boys on each occasion thought there would be a lot of change, while only a small minority thought there would be little or no change. (There was no substantial difference between the three industrial groups, especially if we consider that the line between those who think in terms of 'a lot of change' and those who forecast 'some change' is hard to draw clearly.)

Table 21A and B

Expectation of change in work of trade

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
A lot of change	73	27	43	18	38	13	51	58
Some change	16	6	41	17	50	17	35	40
Little change	8	3	17	7	12	4	12	14
Don't know	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	100	37	101	42	100	34	99	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
A lot of change	58	19	49	20	58	19	54	58
Some change	30	10	29	12	21	7	27	29
Little change	12	4	20	8	15	5	16	17
Don't know	0	0	2	1	6	2	3	3
	100	33	100	41	100	33	100	107

This question was followed immediately by an enquiry as to whether they thought they would be able to adjust to any changes which might come in the future, and if so how. Two things emerged from this enquiry (see Table 22A and B). The first is that very few of the

Table 22A and B

Adaptation to change

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Mentions re-training	92	34	66	28	47	16	69	78
Expects to pick it up	8	3	31	13	41	14	27	30
Expects difficulty	0	0	2	1	9	3	4	4
Don't know	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1
	100	37	99	42	100	34	101	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Mentions re-training	73	24	44	18	30	10	49	52
Expects to pick it up	27	9	44	18	64	21	45	48
Expects difficulty	0	0	10	4	3	1	5	5
Don't know	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	2
	100	33	100	41	100	33	101	107

apprentices in either the first or second years thought they would have any difficulty in adjusting to any new methods or techniques or types of machinery which might be introduced in the future. This is no doubt understandable. Young people standing at the threshold of their working life and involved in learning new things day by day can be expected to take a hopeful view of their ability to learn in the future. The second point is of more interest. A large proportion of the apprentices spontaneously referred to the possibility of some form of re-training or continued training in the future, to help them to keep up with new developments. In the case of the electricity supply apprentices this was probably to be expected, since the training centre they were attending also ran re-training courses for craftsmen and others, and they were aware of this going on. This no doubt accounts for the particularly large number of these boys who mentioned re-training. But it is interesting that more than half of the other apprentices also referred in their first interviews to some form of further training or learning in the future, eg, by returning to a training centre, by being sent on special courses, or by attending evening classes. It will be seen that there was a drop in the number mentioning re-training in the second interviews and that more of the boys in each industrial group thought that they would just 'pick it up' while doing the work.

Inevitably the figures in the tables conceal some of the variety of opinion and expression. Very few of the apprentices felt strongly that change is unlikely but one or two motor mechanic apprentices did express this point of view clearly. One boy said:

> "The skills will last because cars are built on the same principles as when the car came out. What we learn now will last, it won't go out of date."

Another said:

> "The skills will last all my life,"

but he added:

> "unless something happens to the motor industry - it gets stopped because of pollution or something."

A good number of boys felt that change would be gradual and this would allow them to keep up with new developments without difficulty:

> "They'll change but not too much. If you've got the background you should be able to adapt and pick it up." (ES)

> "As the car advances the mechanic will advance. I'll pick up some of it. Other things I'll have to learn from books." (MV)

"They'll change but not too much. I'll be able to learn by picking things up, because the change will come gradually." (SB)

Others felt that the basic skills of their trade would remain unaltered, though there would be changes in machinery or other things:

"The basics will remain the same, but other things have got to change - you can see it happening." (MV)

"Some things will change as modern methods come in, but basically the skills will be the same." (ES)

"The skills will last all my life as a base, but some things will change - some methods will change." (SB)

"There will be better methods. Not very different but faster and more efficient." (ES)

Many of the boys realised that they were living in an age of change, and that change was a constant process going on all the time:

"There will always be changes - they'll change a lot over the years." (SB)

"They'll change because everything's changing." (ES)

"There will be changes - projects at school showed us how industry changes." (MV)

"Skills are changing all the time." (SB)

"Everything will change every few years. I'll have to take it in my stride." (ES)

But one or two apprentices, particularly motor boys, felt there could be sudden dramatic changes:

"No change is likely till they bring in a new type of car altogether, and then it will be completely different." (MV)

"The motor mechanic's trade will go out - they might invent something else." (MV)

As already indicated, the large majority of the apprentices felt they would be able to cope with the coming changes, either by 'going on a course' or by being sent back to a training centre for a spell, or by going to 'night school'. Some, however, did realise it could raise problems or difficulties for them in the future:

"I don't know how it'll affect me. I could be left on the shelf." (ES)

"I could be unemployed through progress ... I'll probably turn into a fitter of pieces and not learn new things." (MV)

"It's up to me to see I'm not left behind - I'll just need to try." (SB)

"It'll change a lot. I won't be able to keep up so I'll probably leave." (MV)

But for most of the apprentices the prospect did not seem to present a problem. It was something they expected and accepted. Their responses

on this subject were, moreover, different in character from their comments on the importance of a trade for trade-security. In that connection, it will be recalled, the apprentices seemed to be repeating conventional and traditional phrases. Their views about change, however, seemed to arise out of their own understanding of the nature of the modern world in which they lived. They saw change all round about them, and realised that it would continue in the future.

This acceptance of the idea of change and re-training is interesting in the light of the findings of other writers that apprentices rejected the idea of change in their trade. For example, Ethel Venables writes of apprentices at a technical college:

> "Suggestions that they need to be ready for changes in the future - that twenty years hence the factory would be presented with new problems, and they would find they only knew 'one bit', were rejected without comprehension." (2)

Similarly, Veness reports of young men undergoing training that

> "No one envisaged the possibility of re-training - that in their working life their job or skill might become obsolete." (3)

This suggests that today's apprentices may possibly be more aware of coming changes than were their counterparts a few years ago.

This acceptance of the idea of change may be something of a new development amongst apprentices, but it is not out of keeping with the attitude of typical craftsmen. We suggested earlier that a craftsman 'is in favour of change which promotes efficiency without threatening his trade-security,' (Ideal Type point (ix)). But the other half of that statement is that a craftsman 'is resistant to change if it threatens his trade-security.' The responses about change which we have discussed contain almost no notion that change could be a threat to security, and there is accordingly no suggestion of resistance to change. In the hope of getting some idea of how the apprentices looked upon change when it comes as a threat to security a further question was put to them. This went as follows; 'You know how, when new technology or new machinery is introduced in a works, this is progress, but it can mean that people are put out of work because of it. Do you think it is right to put people out of work for the sake of technological progress, or should we hold back progress to keep people employed?' On being asked this many of the apprentices were reluctant to give unequivocal support to either of the stated alternatives, and therefore gave qualified or mixed answers. An attempt at classification

---

(2) Venables (1967) p63.
(3) Veness (unpublished).

