

A Study of the Social Background of Students in the Irish Universities

By MONICA NEVIN

(Read before the Society on May 10th 1968)

In a paper read before the Society in January 1967, an account was given of the results of a survey carried out in the academic year 1964/65 to study the social background of the students in University College, Dublin. In the following academic year, 1965/66, arrangements were made to extend the survey to cover the remaining university institutions of the Republic and in the spring of 1966 the survey-questionnaire was distributed in U.C.C., U.C.G. and T.C.D. to full-time students of all faculties entering college for the first time in the Michaelmas term of 1965. The questionnaire was distributed also in St. Patrick's College Maynooth to the entire student body. I wish to thank the authorities of all the Colleges for permission to carry out the survey and for their interest and encouragement. My sincere thanks are due also to the academic staffs in the Colleges without whose help I could never have accomplished the work.

The questionnaire used for the U.C.D. inquiry was retained for the other four Colleges, U.C.C., U.C.G., T.C.D. and St. Patrick's College Maynooth (see 1966-67 Journal of the Society). An Irish version was prepared as an alternative to the English version for distribution in U.C.G. and here I should like to thank Professor de Bhaldraithe of U.C.D. for help with the translation.

After discussion with the Provost Dr. McConnell and the Secretary of Trinity College it was decided that distribution of the questionnaire to the T.C.D. students in person was not feasible and the questionnaires were posted to the term-time address of each first year student and an envelope for the return of the completed form to the Department of Psychology, U.C.D., enclosed. This paper is based on an analysis of the data from the questionnaires completed by the students of the three Colleges, U.C.C., U.C.G. and T.C.D. A close comparison is made of the U.C.D. findings with the findings from the two other constituent colleges of the N.U.I. and with the findings from the T.C.D. survey. St. Patrick's College Maynooth is an ecclesiastical seminary and represents a highly selected population which could not be expected to reflect the structure of the general university population in the Republic. For this reason the data from Maynooth College have been kept separate and are given in the Appendix. Some comparisons are made in the Appendix with the findings from Maynooth College and those of the three constituent Colleges of the N.U.I.

The response rate to the questionnaire was as follows:

						<i>Number</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
U.C.D.	1,147	60.3
U.C.G.	406	56.2
U.C.G.	300	58.0
T.C.D.	385	56.9
<hr/>							
Total	2,238	58.6
St. Patrick's College, Maynooth	224 ¹	80.0

Table 1 shows the distribution among faculties of the first-year full-time day students of the Irish Universities. It is compiled from data supplied by the various university institutions and shows that almost 46 per cent of the first year undergraduates are students of the Humanities. If we take Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Medicine together we find these faculties include 15 per cent of first year students while the Faculty of Science includes 14-15 per cent. The faculty having the next largest number of students is Commerce with 10 per cent.

Table 2 gives the distribution of students among the various colleges and the response rate by faculty. It will be seen that the highest response rate came from University College Dublin with University College Galway next highest. For a postal questionnaire the response from Trinity College is satisfactory.

Social Origin of Students

The usual method of assessing access to university by social origin is to obtain statistics showing the distribution of social groups within the student population. Statistics of this kind appear in Table 3 showing the breakdown of parental occupation by social group. It will be noted from Table 2 that the percentage response to the questionnaire varied from one faculty to another in some of the colleges that is in U.C.D., U.C.C. and U.C.G. To eliminate any bias that this might introduce, data from the various faculties have been scaled up by multiplying the actual response in each faculty by a weighting factor equal to the number of first year students in the faculty divided by the actual response. Students who are the children of fathers in the professions (taking the Higher and Lower Professional groups together) comprise 24½ per cent of the student population. Students whose fathers are classed in the Intermediate Non-Manual Group (Civil Servants below the Higher Executive grade, Garda, Shopkeepers, etc.) form the next highest proportion 20.6 per cent. The Managerial and Executive Group are well represented also, 18.3 per cent, with children of farmers (17 per cent) close behind. Children of manual workers and those whose fathers are classed in social group 7 (transport workers, postmen, hairdressers, waiters, etc.) form less than 10 per cent of the total student population.

The position in the individual colleges varies. The proportion of students whose fathers are farmers is considerably higher in U.C.C. than it is in

¹First year and post-first year students. The number of first-year students was 112 as shown in Table 1.

U.C.D. (22 per cent as compared to 13.9 per cent) and higher still in U.C.G. (28.6 per cent). The proportion in Trinity College is low, 6.3 per cent. The percentage of children whose fathers belong to the Higher Professional Group differs slightly between the three constituent colleges of the N.U.I., being highest in U.C.D. (13.0 per cent), next highest is U.C.C. (10 per cent) and lowest in U.C.G. (7.3 per cent). The percentage is much higher in Trinity College, almost 32 per cent. It should be noted that the Census of Population classes clergymen in the Higher Professional Category and there are a number of Clergymen's children in T.C.D. The percentage of students whose fathers belong to the Lower Professional Group is similar in all three colleges of the N.U.I., around 12 per cent. In Trinity College it is about $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Again, all three constituent colleges of the National University show a similarity in the proportion of their students (between 20 and 25 per cent) who come from the Intermediate Non-Manual Class - Clerical grades, shopkeepers, Garda, etc. In Trinity College 11 per cent come from this group. Where University College Dublin and Trinity College are alike is in the percentage of students from the Managerial and Executive Group, 21.6 per cent in U.C.D. and 23.7 per cent in T.C.D. The percentage from this group is much lower in the Cork and Galway colleges, between 13 and 14 per cent in Cork and only 8 per cent in Galway. The percentage from Group 5 (Senior Salaried Employees) varies from just under 15 per cent in Trinity to 7 per cent in both U.C.D. and U.C.C. and $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in U.C.G. If we take all the lower strata groups together, Group 8, skilled workers, Groups 9 and 10, semi-skilled and unskilled and also Group 7 (transport workers, postmen, barbers etc.) we find that their representation in University College Dublin and in University College Galway is very similar, about 10 per cent. The representation from these groups is slightly higher in University College Cork, about 13 per cent and very low in Trinity College Dublin, that is between 2 and 3 per cent.

We see then that the "middle-class" groups predominate in the universities, that is if we take the upper and lower middle classes together.² In Trinity College there is a definite bias towards the upper social groups (three-quarters of the students in T.C.D. come from the upper groups). The social class composition of the T.C.D. student body seems to reflect largely the distribution in the population by social class of the Protestant community. In University College Dublin where just over half the students come from the upper social groups the bias is less marked. In University College Cork, 42 per cent and in University College Galway not more than a third of the students are from the upper groups. The higher representation of the upper social groups in U.C.D. I take to be a consequence of the higher density in Dublin and Leinster of professional people and of members of the Managerial and Executive class. To take one instance, all (or practically all) higher civil servants are stationed in Dublin and they as a group send a very high proportion of their children to university. These considerations hold also in some measure for T.C.D.

²Groups 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

However, Table 3, although a very useful table, gives an incomplete idea of access to university from the various social groups. Certain social categories with the smallest representation in the university have at the same time the largest representation in the entire population. A better method of assessing access to university is to compare the distribution by social group in the student population with the distribution by social group in the entire population. Table 4 shows this distribution. It gives the number of students in each social group as a percentage of the estimated³ number of potential students. From the table it can be seen that between 37 and 38 per cent of potential students from the higher professional group come to university compared to 2 per cent from the skilled workers' group. The managerial group sends almost 26 per cent of its potential students and Group 5 (senior salaried employees) 20 per cent. An interesting feature of the table is the high participation rate of the lower professional group (which includes teachers) a higher rate than from either the managerial or the senior salaried employees groups. The Unesco Report of the Conference of Ministry of Education of Europe Member States on Access to Higher Education (Vienna, November, 1967) states that "it is the generally accepted idea that certain circles – the families of teachers and subordinate officials – readily aspire to social mobility for their children through study".⁴ The participation rate of students with a lower-middle class background (children of clerks, garda, shop-assistants) is 11½ per cent. Between 3 and 4 per cent of children of farmers come to university.⁵

This picture of educational opportunity at university level is similar to that in other European countries. Bourdieu and Passeron⁶ argue that in France to go to a university (or Grande Ecole) is regarded as "normal" for upper-middle-class boys, "un destin banal et quotidien", whereas lower middle-class children regard entry to university as just "possible". At the bottom of the ladder a boy with a working-class background looks on entry to university as "impossible", statistically he has only two chances in a hundred of going to university. In France too, the farming community is no better represented in the university than it is here and this is the case also in Germany and other European countries. To quote the Unesco Vienna Report again,⁷ "the average income among the rural population is generally lower than in towns. But there is another factor . . . A concomitant of the rural environment is a *sub-culture* which adversely affects access to higher education; its bias towards the concrete discourages the theoretical and abstract cast of mind which is inseparable from higher education".

³The Census of Population 1961 gives in one of its tables (table 7), the number of children under 14 whose parents fall in the various social groups. If the number of children in each group is divided by 14 there is obtained what may be described as the number of "potential" students from each group.

⁴Unesco/Mineuropa/4. Paris 1967. CS/0967 – Eds/2.17. p. 45.

⁵If Maynooth students were included in this table the percentage of both farmers' children and children of garda, clerks etc., would go up slightly.

⁶P. Bourdieu and J. C. Passeron, *Les Heritiers* (1964) Les Editions de Minuit Paris, p. 14.

⁷OP. Cit. p. 76.

As can be seen from Table 4 the proportion of the relevant age group achieving university entrance is $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Social Group Distribution Among Faculties

When we examine the distribution among social groups of the students in the various faculties (Tables 5, 5a, 5b, 5c and Tables 6, 6a, 6b, 6c) we see that the children of farmers predominate in the faculty of agriculture, as indeed might have been expected. In Cork, Dairy Science is a faculty which attracts the children of farmers, as does the faculty of Veterinary Medicine in University College Dublin. It will be remembered that in U.C.D. the professional classes are well represented in the professional faculties and this pattern is repeated in U.C.C. However, in U.C.G. the dominant group in both medicine and engineering is the intermediate non-manual group. Perhaps a combination of lower fees and a slightly higher percentage of scholarships in U.C.G. make it possible for this group to be so well represented in medicine, a faculty normally associated with the higher social groups. There is another factor which may be relevant, the fact that over 95 per cent of the students in the faculty of Medicine in U.C.G. indicated they intended to take summer jobs. In Trinity College the higher professional group predominates in all faculties. In both U.C.C. and U.C.G. the children of skilled workers are to be found fairly evenly divided between arts and science. In U.C.D. nearly half the students with a skilled manual background are in the faculty of arts and about a tenth are in the faculty of science. In U.C.D., U.C.C. and U.C.G. the group with the highest representation in science is the intermediate non-manual group. In Trinity the upper social groups predominate in the faculty of science.

The findings of the Robbins Report showed that the upper social strata in the United Kingdom are drawn to the humanities and to the older professions such as law and medicine, whereas engineering or the technological subjects and science attract students from lower groups.

