POLITICAL ATTITUDE STRUCTURE OF SCHOOLBOYS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

JAMES L. RUSSELL

Education Centre, The New University of Ulster

and

JAMES A. SCHELLENBERG

Department of Sociology, Western Michigan University

Several main dimensions were identified by factor analysis of political attitudes of secondary schoolboys in Northern Ireland. Attitudinal responses of 303 Catholics and 266 Protestants were used in the present study. A composite sub-sample of 260 boys was also derived to give a roughly representative sample of secondary schoolboys in Northern Ireland. Among the key dimensions identified by factor analysis of these samples were: the degree of acceptance of members of the opposite communal group for general social interaction, acceptance or rejection of the other group for more intimate association, the degree of approval of violent behaviour, the amount of positive sentiment toward the government, and the degree of support for the ideological assumptions of Unionism. Attitude scales were derived to represent these factors and tested for reliability. Reasonable reliability was demonstrated for scales measuring most of the above dimensions, though only a composite scale to measure intergroup attitudes˘ had reliability coefficients comparable to those of the other factors.

INTRODUCTION

Dramatic testimony that the mutual hostilities of Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland are being continued by a new generation comes from such statements of political attitudes as the following by two 10-year-old boys:

"Put Police out. British Army out. Free the enternies [internees]. tell ted Heath [the British Prime Minister] to get lost, make a United Ireland, let the IRA [Irish Republican Army] in, put Protictince [Protestants] out . . .".

"Dump all Cathics [Catholics] in Irish sea and stop the troubles and shoot the IRA . . .".

Selected comments of this sort, however well publicised in press reports, can hardly be considered as scientific descriptions of the attitudes of most

young people. Furthermore, they tell us little about the interrelationships of political attitudes with other kinds of attitudes.

Despite the wide attention given to the conflict in Northern Ireland and the frequent mention of its likely impact upon children, there has so far been little systematic study of the political attitudes of Ulster youth. Rose (1971) presents some reasonable inferences about how political attitudes in Northern Ireland are formed. However, his survey evidence is from a sample of adults, so his analysis of influences upon young people is based upon indirect inference. A richly speculative interpretation of attitudinal dynamics of young people in Ulster has been given by Fraser (1973). A psychiatrist, Fraser bases his interpretations primarily on his own clinical experience; he presents little systematic scientific evidence. Fields (1973) has presented some results on the political thinking of selected children, but her evidence also is not presented systematically.

The most thorough study of political attitudes of young people in Northern Ireland reported to date has been by Russell (1972, 1974). Russell developed and administered a questionnaire to approximately 3,000 primary and secondary schoolboys during 1971 and 1972. Previous reports of these studies have been based upon analysis of single attitude items. That is, particular items were presented one at a time as indicating attitudinal dimensions, but little information has so far been presented on the interrelationships of the attitude items. It is upon such interrelationships that the present report is focussed, based upon further analysis of a sample of Russell's secondary students. The primary purpose of the present analysis is to discover whether it is possible to identify key dimensions in the political thinking of Ulster young people. If this first purpose is achieved, a secondary aim is to develop scales to measure these dimensions.

PROCEDURE

Only a sample of Russell's 1,932 secondary students was included in the present analysis. This was primarily to allow any model developed from this analysis to be tested later upon a second sample. A computer-selected random sample of 569 cases was therefore obtained, including 303 Catholics and 266 Protestants. Although not a systematic representative sample of young people in Northern Ireland, this collection of cases does include the main divisions which appear most relevant to political attitudes. Besides approximately equal numbers of Catholics and Protestants, the sample included nearly equal numbers of persons of working class and middle class background and of those from Belfast or the rest of the

Province. Approximately half were of about age 12 and the other half of about age 15.