is to be found in Table 23A and B. It will be seen from this table

Table 23A and B

Whether technical progress is more important than keeping jobs

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Progress more important	35	13	62	26	26	9	42	48
Progress on the whole - (qualified)	16	6	10	4	15	5	13	15
Half-in-half, mixed	16	6	5	2	21	7	13	15
Jobs on the whole - (qualified)	16	6	10	4	12	4	12	14
Jobs more important	16	6	12	5	24	8	17	19
Don't know	0	0	2	1	3	1	2	2
	99	37	101	42	101	34	99	113

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Progress more important	36	12	41	16	55	18	44	46
Progress on the whole - (qualified)	15	5	18	7	9	3	14	15
Half-in-half, mixed	6	2	8	3	21	7	11	12
Jobs on the whole - (qualified)	24	8	15	6	6	2	15	16
Jobs more important	9	3	15	6	9	3	11	12
Don't know	9	3	3	1	0	0	4	4
	99	33	100	39	100	33	99	105

that in both sets of interviews the balance of opinion was in favour of letting progress go ahead even at the expense of jobs. In the first year this opinion is most clearly represented amongst the motor vehicle apprentices, while the shipbuilding apprentices gave it the least support, but the differences are not significant. In the second year, some of the motor vehicle boys shifted away from the 'progress' position, and some of the shipbuilding boys moved towards it. It is difficult to attach much significance to these changes. What is more important is that in both years, with little difference in the overall figures, the boys on the whole tended to favour making progress even if it meant redundancies. Only a small proportion (17% in the first year, 11% in the second) were prepared to say unequivocally that progress should be restrained in order to keep men employed.

If we look more closely at what the boys actually said, one or two interesting points emerge. One is that a good many boys felt that progress was inevitable, and therefore there was no <u>real</u> alternative:

"In the end progress is going to take over, so it's all the same anyway - you've no choice." (MV)

"You can't stop progress. It's a hard thing when men are out of jobs, but they've got to accept it - you can't do anything about it." (MV)

These boys seemed to view progress in almost a fatalistic way. Others thought that unemployment was not necessarily such a disaster anyway - perhaps there was even a hopeful prospect that people would be able to live without working:

"Progress will go on anyway - it's got to. There will be more and more people unemployed - over 50%. Then they will make unemployment money enough that they can live without work." (ES)

"The machines should go ahead. If a machine is making the money you should get it for lying in bed." (SB)

Another and even more interesting point that emerges is that a number of boys viewed this question from the standpoint of the company.

"You've got to have progress, otherwise the company will lose money." (SB)

"If it's going to help production it's common sense to get rid of the people you don't need." (ES)

"You have to bring in the machines, otherwise you wouldn't get the orders." (SB)

There were, of course, the others who felt strongly the other way:

"They should hold back progress. There's no point in being technical with everyone sitting in the house and machines doing all the work." (MV)

"It's not right to put people out of a job. It's better to hold back progress." (ES)

But on the whole, from the tenor of the responses as well as from the figures in the table, it is clear that most apprentices in these early years were in favour of the continuing advance of technology, and were not particularly concerned about unemployment, or people being made redundant.

It is not clear from the responses, however, to what extent the apprentices were thinking of technological changes which could affect craft skills in particular and possibly make them obsolete. The replies to the previous question, however, indicate that most of them did realise that changes, perhaps drastic changes, would affect the skills of their trades in the future. Yet in their replies to this further question there was no suggestion from any of them that technical changes should be resisted if they threatened craft skills. In fact a number of apprentices referred to the possibility of re-training those

who lost their jobs changing technology. In other words there is no sign here of the craftsman's typical resistance to changes 'that threaten his trade-security' (Ideal Type point (ix)). Furthermore there is little difference between the first and second year responses on this issue, which suggests that there can have been little influence by older craftsmen in the direction of this kind of resistance to change.

In all, the responses of the apprentices on the subject of change indicated that most of them expected considerable change in the future, and were willing, in their rational minds at least, to accept its implications in terms of learning new things, possible re-training, and perhaps finding other jobs if necessary. This is not to suggest that they would respond with the same detached rationality if their skills or their jobs were in fact threatened in the future. But it does suggest that in this connection the boys were observing the world with their own eyes, and not adopting the traditional outlook of tradesmen or others. We have seen how, in response to the enquiry about the importance of having a trade, the apprentices seemed to reflect traditional views in the form of conventional sayings about trade-security. Here in the replies concerning change both the content and the way of expression indicate that they were interpreting the situation for themselves. Their language, both in the first and second series of interviews, is the language not of traditional craft ideology, but of young people conscious that they are entering a world of rapid technological change.

c) Promotion

The final question in our interview had to do with the apprentices' attitude to or expectations of promotion in years to come. They were asked whether they expected to be promoted to a higher job later on in life or whether they expected to stay as ordinary tradesmen. They were further asked whether or not they thought they would have a chance if they wanted it. Further if they said they did not expect promotion they were asked why not, and if they did they were asked whether they would go as high as they could or whether they would not want too much responsibility. The summary of the responses is given in Table 24A and B.

It will be seen from the table that the very large majority (about three-quarters) of the apprentices in the first year hoped to be promoted at some time later on. The other quarter was made up of boys who said they would like to be promoted but did not really expect

Table 24A and B

Expectation of promotion

A: First Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Expect promotion - as high as possible	49	18	42	17	35	12	42	47
Expect promotion - not too high	38	14	32	13	27	9	32	36
Wouldn't mind but don't expect it	5	2	7	3	33	11	14	16
Wouldn't want it	5	2	17	7	6	2	10	11
Don't know	3	1	2	1	0	0	2	2
	100	37	100	41	101	34	100	112

B: Second Year

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Expect promotion - as high as possible	30	10	22	9	36	12	29	31
Expect promotion - not too high	27	9	17	7	27	9	23	25
Would like it, but don't know about opportunity	24	8	32	13	15	5	24	26))
Wouldn't mind but don't expect it	0	0	7	3	3	1	4	4)
Wouldn't want it	3	1	20	8	18	6	14	15
Don't know	15	5	2	1	0	0	6	6
	99	33	100	41	99	33	100	107

it (14%), and a small number (10%) who said they would not want promotion. In the second year the desire for promotion remained largely unchanged (there were still only 14% who said they would not want to be promoted), but the expectation of it dropped to some extent: now 28% (ie, the bracketted rows) said that though they would like promotion they did not really expect it. But still a majority (52%) said they hoped for promotion.