A study carried out in the United States by West showed a somewhat similar pattern.⁸ West found that low-socio-economic groups were over-represented in engineering and teaching, high-socio-status groups were over-represented in medicine and law. In France the situation is rather different. Upper class students do predominate in law and medicine but they are also very well represented in the faculty of pharmacology and in the higher technical establishments, the famous *Grandes Écoles*. The high esteem in which the profession of engineering is held in France (in contrast to its relatively low prestige in Britain) would account for its attraction for the upper groups. In the Irish universities (particularly in University College Dublin) the faculty of engineering attracts quite a high proportion of students from the upper social strata. Another point in common with France is the high representation of students from the lower income groups in the faculty of science and to a lesser extent in the faculty of arts. These groups are well represented in the faculties of arts and science in the French universities. In fact, Bourdieu and Passeron⁹ argue that students

⁸C. F. West: *Social Class and Initial Career Choice*. *Social Educ.* Vol. 39, 1966.

⁹Bourdieu and Passeron *OP. Cit.* p. 19.

from the less privileged groups are largely restricted by their educational attainments and aspirations to the faculty of arts. If such students think of a profession it is that of teaching, for which a degree in arts is eminently suitable. Many of those who enter the faculty of science in the universities of France do so also with a view of teaching.

The Social Background of Women Students

The Report of the recent Unesco Conference on Access to Higher Education¹⁰ says "that the effects of social inequality are felt more by girls than by boys". The American sociologist Coleman,¹¹ exploring the college intentions of adolescents suggests that girls' college intentions are more a function of class background than those of boys. Sewell¹² is in agreement with this opinion and holds that while intelligence is somewhat more strongly related to the college plans of boys than is socio-economic status, intelligence is a less important factor than socio-economic status in the case of girls. How far does the data in this survey bear out the assumption that social class plays an even greater part in the chance a girl has of access to university than it does in the case of a boy? Table 7 shows the distribution of the women and the men students in the various colleges, among the social groups. From the table it can be seen that the chance a girl has of going to university is highest when she is the daughter of a father in the higher professional group. As a girl's social status decreases so do her chances of going to university though the difference is less marked in the case of women students in U.C.G. than in either U.C.C. or U.C.D.

Parental Education

Less than a quarter of the students in the Irish universities are the children of graduate fathers and not more than 9 per cent have mothers who are graduates (Table 9). Half of the students' fathers had reached the age of 18 years before completing their education (Table 8). The percentage of students whose mothers had been educated to the age of 18 years or over was 43 (Table 8). Again, the pattern varies between the different university colleges. As we have seen, the general representation from the upper social groups is higher in U.C.D. and T.C.D. than it is in either U.C.C. or U.C.G., and it is not surprising to find the level of parental education in both the Cork and Galway colleges falls below that in the Dublin colleges. For example, 37 per cent of students in T.C.D. (Table 9) and 27 per cent in U.C.D. are the children of graduate fathers compared to 18 per cent in U.C.C. and 9 per cent in U.C.G. Likewise 63 per cent of the T.C.D. students (Table 10) stated their fathers had been educated to the age of 18 years or over and 53 per cent in U.C.D., compared to 43 per cent in U.C.C. and 34 per cent in U.C.G. Similarly the level of educa-

¹⁰Unesco/Mineuropa/4 OP. Cit. p. 66.

¹¹J. S. Coleman: *The Adolescent Society*, Glencoe, 1961

¹²William N. Sewell and Vinal P. Shah: *Sociology of Education*, Winter 1967, Vol. 40, No. 11.

tion reached by mothers of students in Dublin is higher than the corresponding levels in either U.C.C. or U.C.G. (Table 11).

Faculty Differences

The proportion of students coming from homes where at least one parent had been educated to the age of 18 or over was highest in the professional faculties of law, medicine (and dentistry) and architecture. The next highest proportion is in the faculty of social science, reflecting the high number of girls in this faculty. As can be seen from Table 7 women students come largely from the upper social groups. Arts comes next (again possibly reflecting the number of women students). The percentage of students whose fathers reached 18 before completing education and who are in the faculties of science and engineering is between 45 and 50 per cent. The percentage in Commerce is lower still 38 to 39 per cent. Veterinary medicine alone of the professional faculties has a fairly low representation 47½ per cent. This could be explained by the fact that a number of students in this faculty are the children of farmers. The very low proportion of students in the faculty of agriculture whose fathers were educated to the age of 18 is again bound up with the fact that the majority of students in this faculty are farmers' sons.

The pattern for the education of students' mothers is roughly parallel as can be seen from Table 11.

Scholarships

The percentage of university scholarshipholders in the Republic as a whole, is 15, (Table 12). This corresponds with the figure given in the Irish-O.E.C.D. Report, Investment in Education. The percentage in U.C.D. and in U.C.C. is similar (13.6 and 14.3 respectively); it is somewhat higher in both U.C.G. and T.C.D. (between 18 and 20 per cent). Over half the scholarships held in University College Cork are County Council awards, with Corporation scholarships next highest in number, and the same pattern holds for U.C.D. In U.C.G. County Council scholarships again predominate but there are also a high number of Gaeltacht and Department of Education scholarships. In Trinity College there were no Corporation or County Council scholarshipholders among the respondents, the majority of the scholarships falling under the heading, "any other type", in other words various grants or bursaries. There are also some College Entrance scholarships or Exhibitions.

It will be remembered that in U.C.D. the greatest number of scholarships are held in the faculties of science and engineering. University College Cork shows the same pattern. In Trinity College the greatest number of scholarships are held in the faculty of arts. In Galway, 30 per cent of the students in the faculty of agriculture have scholarships and 22 per cent of the science students. In addition, quite a high number of arts students are scholarship holders.

An analysis was made of scholarshipholders by social group (Table 13). In those groups where the numbers are sufficiently great to be statistically significant we find the highest proportion of scholarships in the colleges of

the N.U.I. go to two groups, the lower professional and the intermediate non-manual. In Trinity College due to the very high representation of the higher professional and managerial groups in the social composition of the student body it is not surprising to find the highest number of scholarships, over fifty per cent, held by students in these groups.

Mothers contributing to the Family Income

The percentage of students who stated their mothers contributed to the family income (table 14) is similar in all three constituent colleges of the N.U.I., that is about 20 per cent. It is lower in Trinity College, 15.2 per cent. No great differences show up when an analysis is made by faculty. When an analysis is made by social group it can be seen that mothers of students who belong to the Lower Professional are more likely than mothers of students in any other social group to work to contribute to the family income. This group includes teachers and it may well be that the mother is herself a teacher. It also includes pharmacists and perhaps the mother is a pharmacist or helps in the shop.

Family size and birth order

In the paper analysing the data from the U.C.D. study I suggested that a reasonable hypothesis would be that members of large families are at a disadvantage with regard to access to university, bearing in mind that in general the financial burden of keeping a student at university in this country falls on parents. I had expected the tables giving the distribution in the student population by family size to show a bias away from large families.

For convenience in assessing the data from students' answers families were divided into three categories, small 1-2 children, medium 3-4 and large 5 or more.

Contrary to expectations Table 16 of the U.C.D. study showed a bias away from small families; 48 per cent of the students were members of large families and 14 per cent members of small families. A similar pattern emerged from the U.C.C. and U.C.G. data. Table 16 in this paper gives the overall pattern for the Republic of Ireland and shows that 47 per cent per cent of university students are members of large families.

Many studies concerned with educational opportunity in Britain have found that a child from a large family is less likely to avail of full secondary education than is a child from a small family. However, in the examination of educational opportunity in the Middlesborough district of Yorkshire, Halsey, Floud and Martin¹³ came to the conclusion that there was evidence to show that the educational disadvantages of a large family are less marked for children of Catholic parents even at the bottom of the social scale.

There are variations, in the distribution by family size, among the colleges. University College Galway has the highest percentage of students from large families (57 per cent) and Trinity College the lowest (21 per

¹³J. E. Floud, A. H. Halsey and F. M. Martin: *Social Class and Educational Opportunity* (1958) Routledge Kegan and Paul, p. 91.

TABLE 16
 SIZE OF FAMILY TO WHICH STUDENTS BELONG

Family Size	U.C.D.	U.C.D.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
SMALL (1-2 children)	144	52	28	56	280
MEDIUM (3-4 children)	376	141	98	79	694
LARGE (5 or more children)	486	187	166	36	875
Total number of respondents	1,006	380	292	171	1,849
Percentage					
SMALL (1-2 children)	14.3	13.7	9.6	32.7	15.0
MEDIUM (3-4 children)	37.4	37.1	33.6	46.2	37.5
LARGE (5 or more children)	48.3	49.2	56.8	21.1	47.3

cent). The essentially rural background of the students in U.C.G. coupled with the fact that a smaller number come from the upper social groups makes this a reasonable finding. In University College Cork and University College Dublin the percentage distribution between small (1-2 children) medium (3-4 children) and large families is almost identical. The pattern in Trinity College is quite different and very interesting. It tallies beautifully with the social composition of the student body in T.C.D. Unlike the students in the colleges of the N.U.I., the majority of Trinity students do not come from large families, they come from families of medium size. The next highest proportion (32 to 33 per cent) come from small families.

The majority of students in all the colleges are either first or second children and this I take to be a consequence of the increased spread in recent years of educational opportunity throughout the community.

Vacation Employment

With so few university scholarships available it was reasonable to assume that many students were dependent largely on the money they earn from vacation employment. In fact the survey showed that over 73 per cent of students (Table 20) planned to take summer work. When the data were examined for faculty, it was found that 90 per cent of the engineering students and just on 90 per cent of the architecture students intended to take vacation work. This is the picture as a whole. When the

colleges are taken separately it can be seen that in U.C.G. between 80 and 81 per cent of the students said they would take a job in the summer vacation; in U.C.D. between 78 and 79 per cent and in U.C.C. 74½ per cent. Vacation employment is so much a part of student life nowadays (even in Britain where university education is largely subsidised by the State) that it comes as a surprise to find that not more than 22 per cent of the students in Trinity College expressed their intention of taking summer jobs.

In U.C.G. between 95 and 96 per cent of the medical students were planning to take summer work compared to 69 to 70 per cent in U.C.C. and 83½ per cent in U.C.D. None of the medical students in T.C.D. indicated their intention of taking employment during the summer vacation.

Urban or rural background

Taking Irish university students as a whole almost 64 per cent come from towns of 3,000 population or more (Table 21), but there are wide variations in the percentage from each college. The college which has the highest percentage of students with an urban background is T.C.D., 80 per cent. In U.C.D. there are 70 per cent and in U.C.C. between 59 and 60 per cent. The percentage in U.C.G. is considerably lower than in any of the other colleges, 44 per cent. According to the Report of the Commission on Higher Education¹⁴ the percentage of students in U.C.G. from the city of Galway and within thirty miles has tended to fall in recent years while that of students from other parts of Ireland has tended to increase and was 55 per cent in 1964/65. It may be that students coming to U.C.G. from outside Galway city come mainly from rural districts of Ireland.