Out of slightly over 100 items in Russell's questionnaire (including some questions directed to only one side of the sectarian divide and others filled out by the interviewer), 76 could be considered as primarily attitudinal in nature and as possibly relevant to political matters. These were included in initial exploratory factor analyses. For such factor analyses all items were compressed into dichotomous variables with values of either "0" or "1". This was necessary because the qualitative nature of response categories in the original form did not fit the measurement assumptions of factor analysis.

Two main sets of factor analyses were made. One set of analyses dealt with sub-samples of Protestants and Catholics separately, and gave special emphasis to items written differently for the two populations. A second set of analyses used a composite sample combining Catholics and Protestants in proportions roughly the same as existing among secondary students in Northern Ireland. Only attitude items used for both groups were included in this second set of analyses. For simplicity, we will describe separately further procedures and results for these two sets of factor analyses.

A. *Separate Sub-samples*

In exploratory factor analyses of Catholic and Protestant sub-samples, the number of items was gradually reduced. Failure to obtain a strong loading on a main factor was the primary basis for the omission of an item, though more qualitative considerations were also involved. Among these considerations was the goal of obtaining two sets of items which would be fully comparable for Protestant and Catholic sub-samples.*

In the final factor analysis, 25 dictotomous variables were used for each sub-sample. These included ten items that were the same for both groups, and 15 pairs of items which were highly similar in form but written especially for Catholics or Protestants. The full list of these items is presented in Appendix I.

The final factor analysis first identified principal components for the

---

*In order to achieve this there was one odd case of an item eliminated because it was too powerful! This was the item which asked whether Protestants are the best persons to govern the country. Most Protestants agreed with this idea, and the item correlated well in their sub-sample with other items. However, not a single Catholic agreed, producing in the Catholic sub-sample a universal set of 'O' scores. Thus for Catholics this item failed to constitute a measure of any variation, and the item was dropped despite its power to discriminate between Protestants and Catholics.

matrix of intercorrelations of items. Main diagonal elements of the matrix were replaced by communality estimates, and communality estimates were improved through iteration. Factors with eigenvalues of 1.0 or more were selected and rotated orthogonally, using the varimax method of rotation. Computer programmes of the Statistical Package for the Social Science (Nie, Bent & Hull, 1970) were used for this analysis.

Rotated factor loadings were used to derive factor score coefficients for the primary factors found in both Catholic and Protestant sub-samples. These factor score coefficients were then used to derive a standardised score for each respondent for each primary factor. This involved multiplying the factor score coefficient by a standardised score for each item. Item scores were standardised around a mean of 1.0, thus making the total mean for factor scale scores equal to the sum of items. The result was a 25-item attitude scale designed to measure each of the primary factors in each of the two subpopulations.

After developing a separate scale for each factor, consideration was also given to developing composite scales which would include more than one factor. This was done on the basis of similarity of content in different factors. In order to do this the relevant factor score coefficients were simply combined additively before multiplying by the standardised score for a given item.

To determine the reliability of each of these attitude scales, the split-half method was used. Total scores derived from even-numbered items (as listed in Appendix I) were compared with those derived from odd-numbered items. Coefficients of reliability were computed by the Spearman-Brown formula (which corrects for the reduction in the number of items):

$$\text{Reliability} = \frac{2r}{1+r}$$

where r represents the Pearson product-moment correlation between the scores of the two halves.

B. *Composite Sub-sample*

A composite sub-sample of 260 respondents was obtained by selecting cases from the Catholic and Protestant sub-samples in proportions of 40 per cent and 60 per cent respectively. Attention was also given to favour selection of working class respondents and those who lived outside of the Belfast area, in so far as these were both under-represented in Russell's

original collection of cases. The composite sub-sample thus was made up of 104 Catholics and 156 Protestants, 118 of middle class background and 142 of other socio-economic levels (primarily working class), and 95 from the Belfast area and 165 from other parts of Northern Ireland. This can be considered as a roughly representative sample of Northern Ireland schoolboys, although it still retains slightly more middle class and Belfast cases than would a precisely random sample.