As with previous questions, the numerical summary disguises some of the variety of the responses. For example, some of those who hoped for promotion expressed a firm intention and desire to get on:

> "I'm going to try awful hard to get promoted." (SB)
>
> "I expect to be promoted. I'm ambitious. I'll go as high as I can." (MV)
>
> "I'm going to work my hardest to get promoted. Others may get there before me, but in the end I think I will." (ES)

Others had a more vague and general hope:

> "Once you've been with a firm a while you usually get promoted. I hope to be some day." (MV)
>
> "I hope to be promoted. I can't see myself being a journeyman all my life." (SB)
>
> "Everyone wants to be promoted. I've a good chance if I work well." (ES)

A number said they hoped to be promoted but they did not want to go too high, either because they did not want too much responsibility, or because they wanted to keep in touch with practical as opposed to paper work:

> "I'd take a chance if I got it - to a certain extent; but I'd try to keep on practical work." (ES)
>
> "I'll try to make my way up. I don't know how far I can go. I wouldn't like to go right to the top - there's too much responsibility." (MV)
>
> "I'd like to get on, but not too much - not beyond foreman." (ES)

Of those who did not expect promotion some indicated they would quite like it, though they did not rate their chances high:

> "I can't see me getting promoted. I've not got the brains. But I'd take it if I got the chance." (SB)
>
> "I'd like to but I might not expect to - I might not be good enough." (SB)

And a few were quite clear that they did not want promotion, either because they preferred practical manual work:

> "I don't think I'd want to - I'd rather work with my hands," (SB)

or because they did not want responsibility:

> "I don't want to go up - there's too much responsibility," (MV)

or, in a few cases, because they felt promotion would spoil relationships with their mates or fellows:

> "When you climb the ladder you don't get on with your mates so well." (ES)
>
> "I wouldn't like to get out of touch with the shop floor - you get called a snob - you don't speak the same lingo." (MV)

In interpretation of these responses two points should be made. The first is that by any standard of comparison the level of expectation or promotion indicated by these figures is high. We have already observed that various studies of British workers have revealed low expectation of or desire for promotion amongst the groups of

workers studied (see Chapter 2(c) iii above); and that even amongst young people training for skilled work there is often not much aspiration for positions higher than that of tradesman (Chapter 3(c)). Perhaps it is significant, however, that the shipbuilding apprentices included in Brown's Tyneside study indicated levels of aspiration not much below those indicated here. Since the Tyneside findings are amongst the latest that are available on this subject, it may be that these findings together with ours reflect a change in the climate of opinion in society in general and amongst young people in particular. It is possible that young people today have more interest in promotion and getting on than people in earlier years had. This is admittedly somewhat speculative; but if it is true it means that in their responses to this question (as in the case of the previous question about change in the future) the apprentices were reflecting, not traditional ideas and values, but an understanding or interpretation of the industrial world of today - a world in which opportunities are available for all sorts of people to rise to higher positions. As many of the boys put it, 'Everybody's got a chance'.

The second point has to do with the drop in the numbers in the second year who hoped to be promoted - from 74% (83 apprentices) to 52% (56 apprentices). This seems to indicate a real development in attitudes between the first and second interviews. Here, then, is a change which could perhaps have something to do with the influence of older craftsmen on the apprentices. It could be that what the apprentices learned from tradesmen they worked beside caused some of them to lower their aspirations. The important thing for us to note, however, is that even if this is so (and there can be no certainty about it) the influence of the craftsmen would not be in the direction of a typical craft attitude. We observed (Chapter 2(c) iii, Ideal Type point (x)) that craftsmen are not particularly noted for opposition to promotion, and that in some circumstances they tend to be more open to it than some other workers. This being so, it is clear that any influence in connection with attitudes to promotion which the craftsmen may have had upon the apprentices in our study is not towards the adoption of typical craft attitudes.

We should not, moreover, that there are differences between the industrial groups in the two series of interviews.(4) The fall in the expectation of promotion is not evenly distributed, but took place most amongst the motor apprentices, and least amongst the shipbuilding apprentices. While we cannot be sure why this should be so, we may

make a general conjecture that the changes arise from differing assessments by apprentices in different industries of the chances of promotion within those industries, in the light of the experience they had gained. This would seem a more likely explanation than to assume that the differences arise from differing attitudes amongst the craftsmen in the three industries being passed on to the apprentices.

In summary, then, the enquiry about promotion revealed a high level of aspiration amongst the apprentices in the first year, falling to some extent in the second year, but falling differentially in the three industrial groups. While it is impossible to draw firm conclusions about these responses, they offer some grounds for believing that the high level of aspiration may arise from the apprentices' understanding of contemporary society and the opportunities available in it, and from the influence on them of the values prevalent within that society; secondly, that the changes in aspiration by the second year may be due to the boys' assessment in the light of experience of the chances of promotion within their industry. There does not seem to be any evidence of influence by craftsmen in the direction of typical craft attitudes.

Conclusion

The apprentices' responses to the questions about the future, change and security suggest that they have almost all accepted, perhaps unthinkingly, the traditional belief that having a trade provides 'trade-security', by giving them the assurance of a job somewhere else if it is needed or desired. On the other hand most of them appeared to anticipate considerable changes in their trades in the future, to accept the necessity of future measures to keep them up-to-date, and to believe that technological progress should be continued even if it meant people having to find new jobs. Most of them started their apprenticeship with hopes of future promotion, and many continued to cherish these hopes in the second year. Nowhere did it seem possible that craftsmen in the industry had substantially influenced the apprentices' attitudes. These seemed to arise partly from their background in a traditional industrial community, and partly from their awareness of the realities of contemporary industrial society.

---

(4) In the first year fewer of the shipbuilding apprentices expected promotion. The differences between the groups were significant at the level $p < .02$ by the chi-squared test. By the second year the numbers in the two other groups who expected promotion had fallen, while the number in the shipbuilding group remained much the same, with the result that now the shipbuilding group had the highest proportion expecting promotion (63%) and the motor vehicle group had the lowest (39%).

PART III. CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 8

Having discussed the results of the apprentice survey in some detail, we turn now to a more general consideration of the implications of these findings. First of all it will be useful to draw together and summarise the various conclusions reached in the last three chapters.

The enquiry into the apprentices' attitude to work (Chapter 5) revealed that the boys seemed even in the first interviews at the start of their apprenticeship to have a craftsman-like interest in their work and desire to take pride in it. There is no sign that contact with craftsmen had encouraged this interest and pride by the second year - in fact a few boys showed signs of becoming disillusioned. The craftsman's typical exclusiveness about the boundaries between trades did not significantly show itself in the responses even of the apprentices in their second year.

With regard to relationships at work (Chapter 6) the apprentices in general showed keen support for trade unionism, but there were significant differences between the shipbuilding and motor vehicle apprentices in the first year, differences which seem to be in keeping with the strength and importance of trade unionism within these two industries. By the second year support for trade unions had increased, particularly in the motor group even though there are scarcely any trade unions in the garages concerned. There was also an overall tendency to emphasise the advantages of trade unions for the individual as opposed to group advantages. With regard to the status of craftsmen, the apprentices reflected quite clearly by the first year the traditional view that craftsmen are different from and superior to labourers; and in this connection they seemed to assume that labouring was the only alternative to being a craftsman, as far as manual work is concerned. The questions about management and employers revealed little anti-management or anti-employer sentiment in the first year, although a considerable number thought of industry as being two-sided rather than a matter of teamwork. By the second year there was some increase in anti-employer feeling, and a stronger support for the two-sides view of industry, but this tendency does not seem to be connected with typical craft attitudes. On the subject of authority in industry many of the apprentices in the first year already viewed industrial authority as based on knowledge and experience, in the way that many craftsmen do,

and the proportion taking this view did increase slightly by the second year. In general the boys were able while they were still in their first year and before they had worked under a foreman to give a surprisingly clear outline of the nature and limits of authority in industry.

