

Educational issues and priorities

5

*Harvey Goldstein**

The purpose of this chapter, in common with the others, is to provide no more than a brief summary of the principal findings. Only a small part of the data has been analysed so far and there is much of interest still to explore. We have not yet, for example, even analysed attitudes by whether or not respondents had children at school or at what type of school; we have not yet studied the responses of different age groups within social class or political support groups. Our aim here is mainly to provide interested readers with a broad picture of the main results so that they can take the analysis further themselves.

In designing the questions, we hoped to be able to follow previous surveys in Britain and elsewhere so that comparisons across cultures and times could be reported. This has been difficult for a number of reasons.

First, past surveys of attitudes to education have concentrated on educational 'problems', and we have been unwilling to perpetuate such an emphasis. Second, especially in the United States, simple ratings of education have been sought which, while interesting, are probably of less use than attempts to obtain educational priorities. Hence, this discussion of results only occasionally refers to other studies.

In an environment where school-leavers increasingly face the prospect of unemployment, educational priorities seem bound to reflect this. As will be seen, when asked about the priorities in secondary schools between a number of educational goals, easily the most popular choice was 'more training and preparation for jobs' followed by 'stricter discipline'. For primary schools, however, the most popular priorities were 'smaller classes' followed by 'more emphasis on developing the child's skills and interests'.

As far as general priorities for extra educational spending are concerned,

*Professor of Statistics at the University of London Institute of Education.

the group selected as the most in need of attention was 'less able children with special needs', followed closely by 'secondary schoolchildren'. Surprisingly, perhaps, nursery and pre-school children are accorded a low priority for extra expenditure. Less surprisingly, perhaps, students in higher education are seen as equally undeserving of extra expenditure. Nonetheless, when asked about higher education specifically, very few respondents could be found to support the view that opportunities for young people in Britain to go on to higher education should be reduced. Similarly, only a minority (though a much more sizeable one) would like to see the system of grants for students changed to a loan system.

Attitudes to private education are predictably polarised. Those who have experienced it or are probably in a position to afford it for their children are, on the whole, fairly well disposed to its existence, even to its expansion, while those who have no experience or little prospect of private education are less enthusiastic. Although only one in five of the population would actually like to see a reduction in the number of private schools, the majority of these favour abolition. Nonetheless, a clear majority of our sample believed that a reduction in private education would have no impact on the state system.

As far as multi-cultural education is concerned, we found fairly positive attitudes towards some policies and a negative attitude towards others. There is, for example, strong support for including in the general curriculum more emphasis on the history and culture of countries from which ethnic minority pupils originate. Similarly there is strong support for special classes in English for those who require them. But when asked about special dispensations to pupils from different ethnic backgrounds — such as allowing separate religious instruction if requested, allowing traditional dress to be worn, allowing mother tongue lessons in school hours — the votes in favour decreased substantially. On the whole, there is strong support for measures that will incorporate cultural diversity and little support for those that will encourage cultural separateness.

Previous surveys

Few previous attempts have been made to carry out representative surveys of attitudes to education in Britain. Most previous studies have been small, local and unrepresentative (e.g. Chuman and Gallop 1981, Luckham 1972). In 1979 and 1980, however, the National Consumer Council carried out a large survey of 2000 adults using a probability sample (National Consumer Council, 1981). Unfortunately, this survey was directed mainly towards eliciting consumer concerns about services. Of the 16 questions dealing with education, almost all asked about the respondents' 'worries' or 'complaints'. While of interest, such questions inevitably represent only one aspect of public attitudes. Over and above such limitations, there is the more general problem in surveys of the subtle effects of question wording on response. It is well known, for example, that by wording questions negatively as opposed to positively, or by adding a 'neutral' response to a preference scale, responses can be altered — both in terms of marginal frequencies and associations between variables (Kalton & Schuman, 1982). This awareness has informed the design of the present enquiry.