For factor analyses of the composite sub-sample, only items were used which were the same for both Catholic and Protestant respondents. After preliminary analyses, the number of items was reduced to 20. The full list of these 20 dichotomous items is presented in Appendix II.

Factor analysis procedures for the composite sub-sample were similar to those described above for separate sub-samples. The only significant difference was that instead of selecting all factors for rotation with eigenvalues of 1.0 or more (in the identification of principal components), an eigenvale of 1.4 was now required. The consequence of this was to reduce the number of factors which would be rotated, thus producing a simpler factor structure.

Further procedures to derive factor scale scores and to estimate the reliability of factor attitude scales were generally the same as those described above for separate sub-samples. However, with the present sample, no attempt was made to combine specific factors for composite factor scales.

RESULTS

A. *Separate Protestant and Catholic Sub-samples*

The final factor analysis (using the 25 items for each group indicated by Appendix I) identified eight factors for the Catholic group and seven for the Protestants. Of these, five factors when rotated appeared almost identical for the two groups, including the form and order of the two items with highest factor loadings. These factors were named G, M, O, P and R. The names, though always somewhat arbitrary when applied to factors, were chosen for their association with the following words: government, marriage, order, pugnacity and religion. Factor G had highest loadings on items 23 and 25, reflecting positive acceptance of the Government of Northern Ireland. Factor M had highest loadings on the items regarding

intermarriage or conversion to the other Faith (items 9 and 10), with the loading on intermarriage especially high. Factor O reflected positive attitudes toward the police and soldiers (items 21 and 22); Factor P represented especially a willingness to riot and throw stones at young people (items 19 and 20); and Factor R had highest loadings on church-related items (items 4 and 5).

In addition to the above five pairs of factors, one other pair appeared similar for the two groups, even though the particular rank order of factor loadings varied. This was the factor which loaded most strongly for Catholics upon items 12, 13, 11 and 15 (in that order) and for Protestants upon items 15, 17, 12 and 13. Inspection of the content of these items suggests a close parallel for the two groups, indicating friendship or social acceptance of those in the opposite group. This factor was given the name of F (for friendship). Using the same factor name here for both Protestant and Catholic groups may be more questionable than for other cases (factors G, M, O, P and R). Certainly the focus of Protestants upon persons in the Republic is somewhat different from Catholic attitudes towards Protestants in Northern Ireland. Nevertheless, for simplicity we will use the same name (F) for both sub-samples.

It should be kept in mind that strictly speaking we have identified 12 different factors, two each with the names F, G, M, O, P and R. However, the general similarity in content of the corresponding factor pairs for Catholic and Protestant groups has led us to use the same name for both.

In addition to factors F, G, M, O, P and R, three other factors appeared in one or the other group. These we may call X, Y and Z. Factor X appeared for Prtestants and Y and Z for Catholics. Factor X related especially to perceived Catholic hostility toward the Protestant faith, Factor Y concerned perceived similarity to people in England, and Factor Z especially related to the political link with Britain. These three factors not only failed to indicate the symmetry shown by the two groups for the other factors, but they were also more difficult to interpret clearly. For both of these reasons they will not be further analysed in this report.

For the Catholic sub-sample, the order in which factors appeared was F, G, P, R, M, O, Y and Z. These explained respectively 44.2, 16.7, 10.6, 8.9, 6.5, 5.5, 4.1 and 3.5 percent of the variance within the final factor analysis. For the Protestant sub-sample, the order was P, M, G, X, O, F and R, explaining respectively 51.9, 15.7, 8.8, 7.6, 5.9, 5.6 and 4.5 percent of the variance.

The over-all impression of these results is that of a very close parallel in structures of attitudinal organisation of Protestants and Catholics. Essentially the same main factors appeared for both groups. However,

some differences are suggested by the order in which the factors were generated. Pugnacity and intermarriage (P and M) appeared to represent stronger dimensions for defining Protestant attitudes than was the case for Catholics; while social acceptance of the opposite group and religion (F and R) appeared more important for organising attitudes among Catholics.