Undergraduates' choice of course

In recent years much interest has been shown in the factors influencing choice of university course. How far is the choice made by the student himself and how far do his parents or his school influence his choice? Table 22a shows that almost 56 per cent of the students claim to have made their own choice. The percentage varies slightly between the colleges rising to 60 per cent in U.C.G. Just over a quarter of the students had been influenced in their choice by their parents (Table 22b) and 19 per cent (Table 22c) had been influenced by other factors, notably school staff, school friends, Career Guidance talks. When we examine the responses from the various colleges we find the percentage of students influenced by parents does not differ significantly. The percentage of students influenced by school staff etc., varies slightly between the four colleges, from over 21 per cent in U.C.C. to 16 per cent in U.C.G.

When an analysis by faculty is made we find that the lowest percentage of students claiming to have made their own choice occurs in the faculty of social science. The next lowest percentage is in the faculty of commerce. The professional faculties show a fairly high percentage. In my previous paper I suggested that the majority of students view going to a university

¹⁴Commission on Higher Education, 1967, Vol. 1. p. 62.

solely as a means to a vocational goal. Whenever possible they choose a course which provides a preparation for a profession, in preference to a course such as science where the job prospects are not so clear-cut. This is more true of the students from the upper social groups and has been noted by Marris¹⁵ in a study of Cambridge students. Marris argued that the upper-middle class student sees his university career primarily as a means of qualifying for an occupation similar in status to his father's. By contrast the working-class student when it comes to choosing a university course "sticks to the academic specialisation with which he is most familiar and in which he has proved his ability". The data from the N.U.I. seem to support the view of Marris by showing the upper social groups less dominant in the faculty of science than in the professional faculties.

Attitude to studies

Having chosen his course, how does the university student look on his studies? Table 23 shows that the percentage of students who genuinely enjoy their studies is fairly constant between the university institutions, varying between 51 and 50½ per cent. This is not as high a percentage as might perhaps be expected and seems to support Marris' conclusion that the intellectual opportunities of the university are not uppermost in the mind of the average student.¹⁶ But it should be remembered that we are dealing with first-year students who may have had to make considerable changes in their study habits to adapt to the university situation. By the time students are in their second year at university their attitudes may have changed greatly. We should note also the fact that less than 15 per cent of the students actually dislike their studies.

A profile of the "average" university student

We see then that the pattern of the student body given by a comparison of the data of the various university institutions in the Republic is fairly uniform. The picture which emerges shows that the average student enters on a course of study chosen by himself. When his choice has not been entirely his own he considers his parents to have had more influence on his choice than either his school or his friends. It appears that his choice is governed to a great extent by his vocational aspirations or by those of his parents. If his father is a member of one of the professions the student will probably enter one of the professional faculties. There is reason for supposing that many students look on their university course solely in the light of a qualification leading to a career and that it is the career in which they are interested not the subject matter of the course. This may be one of the factors underlying a certain lack of enthusiasm for studies. But even when a student does not find great satisfaction in his studies he spends a reasonable number of hours working at them.

The average student is supported at college by his family, aided by such earnings as he obtains from vacation work. If he elects to attend U.C.G.,

¹⁵Peter Marris: *The Experience of Higher Education* 1964, Routledge, Kegan and Paul, p. 31.

¹⁶OP. Cit.

he may have a slightly better chance of scholarship support. He is likely to be the first or second child in the family and his chance of going to university does not seem to be biased in favour of being a member of a small family. He belongs to the first generation if his family to enter university, more especially if he is a student of either U.C.C. or U.C.G. If he is a student of either U.C.D. or of T.C.D. it is probable his father has been educated to the age of 18 years or over but if he is a student of either U.C.C. or U.C.G. this is less likely.

CONCLUSIONS

The principal object of this survey was to put on record factual information about the social background of students in the Irish universities. What has emerged is that our students come from all levels of society but that a disproportionate number come from the upper income groups. An increase in the number of scholarships and grants is badly needed and would help in bringing into university children of parents of moderate means. But we need to do more than provide increased financial help at the level of university entrance. Potentially able children are lost to university through failure to complete secondary education. The Irish-O.E.C.D. report *Investment in Education* showed a large dropout from education occurred at the transition from primary to post-primary or secondary education. In other words the die has been cast long before university entrance. A first aim would be to increase the proportion of children from the lower social groups completing secondary education to the age of 18 and in fact the first step in this direction was taken in September last with the coming into effect of free-post-primary education.

The more we experience the problem of demand for higher education the more we become aware of the wide variety of the factors operating to curtail the amount of education received by children in certain social groups. For example, there is the factor of the parent's own educational level. This is bound up of course with social position but since parents' education, their attitudes to education and encouragement of their children have been found to be closely interconnected, the educational level attained by parents must have a decisive effect on the educational level their children will attain. The report of the Vienna Conference of Ministers of Education argues that while the economic situation appears to be a determining factor in access to the higher levels of education, it is a factor which operates according to the culture of the parents. "In this respect the major indication is provided by the father's profession and training (particularly the level of studies) which it implies. Culture for its part engenders attitudes, motivations, and prejudice with regard to study. All these elements combine to determine the extent to which the family or the environment is favourable to education".¹⁷ The quality of the education available in the area in which the family lives must be taken into consideration too, as must the attitudes and values of the peer group to which the

¹⁷Unesco/Mineuropa/4. Paris 1967. CS/0967 - Eds/2.17.

child belongs. What we need is knowledge of the relative importance of these factors. The Drogheda Manpower Survey reports finding a very favourable attitude to prolonged education on the part of mothers interviewed and also on the part of the sample of young people who were interviewed. This is a most encouraging finding. At least one study linking performance in primary school with social background is in progress and within a few years similar information at post-primary level should be available. We will then have a better idea of the nature and magnitude of the problem.

This survey may have a significance unforeseen at the time of its inception three years ago, in that it records the social background of Irish university students before changes such as the government plan for free post-primary education (and a possible increase in university scholarship provision fore-shadowed by the report of the Commission on Higher Education) have come into operation. A similar survey could be carried out usefully in another six or seven years to see the effect of these changes on the pattern of access to university from the different social groups.

APPENDIX

St. Patrick's College Maynooth

The most striking fact about the social structure of the students in St. Patrick's College Maynooth is the very high representation of the farming community. Nearly half the students are the children of farmers, Table 2d in the Appendix. Less than a quarter of the students come from the upper social groups and 15½ per cent are the sons of clerical workers, shopkeepers, garda, etc. Between 6 and 7 per cent are the children of manual workers. Given the fact that almost half the students in Maynooth College come from the farming community it is not surprising to find that only 20 per cent of them could be classed as urban (Table 22d). And consistent with the social group composition of the student body is the fairly low level of education attained by the students' parents. The fathers of almost half the students had left school before the age of 15 and not more than a quarter had completed full secondary education (Table 8d). The number of students' mothers leaving school before 15 was smaller than the corresponding figure for fathers leaving before 15 years of age. More mothers than fathers had received some secondary education. This pattern differs from that in the colleges of the National University and Trinity College but it follows the pattern for mothers of students from group 12 (Farmers) in the other colleges.

Again, given the social class composition of the student body in Maynooth, it is not surprising to find that the majority of the students are members of large families. Table 16d shows that almost 60 per cent come from large families and only ten per cent from small families. The percentage of students' mothers contributing to the family income (Table 14d) approximates to that for mothers of students in the three constituent college of the N.U.I.

*Key to social group code numbers used in this study***Social Group**

1. Agricultural labourers, forestry labourers, fishermen, turf-workers.
2. Higher professional; physicians, surgeons and other medical practitioners, veterinary surgeons, members of the legal profession, engineers, foresters (Department of Lands, Forestry inspectors), Analytical Chemists and other scientists, accountants (professional).
3. Lower professional; teachers, pharmacists, librarians, journalists, authors, actors, musicians, painters, nurses, opticians.
4. Administrative, executive and managerial workers; members of the Dail and Senate, civil service officials of higher executive rank or above, local authority officials, garda inspectors, superintendents, directors, managers, proprietors of large concerns, managers, buyers of wholesale or retail trade.
5. Senior salaried employees; commissioned officers in army, commercial travellers, manufacturers) agents, auctioneers, valuers, transport inspectors and supervisors, ships' engineering officers, aircraft pilots, stationmasters.
6. Intermediate non-manual workers; clerks, civil servants of executive officer or junior rank, local authority officers of junior rank, shop assistants, shopkeepers (own account), garda sergeants and lower ranks, detectives, garage proprietors (own account).
7. Other non-manual workers; bus conductors, postmen, post office assistants, fire brigade men, stewards, cooks (hotel and restaurant), hairdressers, barbers, photographers, physical training instructors.
8. Skilled manual workers; engine drivers, firemen (railway), painters and decorators, tailors, upholsterers, millers, bakers, printers, dental mechanics, masons, plasterers, plumbers, electricians.
9. Semi-skilled; kiln-operators, foundry-labourers, electrical and television assemblers, spinners and knitters, sugar refiners, meat curers, dock labourers, stevedores, lorry drivers, packers.
10. Unskilled; Contractors' labourers, road labourers, general labourers.
11. Persons who cannot be allocated to above groups or to group 12; for example, widows.
12. Farmers, farm managers, farm foremen.

DISCUSSION

Mr. T. J. McElligott at the outset may I say I do not think we can over-estimate the importance of Mrs. Nevin's paper as a sociological document. That the matter is extremely apropos is clear from a reading of the national press over the past year and, if we are to avoid student discontent and, perhaps, riots in the future, then far more of our work, our thoughts, our means and our attention must be focussed on the needs of our growing student population.

Obviously, on the question of who should go to university, the principle of selection ought to be educational not financial. A boy or girl of 18 who has a good school education is capable of doing useful work. If he or she is to be exempted for a further period of three or four years, the community has a right to expect that the time will be profitably employed. But, before deciding who is to go to university, we must have some view as to the function of the university in the life of the community. Universities exist for two purposes: on the one hand, to train men and women for certain professions; on the other hand, to pursue learning and research without regard to immediate utility. We should therefore wish to see going to the universities those who are going to practice these professions, and those who have that special kind of ability which will enable them to be valuable in learning and research.

Research of a rigorous nature has no long tradition in Ireland and much educational discussion is still insecurely based on assumptions, generalisations and deductions not always grounded on the rock of verifiable fact. This makes for vague, illdefined conclusions even if it does encourage discursive and often entertaining debate. Papers such as that we have had this evening are, therefore, extremely valuable. Mrs. Nevin mentions "the significance unforeseen at the time of its inception" that her survey may have. May I suggest that it will be of additional value because of the new conditions for university entrance both to National University and Trinity College and, also because of the new scheme of grants to university students. To what extent will these changes alter the pattern, that the lecturer has traced so clearly? To what extent will the quality of the work in the schools influence this pattern by lessening the importance of the parents' position and by emphasising academic merit as determined by examination marks?

Again, when the methods of Career Guidance become more refined and when the advisory service for pupils is more widely availed of – may we not expect to see the undergraduate's choice of course determined by reference to factors not now generally considered? And, it is possible that the new Leaving Certificate course may be a first step towards broadening the student's choice by broadening the spread of subjects offered. More money for schools will mean the possibility of employing more specialist teachers and we may find that "the working-class student" may be among the first to benefit. Mrs. Nevin notes that Marris, in his study of Cambridge students, found that the working-class student when it comes to choosing a university course "sticks to the academic specialisation with which he is most familiar and in which he has proved his ability".

