

SUMMARIES

Patriotism and Political Socialization

by Pertti Toukoma

The author reports the results of an interview study of patriotism of 12 year old urban elementary and secondary school boys. In the analysis the total sample of 200 boys was divided on the basis of the social class (higher and lower) and type of school (elementary and secondary) into four subsamples. The 25 items pertaining to patriotism were factor analyzed separately in each subsample, four factors were extracted and the first factor in principle component analysis (varimax rotation) turned out to be the main patriotism factor in all groups. The loadings of the different variables in this factor were then compared in different groups. The comparisons indicated that patriotism in elementary school / lower class-group was submissive, and in elementary school / higher class- group rightwing- authoritarian; in secondary school / lower social class-group patriotism was democratic and in secondary school / higher class-group submissive.

The author used also cosine rotation instead of varimax rotation. The correlations of the patriotism factor with other factors in this case indicated that patriotism was most differentiated from the other factors in the elementary school groups. The percentage of the patriotism factor of the total explained variance used as the measure of the extensiveness of patriotism- was in turn highest in the higher social class groups. Cross tabulation indicated that the conception of patriotism was most differentiated and extensive in the elementary school / higher social class-group. The analysis of the patriotism factor together with the second factor (secondary patriotism) and the transformation analysis of the four factors indicated that neither school or class alone, but the congruency (elementary school / lower class, secondary school / higher class) or incongruency (elementary school / higher class, secondary school / lower class) determined the attitude structure of patriotism. Furthermore, the structure developed in opposite direction in cases of upward mobility (secondary school / lower class) and downward mobility (elementary school / higher class).

The Opportunity Structure, Social Participation, and Level of Political Information of the Finnish Secondary and Vocational School Students

by Ilkka Heiskanen and Veronica Stolte Heiskanen

The authors first outline a general theoretical schema for their analysis. They start with the general concept of opportunity structures that on societal level determine the range and intensity of the individual and group activities.

According to this idea certain social institutions (e.g. family, school, job) alone or in combination differentiate individuals and groups as to the amount of resources they can obtain for social activities. At the same time these very same institutions or combinations of institutions however demand from the individuals and groups some potentials before they can actually adopt these resources and use them. Thus these institutions or combinations of institutions form opportunity structures that determine the range of activities and their intensity. The authors suggest a typology of high / low resources and high / low potentials that divide the individuals and groups into four types according to their ability for social activities. The social activities are also divided from the point of view of the opportunity structure into central / peripheric and actively / passively involving. Then the authors suggest a set of general hypotheses about the effects of the opportunity structure on the individuals' and groups' social participation and level of information and test them using questionnaire data obtained from 1048 Finnish secondary and vocational school students. The confirmation of the hypotheses indicate the validity of the general theoretical approach based on the idea of opportunity structures, but the authors indicate the need of more specific models and more sophisticated measurement for further elaboration of the schema suggested. The authors furthermore discuss the applicability of this theoretical approach in the study of political socialization in general and in the study of the societal political consequences of socialization in particular.

Academic Field, Change in Party Affiliation and Political Attitudes among Students

by Pentti Lammi and Risto Sänkiäho

The report is based on questionnaire data gathered from a sample of 218 law students and 238 social science students enrolled at the University of Helsinki in the Spring of 1969. The students were asked, whether they had changed their party affiliation during their studies and if, so in what direction. They were also asked a set of attitude items that were factor analyzed (principle component analysis, varimax solution). Five factors were extracted.

The cross tabulation indicated that social science students had changed their party affiliation more often (32.8 %) than law students, and the direction was most often from bourgeois parties to socialist parties (18.1 %). The law students had changed less often (22 %) and the direction was most often from conservative bourgeois party to center bourgeois party. Among the law students one could also detect a countertrend from socialist and center parties to conservative party (5 %). Among the social science students those majoring in economics had changed more often toward bourgeois parties, and less often toward socialist parties.

The factor scores of the five factors (socialism- capitalism, moral conformity, democratization of university, reliance on development, support of the

establishment) were crosstabulated with party affiliation and the new party affiliation of the changers. It was found out, that party affiliation explained best the students' scores on socialism-capitalism dimension, and the changers had usually socialized the right attitudes for their new affiliation. The discriminant analysis of the party / academic field of studies- groups (socialist and bourgeois law students, economics students, other social science students) indicated that the groups were best differentiated from each other by the discriminant function combining mainly the effects of socialism-capitalism and democratization of university factors. This discriminant function also ordered the socialist and the bourgeois students within both groups in the same order of the academic field thus indicating the independent effect of the academic field on the attitude structure.