Surveys in other countries

In the United States and Canada there has been somewhat more activity. Since 1969 the US Gallup organisation has conducted an annual probability-based survey involving about 1500 adults to study attitudes towards American public (ie. non-private) schools (Gallup, 1982). Similar questions are asked each year permitting simple analyses of trends, and it has become a major source for commentators on the state of US schooling. Many of the Gallup attitude questions ask respondents to 'grade' aspects of education - for example, teachers - or to 'rate' the amount of attention paid to a number of listed school subjects. Gallup's starting point, however, is to ask about major problems facing schools, with the risk that the 'response set' thus created might have a negative impact on respondents' attitudes to subsequent issues.

In Canada, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education has carried out four surveys of attitudes to education from 1978 to 1982 (Livingstone *et al*, 1983). Several questions asked people to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with issues such as discipline, contact with parents etc. Other questions asked people to agree or disagree with statements, for example about relations between school and work. There were also priority questions both on relative government spending, and on spending within the educational system.

Necessarily, surveys in other countries are difficult to use comparatively because of different educational and cultural traditions which in turn create problems for question wording. In addition, we were conscious that our survey was being conducted at a time of major budgetary cuts in Britain, so we wanted to avoid formulating questions that allowed respondents to opt for unconstrained improvements. Instead we concentrated initially on priorities.

The findings

Resource allocation

Our first two questions in this section were designed to establish the perceived importance of different aspects of education. The first sought a ranking of different levels of education by asking for respondents' two major priorities for extra public spending on education. The items we presented and the overall results were:

First priority for extra spending	%
Nursery or pre-school children	10
Primary school children	16
Secondary school children	29
Less able children with special needs	32
Students at colleges, universities and polytechnics	9

Table 5.1 at the end of this chapter includes the principal breakdowns. It shows that women, the elderly, Labour identifiers and those who left school at 16 or under all attach a relatively higher priority to the needs of less able children or under all attach greater priority than men to pre-school education at the expense of higher education; among those with personal or household experience of private education, this relative preference is reversed. The strong vote for children with special needs may in part reflect the concentration of local education authorities on special needs provision following the 1981 Education Act. But the overall preference for less able children and secondary school children, in comparison with all other listed groups, is very clear.

In the event, although the question was principally concerned with different levels of education, we inserted the option of special needs provision in order to explore preferences for particular groups of children within the system. The results we obtained suggest that further research could usefully be undertaken to explore priorities between different groups of children within each level of education.

Factors in improving schools

In our second question on priorities, we asked our sample to select what they considered to be the most important factor which could lead to improvements first in primary schools, then in secondary schools (see Tables 5.2 and 5.3). A list of thirteen possible improvements was given to respondents, from which they were asked to select only the single most important.

'Smaller classes' were most highly rated for primary schools (31%), followed by 'more emphasis on developing the child's skills and interests' (19%), and 'more resources for books and equipment' (15%). More discussion between parents and teachers' and 'stricter discipline' accounted only for about 10% each, and a number of other factors achieved 3% or less - better buildings, better pay for teachers, involvement of parents in governing bodies, emphasis on preparation for exams, preparation for job training, more emphasis on arts, maths or English. Some interesting age patterns emerge, the older respondents being more inclined to choose stricter discipline at the expense, for instance, of developing skills and interests. There was also less concern with smaller classes among ethnic minorities while those who stayed in full-time education after the age of 16 tended to give a relatively higher priority to developing a child's skills and interests. Women were particularly concerned about smaller classes.

The pattern of answers for secondary schools was very different. Here 'smaller classes' was given first priority by only 10% of the sample, the same proportion who favoured 'more spending on books and equipment'. For secondary schools, 'more training and preparation for jobs' was given the greatest support (27%), followed by 'stricter discipline' (19%) and 'more emphasis on developing skills and interests' (13%). More discussion between parents and teachers was an even smaller priority (5%) than it was for primary schools. Only 7% chose 'more emphasis on exam preparation', while items such as better buildings, better pay for teachers, involvement of parents in governing bodies and emphasis on arts, maths or English all achieved a very low priority (less than 3%).

Unlike the priorities for primary schools, we found no major sex differences in the results, but there were age differences. The younger age groups placed even greater emphasis on training for jobs at the expense mostly of stricter discipline.