The schools have a responsibility to place the pupil on the next rung of the ladder after he leaves school. But they may be forced to place him on on the wrong rung and, at present, they often are through their financial inability to cater fully for his academic needs. By narrowing the range of subjects offered at secondary school level we inevitably restrict the student in his choice of subjects at university level. And that, in turn, must have an effect on the undergraduate numbers following various courses. In this context, Mrs. Nevin has quoted from Bourdieu and Passeron who,

in *Les Heritiers*, argue that students from less privileged groups are largely restricted by their educational attainments and aspirations to the faculty of arts.

The value of the paper read this evening is equally important whether you consider it as an educational document or a social one. It is a record of the social background of university students in the middle sixties of the 20th century. The next quarter of a century may see the existing pattern greatly changed because of the discrediting of certain theories once widely held. These were that educational resources would always be scarce, that society could, therefore, afford to educate only the few destined to become leaders and, finally, that ability was something fixed and immutable that could be identified by examination and that did not alter very greatly during life.

Changes will inevitably follow, changes that will provide material for research workers of the future. Meanwhile, it remains for me to add my meed of praise to that of the proposer of the vote of thanks which I have much pleasure in seconding.

Dr. Geary: Amongst its other merits, I was greatly struck by the vast amount of work which has already gone into the paper, so naturally I ask Mrs. Nevin to do more in the direction of primary analysis. Overwhelmingly the most important table is Table 4 which significantly relates the survey results to those of the population census, indicating how children of the manual classes are at a disadvantage, education-wise. (I reply parenthetically to Professor Jessop, the 58,000, is, I think, the number in the single age group 18 and it is distributed by classes). I would ask the lecturer if she has fully exploited the relationship of her survey aggregates to census totals (as in her Table 4) and, if not, I suggest she should do so. The results would be more significant than comparison of colleges which abound in the paper.

Taking a line from Table 4, and addressing myself rather particularly to our Hon. Treasurer who, by a fortunate chance, happens to be the director of C.S.O., responsible for the census, I would like to make a suggestion about the next census, presumably in 1971. Abandoning any notions of high idealism, it must be demonstrated to the working classes (for their clever children) that education pays. It was a rugged American philosopher of other days who said "money doesn't buy happiness but it buys a dam' good substitute". My concrete suggestion is that a column be included on the census household form asking for income group to which each gainfully occupied person belongs. This income data, linked to the existing columns about level of education attained, will show the incremental income value of each step from level to level. Individual capital investment in education will equal actual cost of education for ages, e.g. 15-18, 15-21 plus what the boy or girl would have earned if their education had stopped at primary level. I believe that an excellent return on capital would be revealed. If not, the results would be a challenge to the education authority to justify its cost economically.

Dr. L. P. F. Smith: It would add to the use of a most interesting paper if information could be obtained on the rate of fallout by different groups of students. Our failure rate is about 50 per cent in first year of certain faculties. American figures suggest that this accentuates the pattern shown.

I may be considered conservative, but I feel it natural and desirable that parents pass on what they have to their children and that children want to achieve as their parents did. Teachers help their childrens studies; farmers sons are likely to enter and excel in agriculture; sons succeeding to family business now study commerce.

School guidance shown in Table 22c confirms the low grading of agricultural occupations by teachers. In the case of Vets this cannot be explained by low income expectation or shortage of employment openings.

Does work on the home farm count as vacation work? It would be difficult for a farmer's son to avoid – in fact freeing of children to help at harvest is one of the basic reasons for long summer holidays.

The inclusion of evening students would change the pattern in U.C.D., where it provides a way of working through college.

Mr. Desmond Rea: My justification for proposing this vote of thanks to Mrs. Nevin for this worthwhile paper is that I have carried out some work in this field at Queen's University, Belfast, work that is complementary to Mrs. Nevin's endeavours.* In that Mrs. Nevin has covered in her research five colleges it should be stated that her work is more comprehensive than mine.

It is, I believe, essential to emphasise why this work of Mrs. Nevin is important. Both from the individual's point of view and that of his country it is imperative that there is no waste of individual capacities by denying him or her the chance of development. Mrs. Nevin reveals that as the colleges are largely middle-class institutions such waste does take place (Page 203). And she underlines, this point when she states that the chance a girl has of going to university is highest when she is the daughter of a father in the "higher professional group" (Page 206). Mrs. Nevin rightly calls for increased scholarship aid to enable children of families of moderate means to proceed to university and she has emphasised – again rightly – that "potentially able children are lost to university through failure to complete secondary education" (Page 212). She has underlined the importance of "la famille educogène" not only in this respect but as her explanation of the high percentage of children from large families in the colleges.

In conclusion I would welcome Mrs. Nevin's call for further research into the relative importance of the factors she has listed, which have a bearing on this subject.

I have much pleasure in proposing this vote of thanks.

*See "A Discussion on Social Class Background with special reference to students at Queen's University, Belfast", included on Page 152 in this issue of the Journal (*Editor*)

J. McKenna: Three aspects of Mrs. Nevin's study which I would like to comment upon are firstly the care taken in the collection and on the interpretation of data, exemplified by the technique in the elimination of bias, a factor which had to be dealt with because of the differential rate of percentage response from the various faculties. Without this care the study would have as little value as such unsubstantiated opinions as that 80 per cent of school children can be written off by the age of eight, as far as higher education is concerned. Broadly speaking however the study indicates that a disproportionate number of Irish university students are children of parents in the upper income groups and analyses the social position, family background and courses chosen by Irish students to maintain or raise their social status in the community.

The second comment which is worth making is the fact that similar studies in other countries have arrived at similar conclusions however, comforting this may be. Rosen (1956) writing on what he termed the "Achievement Syndrome" in U.S.A. found that members of the middle class tend to have considerably higher need achievement than individuals in lower social strata. Plotted on a graph the mean achievement scores of social classes fall along a regression curve with the highest mean score in the group most likely to be described as middle class when the trichotomy of upper, middle, and lower class are used. In England similar findings have been common to date.

Finally an important point of this study is that it is an accurate recording of the Irish student population in the mid sixties with all the social and psychocultural implications which these figures carry. It is clear from this that while upward social mobility is more possible for the higher income groups, it is also clear that the implementary values which encourage application to study are more characteristic of the middle classes than of individuals in lower social strata. This is likely to change with the growth of Colleges of Technology which will probably draw on more predominantly local and neighbourhood populations. The rapid expansion in technological education too, may bring about changes in our values with regard to instruction. It is possible that the classical, humane, tradition in Irish education with its predilection for the theoretical, abstract, and verbal cast of mind has had a bias against the concrete and the applied. Ruth Rice (1964) writing on the social and educational background and career prospects of students in a College of Advanced Technology in England showed that 17 per cent of the students came from lower working class, 25 per cent from upper working class, 29 per cent from middle class homes. On qualification they will have the same chance as university graduates to reach a position of status in the community. Such changes are already beginning to effect the structure of higher education in Ireland and the findings of this survey will be of enduring interest to the social historian who will have a reliable analysis of the Irish University student population of the mid-sixties.

REFERENCES

- BOURDIEU, P. and PASSERON, J.C. *Les Heritiers* (1964). Les Editions de Minuit Paris.
- Census of Population* (1961). Central Statistics Office, Dublin.
- COLEMAN, J. S. *The Adolescent Society*. 1961, Glencoe.
- FLOUD, J. E. *et al.* *Social Class and Educational Opportunity*. 1958, Routledge, Kegan and Paul.
- MARRIS, PETER. *The Experience of Higher Education*, 1964, Routledge, Kegan and Paul.
- Report of Commission on Higher Education*, 1967, Vol. 1, Dublin Stationery Office.
- Report of Conference of European Ministers of Education*, Unesco/Mineuropa/4 Paris 1967. CS/0967 – Eds/2.17.
- SEWELL, WILLIAM N. and SHAH VINAL P. *Social Education*, Winter 1967. Vol. 40, n. II.
- WEST, C. G. *Social Class and Initial Career Choice*, *Sociology of Educ.*, Vol. 39, 1966
- WARD, CONOR K. *Manpower in a Developing Community* 1967, Dublin, An Roinn Saothair.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION AMONG FACULTIES OF THE FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME DAY STUDENTS OF THE IRISH UNIVERSITIES

Faculty	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	St. Patrick's Maynooth	Totals	Percentage
Agriculture	71	36	39	9	—	155	3.9
Architecture	46	—	—	—	—	46	1.2
Arts ¹	693	312	251	320	99	1,675	42.6
Commerce ²	200	59	76	69	—	404	10.3
Engineering	147	59	32	35	—	273	6.9
Law	46	15	—	31	—	92	2.3
Medicine and Dentistry	238	96	63	81	—	478	12.2
Science ³	266	145	56	103	13	583	14.8
Social Science ⁴	101	—	—	14	—	115	2.9
Veterinary Medicine	95	—	—	15	—	110	2.8
Totals	1,903	722	517	677	112	3,931	99.9

¹Includes Hons. School of Arts and School of General Studies (T.C.D.).

²Includes School of Business Studies (T.C.D.).

³Includes 46 Pharmacy students (U.C.D.) and 29 Dairy Science students (U.C.C.).

⁴In U.C.C. students of Social Science are listed in the Faculty of Arts. There were 6 first year Social Science students in U.C.C. in the session 1965/66.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST YEAR¹ FULL-TIME STUDENTS, AND FACULTY RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Faculty	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
	Number of Students				
Agriculture	71	36	39	9	155
Architecture	46	—	—	—	46
Arts	693	312	251	320	1,576
Commerce	200	59	76	69	404
Engineering	147	59	32	35	273
Law	46	15	—	31	92
Medicine and Dentistry	238	96	63	96 ⁴	493
Science	266 ³	145 ³	56	103	570
Social Science	101	—	—	14	115
Veterinary Medicine	95	—	—	—	95
TOTAL	1,903	722	517	677	3,819
	Number of Students who responded (Residents of Republic in brackets)				
Agriculture	48 (48)	19 (18)	27 (27)	5 (5)	99 (98)
Architecture	31 (29)	—	—	—	31 (29)
Arts	372 (340)	165 (154)	119 (117)	201 (83)	857 (694)
Commerce	100 (98)	29 (29)	34 (34)	42 (27)	205 (188)
Engineering	136 (134)	38 (38)	23 (22)	14 (12)	211 (206)
Law	32 (29)	9 (9)	—	18 (2)	59 (40)
Medicine and Dentistry	155 (139)	51 (46)	45 (45)	47 (15)	298 (245)
Science	158 (144)	95 (90)	52 (50)	53 (27)	358 (311)
Social Science	62 (52)	—	—	5 (1)	67 (53)
Veterinary Medicine	53 (48)	—	—	—	53 (48)
TOTAL	1,147 (1,061)	406 (384)	300 (295)	385 (172)	2,238 (1,912)
	Percentage Response				
Agriculture	68.0	52.8	69.2	55.6	63.9
Architecture	67.0	—	—	—	67.4
Arts	54.0	52.9	47.4	62.8	54.4
Commerce	50.0	49.2	44.7	60.9	50.7
Engineering	92.5	64.4	71.9	40.0	77.3
Law	70.0	60.0	—	58.1	64.1
Medicine and Dentistry	65.2	53.1	71.4	49.0	60.4
Science	52.0	65.5	92.9	51.5	62.8
Social Science	61.0	—	—	35.7	58.3
Veterinary Medicine	56.0	—	—	—	55.8
TOTAL	60.3	56.2	58.0	56.9	58.6