For purposes of general meaning, it is possible to group the factors into more comprehensive patterns. Factors G and O both have their primary focus upon allegiance toward governing institutions. It is therefore possible to combine these two to develop an attitude scale for measuring such allegiance. Such a scale would have to be interpreted as having two distinct factors: one concerned primarily with political representatives (G) and a second with security forces (O). Similarly, factors F and M are both concerned with acceptance (or rejection) of persons of the opposite communal group. They may therefore be grouped together for a common attitude scale which includes the distinct factors of general social acceptance (F) and acceptance into familial relationships (M). If we consider that factor P may also have some reference to intergroup relations and if we want a general index of peaceful sentiments, then we may combine factors P with F and M. Such a scale of intergroup benevolence or good will would of course have to be interpreted as composed of those three distinct factors.

Following the above considerations, we grouped the factors for each communal group into three more general attitude scales. These composite scales we have named respectively ALL (for allegiance), ACC (for acceptance), and BEN (for benevolence). ALL is obtained by adding the factor scale scores for respondents for factors G and O. ACC is obtained by adding the factor scale scores for factors F and M; and BEN is obtained by subtracting the scale scores for factor P from ACC scores.

In the process of deriving factor scores and composite attitude scale scores from each individual, sub-totals were obtained respectively for even-numbered and odd-numbered items. This allowed the determination of split-half reliability for each scale. Reliability coefficients thus obtained are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Coefficients of Reliability for Attitude Scales Derived from Separate Sub-Samples

Single Factor Scales	Catholic Sub-Sample ($n=303$)	Protestant Sub-Sample ($n=266$)
F	.72	.55
G	.48	.28
M	.08	.72
O	.39	.60
P	.74	.60
R	.59	.59
Composite Scales		
ALL	.53	.56
ACC	.74	.80
BEN	.84	.82

B. *Composite Sub-sample*

Three main factors were identified for the composite sub-samples of 260 secondary schoolboys, using the 20 attitude items indicated by Appendix II.

The first factor had primary loadings (of .50 or more) with items 14, 19, and 10 (item 19 loading negatively). Other strong loadings were with items 7 (negatively), 20, 5, 1 and 8. The content of this factor is strongly ideological and appears to reflect the main ingredients of the Unionist political tradition in Northern Ireland. For this reason we may label this factor as "U".

The second factor had primary loadings with items 4 and 3 and other strong loadings with items 5, 1 and 2. That all of these items stand for elements in the governing institutions of Northern Ireland lead us to interpret this factor as expressing a favourable attitude toward government. This is quite similar to the factor identified as G for Protestant and Catholic sub-samples. For this reason we will again use the same label to identify it here.

The third factor had primary loadings with items 16 and 17 and an additional strong loading with item 15. These show this factor to be very similar to the factor identified for Catholic and Protestant sub-samples as "P". The same label will therefore be used again here to identify this third factor.

After rotation, factors U, G and P accounted for 59.4, 27.2 and 13.3 percent of variance respectively among the three factors.

Single factor attitude scales were developed for each of the three

factors and tested for reliability upon the same sample. Split-half reliability coefficients for these three factors are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Coefficients of Reliability for Attitude Scales Derived from the Composite Sub-Sample (n=260)

Factor Scales	Reliability
U	.79
G	.68
P	.70

DISCUSSION

It would be presumptuous to say that we have identified *the* dimensions of political attitudes of young people in Northern Ireland. It should be kept in mind that a given factor structure only reflects the intercorrelations of a particular set of items with a particular population or sample. Different sets of items produce different sets of factors, as can be seen in our results. By omitting items especially relating to Unionist or Nationalist sentiment and selecting instead those expressive of intergroup relations, we obtained factors for the separate sub-samples which stressed intergroup relations but did not include anything comparable to the dimension U which came first among composite sample factors. With the composite sub-sample, on the other hand, items concerning intergroup relations were omitted and thus no factor emerged to represent this dimension. Both sets of factor analysis, however, had the same key items expressing sentiment toward government and acts of generalised aggressiveness, and therefore the factors G and P showed in all the factor analyses.