It would be wrong to make too much of direct comparisons of priorities between primary and secondary schools in Britain, because we allowed respondents to select only one improvement for each. Nevertheless, it does appear that job training and stricter discipline are the clear priorities for secondary schools, while smaller classes and the related item of developing individual skills and interests are the priorities for primary schools. In both cases it was surprising that so few people gave priority to so-called 'basic' subjects such as mathematics and English, given the continuing public commentary on these. If we had asked directly about 'basic skills' it is possible that a somewhat larger percentage would have chosen this option. In the 1982 US Gallup poll, about 26% of the sample felt there should be more emphasis on the 'basics', while in Ontario 'basic' and 'everyday' skills were ranked only third behind 'job training and career preparation', and 'development of creativity'. More relevant, perhaps, when asked about basic reading, writing and arithmetic, 93% of the US public were opposed to any cuts. Unfortunately these questions were not asked in terms of priorities and therefore have only limited utility here. In any case the differences between America and Britain seem to be large: for example the NCC survey in Britain found that only 9% of respondents regarded discipline as a problem compared with 70% in the US Gallup poll.

The thirteen options we presented to respondents in this question clearly do not represent similar levels of additional expenditure or resource allocation. But the question was framed primarily in order to understand how educational objectives are viewed in primary and secondary schools. In summary it appears that at secondary level the specific issue of job training tends to overwhelm most other issues, while at primary level somewhat broader educational objectives are still allowed scope.

State and private schools

With private schooling continuing as a political issue, and often linked to the possible consequences of reduced resources for state schools, it is interesting to estimate the support for different levels of private schooling and the possible effect of a reduction in their number on state schools. Two questions were asked. The first obtained people's views on the relative number of private schools in Britain (more, fewer, the same), and the second on the likely impact of their existence on state schools. It seemed most useful to obtain views about the effect of a change in the number of private schools, so we sought opinions on the effect of fewer private schools. We could – instead or in addition – have asked for opinions on the effect of more private schools and this might well have produced a different picture. But resource limitations prevented our doing so.

The majority of respondents (67%) favoured the *status quo* and thought in any case that a reduction in private schools would make no difference to the state system (59%) (see Tables 5.4 and 5.5). But the balance among the minority who wanted a change was in favour of a reduction in private education (19%) as opposed to an expansion (11%). Moreover, the majority of those who wanted

a reduction favoured abolition of the private school system. This balance of opinion was reflected among different age groups. Not surprisingly, among those with household experience of private education, those in the higher social classes and Conservative identifiers (which are related characteristics), the balance of opinion was more favourable to private schools. Conversely, among those in manual occupations and Labour identifiers a stronger vote against private schools is apparent; around one in three Labour identifiers, for instance, would favour a reduction in the number of such schools, and one in five would favour abolition. Alliance identifiers had intermediate views both on the number of private schools and on the likely impact of a reduction.

Overall, as many respondents (18%) thought that state schools would benefit as those who thought they would suffer if private schools were reduced, the majority believing that the state schools would not be affected. The same proportion of Conservative identifiers (12%) as of Labour identifiers held 'non-conforming' views on this issue.

A related issue is the question of who benefits most from present public expenditure on education. The question we asked was:

On the whole, which of these three types of family would you say gets best value from their taxes out of government spending on education . . . those with high incomes, those with middle incomes, or those with low incomes?

We asked similar questions on health and housing, and it is interesting to compare the answers.

Government spending on		Who benefits most:	
NHS	Housing	Education	
44	36	30	Low income families
24	30	34	High income families
%	%	%	

There is, however, a strong class and income effect here: on the whole, those with high incomes believe that low income families benefit more, and vice versa. But it is interesting to note that, of the three areas of expenditure we investigated, education was viewed as the most regressive. It will be instructive to monitor these answers over the years as the debate on resources for both the health and education services continues.