¹Entering for the first time in the academic session 1964/65 (U.C.D.) and 1965/66 (U.C.C., U.C.G. and T.C.D.).²Includes students of Pharmacy.³Includes students of Dairy Science.⁴Includes students of Veterinary Medicine.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH

TABLE 2d

**NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST YEAR
STUDENTS DOMICILED IN THE REPUBLIC CLASSIFIED BY
PARENTAL SOCIAL GROUP**

Social Group	Number of Respondents	Number of Students	Percentage of Students
12. Farmers	40	48	46.6
1. Agricultural Workers	—	—	0.0
2. Higher Professional	3	4	3.5
3. Lower Professional	13	16	15.1
4. Managerial and Executive	2	2	2.3
5. Senior Salaried Employees	4	5	4.7
6. Intermediate Non-Manual	12	15	14.0
7. Other Non-Manual	5	6	5.8
8. Skilled Manual	5	6	5.8
9. Semi-skilled Manual	—	—	0.0
10. Unskilled Manual	—	—	0.0
11. Cannot be allocated	1	1	1.2
Totals	86	103	100.0

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS DOMICILED IN THE REPUBLIC CLASSIFIED BY PARENTAL SOCIAL GROUP

Social Group	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	Res-pond-ents A	Stud-ents B	Per-cent-age of Res-pond-ents C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
12. Farmers	146	237	13.9	85	151	22.1	78	146	28.6	10	19	6.3	319	553	16.9
1. Agricultural Workers ...	7	12	0.7	0	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	0.7	8	14	0.4
2. Higher Professional ...	138	221	13.0	38	68	10.0	22	37	7.3	52	97	31.9	250	423	13.2
3. Lower Professional ...	127	204	12.0	43	76	11.1	34	62	12.2	9	17	5.6	213	359	11.3
4. Managerial Executive ...	225	368	21.6	53	94	13.8	29	41	8.0	39	72	23.7	346	575	18.3
5. Senior Salaried Employees	82	125	7.3	27	48	7.0	14	28	5.5	24	45	14.8	147	246	7.8
6. Inter. Non-Manual ...	210	341	20.1	81	144	21.0	80	133	26.1	19	33	10.9	390	651	20.6
7. Other Non-Manual ...	33	58	3.3	11	20	2.9	5	10	2.0	1	2	0.7	50	90	2.6
8. Skilled Workers ...	56	94	5.5	36	64	9.4	18	30	5.7	1	2	0.7	111	190	5.9
9. Semi-skilled Workers	6	10	0.6	3	5	0.7	4	7	1.4	2	4	1.3	15	26	0.8
10. Unskilled Workers ...	4	7	0.4	1	2	0.3	3	5	1.0	—	—	—	8	14	0.4
11. Persons who cannot be allocated to above groups	16	25	1.5	6	11	1.6	6	11	2.2	6	11	3.6	34	58	1.8
Totals	1,050	1,702	99.9	384	683	99.9	293	510	100	164	304	100.2	1,891	3,199	100

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN EACH SOCIAL GROUP AS
A PERCENTAGE OF THE NUMBER OF POTENTIAL STUDENTS
IN THE REPUBLIC

Social Group	Number of Potential Students	Number of students in the Republic	Number of students in each social group as percentage of potential students
12. Farmers	14,906	553	3.7
1. Agricultural Workers	4,328	14	0.3
2. Higher Professional	1,137	423	37.2
3. Lower Professional	1,245	359	28.8
4. Managerial and Executive	2,238	575	25.7
5. Senior Salaried Employees	1,236	246	19.9
6. Intermediate Non-Manual Workers	5,679	651	11.5
7. Other Non-Manual	5,603	90	1.6
8. Skilled Manual	9,011	190	2.1
9. Semi-skilled	4,495	26	0.6
10. Unskilled	5,952	14	0.2
11. Persons who cannot be allocated to above groups	2,725	58	2.1
Totals	58,554	3,199	5.5

U.C.D.

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FROM THE REPUBLIC CLASSIFIED BY FACULTY AND BY PARENTAL SOCIAL GROUP

Faculty	Number who answered	Social Groups. (See Appendix. Coding of Parental Social Groups).												Parents occupation not given
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Agriculture	48	1	2	4	3	2	5	1	1	—	—	—	28	1
Architecture	29	—	9	3	2	4	5	1	2	—	—	—	2	1
Arts	340	5	38	42	71	17	75	14	24	2	1	2	45	4
Commerce	98	—	5	6	31	10	26	4	5	1	1	1	6	2
Engineering	134	—	10	19	30	20	31	2	4	1	1	2	14	—
Law	29	—	11	1	10	3	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—
Medicine and Dentistry	139	1	29	20	32	11	28	2	3	—	—	4	7	2
Pharmacy	20	—	3	13	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	2	—
Science	124	—	12	13	23	9	25	7	9	2	—	5	18	1
Social Science	52	—	11	4	11	6	7	2	4	—	1	1	5	—
Veterinary Medicine	48	—	8	2	12	—	5	—	1	—	—	1	19	—
Totals	1,061	7	138	127	225	82	210	33	56	6	4	16	146	11

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK

TABLE 5a

NUMBERS OF RESPONDENTS FROM THE REPUBLIC CLASSIFIED BY FACULTY AND BY PARENTAL SOCIAL GROUP

Faculty	Number who answered	Social Groups (see Appendix. Coding of Parental Social Groups)												Parents occupation not given	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Agriculture	18	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	—
Arts	154	—	15	12	20	10	39	5	17	1	1	3	31	—	
Commerce	29	—	1	5	3	2	9	1	3	—	—	—	5	—	
Engineering	38	—	4	10	5	4	6	3	—	—	—	1	5	—	
Law	9	—	4	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Medicine	46	—	13	6	9	2	4	1	—	—	—	2	9	—	
Dairy Science	18	—	—	—	7	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	8	—	
Science	72	—	1	7	5	9	19	1	16	2	—	—	12	—	
Totals	384	—	38	43	53	27	81	11	36	3	1	6	85	—	

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE GALWAY

TABLE 5b

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FROM THE REPUBLIC CLASSIFIED BY FACULTY AND BY PARENTAL SOCIAL CLASS

Faculty	Number who answered	Social Groups (see Appendix. Coding of Parental Social groups)												Parents occupation not given
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Agriculture	27	—	—	2	—	—	3	—	2	2	—	1	17	—
Arts	117	—	9	17	9	9	23	3	7	1	1	2	36	—
Commerce	32	—	—	3	5	1	10	1	1	1	—	—	10	2
Engineering	22	—	4	1	3	1	9	—	—	—	1	1	2	—
Medicine	45	—	6	5	8	2	14	1	3	—	—	—	6	—
Science	50	—	3	6	4	1	21	—	5	—	1	2	7	—
Totals	293	—	22	34	29	14	80	5	18	4	3	6	78	2

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

TABLE 5c

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS FROM THE REPUBLIC CLASSIFIED BY FACULTY AND BY PARENTAL SOCIAL GROUP

Faculty	Number who answered	Social Groups (see Appendix. Coding of Parental Social Groups)												Parents occupation not given	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Agriculture	5	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—
Business Studies	27	—	7	—	6	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	—
General Studies	27	—	7	2	8	7	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Hons. School Arts	49	1	17	5	13	3	3	1	1	2	—	—	2	1	7
Social Studies	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Engineering	11	—	6	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Legal Science	2	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medicine	15	—	5	1	1	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	—
Natural Sciences	27	—	8	1	7	6	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Totals	164	1	52	9	39	24	19	1	1	2	0	6	10	8	

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE DUBLIN

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL GROUPS WITHIN THE FACULTIES

Faculty	Social Groups (See Appendix).												Total	Dominant Group
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Agriculture	2	4	9	6	4	10	3	2	—	—	—	60	100	Farmers
Architecture	—	32	11	7	14	18	4	7	—	—	—	7	100	Higher Professional
Arts	1.5	11.3	12.5	21.1	5.1	22.3	4.2	7.2	0.6	0.3	0.6	13.3	100	Manager; Int. non-manual
Commerce	—	5	6	32	11	27	4	6	1	1	1	6	100	Manager; Int. non-manual
Engineering	—	7	14	22	15	23	1	3	2	1	2	10	100	Manager; Int. non-manual
Law	—	40	4	30	10	8	—	8	—	—	—	—	100	Higher Professional; Managerial
Medicine and Dentistry	1	21	15	23	8	20	2	2	—	—	3	5	100	Higher Professional; Manager; Int. non-manual
Pharmacy	—	15	65	—	—	5	—	—	5	—	—	10	100	Lower Professional
Science	—	10	10	19	7	20	6	7	2	—	4	15	100	Farmers; Manager; Int. non- manual
Social Science	—	21	8	21	12	13	3	8	—	2	2	10	100	Higher Professional; Manager.
Veterinary Medicine	—	17	4	25	—	10	—	2	—	—	2	40	100	Farmer; Manager; Higher Professional

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK

TABLE 6a

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL GROUPS WITHIN THE FACULTIES

Faculty	Social Groups (see Appendix)												Total	Dominant Group
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Agriculture	—	—	16.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	83.3	100	Farmers
Arts	—	9.7	7.8	13.0	6.5	25.3	3.3	11.0	0.7	0.7	2.0	20.1	100	H. Professional, Inter. Non-Manual, Farmers
Commerce	—	3.5	17.2	10.3	6.9	31.0	3.5	10.3	—	—	—	17.2	100	Int. Non-manual, H. profession Professional
Engineering	—	10.5	26.3	13.2	10.5	15.8	7.9	—	—	—	2.6	13.2	100	Lower Profession
Law	—	44.4	—	44.4	—	11.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	100	H. Prof., Managerial
Medicine	—	28.3	13.0	19.6	4.4	8.7	2.2	—	—	—	4.4	19.6	100	H. Prof., Managerial, Farmers
Dairy Science	—	—	—	38.9	—	16.7	—	—	—	—	—	44.4	100	Farmers, Managerial
Science	—	1.4	9.7	6.9	12.5	26.4	1.4	22.2	2.8	—	—	16.7	100	Inter. Non-manual, Skilled Manual.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE GALWAY