On the subject of the future, security and change (Chapter 7) the apprentices were almost unanimous in giving 'trade-security' as their reason for wanting a trade. Their opinions on this point were frequently given in the form of traditional or conventional phrases. At the same time they were generally conscious of the likelihood of technological change affecting their trades in the future, and seemed willing to accept in their minds the implications of such changes in terms of future re-training and possibly of redundancy. On these points there was little change between the first and second interviews, and both the form and content of the responses suggested that the apprentices were expressing their own interpretation of the world they were entering, rather than typical craftsmen's views or the traditional assumptions of an industrial community. Finally the responses concerning promotion showed a high level of aspiration in the first year. By the second year there was a falling off in the expectation of promotion, but promotion was still seen as desirable by the large majority.

Taking all these points together, we may further summarise the results of the survey as follows.

1) The apprentices in all three industries gave clear indications even in the first few months of their apprenticeship and before they had worked with craftsmen, of having some attitudes which are typical of craftsmen generally. This is seen particularly in their responses about the nature of work, about trade unions, about the superiority of craft status over that of labourer, and about trade-security. Other responses seem to point somewhat less clearly in the same direction.

2) The apprentices in their first year as well as in their second showed that they held some attitudes which seemed to have nothing to do with typical craft attitudes, particularly on the subjects of change and promotion.

3) There were few important differences between the three industrial groups, except in their first-year responses on the subject of trade unionism. On this point the responses of the shipbuilding apprentices were significantly different from those of the others, particularly the motor vehicle apprentices.

4) A comparison of the second-year interviews with the first showed very little movement in the direction of typical craft attitudes. In other words, the apprentices showed no signs of being moulded by the craft ideology during the period between the middle of the first and the middle of the second year of apprenticeship. It is clear, therefore, that we are not able on the basis of this enquiry to point to any clear indication of the influence of craftsmen on the apprentices during the period in which they were working in the industries concerned.

5) Some of the changes in attitude which did appear seemed to have nothing to do with craft attitudes, eg, the falling off in the expectation of promotion, and the increase in the support for the view of industry as two-sided and of employers as frequently unfair to workers. Other changes seemed to suggest a possible diminution of what appeared to be craft sentiment, eg, the signs of disillusionment over the interest and satisfaction to be obtained from work, and the increased emphasis on the advantages to the individual of trade union membership.

The apprentice survey was undertaken, it will be recalled, in order to discover something more about apprenticeship as a process of socialisation, and in particular about how and when the attitudes which are held by craftsmen are acquired. In the light of these results of the survey three broad questions arise in connection with apprentice socialisation which deserve further consideration. In considering them we move from the discussion of the results themselves to more theoretical or speculative points which suggest themselves as a result of the enquiry. The three questions to be considered are:

a) Why is there no evidence of the acquisition of craft ideology on the part of apprentices during the course of a year?
b) How are we to account for those changes which did take place between the first and second year interviews, and which seem to have nothing to do with craft ideology?
c) How are we to account for the attitudes which the apprentices exhibited during their first year?

(a) There are two or three possible answers to the question of why the apprentices showed no sign of acquiring craft ideology during the course of a year. One is that the period of time involved was too short. None of the boys had worked in the industry for more than twelve months between the first and second interviews, and some (particularly the electricity supply apprentices) had done so for only a few weeks. Perhaps this period of time at a relatively early stage of apprenticeship

is not sufficient to allow the influence of craftsmen to appear.(1) If this is so, it would mean that socialisation into the ideology of craftsmen may well take place in the way that many have assumed, but it is too slow and long a process to permit of its being detected during the course of a year.

A second and different kind of answer is suggested by the thought that perhaps the craftsman-apprentice relationship has altered in recent years and therefore the influence of craftsmen may not be exerted in the same way. This thought arises from the fact that nowadays very few apprentices are put to work with one tradesman over a long period of time. This used to be the common practice, with the result that the apprentice came to work in close relationship with the one man, who took responsibility for him. Whether or not this was a good arrangement in other respects, it probably did facilitate the handing on of craft ideology to apprentices. Nowadays the usual practice is for apprentices to work with different tradesmen or with groups of tradesmen, and sometimes on their own or with other apprentices. In such situations the passing on of craft traditions may not happen so easily.

A third possible answer, more far-reaching in its implications, is that perhaps a real and important change has been taking place in the attitudes of craftsmen themselves. In discussing craft attitudes in Chapter 2 we had occasion to point out more than once that changing conditions in industry have made some of the traditional craft positions irrelevant. The increased specificity of skills to particular firms has made transferrability of skill less automatic. Increased bureaucratisation of the planning of work has made the decisions and personal responsibility of the craftsman less necessary for the work process, and the control by craftsmen of their own work less possible. The increase in the number of well-paid semi-skilled jobs has made the status of the craftsman less obviously desirable. And changes in technology and in organisation (through, for example, productivity bargaining) have made traditional trade boundaries increasingly untenable. Admittedly, research into industrial attitudes discussed in Chapter 2 has shown that the craft ideology has retained its hold until recent times even under changed conditions. But it may be that as a result of such changed conditions and of other influences at work in society at

---

(1) Against this it may be added that there is no evident difference between those who had worked for a whole year beside craftsmen, and those who had worked in this way for only a few weeks. It may, however, be argued that even the period of a full year is insufficient for this purpose.

large, the craft ideology or certain parts of it are now beginning to wear thin, even in traditional craft industries such as shipbuilding. That this may be the case is suggested by some of the remarks by shipbuilding apprentices about older tradesmen. If this is so, the apparent lack of influence of craftsmen on the thinking of the apprentices in our study could be an indication of the diminished force of the craft ideology. On that speculative note we leave the question of why the apprentices showed no sign of having been influenced by the thinking of craftsmen.

(b) The changes which appeared in the attitudes of the apprentices between the first and second interviews did not seem to be in the direction of increased adoption of craft attitudes. How, then, are we to account for these changes? The most noticeable changes were that by the second year the apprentices were, firstly, more inclined to adopt a 'two-sides' view of industry; secondly, more keen generally in their support for trade unionism; and thirdly, less confident about the likelihood of their achieving promotion in the future. (The second of these points - increased support for trade unionism - might appear to be a craft attitude, but the fact that this increase is most marked amongst the motor vehicle apprentices in an industry where the tradesmen generally are not in a union makes it impossible to attribute this change in attitude to the influence of craftsmen.) These attitudes which were being increasingly adopted by the apprentices are not peculiarly craft attitudes, but are most suitably interpreted as attitudes common amongst industrial workers generally. It must be remembered that between the first and second interviews not only did the apprentices start working with craftsmen, but in doing so they also moved from a position of learners still outside the processes of production and the normal relationships of industry, to a position of involvement in these processes and relationships. They had moved from being sheltered learners to being industrial workers. It seems quite probable that from this new position they would see a number of things in a new way. Faced with the realities of the shop floor they might well begin to see promotion as less attainable than they had thought. Faced with their vulnerability as industrial workers they might well begin to feel the need for a trade union for their protection. Faced with the actual worker-management relations of industry they might well tend to become more aware of the two-sides rather than of the teamwork of industry. That is to say, these changes in attitude may be the result of the new perception of their situation on the part of boys who had moved from training centre

to shop floor. It could, of course, be argued that the changes in attitude were due rather to the influence of men in industry amongst whom they had found themselves. But the lack of evidence that craftsmen had influenced the boys in the direction of craft attitudes, and the lack of any evidence that the attitudes of the men in the industries concerned were similar to the changed attitudes of the second year apprentices make it seem more plausible to suggest that the changes in attitude were due to the new perception of their situation on the part of the apprentices themselves rather than to the influence of older workers. In other words, these changes seem to reflect the adjustment which all young people must have to make in the understanding of their situation as they move out of school onto the shop floor of industry. They seem to be part of the socialisation process of beginning work, rather than the socialisation of apprentices as such.