Educational standards

The question of changes over time in educational 'standards' has continued to dominate media discussions of education, despite the dubious relevance of any research evidence to support a particular view, or even to supply a generally accepted definition of 'standards'. Nevertheless, only 4% of the sample failed to express a view on this issue, and overall about the same number (39%) thought that standards had improved since their own schooldays as thought they had deteriorated (41%). Not surprisingly, those most recently in school were less likely than others to believe that standards had either improved or declined, since there would not have been time. There is, however, a large social class difference in the answers: the middle classes, Conservatives, those who left

school beyond the minimum age, and those with household experience of private schooling all had majorities who believed that standards had declined since they were educated. On the whole, the opposite was true for working class respondents, Labour identifiers and early school leavers (see Table 5.6). There seems to be no good previous data with which to compare the present findings and this makes them somewhat difficult to interpret. During the 1970s the US Gallup Poll found a downward trend in the high ratings, but it had ceased by the end of the 1970s. Likewise, in Ontario there was a decline in 'satisfaction with schools' from 1978 to 1979 but little change after that. Once again, this question is essentially more useful as a monitoring device than it is for a single reading.

Publication of examination results

The 1981 Education Act has required schools to make public examination results publicly available from 1982. It is too early to assess the importance of this development. Nevertheless, it seemed useful to establish a baseline level of opinion so that changing views can be monitored by future surveys.

About two-thirds of people think such information would be useful for parents of present or future pupils, but only about half of these think it would be very useful. These figures may simply reflect a general feeling that publication of hitherto unavailable information ought to be useful; so it would be rash to read too much into the answers. There were some minor age differences in the distribution of answers, with younger respondents less likely to be enthusiastic than those in the 35-44 age group, a group for whom such information is probably most relevant to their assessment of secondary schools.

Opportunities for higher education

In our earlier question about overall educational priorities, only 9% chose higher education as their first priority for extra educational spending (see Table 5.1). Nevertheless 44% feel that opportunities for young people to go on to higher education should be increased. At a time when such opportunities are decreasing as a result of government cuts only 5% felt that there should be fewer such opportunities. This is not necessarily contradictory. After all, education spending is given a high ranking (24%, second only to health) by respondents (see Chapter 4) in relation to government spending in general. This is true incidentally of the USA as well, where education was the most popular first priority (21%), just ahead of health and in Canada it was third (13%) behind both health and job creation.

The younger age groups, Labour identifiers, and those with full time education after the minimum school leaving age were more favourably disposed towards increased opportunities for higher education than were the elderly, Conservative and Alliance identifiers, and those who left school before 16. Ethnic minorities were strongly in favour of increased opportunities (60%) with only a third believing opportunities were currently at about the right level (see Table 6.7). The cluster of groups in favour of promoting higher education

— the younger, the better educated and Labour identifiers — is unusual and ought to be examined in further work. Although not currently an issue, there had in 1982/3 been discussion of giving loans rather than grants to students in higher education, so we included a question to establish public support for such a change. A majority of respondents (57%) were in favour of retaining the grant system, and there was a clear age trend from those under 35 (66%) to those 55 and over (45%) and a trend also from Labour (66%) through Alliance to Conservative (51%) (see Table 5.8). Those with full time education beyond 16 (and therefore more likely to have experienced grants) were also more likely to opt for grants in preference to loans.

Provision for cultural diversity in schools

In the self-completion part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked whether or not they thought that schools containing many children whose parents come from other countries and cultures should adopt special policies. Such policies included:

% agreeing	
77	providing special classes in English if required
74	teaching all children about the history and culture of these countries
74	allowing those for whom it is important to wear traditional dress at school
43	teaching children (from different backgrounds) about the history and culture of their parents' countries of origin
40	providing separate religious instruction if their parents request it
32	allowing these children to study their mother tongue in school hours
16	

Table 5.9 contains more detailed breakdowns. The responses suggest considerable support for making some provision for minority cultures in schools, but rather more support for policies that will enhance uniformity rather than diversity. Thus, for instance, there is little support for separate religious or mother tongue instruction while there is strong support for teaching English and for the overall curriculum to include more about different cultures. As always, however, there are subgroup differences. Principally, women are somewhat more favourably disposed than men towards separate religious instruction, traditional dress and a curriculum expansion to include lessons to all children about different cultures; the oldest age group was more sympathetic towards separate religious instruction, while the non-manual group was more sympathetic towards provision of English classes. Ethnic minority groups were more sympathetic towards almost all aspects, but primarily towards mother tongue provision and curriculum expansion for minority ethnic groups. On all the policies, Labour and Alliance identifiers were more sympathetic than Conservative towards allowances being made for cultural minorities in schools, particularly towards steps to encourage diversity rather than those, such as English classes, that enhance standardisation.