TABLE 6b

PERCENTAGE OF SOCIAL GROUPS WITHIN THE FACULTIES

Faculty	Social Groups (see Appendix)												Total	Dominant Group
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Agriculture	—	—	7.4	—	—	11.1	—	7.4	7.4	—	3.7	63.0	100	Farmers
Arts	—	7.7	14.5	7.7	7.7	19.7	2.6	6.0	0.9	0.9	1.7	30.8	100	Farmers
Commerce	—	—	9.4	15.6	3.1	31.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	—	—	31.3	100	Farmers. Int. Non-manual
Engineering	—	18.2	4.6	13.6	4.6	40.9	—	—	—	4.6	4.6	9.1	100	Int. Non-Manual.
Medicine	—	13.3	11.1	17.8	4.4	31.1	2.2	6.7	—	—	—	13.3	100	Int. Non-Manual
Science	—	6.0	12.0	8.0	2.0	42.0	—	10.0	—	2.0	4.0	14.0	100	Inter. Non.Manual

TRINITY COLLEGE

TABLE 6C

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL GROUPS WITHIN THE FACULTIES

Faculty	Social Groups (see Appendix)												Total	Dominant Group
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Agriculture	—	20.0	—	20.0	—	20.0	—	—	—	—	20.0	20.0	100	Numbers too small to be Significant
Business Studies	—	25.9	—	22.2	18.5	18.5	—	—	—	—	3.7	11.1	100	Higher Profess. and Managerial
General Studies	—	25.9	7.4	29.6	25.9	7.4	—	—	—	—	—	3.7	100	Higher Profess. and Managerial
Arts (Hons.)	2.0	34.7	10.2	26.5	6.1	6.1	2.0	2.0	4.1	—	4.1	3.1	100	Higher Professional
Social Studies	—	—	—	—	100	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100	Numbers too small to be significant
Engineering	—	54.6	—	18.2	—	18.2	—	—	—	—	9.1	—	100	Professional
Legal Science	—	50.0	—	50.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100	Professional and Managerial
Medicine	—	33.3	6.7	6.7	20.0	—	—	—	—	—	6.7	20.0	100	Professional
Natural Science	—	29.6	3.7	25.9	22.2	14.8	—	—	—	—	—	3.7	100	Professional Managerial and Senior Salaried Employees

TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF MEN AND WOMEN RESPONDENTS AMONG SOCIAL GROUPS

Number of Men and Women Students	Social Groups												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
U.C.D.													
Men	5	90	92	167	67	174	26	44	4	2	15	108	794
Women	2	48	35	58	15	36	7	12	2	2	1	38	256
TOTAL	7	138	127	225	82	210	33	56	6	4	16	146	1,050
Women as percentage of the total number	28	35	28	26	18	17	21	21	33	50	6	26	24.4
U.C.C.													
Men	—	21	34	35	21	62	9	27	3	1	4	57	274
Women	—	17	9	18	6	19	2	9	—	—	2	28	110
TOTAL	—	38	43	53	27	81	11	36	3	1	6	85	384
Women as percentage of the total number	—	44	21	34	22	23	18	25	—	—	33	33	28.7
U.C.G.													
Men	—	12	21	20	8	59	3	14	3	2	4	54	200
Women	—	10	13	9	6	21	2	4	1	1	2	24	93
TOTAL	—	22	34	29	14	80	5	18	4	3	6	78	293
Women as percentage of total number	—	45	38	31	43	26	40	22	25	33	33	31	31.7
T.C.D.													
Men	1	38	6	28	18	17	1	1	1	—	3	9	123
Women	—	14	3	11	6	2	—	—	1	—	3	1	41
TOTAL	1	52	9	39	24	19	1	1	2	—	6	10	164
Women as percentage of total number	—	25	33	28	25	10	—	—	50	—	50	10	25.0

TABLE 8

**PARENTAL EDUCATION (1). AGE AT WHICH PARENTS COMPLETED
FULL-TIME EDUCATION**

	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
FATHER					
Under 15	190	92	86	19	387
Between 15 and 18	238	108	73	41	460
18 and over	488	152	97	101	838
Total	916	352	256	161	1,685
MOTHER					
Under 15	167	68	65	19	319
Between 15 and 18	321	140	109	51	621
18 and over	397	145	83	87	712
Total	885	353	257	157	1,652
Percentage Response					
FATHER					
Under 15	20.7	26.2	33.6	11.8	23.0
Between 15 and 18	26.0	30.6	28.5	25.5	27.3
18 and over	53.3	43.1	37.9	62.7	49.7
Total	100	99.9	100	100	100
MOTHER					
Under 15	18.9	9.3	25.3	12.1	19.3
Between 15 and 18	36.3	39.7	42.4	32.5	37.6
18 and over	44.9	41.1	32.4	55.4	43.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH

TABLE 8d

**PARENTAL EDUCATION (1). AGE AT WHICH PARENTS COMPLETED
FULL-TIME EDUCATION**

	18 years of age or over	Between 15 and 18	Under 15	Total
Father	49	50	90	189
Percentage	25.93	26.46	47.62	100
Mother	36	75	72	183
Percentage	19.67	40.98	39.34	100

TABLE 9

PARENTAL EDUCATION (2). PARENTS WHO ARE GRADUATES

	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
FATHERS					
No. of respondents	1,061	371	287	172	1,891
No. of Graduates	288	67	27	63	445
Percentage ...	27.1	18.1	9.4	36.6	23.5
MOTHERS					
No. of respondents	1,061	371	290	172	1,894
No. of Graduates	107	33	12	21	173
Percentage ...	10.1	8.9	4.1	12.2	9.1

TABLE 9d

PARENTAL EDUCATION (2) . PARENTS WHO ARE GRADUATES

	Graduates	Number in Sample	Percentage
Father	10	195	5.13
Mother	4	195	2.05

TABLE 10

PARENTAL EDUCATION (3). ANALYSED BY FACULTY, AGE AT WHICH FATHER COMPLETED FULL-TIME EDUCATION

Faculty	U.C.D.		U.C.C.		U.C.G.		T.C.D.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 15 years										
Agriculture	16	40.0	9	50.0	14	60.9	1	20.0	40	46.5
Architecture	3	12.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	12.5
Arts	65	21.4	38	27.7	35	34.0	9	11.7	147	23.7
Commerce	16	21.0	3	11.0	10	38.5	4	16.7	33	21.3
Engineering	32	26.0	7	18.9	4	19.0	2	18.2	45	23.7
Law	2	8.0	2	22.2	—	—	—	—	4	10.3
Medicine	12	10.0	3	7.0	8	21.0	1	7.7	24	11.5
Science	26	25.0	30	36.6	15	33.3	2	7.4	73	26.4
Social Science	10	21.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	20.8
Veterinary Medicine	8	21.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	21.0
TOTAL	190	20.7	92	26.1	86	33.6	19	11.8	387	23.0
Between 15 and 18 years										
Agriculture	8	20.0	5	27.8	5	21.7	2	40.0	20	23.3
Architecture	5	21.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	20.8
Arts	77	25.3	46	33.6	24	23.3	14	18.2	161	25.9
Commerce	29	37.0	13	48.2	12	46.2	8	33.0	62	40.0
Engineering	37	31.0	11	29.7	8	38.0	3	27.3	59	31.1
Law	6	22.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	15.4
Medicine	25	22.0	11	26.2	12	31.6	5	38.5	53	25.5
Science	28	24.0	22	26.8	12	26.7	8	29.6	70	23.4
Social Science	11	24.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	25.0
Veterinary Medicine	12	32.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	31.6
TOTAL	238	26.0	108	30.7	73	28.5	41	25.5	460	27.3
18 years or over										
Agriculture	16	40.0	4	22.2	4	17.4	2	40.0	26	30.2
Architecture	16	67.	—	—	—	—	—	—	16	66.7
Arts	162	53.3	53	38.7	44	42.7	54	70.1	313	50.4
Commerce	33	42.0	11	40.7	4	15.4	12	50.0	60	38.7
Engineering	52	43.0	19	51.4	9	42.9	6	54.5	86	45.3
Law	19	70.0	7	77.8	—	—	3	100.0	29	74.4
Medicine	78	68.0	28	66.7	18	47.4	7	53.8	131	63.0
Science	68	55.7	30	36.6	18	40.0	17	63.0	133	48.2
Social Science	26	55.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	26	54.2
Veterinary Medicine	18	47.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	18	47.4
TOTAL	488	53.3	152	43.2	97	37.9	101	62.7	838	49.7

TABLE 10d

PARENTAL EDUCATION (3). ANALYSED BY FACULTY. AGE AT WHICH FATHER COMPLETED EDUCATION

Faculty	Under 15	Between 15 and 18	Over 18	Total
Arts ...	86	47	40	173
Percentage ...	49.71	27.17	23.12	100
Science ...	4	3	9	16
Percentage ...	25.00	18.75	56.25	100
Total ...	90	50	49	189

TABLE II

PARENTAL EDUCATION (3). AGE AT WHICH MOTHER COMPLETED EDUCATION. ANALYSED BY FACULTY

Faculty	U.C.D.		U.C.C.		U.C.G.		T.C.D.		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	Under 15 years									
Agriculture	11	29.0	5	27.8	9	39.1	2	40.0	27	32.1
Architecture	6	26.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	26.0
Arts	56	19.0	29	20.4	30	29.1	9	11.5	124	20.0
Commerce	17	21.0	5	19.2	8	28.6	3	3.8	33	20.8
Engineering	29	26.0	6	16.2	3	16.7	2	18.2	40	22.3
Law	—	—	1	12.5	—	—	—	—	1	2.8
Medicine	11	9.6	2	4.7	4	10.0	2	18.2	19	9.1
Science	23	20.7	20	25.3	11	24.4	1	4.4	55	21.3
Social Science	8	18.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	17.8
Veterinary Medicine	6	15.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	15.0
TOTAL	167	18.9	68	19.3	65	25.3	19	12.1	319	19.3
	Between 15 and 18 years									
Agriculture	16	42.0	6	33.3	10	43.5	1	20.0	33	39.3
Architecture	7	30.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	30.4
Arts	104	35.1	65	45.8	43	41.8	25	32.1	237	38.3
Commerce	31	39.0	12	46.2	12	42.9	7	28.0	62	39.0
Engineering	44	39.0	14	37.8	10	55.6	3	27.3	71	39.7
Law	12	48.0	—	—	—	—	1	33.3	13	36.1
Medicine	37	32.2	13	30.2	17	42.5	5	45.5	72	34.4
Science	45	40.5	30	38.0	17	37.8	8	34.8	100	38.8
Social Science	15	34.1	—	—	—	—	1	100	16	35.6
Veterinary Medicine	10	25.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	25.0
TOTAL	321	36.3	140	39.7	109	42.4	51	32.5	621	37.6
	18 years or over									
Agriculture	11	29.0	7	39.0	4	17.4	2	40.0	24	28.6
Architecture	10	43.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	43.5
Arts	136	46.0	48	33.8	30	29.1	44	56.4	258	41.7
Commerce	32	40.0	9	34.6	8	28.6	15	60.0	64	40.3
Engineering	40	35.0	17	46.0	5	27.8	6	54.5	68	38.0
Law	13	52.0	7	87.5	—	—	2	66.7	22	61.1
Medicine	67	58.0	28	65.1	19	47.5	4	36.4	118	56.5
Science	43	38.7	29	36.7	17	37.8	14	60.9	103	40.0
Social Science	21	48.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	21	46.7
Veterinary Medicine	24	60.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	24	60.0
TOTAL	397	44.9	145	41.1	83	32.3	87	55.4	712	43.1