(c) We turn now to the question of how we are to account for the attitudes which the apprentices exhibited during their first year, (summarised above as the first three results of the survey). We start by thinking of their craft-type attitudes in particular. How is it that such attitudes were so clearly present in the minds of new apprentices? And how is it that differences between the attitudes of apprentices in the three industrial groups arose? A first possible answer that suggests itself is that there could have been some factor or combination of factors in the social or family background of these particular apprentices to which these attitudes could be attributed. If the fathers of the majority of the boys were themselves tradesmen this might be considered sufficient explanation of the craft-type attitudes of new apprentices. Or if the apprentices belonged to some kind of occupational community this might result in craft attitudes in general, and in attitudes appropriate to a particular occupation being passed on to young people before they entered work. An examination of the relevant facts about the apprentices' background, however, showed that neither of these possibilities existed in fact. In connection with father's occupation the boys were asked in detail not only where and in what capacity their father was employed, but also whether or not their father had served his time as a tradesman in earlier life. The details are shown in Tables 25 and 26. It will be seen from these tables that while nearly half of the fathers had in fact served their time as tradesmen, many of these men were no longer working in their trade, and that in terms of current occupation semi-skilled workers were in the majority. These tables were cross-tabulated with the interview responses to see if there was any

Table 25

Whether father is time-served tradesman

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Father time-served	48	16	41	17	51	17	47	50
Father not time-served	51	17	59	24	45	15	52	56
Don't know	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1
	99	33	100	41	99	33	100	107

Table 26

Father's present occupation (2)

	ES		MV		SB		All	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Professional, management	15	5	5	2	0	0	7	7
Supervisors, technicians, clerical	18	5	14	6	18	6	16	17
Time-served craftsmen working in trade	21	7	29	12	30	10	27	29
Self-employed	6	2	7	3	3	1	6	6
Semi-skilled	38	13	43	17	30	10	37	40
Unskilled, labourers	3	1	2	1	12	4	6	6
Not working, unknown	0	0	0	0	6	2	2	2
	101	33	100	41	99	33	101	107

association between father's occupation and the interview responses of the boys. In fact no significant association emerged. In other words, as far as we can see the attitudes of the boys were not connected with whether their fathers were themselves tradesmen at any time, or with their fathers' current occupation.

The other possibility suggested was that the apprentices had been brought up in some kind of occupational community through which norms and attitudes concerning work in general and one industry or group of trades in particular were passed on to the boys before they started work. Such occupational communities may be hard to define or identify,(3) but

(2) The classification in Table 26 is based broadly on the Registrar-General's Classification, but a special category was introduced for craftsmen working in their trade. It is interesting to note that by cross-tabulating Tables 25 and 26 we can learn that of the 50 fathers who had served an apprenticeship, 3 were now in managerial or professional positions, 9 were employed as supervisors, technicians or clerical workers, 1 was self-employed, 7 were in semi-skilled work and 1 was unknown, leaving 29 still employed in their own trade.

(3) For an attempt at definition and delineation see Salaman (1971).

the term implies at the very least a community based on residence in a common geographical area and on employment in the predominant industry of that area. On the basis of this definition it is clear, first of all, that the electricity supply apprentices could not have belonged to such an occupational community since they were drawn from all over southern Scotland. Nor could the motor vehicle apprentices, since they were employed in small garages mostly in different parts of Lanarkshire which nowhere represented the predominant industry of the area, and since also only two of them had fathers who were time-served motor mechanics. It might have been thought, however, that the shipbuilding apprentices were drawn from an occupational community of shipyard workers on the Clyde. The fact that of the 34 shipbuilding apprentices 9 had fathers and 3 more had other relatives employed in shipbuilding might seem to support this possibility. Two other facts, however, point in the opposite direction. The first is that of the 34 only 8 came from homes in traditionally shipbuilding areas, while the rest came from homes all over greater Glasgow.(4) And the second is that on leaving school only six of the 34 applied in the first instance to shipbuilding firms for employment, while the rest all applied first to various engineering and other firms thus indicating that shipbuilding was not the obvious or natural choice. Altogether this does not suggest that the shipbuilding apprentices as a whole were drawn from an occupational community. Furthermore, a comparison of the responses of the 12 boys with fathers or relatives in shipbuilding with those of the total shipbuilding group showed that the 12 did not have a different response pattern from that of their colleagues.(5) In other words, the distinctive responses of the shipbuilding apprentices, in particular with regard to trade unionism, are not attributable to the 12 who had relatives in the industry. We are forced to the conclusion, then, that we must exclude the concept of occupational community in our attempt to provide an explanation of the attitudes exhibited by the apprentices.

If father's occupation and the existence of an occupational community provide no great help in accounting for the craftsman-type attitudes of

---

(4) A comparison is interesting with the two groups of shipbuilding apprentices in Brown's Tyneside study. There 19% and 25% of the two groups respectively had fathers in shipbuilding; a further 14% and 10% had other relatives in shipbuilding; 30% and 46% lived in Wallsend, the actual location of the yard, and a further 41% and 33% lived in nearby shipbuilding towns. Altogether there appears to be greater evidence of an occupational community in the case of these apprentices.