Nevertheless, considering all the samples used and all the items included in both sets of factor analysis, we can be reasonably sure that we have identified some of the key dimensions in the political thinking of youth in Northern Ireland. Among these would be the degree of acceptance of the other communal group for general social interaction (F), the degree of acceptance of the other group for possible inclusion in family activities (M), the degree of approval for general aggressiveness and violence (P), the degree of positive sentiment toward agents of government (G), and the amount of support for the ideological commitments of Unionism (U).

To assess the reliability with which the various factors could be measured

in attitude scales, the split-half method was used to obtain coefficients of reliability. For the separate Protestant and Catholic sub-samples, most of the single factor scales (shown in Table 1) are quite low in reliability. With several exceptions (the F and P scales for Catholics and the M scales for Protestants, which show reasonably high reliability), these single factor scales do not have sufficient reliability to warrant their use as attitude scales in their own right.

The composite factor scales in Table 1 generally show an improvement in reliability over single factor scales. The ALL scale still is of questionable reliability, but the ACC and BEN scales appear to show a satisfactory level.

In the case of the composite sub-sample, all three of the single factor scales show generally satisfactory reliability. This is shown by Table 2. Because these show reasonable reliability as single factor scales and their content did not suggest further combination, no attempt was made to derive scales to measure combinations of these factors.

Further research on attitudes of young people in Northern Ireland (or for comparable studies in other settings) may make use of attitude scales created from the present factor analyses. Any of the three single factor scales developed from the composite sub-sample, or the ACC or BEN scales from the separate Protestant and Catholic sub-samples, would appear to have sufficient reliability to use in the present form. These scales may be constructed by the following procedures: (a) the same items are used for the appropriate factor scale, dichotomised in the same way, (b) dichotomised item scores are changed to standardised scores, (c) standardised scores are multiplied by relevant factor score coefficients, and (d) the products are summed for the entire set of items.*

---

*Complete lists of factor loadings and factor score coefficients for all items included in Appendix I or II may be obtained upon request from either author.

REFERENCES

FIELDS, M. (1973). *A Society on the Run*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
FRASER, M. (1973). *Children in Conflict*. London: Secker and Warburg.
NIE, N., BENT, D. H. & HULL, C. H. (1970). *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
ROSE, R. (1971). *Governing withour Concensus*. London: Faber.
RUSSELL, J. L. (1972). *Some Aspects of the Civil Education of Secondary Schoolboys in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: Northern Ireland Community Relations Commission.
RUSSELL, J. L. (1974). *Socialization into Conflict*. Ph.D. thesis, Strathclyde University.

APPENDIX I

ATTITUDE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT SUB-SAMPLES

Under each item are the dichotomous breakdowns used for scoring. To the left are response categories scored as 0, and to the right are those scored as 1. At the end of those scored as 1 is indicated (in parentheses) the percent of the sub-sample given this score.