References

- LUCKHAM, B., 'The Image of Adult Education', *Studies in Adult Education*, 4, (1972) pp 1-20.
- CHUMAN, P. A. S. and GALLUP, R., 'Educational Attitudes of Bengali Families in Cardiff', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 2, (1981) pp 127-144.
- NATIONAL CONSUMER COUNCIL, *An Introduction to the Findings of the Consumer Concerns Survey*, NCC, London (1981).
- KALTON, G. and SCHUMAN, H., 'The Effect of the Question on Survey Responses; a Review', *Journal of Royal Statistical Society, A*, 145, (1982) pp 42-73.
- LIVINGSTONE, D. W., HART, D. J. and McLEAN, C. D., *Public Attitudes Toward Education in Ontario 1982*, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Informal Series/51.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks are owed to the following people who provided help and comment on early versions of the questions:

Tessa Blackstone
James Cornford
Barbara Goldstein
Barbara Gippis
Stephen Steadman
William Taylor
Barbara Tizard
Jenny Tuson
Alison Wolfe

5.1 HIGHEST PRIORITY FOR EXTRA GOVERNMENT SPENDING ON EDUCATION (Q.65a)
by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
schooling of household members and party identification

	TOTAL		SEX		AGE †		SOCIAL CLASS			ETHNIC GROUP		AGE LEFT FULL-TIME EDUCATION †		SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD †		PARTY IDENTIFICATION †					
			Male	Female	18-35	36-54	Non-manual	Manual	Looks after home	Other	White	Black/Asian/Other	16 or under	Over 16	State Only	Private (any member)	Cons.	Alli-ance	Labour	Non-aligned	
Nursery/pre-school children	10	7	7	13	13	12	7	9	10	15	7	10	12	10	11	11	6	9	8	13	9
Primary school children	16	18	15	15	14	17	18	15	18	16	17	16	18	16	17	17	11	16	16	18	14
Secondary school children	29	33	25	25	33	30	22	33	29	22	21	29	24	26	36	27	37	34	34	23	21
Less able children with special needs	32	27	37	37	30	29	37	29	32	38	36	32	38	35	21	33	30	28	27	37	41
Students at colleges, universities or polytechnics	9	12	7	7	9	11	9	11	9	5	17	10	7	8	14	9	14	11	11	7	9
None of these/don't know	3	3	3	3	1	2	6	3	2	5	2	3	1	3	2	3	3	3	4	2	5
Not answered	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	*	*	*	2	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	-	*	1
BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS	1719	793	926	807	533	593	587	602	664	346	106	1631	88	1338	377	1491	228	664	232	565	216
Unweighted	1761	807	954	807	525	623	607	624	678	353	106	1677	84	1381	374	1529	232	676	238	584	221

For notes on breakdowns, symbols and tabulations, refer to Appendices I and II.

5.2 MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR TO IMPROVE PRIMARY SCHOOLS (Q.66a)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

TOTAL	SEX	AGE †	SOCIAL CLASS	ETHNIC GROUP	AGE LEFT FULL-TIME EDUCATION †	SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD †	PARTY IDENTIFICATION †
	Male Female	18-34 35-54 55+	Non-manual Manual Looks after home Other	White Black/Asian/Other	16 or under 16 or over 16	State Only (Private any member)	Cons. Alliance Labour allied Non-aligned
1719	793 926	533 593 587	602 664 346 106	1631 88	1338 377	1491 228	664 252 565 216
1761	807 954	525 623 607	624 678 353 108	1677 84	1391 374	1529 232	676 258 594 221
1	*	1	*	*	1	1	*
2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2
11	14	8	10	11	12	11	12
11	10	6	12	11	12	11	14
19	21	26	16	19	17	20	19
31	27	32	32	31	30	30	31
9	9	9	10	10	10	10	9
15	17	19	17	15	16	16	13
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