(5) The single exception was the reply, referred to in connection with the demarcation issue, where 5 out of 6 apprentices who said a foreman had no right to tell a tradesman to do something which is part of another trade, were apprentices who had relatives in shipbuilding, (see Table 17A).

the new apprentices on the one hand, and for the differences between the industrial groups on the other, we turn to two other approaches, or lines of thought, which seem to provide the most useful way of interpreting the results of the survey. The first is to invoke the concept of anticipatory socialisation. This concept is discussed at length by Merton in his study of reference group theory. It is defined by him as

> "the acquisition of values and orientations found in statuses and groups in which one is not yet engaged but which one is likely to enter."(6)

In our case this would mean that the apprentices, knowing that they were going to become craftsmen, and craftsmen of a particular trade in a particular industry, began to acquire the values and attitudes of craftsmen in that industry in an anticipatory way, before they had ever started work in the industry. The importance of this concept for a study such as this can be understood from this passage by Stanton Wheeler:

> "Since much activity may go on between the decision to enter a program and actual participation, it seems likely that a considerable amount of socialisation effect is achieved before the person enters. While it would be a mistake to assume this as a general principle, it is noteworthy that there are few studies of this pre-entry period. Studies showing no change in opinions or attitudes during the course of participation in a socialising organisation might lead one to conclude that there was no effect. However, another possibility is that there were strong effects, so strong, indeed, that most prospective recruits changed before participation."(7)

Anticipatory socialisation, so defined and described, would seem to be a useful explanatory device to help us to understand the responses of the apprentices in our survey. It can be assumed that the apprentices had had it in mind, probably since before they left school, to 'get a trade' if at all possible. This was followed by their being offered and accepting an apprenticeship in a particular industry, and in due course they started their period of training in the training centre concerned. By the time the first series of interviews was held, the boys had had a considerable period of time in which they saw themselves as future tradesmen. 'Much activity', as Wheeler puts it, will have been going on in the minds of the boys during this period. While our study has shown no great change of attitude between the first and second interviews, it is possible that 'strong effects' may have been felt by the boys before they started their apprenticeship, or during their first

---

(6) Merton (1968) p438. On anticipatory socialisation generally see pp319-22 and 438-9.

(7) Wheeler (1966) p84.

few weeks at a training centre.

To put it more concretely, what is being suggested is that the apprentices knew or assumed beforehand something of the typical or appropriate attitude-set of craftsmen. They knew that craftsmen could find their work interesting and could see it as something to take pride in. They knew that craftsmen felt themselves to be superior to labourers. They knew that a trade offered 'trade-security'. As they set their minds to secure an apprenticeship and further as they started their training, they were gradually influenced by the 'strong effects' of the craft ideology, and adopted some aspects of it as their own in an anticipatory way, even before they began working in their industry.

This concept may also help us to understand how the responses of the three industrial groups came to be different at certain points. This difference was particularly apparent, as we have seen, in the responses of the shipbuilding and motor vehicle apprentices in connection with trade unionism. Yet there is little or nothing in the background of the groups concerned to suggest why they should adopt such different positions. Here we can assume that the boys in the two groups had been influenced by what they knew or understood beforehand about the industries they were going to enter. The boys entering shipbuilding knew that their industry was one where unions were strong. In particular they would have heard of the widely-publicised 'work-in' by union members at Upper Clyde Shipbuilders. The motor vehicle apprentices, on the other hand, were going to work mainly in small garages. These would not be the kinds of establishments with which they associated trade unionism. Accordingly the apprentices in each group, by a process of anticipatory socialisation, would have acquired and made their own the attitudes and values found in the groups they were about to enter.

In this way 'anticipatory socialisation' is a useful way of understanding and explaining the processes by which the apprentices came to adopt some of the attitudes which have been observed. Nevertheless, it will be obvious that the use of this explanatory device still leaves some important questions unanswered, and this makes necessary the introduction of a second line of thought. It is clear that if young people acquire beforehand the values or attitudes of the groups they are to enter, they must have some means of knowing what the appropriate values and attitudes are. If our apprentices adopted craft-type attitudes in an anticipatory way before they had ever worked with craftsmen, what was the source of these attitudes and of their knowledge of them? We have seen in our study of other enquiries into the

attitudes of school-leavers that in the main the young people concerned did not have craft-type attitudes to the extent that the apprentices in this study seemed to have. Few of them, for example, showed the same interest in work for its own sake, or the same concern for trade security or the same support for trade unions. The attitudes of our apprentices, therefore, cannot be thought of as part of a common stock of attitudes shared by most school-leavers. From where then were these attitudes learned?

To answer this question it seems necessary to assume or to hypothesise that there is within certain industrial communities a body of common knowledge in relation to occupations, their significance and the attitudes that are appropriate to them. In particular, in an area such as west central Scotland, with its long tradition of industrial craftsmanship, and with a large proportion of craftsmen in the community, it is likely that certain ideas and beliefs about trades and the attitudes of craftsmen are taken in by young people, as it were, with the air they breathe. This would appear to be the significance of the fact, to which attention was drawn earlier, that the apprentices' ideas about the importance of having a trade for reasons of trade-security were expressed in what seemed like traditional or conventional common-sense phrases. It is further interesting that many of them, when asked where they got that idea, could think of no source for it. Many of them replied: "It's common sense," or "I thought of it myself." Similarly we noticed that the apprentices assumed that there was a difference of status between craftsmen on the one hand and labourers on the other. Ideas like these, which are significant points in craft ideology, seem to have been sufficiently prevalent and taken-for-granted within the community from which the boys came, that they were adopted as a matter of course even by lads whose fathers were not tradesmen themselves.

If this seems to be the case in connection with some in particular of the apprentices' expressed attitudes, it is likely that other attitudes as well come from this general community source. It is probable that within traditional industrial communities with a large proportion of craftsmen in the labour force, the ideas that craft work is inherently more interesting and satisfying than other work, that a craftsman should be able to control and be responsible for his work, and even that a foreman should be someone who knows his trade better than others - these ideas may be sufficiently widely held and communicated within the ordinary course of community life that boys entering apprenticeships assume that these are the attitudes which it

is appropriate for them to adopt. In other words, the explanation which seems to suggest itself for many of the attitudes of the apprentices is that the wider community outside the industry itself is acting as a general socialising agent, through which young people pick up their concepts of what trade and craftsmanship are about, and what the attitudes of craftsmen traditionally are.

It does not seem possible to go much further than this in explaining at least the more traditional and craftsman-like parts of the apprentices' attitudes. The position might be clearer if any significant study had been made of the attitudes of workers and working-class people in the industrial areas of central Scotland. We do not know whether or not these are similar to the attitudes of workers studied in England and elsewhere.(8) Without such studies we cannot tell to what extent the attitudes shown by our apprentices are in fact prevalent within the community as a whole.

A further comment should, however, be made in connection with those other parts of the apprentices' attitudes which do not seem to be in line with traditional assumptions or with craft ideology. We noted particularly in connection with the enquiries into the boys' attitudes to technical change in the future and to the possibility of promotion, that here the responses seemed to reflect not so much traditional assumptions or craft ideology, as an outlook in keeping with the industrial society which they see around them today. Their assumption that rapid change would affect their trades in the future, that some form of re-training would probably be necessary later on, and that promotion was not only desirable but was also a possibility for anyone - these ideas seem to have little to do with craft ideology. It is not that they <u>necessarily</u> conflict with craft attitudes, but that both the ideas themselves and the way they were expressed seem to reflect the young people's interpretation of the age in which they live rather than the ideas of a traditional community. This suggests that along with, and possibly at times in conflict with the craft-type attitudes which the apprentices have been acquiring apparently from the traditional industrial community, they have also been acquiring other ideas, attitudes and values from the wider contemporary society of

---

(8) T T Paterson in his detailed study of one firm in Glasgow (Paterson, 1960) suggested that there is a tradition of 'anti-authoritarianism' peculiar to the Glasgow area. Also many observers and practitioners in the industrial relations field have detected a difference in the atmosphere of industrial relations between Scotland and England. It may be that in a variety of ways Scottish attitudes are different and therefore a comparison of Scottish apprentice attitudes with a craft ideology observed largely in England is misleading.

which they are part. We can only speculate that it is through the socialising influence of the mass media and the educational system that the apprentices came to hold such attitudes. Here it is worth recalling the remarkably clear understanding which the apprentices as a whole exhibited of the nature of authority in an industrial organisation (see Chapter 6). Such understandings illustrate the success of what seems to be the second formative influence on the apprentices' attitudes - the general socialising agents which help young people to make sense of the kind of society they are entering.