TABLE 11d

PARENTAL EDUCATION (4). ANALYSED BY FACULTY. AGE AT WHICH MOTHER COMPLETED EDUCATION

Faculty	Under 15	Between 15 and 18	Over 18	Total
Arts ...	66	69	32	167
Percentage ...	39.52	41.32	19.16	100
Science ...	6	6	4	16
Percentage ...	37.50	37.50	25.00	100
Total ...	72	75	36	183

TABLE 12

SCHOLARSHIPHOLDERS (I). ANALYSED BY FACULTY

Faculty	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	Scholarshipholder	Respondents	Percentage of scholarshipholder												
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
Agriculture	12	48	25.0	2	18	11.1	8	27	29.6	—	5	—	22	98	22.4
Architecture	4	29	13.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	29	13.8
Arts	41	340	12.1	15	154	9.7	22	117	18.8	23	83	27.7	101	694	14.6
Commerce	5	98	5.1	1	29	3.4	3	34	8.8	1	27	3.7	10	188	5.3
Engineering	40	134	29.9	10	38	26.3	3	22	13.6	2	11	18.2	55	205	26.8
Law	3	29	10.3	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	3	40	7.5
Medicine	6	139	4.3	5	46	10.9	7	45	15.6	4	15	26.7	22	245	9.0
Science	33	144	22.9	22	90	24.4	11	50	22.0	4	27	14.8	70	311	22.5
Social Science	—	52	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	52	—
Veterinary Medicine	—	48	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	—
Totals	144	1,061	13.6	55	384	14.3	54	295	18.3	34	171	19.9	287	1,911	15.0

TABLE 13

SCHOLARSHIPHOLDERS (2). ANALYSED BY SOCIAL GROUP

Social Groups	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	Scholar- shipholders A	Respond- ents B	Percent- age of scholar- shipholders C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
1. Agricultural Workers	2	7	28.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	100	3	8	37.5
2. Higher Professional	3	138	2.2	1	38	2.6	3	22	13.6	12	52	23.1	19	250	7.6
3. Lower Professional	24	127	18.9	10	43	23.3	10	34	29.4	5	9	55.5	49	213	23.0
4. Managerial & Executive	19	225	8.4	4	53	7.5	2	29	6.9	5	39	12.8	30	346	8.7
5. Sen. Salaried Employees	8	82	9.8	3	27	10.3	1	14	7.1	3	24	12.5	15	147	10.2
6. Inter. Non-Manual	39	210	18.6	14	81	17.3	15	80	18.8	3	19	15.8	71	390	18.2
7. Other Non-Manual	10	33	30.3	7	11	63.6	1	5	20.0	—	1	—	18	50	36.0
8. Skilled Workers ...	8	56	14.3	8	36	22.2	4	18	22.2	1	1	100	21	111	18.9
9. and 10. Semi and Unskilled ...	2	10	20.0	1	4	25.0	3	7	42.9	1	2	50	7	23	30.4
11. Persons who cannot be allocated ...	4	16	25.0	—	6	—	2	5	33.3	1	6	16.7	7	34	20.6
12. Farmers ...	22	146	15.1	7	85	8.2	13	78	16.7	1	10	10.0	43	319	13.5
Total ...	141	1,050	13.4	55	384	14.3	54	293	18.4	33	164	20.1	283	1,891	15.0

TABLE 14

MOTHERS WORKING TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE FAMILY INCOME (1);
ANALYSED BY SOCIAL GROUP

Social Group	Number of Respondents				
	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
1. Agricultural Workers ...	7	—	—	1	8
2. Higher Professional ...	138	38	22	52	250
3. Lower Professional ...	127	43	34	9	213
4. Managerial and Executive	225	53	29	39	346
5. Senior Salaried Employees	82	27	14	24	147
6. Inter. Non-Manual ...	210	81	80	19	390
7. Other Non-Manual ...	33	11	5	1	50
8. Skilled Workers ...	56	36	18	1	111
9. and 10. Semi- and Unskilled Workers ...	10	4	7	2	23
11. Persons who cannot be allocated to any of the above groups or 12 ...	16	6	6	6	34
12. Farmers ...	146	85	78	10	319
Total ...	1,050	384	293	164	1,891
	Mothers Working				
Agricultural Workers ...	1	—	—	—	1
Higher Professional ...	23	5	2	4	34
Lower Professional ...	48	23	11	5	87
Managerial and Executive ...	39	5	7	4	55
Senior Salaried Employees ...	17	10	3	3	33
Inter. Non-Manual ...	57	18	17	2	94
Other Non-Manual ...	8	3	2	—	13
Skilled Workers ...	14	5	1	1	21
Semi-and Unskilled ...	2	1	2	1	6
Persons who cannot be allocated to above or Farmers ...	5	—	2	3	10
Farmers ...	25	11	12	2	50
Total ...	239	81	59	25	404
	Percentage				
Agricultural Workers ...	14.3	—	—	—	12.5
Higher Professional ...	16.7	13.2	9.1	7.7	13.6
Lower Professional ...	37.8	53.5	32.4	55.6	40.8
Managerial and Executive ...	17.3	9.4	24.1	10.3	15.9
Senior Salaried Employees ...	20.7	37.0	21.4	12.5	22.4
Inter. Non-Manual ...	27.2	22.2	21.3	10.5	24.1
Other Non-Manual ...	24.2	27.3	40.0	—	26.0
Skilled Workers ...	25.0	13.9	5.6	100	18.9
Semi and Unskilled ...	20.0	25.0	28.6	50.0	26.1
Persons who cannot be allocated Farmers ...	31.3	—	33.3	50.0	29.4
Farmers ...	17.1	12.9	15.4	20.0	15.7
Percentage ...	22.8	21.1	20.1	15.2	21.4

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE MAYNOOTH

TABLE 14d

MOTHERS WORKING TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE FAMILY INCOME (1)

Mothers Working 36	Number in Sample 196	Percentage 18.37
-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------

MOTHERS WORKING TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE FAMILY INCOME (2). ANALYSED BY SOCIAL CLASS

	Social Groups											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Number in each social group. N=193 ...	1	6	25	8	8	30	8	12	—	1	1	93
Number who said Mother worked N=33	—	2	9	2	—	5	1	2	—	1	—	11
Percentage ...	—	33.33	36.00	25.00	—	16.67	12.50	16.67	—	100.0	—	11.83

TABLE 15

MOTHERS WORKING TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE FAMILY INCOME (2);
ANALYSED BY FACULTY

Faculty	Number of Respondents				
	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
Agriculture	48	18	22	5	93
Architecture	29	—	—	—	29
Arts	337	154	117	83	691
Commerce	98	29	32	27	186
Engineering	131	38	22	12	203
Law	29	9	—	2	40
Medicine and Dentistry	138	46	45	15	244
Science	142	90	50	27	309
Social Science	50	—	—	1	51
Veterinary Medicine	48	—	—	—	48
Total	1,050¹	384	288²	172	1,894
	Mothers Working				
Agriculture	12	4	4	1	21
Architecture	6	—	—	—	6
Arts	77	33	31	14	155
Commerce	25	7	5	2	39
Engineering	29	10	3	1	43
Law	4	2	—	—	6
Medicine and Dentistry	44	7	9	3	63
Science	27	18	7	5	57
Social Science	8	—	—	—	8
Veterinary Medicine	12	—	—	—	12
Total	244	81	59	26	410
	Percentage				
Agriculture	25.0	22.2	18.2	20.0	22.6
Architecture	20.7	—	—	—	20.7
Arts	22.8	21.4	26.5	16.9	22.4
Commerce	25.5	24.1	15.6	7.4	21.0
Engineering	22.1	26.3	13.6	8.3	21.2
Law	13.8	22.2	—	—	15.0
Medicine and Dentistry	31.9	15.2	20.0	20.0	25.8
Science	19.0	20.0	14.0	18.5	18.4
Social Science	16.0	—	—	—	15.7
Veterinary Medicine	25.0	—	—	—	25.0
Total	23.2	21.1	20.5	15.1	21.6

¹A total of eleven did not answer this question.²A total of seven did not answer this question.

TABLE 17

RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SIZE OF FAMILY AND POSITION IN FAMILY WITH NUMBER OF FIRST CHILDREN NORMALISED TO 100

Position in family	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.		
	100			100			100			100		
	69			62			91			105		
	3	4		3	4		3	4		3	4	
1	100	100		100	100		100	100		100	100	
2	83	79		68	84		60	105		117	125	
3	60	68		73	53		77	46		142	150	
4	—	55		—	37		—	14		—	50	
	5	6	7-9	5	6	7-9	5	6	7-9	5	6	7.9
1	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
2	65	55	54	83	112	53	89	39	100	550	50	—
3	45	36	78	100	125	47	67	69	100	200	—	—
4	53	38	16	67	100	35	45	39	100	50	50	100
5	47	29	51	44	25	59	56	31	22	100	50	—
6	—	33	43	—	75	35	—	23	44	—	—	—
7	—	—	38	—	—	47	—	—	89	—	—	—

TABLE 18

**SIZE OF FAMILY. RESPONDENTS CLASSIFIED BY SIZE OF FAMILY
AND BY POSITION IN FAMILY**

Position in family	U.C.D.		U.C.C.		U.C.G.			T.C.D.				
	Number of Children											
	2		2		2			2				
1	67		29		12			19				
2	46		18		11			20				
Total¹	113		45		23			39				
Position in family	Number of children [continued]											
	3		4		3		4		3		4	
1	63	74	22	32	17	22	12	8				
2	52	58	15	27	10	23	14	11				
3	38	50	16	17	13	10	17	12				
4	—	41	—	12	—	3	—	4				
Total	153	223	53	88	40	58	43	35				
Position in family	Number of Children [continued]											
	5		6		7-9		5		6		7-9	
1	55	42	37	18	8	17	18	13	9	2	2	3
2	36	23	20	15	9	9	16	5	9	11	1	—
3	25	15	29	18	10	8	12	9	9	4	—	—
4	29	16	6	12	8	6	8	5	9	1	1	3
5	26	12	19	8	2	10	9	4	2	2	1	—
6	—	14	16	—	6	6	—	3	4	—	—	1
7	—	—	14	—	—	8	—	—	8	—	—	—
Total²	171	122	141	71	43	64	63	39	50	20	5	7

¹These totals do not include students coming from families with only one child, i.e. 31 students in U.C.D., 7 in U.C.C., 5 in U.C.G. and 17 in T.C.D.

²Excluded from this table are families with ten or more children.