More resources for books and equipment
 More discussion between parents and teachers
 Smaller classes
 More emphasis on developing child's skills and interests
 Stricter discipline
 Other factor
 None of these/don't know
 Not answered

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS
 Weighted
 Unweighted

5.3 MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR TO IMPROVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS (Q66b)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

TOTAL	SEX	AGE †	SOCIAL CLASS			ETHNIC GROUP		AGE LEFT FULL-TIME EDUCATION †	SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD*		PARTY IDENTIFICATION †							
	Male Female	18-34 35-54 55+	Non-manual Manual Looks after home [†]	Other	Black/ Asian/ Other	White Asian/ Other	16 or under Over 16	State only	Private (any member)	Cons. ance	All- Labour	Liberal allied	Non- aligned					
1719	793 926	533 525	303 621	307 607	602 624	664 678	368 353	106 106	1631 1677	88 84	1338 1391	377 374	1491 1529	228 232	664 674	252 258	665 664	216 221
1701	793 926	533 525	303 621	307 607	602 624	664 678	368 353	106 106	1631 1677	88 84	1338 1391	377 374	1491 1529	228 232	664 674	252 258	665 664	216 221
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	13	16	16	8	15	12	14	14	13	16	12	17	13	15	14	18	12	9
27	26	35	24	27	24	28	32	23	27	28	25	28	23	24	27	30	26	
19	17	11	21	24	20	19	19	14	19	13	20	15	18	21	16	17	19	
6	8	5	6	9	6	8	5	8	6	10	7	5	6	6	6	7	7	
2	2	1	1	5	1	3	3	-	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	2	4	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

More resources for books and equipment
 More discussion between parents and teachers
 Smaller classes
 More emphasis on preparation for exams
 More emphasis on developing child's skills and interests
 More training and preparation for jobs
 Stricter discipline
 Other factor
 None of these/don't know
 Not answered

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS
 Weighted Unweighted

5.4 PROPORTION OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS (Q67a)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

	SEX		AGE		SOCIAL CLASS		ETHNIC GROUP		AGE LEFT FULL-TIME EDUCATION		SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD		PARTY IDENTIFICATION					
	Male	Female	10-14	15-54	Non-manual	Looks after home	White	Black/Asian/Other	16 or under	Over 16	State only	Private (any member)	Cons.	All-Labour	Non-identified			
TOTAL	11	12	8	12	12	11	9	10	11	13	10	15	9	25	19	7	4	8
More	11	12	8	12	12	11	9	10	11	13	10	15	9	25	19	7	4	8
About same as now	67	65	69	69	64	71	65	68	67	68	68	67	68	63	73	74	59	66
Fewer	8	8	9	9	8	6	9	9	9	5	9	8	9	5	3	9	14	9
None at all	11	12	10	11	10	12	8	12	11	11	11	9	12	5	4	8	20	10
Other answer/don't know	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	6
Not answered	1

5.5 EFFECT ON STATE SCHOOLS IF FEWER PRIVATE SCHOOLS (Q67b)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

	SEX		AGE		SOCIAL CLASS		ETHNIC GROUP		AGE LEFT FULL-TIME EDUCATION		SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD		PARTY IDENTIFICATION							
	Male	Female	10-14	15-54	Non-manual	Looks after home	White	Black/Asian/Other	16 or under	Over 16	State only	Private (any member)	Cons.	All-Labour	Non-identified					
TOTAL	18	19	17	18	17	17	17	19	24	18	8	17	20	17	20	12	18	25	15	
STATE SCHOOLS:																				
would benefit	18	17	20	21	21	14	23	15	16	22	18	17	23	18	24	26	16	12	14	
would suffer	59	61	58	59	57	62	58	64	58	47	59	65	60	57	54	59	63	57	63	
It would make no difference	4	3	6	2	3	7	2	4	8	5	4	10	5	1	3	3	2	5	7	
Don't know	1	.	.	2	1	
Not answered	
BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS																				
Weighted	1719	793	926	533	593	587	602	664	346	106	1631	88	1338	377	1491	288	604	602	565	216
Unweighted	1761	807	954	525	623	607	624	678	353	106	1677	84	1381	374	1529	232	676	258	584	221