The general conclusions, therefore, of our study can be stated as follows. The attitudes of the apprentices, many of which were similar to craft attitudes in the first year and did not change very much by the second year, seem to have been acquired by the boys through a process of anticipatory socialisation, by which they adopted beforehand attitudes and values felt to be appropriate to the positions they were entering. Such a process would also account for such differences as did appear between the industrial groups in the first year. The source of these attitudes and values, however, is less easily discernible, but has been attributed to two general influences in the community at large - first, the influence of an industrial community in which crafts have played an important part in the past and where craft attitudes are common knowledge; and second, the influence of other general socialising agents, such as the mass media, school and possibly personal acquaintance through which the boys have gained a perception of modern industrial society.

These conclusions, if they find acceptance, must add support to those who, in studying workers' attitudes, have emphasised the orientation which people bring with them to their work, as opposed to the attitudes which they acquire at work.(9) Earlier in this thesis it was pointed out that many writers have assumed the importance of apprenticeship as a socialisation process, through which the attitudes and ideology of craftsmen are acquired. Within a small study covering only the first part of the apprenticeship period of the apprentices concerned it is not, of course, possible to show that apprenticeship is not a significant socialising process. What can be claimed is that our investigation has shown that with apprentices as with older workers,

---

(9) See, eg, Goldthorpe (1968), Ingham (1970).

the attitudes and orientation which they bring with them from the wider community are a very important part of their socialisation as craftsmen.

FIRST INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

I Job and Trade

1) When you left school would you have been willing to take a job without an apprenticeship, or were you only interested in a trade? Why do you think a trade is important?

2) What made you want to be a (name trade) ?

3) When you look around you at other people, do you get the idea that most adult people enjoy work, or do most of them work only for money?

4) Do you enjoy your work, or are you working only for money?

5) Do you think you will always feel like this about your work, or do you think you will change later on? Why?

II Industry

6) Some people say that an industrial firm is like a football team - everyone is on the same side and good teamwork is to everyone's advantage. Others say you can't have good teamwork in industry because employers and men are really on 2 different sides. I wonder which you would agree with more?

7) What do you think the top manager of a firm actually does? Will he be busy or not very busy?

8) Do you think he is important for keeping the work of the firm going, or could it go on just as well without him?

9) Do you think that later on you will join a trade union, or not? Why?

10) Do you think it is important for workers generally to be in a trade union, or does it not really matter? Why?

11) From what you have heard, do you think that Trade Unions generally are doing a good job, or are they mainly just causing trouble?

12) Do you think that most employers treat workers fairly, or are they trying to hold down or screw down the workers?

III Authority

13) You know how in a workshop the foreman has the right to tell workers what to do. What gives him that right?

14) Do you think that the kind of authority that foremen have is the same as the kind of authority that parents and school teachers have, or is it different?

15) Can you tell me something that you think a foreman has no right to tell a person to do?

IV The Future and Change

16) Do you like the idea of settling down in one job for a long time when your time is served, or would you prefer to have some change or variety?

17) Do you think that when you are time-served you will always have a job, or do you think you could find yourself unemployed at any time?

18) Do you think it is right to put people out of jobs for the sake of technical progress, or should we hold back progress to keep people employed?

19) Do you expect that the work and skills of your trade will change a lot over the years, or will the skills you learn now last you all your life?

20) If things change, how will this affect you - will you be able to adjust to the changes? How?

21) Do you think you will get on and be promoted in your work in the future, or do you expect to stay at the level of a tradesman all your life? Would you go as high as you could, or would you not want too much responsibility?

SECOND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The second interview schedule was identical with the first except for the following alterations.

Q.1) now read: Do you really think it is important for a person to have a trade these days, or could he get on just as well without one? Why?

Q.2) now read: What are the advantages of being in your particular trade?

After Q.5) the following questions were inserted:

a) What do you like about your work?

b) What do you dislike about your work?

c) Do you think it is important for apprentices to be taught something about other trades, or should they concentrate on their own?

d) (For shipbuilding apprentices only): Are you in favour of tradesmen being allowed to do some parts of other tradesmen's work, or not? Why?

At the end the following was added:

I wonder if you would tell me what your father does and where he works?

Did he serve his time in a trade?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALEXANDER, K J W, and JENKINS, C L (1970): Fairfields: A Study of Industrial Change, London, Penguin Press.

ARGYLE, M (1972): The Social Psychology of Work, London, Penguin Press.

ASHTON, D N (1973): 'The Transition from School to Work: Notes on Young Male Workers', Sociological Review, Vol 21, NS Feb 1973, pp101-125.

BECKER, H and CARPER, J (1971): 'The Elements of Identification with an Occupation' and 'The Development of Identification with an Occupation' in Sociological Work, (Ed) Howard Becker, Allen Lane, Penguin Press, London, pp177-201.

BELL, J D M (1954): 'Trade Unions' in Flanders and Clegg (Eds), The System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain, Oxford, Blackwell, pp128-196.

BERGER, P L and LUCKMANN, T (1967): The Social Construction of Reality, London, Allen Lane, Penguin

BLAUNER, R (1964): Alienation and Freedom, Chicago, University Press

BRIGGS, A (1954): 'Social Background' in Flanders and Clegg (Eds) The System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain, Oxford, Blackwell, pp1-41.

BROWN, R K et al (1972): 'The Contours of Solidarity: Social Stratification and Industrial Relations in Shipbuilding', British Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol X, No 1, March 1972, pp12-42.

BROWN, R K (1973a): 'The Attitudes to Work, Expectations and Social Perspectives of Shipbuilding Apprentices', University of Durham, unpublished paper.

BROWN, R K (1973b): 'Sources of Objectives in Work and Employment' in Child (Ed) Man and Organisation, London, Allen and Unwin, pp17-38.

CANNON, I C (1961): The Social Situation of the Skilled Worker, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London.

CARTER, M P (1962): Home, School and Work, London, Pergamon Press.

CARTER, M P (1966): Into Work, Harmondsworth, Penguin Press.

CICOUREL, A V (1964): Method and Measurement in Sociology, New York, Free Press.

CLEGG, H A (1970): The System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain, Oxford, Blackwell.

COHEN, P S (1966): 'Social Attitudes and Sociological Enquiry', British Journal of Sociology, Vol 17, 1966, pp341-352.