TABLE 19

NUMBER IN FAMILY (ANALYSED BY SOCIAL GROUP)

Social Groups	Size of Family														
	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	Small	Medium	Large	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C	A	B	C
1. Agricultural Workers	1	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	4	3
2. Higher Professional	19	48	64	6	13	19	2	8	12	11	29	12	38	98	107
3. Lower Professional ...	17	44	65	3	16	22	3	11	20	3	3	3	26	74	110
4. Managerial & Executive	29	90	95	4	24	25	2	10	16	17	16	6	52	140	142
5. Sen. Salaried Employees	9	38	31	8	11	7	2	5	7	8	13	3	27	67	48
6. Inter. Non-Manual ...	39	79	88	13	29	39	6	32	42	6	11	2	64	151	171
7. Other Non-Manual	5	12	15	1	6	4	—	3	2	1	—	—	7	21	21
8. Skilled Workers ...	11	16	25	8	14	14	—	5	13	1	—	—	20	35	52
9. Semi-skilled ...	1	2	2	1	—	2	2	—	2	1	—	—	5	2	6
10. Unskilled ...	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	3
11. Persons who cannot be allocated to above groups or 12 ...	2	5	7	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	8	10	14
12. Farmers ...	11	39	91	7	26	51	8	22	48	3	2	5	29	89	195
Totals ...	144	376	486	52	141	187	28	98	166	54	76	33	278	691	872

Seven of the students in T.C.D. who answered the questions on family size did not give their fathers occupation. So when the analysis by social group is made the totals in table 16 and table 19 do not correspond.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH

TABLE 19d

NUMBERS IN FAMILY. ANALYSED BY SOCIAL GROUP

Group	Size of Family			No. who answered
	Small 1-2	Medium 3-4	Large 5 +	
1. Agricultural Workers ...	1	—	—	1
2. Higher Professional ...	—	1	5	6
3. Lower Professional ...	1	6	18	25
4. Managerial and Executive	1	3	4	8
5. Senior Salaried Employees	—	5	3	8
6. Intermediate Non-Manual	2	13	15	30
7. Other Non-Manual ...	1	4	3	8
8. Skilled workers ...	3	3	6	12
9. Semi-skilled workers ...	—	—	—	—
10. Unskilled ...	—	1	—	1
11. Persons who cannot be allocated to above groups or to 12 ...	—	—	1	1
12. Farmers ...	11	23	59	93
Totals ...	20	59	114	193

TABLE 20
STUDENTS WHO INTEND TO TAKE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Faculty	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
	Number of Students				
Agriculture ...	48	18	27	5	98
Architecture ...	29	—	—	—	29
Arts ...	340	154	117	83	694
Commerce ...	98	29	34	27	188
Engineering ...	134	38	22	11	205
Law ...	29	9	—	2	40
Medicine ...	139	46	45	15	245
Science ...	144	90	50	27	311
Social Science ...	52	—	—	1	53
Veterinary Medicine	48	—	—	—	48
Total ...	1,061	384	295	171	1,911
	Respondents who intended to take summer employment				
Agriculture ...	44	12	23	4	83
Architecture ...	26	—	—	—	26
Arts ...	238	110	90	7	445
Commerce ...	87	25	22	26	160
Engineering ...	129	35	22	—	186
Law ...	18	7	—	—	25
Medicine ...	116	32	43	—	191
Science ...	107	65	38	—	210
Social Science ...	35	—	—	1	36
Veterinary Medicine	36	—	—	—	36
Total ...	836	286	238	38	1,398
	Percentage				
Agriculture ...	91.7	66.7	85.2	80.0	34.7
Architecture ...	85.7	—	—	—	85.7
Arts ...	70.0	71.4	76.9	25.9	64.1
Commerce ...	88.7	86.2	64.7	96.3	85.1
Engineering ...	96.3	92.1	100	—	90.7
Law ...	62.1	77.8	—	—	62.5
Medicine ...	83.5	69.6	95.6	—	78.0
Science ...	74.3	72.2	76.0	—	67.5
Social Science ...	67.3	—	—	100	67.9
Veterinary Medicine	75.0	—	—	—	75.0
Total ...	78.8	74.5	80.7	22.2	73.2

TABLE 21

STUDENTS WHO LIVE IN A TOWN OF 3,000 POPULATION OR OVER

Faculty	U.C.D.	U.C.C.	U.C.G.	T.C.D.	Total
	Number of students				
Agriculture ...	48	18	27	5	98
Architecture ...	29	—	—	—	29
Arts ...	340	154	117	83	694
Commerce ...	70	29	34	27	160
Engineering ...	134	38	22	11	205
Law ...	29	9	—	2	40
Medicine ...	139	46	45	15	245
Science ...	144	90	50	27	311
Social Science ...	43	—	—	1	44
Veterinary Medicine	48	—	—	—	48
Total ...	1,024 ¹	384	295	171 ²	1,874
	Number who live in town of 3,000 or over				
Agriculture ...	18	3	1	4	26
Architecture ...	25	—	—	—	25
Arts ...	240	91	59	68	458
Commerce ...	51	18	12	17	98
Engineering ...	101	28	15	11	155
Law ...	26	8	—	2	36
Medicine ...	102	28	22	12	164
Science ...	103	49	21	22	174
Social Science ...	35	—	—	1	36
Veterinary Medicine	20	—	—	—	20
Total ...	721	225	130	137	1,192
	Percentage				
Agriculture ...	37.5	16.7	3.7	80.0 ³	26.5
Architecture ...	86.2	—	—	—	86.2
Arts ...	70.6	59.1	50.4	81.9	66.0
Commerce ...	72.9	62.1	35.3	63.0	61.3
Engineering ...	75.4	73.7	68.2	100.0	75.6
Law ...	89.7	88.9	—	100.0	90.0
Medicine ...	73.4	60.9	48.9	80.0	66.9
Science ...	71.5	54.4	42.0	81.5	55.9
Social Science ...	81.4	—	—	100.0	81.8
Veterinary Medicine	41.7	—	—	—	41.7
Total ...	70.4	59.6	44.1	80.1	63.6

¹Thirty-seven U.C.D. students did not answer this question.²One T.C.D. student did not answer this question.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH

TABLE 21d

RESPONDENTS WHO INTEND TO TAKE SUMMER EMPLOYMENT

Faculty	Number who answered YES	Number in sample	Percentage
Arts	41	180	22.78
Science	3	16	18.75
Totals	44	196	22.45

TABLE 22d

RESPONDENTS WHO LIVE IN A TOWN OF 3,000 POPULATION OR OVER

Faculty	Number who answered YES	Percentage	Number in sample
Arts	30	16.67	180
Science	10	62.50	16
Totals	40	20.41	196

TABLE 22a

FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENT IN HIS CHOICE OF COURSE (1). OWN CHOICE

Faculty	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	No. of students	Own Choice	Per-centage	No. of students	Own Choice	Per-centage	No. of students	Own Choice	Per-centage	No. of students	Own Choice	Per-centage	No. of students	Own Choice	Per-centage
Agriculture	48	32	66.7	18	10	55.6	26	13	50.0	5	4	80.0	97	59	60.8
Architecture	29	17	58.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	17	58.6
Arts	340	197	58.0	154	76	49.4	114	77	67.5	83	46	55.4	691	396	57.3
Commerce	99	47	48.0	29	15	51.7	27	16	59.3	27	12	44.4	181	90	49.7
Engineering	34	66	49.2	38	21	55.3	21	11	52.4	11	7	63.6	204	105	51.5
Law	29	17	58.7	9	4	44.4	—	—	—	2	2	100	40	23	57.5
Medicine	139	87	62.6	46	28	60.9	45	30	66.7	15	11	73.3	245	156	63.7
Science	144	77	53.5	90	47	52.2	44	19	43.2	27	12	44.4	305	155	50.8
Social Science	52	20	38.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	53	20	37.8
Veterinary Medicine	48	35	73.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	35	73.0
Total	1,061	595	56.0	384	201	52.3	277 ¹	166	59.9	171 ²	95	55.6	1,893	1,056	55.8

¹Eighteen U.C.G. students did not answer the question.

²One T.C.D. student did not answer the question.

TABLE 22b

FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENT IN HIS CHOICE OF COURSE (2). PARENTS OR PARENTS PLUS ANOTHER FACTOR

Faculty	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	No. of students	Par-ents	Per-cent-age	No. of students	Par-ents	Per-cent-age	No. of students	Par-ents	Per-cent-age	No. of students	Par-ents	Per-cent-age	No. of students	Par-ents	Per-cent-age
Agriculture	48	16	33.3	18	9	47.4	26	10	38.5	5	—	—	97	35	36.1
Architecture	29	9	31.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	9	31.0
Arts	340	90	26.5	154	43	27.9	114	26	22.8	83	20	24.1	691	179	25.9
Commerce	98	35	35.8	29	7	24.1	27	6	22.2	27	10	37.0	181	58	32.0
Engineering	134	35	26.1	38	10	26.3	21	5	23.8	11	3	27.3	204	53	26.5
Law	29	9	31.0	9	3	33.3	—	—	—	2	—	—	40	12	30.00
Medicine	139	30	21.6	46	12	26.1	45	9	20.0	15	2	13.3	245	53	21.6
Science	144	29	20.1	90	17	18.9	44	10	22.7	27	7	25.9	305	63	20.7
Social Science	52	13	25.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	53	13	24.5
Veterinary Medicine ...	48	13	27.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	13	27.1
Total	1,061	279	26.3	384	101	26.2	277	66	23.8	171	42	24.6	1,893	488	25.8

TABLE 22c

FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCED STUDENT IN HIS CHOICE OF COURSE (3). SCHOOL, CAREER GUIDANCE, READING T.V., RADIO, ETC.

Faculty	U.C.D.			U.C.C.			U.C.G.			T.C.D.			Total		
	No. of students	School etc,	Per-centage	No. of Stud-ents	School etc.	Per-centage	No. of stud-ents	School etc.	Per-centage	No. of stud-ents	School etc.	Per-centage	No. of students	School etc.	Per-centage
Agriculture	48	—	—	18	—	—	26	3	11.5	5	1	20.0	97	4	4.1
Architecture	29	3	10.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	3	10.3
Arts	340	53	15.5	154	35	22.7	114	11	9.7	83	17	20.5	691	116	16.8
Commerce	98	16	16.2	29	7	24.1	27	5	18.5	27	5	18.5	181	33	18.2
Engineering	134	33	24.7	38	7	18.4	21	5	23.8	11	1	9.1	204	46	22.5
Law	29	3	10.3	9	2	22.2	—	—	—	2	—	—	40	5	12.5
Medicine	139	22	15.9	46	6	13.0	45	6	13.3	15	2	13.3	245	36	14.7
Science	144	38	26.4	90	29	32.2	44	15	34.1	27	8	29.6	305	90	29.5
Social Science	52	19	36.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	100	53	20	37.7
Veterinary Medicine ...	48	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	48	—	—
Total	1,061	187	17.7	384	83	21.6	277	45	16.3	171	34	19.9	1,893	356	18.8

TABLE 23

STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TO STUDIES

Attitude	U.C.D.		U.C.C.		U.C.G.		T.C.D.		Total	
	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage	Number	Per-centage
Students who like their studies	610	53.1	216	53.2	153	51.0	217	56.5	1,196	53.5
Students who work conscientiously even though they may not like their studies	345	30.1	162	39.9	113	37.7	93	24.2	713	31.9
Students who dislike their studies	192	16.7	28	6.9	34	11.3	74	19.3	328	14.7
Total	1,147	99.9	406	100	300	100	384	100	2,237	100