5.6 STANDARDS NOW COMPARED WITH THOSE DURING RESPONDENT'S SCHOOLING (Q.69)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

TOTAL	SEX		AGE			SOCIAL CLASS			ETHNIC GROUP		AGE LEFT FULL TIME EDUCATION		SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD		PARTY IDENTIFICATION				
	Male	Female	18-34	35-54	55+	Non-manual	Manual	Looks after home	Other	White	Black/Asian/Other	16 or under	Over 16	State only	Private (any member)	Cons.	All-ance	Labour	Other
39	38	41	20	46	51	32	44	46	36	41	26	44	22	41	27	33	36	49	38
15	17	13	30	11	6	15	17	11	21	15	15	14	18	16	11	12	16	15	21
41	41	40	44	40	38	50	35	37	34	41	35	37	53	38	54	50	43	31	33
5	4	5	6	4	5	3	5	5	10	3	24	4	7	4	7	4	5	4	8
*	1	*	*	1	1	1	*	-	*	1	-	*	1	1	*	*	-	1	1

5.7 OPPORTUNITIES TO GO ON TO HIGHER EDUCATION (Q.71a)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

44	44	43	47	48	37	42	45	41	53	43	60	42	49	44	45	38	44	54	35
49	48	49	48	47	51	51	47	50	42	50	33	50	46	49	48	54	48	41	53
5	5	5	4	4	7	5	5	5	2	5	2	5	5	5	5	6	6	3	6
2	2	3	1	2	5	2	2	4	-	2	5	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	5
*	*	*	*	-	1	*	*	*	2	*	-	*	-	*	*	*	*	*	1

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS

Weighted
Unweighted

1719	793	926	533	593	587	602	664	346	106	1631	88	1338	377	1491	228	664	852	665	216
1761	807	954	526	623	607	624	678	353	106	1677	84	1381	374	1529	232	676	258	564	221

5.8 STUDENTS SHOULD GET GRANTS OR LOANS (Q.71b)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

TOTAL	SEX	AGE†	SOCIAL CLASS	ETHNIC GROUP	AGE LEFT FULL TIME EDUCATION†	SCHOOLING OF HOUSEHOLD*	PARTY IDENTIFICATION†									
	Male	18-34	Non-manual	White	16 or under	State member only	Cons.									
	Female	35-54	Manual	Black/Asian/Other	17 or over	Any member private	All-Party									
		55+	Looks after home				Labour									
			Other				Non-aligned									
Grants	57	58	66	61	45	58	52	51	58	66	66	50				
Loans	38	38	30	36	47	37	39	31	31	45	45	36	30	39		
Don't know/other answer	4	4	3	3	7	4	4	5	2	3	5	1	3	4	4	10
Not answered	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

5.9 PROVISIONS FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN SCHOOLS (Q.216)
 by sex, age, social class, ethnic group, age of leaving full-time education,
 schooling of household members and party identification

Provide special English classes if required	Provide separate religious instruction if requested by parents	Allow traditional dress if important	Study mother tongue in school hours	Teach history and culture of parents' country	Teach history and culture of these countries to all children	No self-completion questionnaire													
77	77	77	81	78	74	82	74	78	76	77	80	75	87	77	82	77	84	78	70
32	29	35	32	29	36	29	33	34	42	32	41	31	36	32	34	27	41	36	30
43	40	46	47	45	38	44	40	45	49	43	48	41	52	42	49	38	53	45	41
16	17	16	16	15	18	18	15	15	24	16	32	14	25	16	20	12	16	20	18
40	39	42	42	34	42	42	39	37	50	40	53	39	47	40	43	36	46	45	34
74	70	77	75	75	71	76	71	74	71	74	71	72	79	73	76	73	79	74	68
6	7	6	4	6	9	6	7	5	7	6	10	7	5	7	5	6	4	6	12
1719	793	926	533	593	587	602	664	348	108	1631	88	1338	377	1491	228	664	232	563	216
1761	807	954	525	623	607	624	678	353	106	1677	84	1381	374	1529	232	676	258	584	221

BASE: ALL RESPONDENTS
 Weighted
 Unweighted