COTGROVE, S and VAMPLEW, C (1972): 'Technology, Class and Politics: The Case of the Process Workers', Sociology, Vol 6, No 2, May 1972, pp169-185.

DAHRENDORF, R (1959): Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

DALTON, M (1964): 'Men Who Manage' in Hammond (Ed) Sociologists at Work, New York.

DANIEL, W W (1973): 'Understanding Employee Behaviour in its Context' in Child (Ed) Man and Organisation, London, Allen and Unwin, pp39-62.

DEUTSCHER, I (1971): 'Words and Deeds: Social Science and Social Policy', in Filstead (Ed) Qualitative Methodology, Chicago, Markham.

ELDRIDGE, J E T (1968): Industrial Disputes, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

ELDRIDGE, J E T (1971): 'Weber's Approach to the Sociological Study of Industrial Workers' in Sahay (Ed) Max Weber and Modern Sociology, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

FERGUSON, T and CUNNISON, J (1951): The Young Wage-Earner, Oxford University Press.

FLANDERS, A (1954): 'Collective Bargaining' in Flanders and Clegg (Eds) The System of Industrial Relations in Great Britain, Oxford, Blackwell, pp252-322.

FLANDERS, A (1964): The Fawley Productivity Agreements, London, Faber.

FOX, A (1966): Industrial Sociology and Industrial Relations, Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations Research Paper No 3, London, HMSO.

FOX, A (1971): A Sociology of Work in Industry, London, Macmillan.

FREUND, J (1968): The Sociology of Max Weber, London, Penguin Press.

GOLDTHORPE, J H et al (1968): The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour, Cambridge University Press.

GOLDTHORPE, J H et al (1971): The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure, Cambridge University Press.

GOULDNER, A W (1954): Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

HOBSBAWM, E J (1964): Labouring Men: Essays in the History of Labour, London, especially chapter on 'The Labour Aristocracy in the Nineteenth Century', pp272-315.

HOGGART, R (1964): The Uses of Literacy, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

HUNTER, L C and ROBERTSON, D J (1969): The Economics of Wages and Labour, London, Macmillan.

INGHAM, G K (1970): Size of Industrial Organisation and Worker Behaviour, Cambridge University Press.

JAHODA, G (1952): 'Job Attitudes and Job Choice among Secondary Modern School Leavers (1)', Occupational Psychology, Vol 26, No 3, pp125-140.

JONES, K and GOLDRING, J (1966): Productivity Bargaining, London, Fabian Research Series.

JEPHCOTT, P (1967): Time of One's Own, Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd.

KARPIK, L (1968): 'Expectations and Satisfactions in Work', Human Relations, Vol 21, No 4, Nov 1968.

KNOWLES, K G J C (1952): Strikes: A Study of Industrial Conflict, Oxford, Blackwell.

LANGDALE, E (1971): 'The Transition from School to Work', The Training Officer, Vol 1, No 8, August 1971.

LIEPMANN, K (1960), Apprenticeship, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McCARTHY, W E J (1964): The Closed Shop in Britain, Los Angeles, University of California Press.

MACKENZIE, G (1973): The Aristocracy of Labour, Cambridge University Press.

McKERSIE, R and HUNTER, L C (1973): Pay, Productivity and Collective Bargaining, London, Macmillan.

MAIZELS, J (1970): Adolescent Needs and the Transition from School to Work, London, Athlone Press.

MERTON, R K (1968): Social Theory and Social Structure, (1968 Enlarged Edition) New York, Free Press.

MILLS, C W (1956): White Collar, New York, Oxford University Press.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR PRICES AND INCOMES (1967): Report No 36: Productivity Bargaining, London, HMSO.

PALMER, V (1964): 'Young Workers in their First Job: An Investigation of Attitudes to Work and their Correlates', Occupational Psychology, Vol 38, No 2, pp99-113.

PATERSON, T T (1960): Glasgow Ltd, Cambridge University Press.

PERKIN, H (1969): The Origins of Modern English Society 1780-1880, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

PHELPS BROWN, E H (1959): The Growth of British Industrial Relations, London, Macmillan.

PHELPS BROWN, E H (1962): The Economics of Labour, Yale.

ROBERTS, G (1967): Demarcation Rules in Shipbuilding and Shiprepairing, Cambridge University Press.

ROBERTS, K (1971): From School to Work: A Study of the Youth Employment Service, Newton Abbot, David and Charles.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON TRADE UNIONS AND EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS (1967): Productivity Bargaining and Restrictive Labour Practices, Research Paper No 4, London, HMSO.

SALAMAN, G (1971): 'Some Sociological Determinants of Occupational Communities', Sociological Review, N.S. 19, 1, pp53-77.

SCHOOLS COUNCIL (1968): Enquiry One: Young School Leavers, Government Social Survey, HMSO.

SCOTT, W H et al (1956): Technical Change and Industrial Relations, Liverpool University Press.

SILVERMAN, D (1970): The Theory of Organisations, London, Heinemann.

SMITH, E O (1971): Productivity Bargaining: A Case Study in the Steel Industry, London, Pan Piper.

STINCHCOMBE, A C (1959): 'Bureaucratic and Craft Administration of Production: A Comparative Study', Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol IV, Sept 1959, pp168-187.

SYKES, A J M (1965): 'Some Differences in the Attitudes of Clerical and Manual Workers', Sociological Review, No 13, Nov 1965, pp297-310.

THOMAS, B and MADIGAN, C (1974): 'Strategy and Job Choice after Redundancy: A Case Study in the Aircraft Industry', Sociological Review, Vol 22, No 1, NS Feb 1974, pp83-102.

TOURAINE, A et al (1965): Workers' Attitudes and Technical Change, Paris, OECD.

TURNER, H A (1962): Trade Union Growth, Structure and Policy, London, Allen and Unwin.

WEBB, S and B (1913): Industrial Democracy (1902 edition), London, Longmans Green.

WEBER, M (1964): The Theory of Social and Economic Organisations (Edited by T Parsons), New York, Free Press.

WEBER, M (1949): The Methodology of the Social Sciences, New York, Free Press.

WEDDERBURN, D and CROMPTON, R (1972): Workers' Attitudes to Technical Change, Cambridge University Press.

WEDDERBURN, K W and DAVIES, P L (1969): Employment Grievances and Disputes Procedures in Britain, Los Angeles, University of California Press.

WHEELER, S (1966): 'The Structure of Formally Organised Socialisation Settings' in O G Brim and S Wheeler, Socialisation after Childhood, New York, John Wiley.

WILLIAMS, G (1957): Recruitment to Skilled Trades, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

WILLINER, A (1964): 'Payment Systems in the French Steel and Iron Making Industry: An Exploration in Managerial Resistance to Change' in Zollscham and Hirsch Explorations in Social Change, Boston, H M Co, pp593-618.

VENABLES, E (1967): The Young Worker at College, London, Faber.

VENESS, T (1962): School Leavers: Their Aspirations and Expectations, London, Methuen.

VENESS, T (unpublished): 'Follow up of an Enquiry into the Plans, Expectations and Ambitions of School Leavers', SSRC Report B/11/040 B.