Items for Catholic Respondents
1. Sometimes people say that it would be right to fight to do away with the border and join the Republic.
   0—Just Agree; Just Disagree   1—Strongly Agree (31.4%)
   Strongly Disagree; No Answer
2. Do you think that people have a right to fight in order to bring about a United Ireland?
   0—No; No Answer   1—Yes (54.5%)
3. Sometimes the Government bans parades planned by Republican groups. When this happens do you think it is still all right for these to be held?
   0—No; Depends; No Answer   1—Yes (43.6%)
4. How important do you think it is to believe all that the Catholic church teaches?
   0—Fairly Important;   1—Very Important (63.7%)
   Not Very Important;
   Not At All Important;
   No Answer.
5. How important is it to do everything the Priest says?
   0—Fairly Important;   1—Very Important (54.8%)
   Not Very Important;
   Not At All Important;
   No Answer.
6. Do you think of yourself as a strong Catholic or as an average Catholic?
   0—Average; Neither; No Answer   1—Strong (38.3%)
7. Some people say that all Protestants want to destroy the Catholic religion.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (36.6%)
8. Some people say that all Protestants want to keep the link with Britain.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (51.2%)
9. 'I wouldn't mind if my sister or brother became a Protestant'.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (19.1%)
10. 'I wouldn't mind if my sister or brother married a Protestant'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (39.6%)
11. 'I wouldn't mind if my friends were Protestants'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (71.3%).
12. 'I wouldn't mind if half the children in my school were Protestants'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (56.1%
13. 'I wouldn't mind if most of my neighbours were Protestants'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (53.5%)
14. 'Protestants should be sent our of Ireland'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (35.3%)
15. Would you say that Protestant children are much different or about the same as you?
    0—Different; No Answer   1—About Same (62.7%)

Items for Protestant Respondents
1. Some people say that it would be right to fight to keep Northern Ireland linked to Britain.
   0—Just Agree; Just Disagree;   1—Strongly Agree (40.6%)
   Strongly Disagree; No Answer
2. Do you think that people have a right to fight in order to keep Ulster Protestant?
   0—No; No Answer   1—Yes (62.0%)
3. Sometimes the Government bans parades planned by Protestants. When this happens, do you think it is still all right for these to be held?
   0—No; Depends; No Answer   1—Yes (41.0%)

4. How important do you think it is to believe all the Bible teaches?
   0—Fairly Important;   1—Very Important (39.9%)
   Not Very Important;
   Not At All Important;
   No Answer

5. How important is it for members of a Church to do what their Minister tells them?
   0—Fairly Important;   1—Very Important (32.0%)
   Not Very Important;
   Not At All Important;
   No Answer

6. Do you think of yourself as a strong Protestant or as an average Protestant?
   0—Average; Neither;   1—Strong (33.8%)
   No Answer

7. Some people say that all Roman Catholics want to destroy the Protestant religion.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (45.1%)

8. Some people say that all Roman Catholics want to end the link with Britain.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (39.5%)

9. 'I wouldn't mind if my sister or brother converted to Catholicism'.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (21.8%)

10. 'I wouldn't mind if my sister or brother married a Catholic'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (29.7%)

11. 'I wouldn't mind if my friends were Catholics'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (62.0%)

12 'I wouldn't mind if half the children in my school were Catholics'
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (48.1%)

13. 'I wouldn't mind if most of my neighbours were Catholics'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (41.0%)

14. 'Catholics should be sent out of Northern Ireland'.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (44.0%)

15. Would you say that Roman Catholic children in Northern Ireland are much different or about the same as you?
    0—Different; No Answer   1—About Same (55.3%)

Items for Both Groups

16. Would you say that people in England are much different or about the same as you?
    0—Different; No Answer   1—About Same (C. 40.6%; P. 57.5%)

17. Would you say that people in the Republic are much different or about the same as you?
    0—Different; No Answer   1—About Same (C. 63.4%; P. 31.6%)

18. Do you think it is all right if young people break windows in empty buildings?
    0—Disagree; Don't Know;   1—Agree; Depends (C. 36.6%; P. 34.6%)
    No Answer

19. Do you think it is all right if young people throw stones at each other?
    0—Disagree; Don't Know;   1—Agree; Depends (C. 34.7%; P. 28.2%)
    No Answer

20. What would you do if you saw Protestants and Catholics fighting near your home?
    0—Move Away;   1—Join in (C. 39.6%; P. 29.3%)
    Watch from where you were;
    Go closer to see what was
    happening; No Answer

21. 'The Police . . . [toward] people like me'
    0—Sometimes want to help;   1—Always want to help (C. 23 4%; P. 59.0%)
    Never want to help;
    Want to hurt.

22. 'The soldiers . . . [toward] people like me'.
    0—Sometimes want to help;   1—Always want to help (C. 26.1%; P. 48.1%)
    Never want to help;
    Want to hurt.

23. 'The Prime Minister of Northern Ireland . . . [toward] people like me'.
    0—Sometimes wants to help;   1—Always wants to help (C. 21.5%; P. 44.7%)
    Never wants to help;
    Wants to hurt.

24. 'The Queen . . . [toward] people like me'.
    0—Sometimes wants to help;   1—Always wants to help (C. 28.4%; P. 69.2%)
    Never wants to help;
    Wants to hurt
25. 'The Government of Northern Ireland . . . [toward] people like me'.
    0—Sometimes wants to help;   1—Always wants to help (C. 16.2%; P. 34.6%)
    Never wants to help;
    Wants to hurt.

APPENDIX II

ATTITUDE ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE COMPOSITE SUB-SAMPLE

Under each item are the dichotomous breakdowns used for scoring and (in parentheses) percent of the sub-sample given the score of 1.

1. 'The Police . . . [toward] people like me.'
   0—Sometimes want to help;   1—Always want to help (46.2%)
   Never want to help;
   Want to hurt
2. 'The Soldiers . . . [toward] people like me.'
   0—Sometimes want to help;   1—Always want to help (38.1%)
   Never want to help;
   Want to hurt
3. 'The Prime Minister of Northern Ireland . . . [toward] people like me.'
   0—Sometimes wants to help;   1—Always wants to help (34.6%)
   Never wants to help;
   Wants to hurt
4. 'The Government of Northern Ireland . . . [toward] people like me.'
   0—Sometimes wants to help;   1—Always wants to help (25.0%)
   Never wants to help;
   Wants to hurt
5. 'The Queen . . . [toward] people like me.'
   0—Some times wants to help;   1—Always wants to help (55.4%)
   Never wants to help;
   Wants to hurt
6. Would you say that people in England are much different or about the same as you?
   0—Different; No Answer   1—About Same (48.5%
7. Would you say that people in the Republic are much different or about the same as you?
   0—Different; No Answer   1—About same (41.5%)
8. The Government of Northern Ireland is good because it has been with us for a long time.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (24.2%)
9. The Government of Northern Ireland is good because it usually provides lots of benefits.
   0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (41.5%)
10. The Government of Northern Ireland is good because it gives us a Queen to rule over us.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (52.3%)
11. The Government of Northern Ireland is good because it usually tries to do good things.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (58.5%)
12. The Government of Northern Ireland is good because it is in the hands of men who are good leaders.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (30%)
13. The Government of Northern Ireland is good because it is what the people vote for.
    0—Disagree; No Answer   1—Agree (46.2%)
14. Protestants are best to govern the country.
    0—Disagree; Depends;   1—Agree (35.0%)
    Don't know; No Answer

15. Do you think it is all right if young people break windows in empty buildings?
    0—Disagree; Don't know; No Answer   1—Agree; depends (36.2%)
16. Do you think it is all right if young people throw stones at each other?
    0—Disagree; Don't know;   1—Agree; depends (31.2%)
    No Answer
17. What would you do if you saw Protestants and Catholics fighting near your home?
    0—Move away; watch from where   1—Join in (33.4%)
    you were; Go closer to see what
    was happening;
    No Answer
18. People like my family can do nothing about changing what the Government in
    Northern Ireland does.
    0—Seldom; Never; No Answer   1—Usually; Sometimes (31.2%)
19. How do you think of yourself?
    0—British; Ulster;   1—Irish (35.8%)
    Sometimes British;
    Sometimes Ulster;
    No Answer
20. The link between Northern Ireland and Britain.
    0—Accept link with reservations;   1—Accept link with all my heart (27.3%)
    Reject link with reservations;
    Reject link with all my heart;
    No Answer.

(Manuscript received June, 1975)