

THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL CAPITAL ON STATE SCHOOL RETENTION RATES: A WORK IN PROGRESS

Gaye Hallam

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a research project in progress. The project will investigate the impact of social capital on school retention at North Rockhampton State High School. The significance of this paper lies in the implication social capital has for Education Queensland's Education and Training Reform policy initiative. This policy is designed to increase retention rates, produce a skilled workforce, and increase in attainment level of students and to develop a culture of integration between providers of education and training. The paper has two parts. It begins with an indicative review of literature that outlines three forms of capital. The specific focus of this literature review is the concept of social capital. The features, characteristics, resources and outcomes of social capital are explored. The review of literature then explores the concept of social capital and its relation to the concept of community. Literature exploring the relationship between post-compulsory secondary schooling, employment and social capital is also discussed. The paper then gives an overview of the design of the research currently in progress. It discusses the case study method, investigating the creation and development of social capital for students, who are enrolled in years 10, 11 and 12 at North Rockhampton State High School and are in paid employment. These students will participate in in-depth structured interviews.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of social capital is often seen as a means for assisting community development and more specifically as a lever for reform (Kahne, O'Brien, Brown, & Quinn, 2001). However, it is uncertain if social capital is a concept that is able to facilitate community development and consequently youth employment pathways. For

example, Temple (2000), argues that social capital may well be the missing component of policy affecting economic growth in OECD countries. He further argues that social capital has been considered, for some time, as an intellectual paradigm and that social capital is emerging as a potential influence for economic, social and public policy development. Temple (2000) further contends that the emergence of theory about social capital and the consequential development of policy is analogous to the emergence and development of theory and policy relating to human capital and its impact on economic growth. The challenge remains to define and understand social capital in terms of who it involves, how its resources affect communities and individuals, and the mechanism that affects economic growth.

This review of literature begins with an exploration of three forms capital, namely economic, human and social. These are broadly defined and discussed in terms of their interrelatedness. The notion of social capital and the emerging understandings and frameworks about social capital are then unpacked. The literature review concludes with a brief discussion of the relationship between social capital, community, schools and work. Following the literature review, the research design is briefly discussed in terms of the case study design and the group of students to whom it is targeted.

FORMS OF CAPITAL

In order to understand the notion of social capital it is necessary to be able to differentiate social capital from other forms of capital. Unfortunately, the literature on the various forms of capital is convoluted and difficult to classify. For example, Caspi, EnterWright, Moffat & Silva (1998) denote three forms of capital, namely human, social and personal. Alternatively, Cocklin & Alston (2003) define five forms of capital, specifically, natural, human, social, institutional and produced. Stayner (2003, p38) depicts financial capital as a sixth form of capital. For the purpose of this paper, capital is classified into three forms, namely, economic, human and social.

Economic Capital

For the purposes of this paper, economic capital includes physical and financial capital (Winch, 2000, p4). Financial capital can be defined

as the funds available within the community that are accessed by individuals or groups. Utilisation of financial capital provides groups and individuals with the power to command physical capital. Physical capital can be considered as raw resources, tools and products, manufactured, harvested and mined. It also includes the built environment containing things such as transport infrastructures, communication networks, buildings and reticulation systems (Cocklin & Alston, 2003).

Human Capital

Human capital refers to the qualifications, skills and knowledge that an individual has access to and utilises in order to take full advantage of opportunities. "Human capital exists in the skills and knowledge acquired by each person" (Caspi et al., 1998, p4). Like economic capital human capital also incorporates component forms of capital. Personal capital can be considered a component of human capital and it "refers to those behavioural characteristics and resources that affect both the motivation and capacity to work" (Caspi et al., 1998, p4). Stayner (2003) also identifies skills and motivation as components of human capital, while Putnam (1993b, np) refers to human and physical capital as the "tools and training that enhance individual productivity".

In a broader sense, human capital incorporates the notion of the people that make up a community. Therefore human capital can be thought of as peoples' collective abilities to problem solve, make decisions, interact, be creative and innovative, use technology and think of new ways of knowing and doing. It also refers to a nations stock of knowledge and skills, as demonstrated by the Chicago School (Friedman & Friedman, 1981). Cocklin & Alston(2003, p4) emphasize "the ability to discover, develop or use new knowledge and skills is a vital aspect of human capital".

Social Capital

Social capital, like other forms of capital, can be considered as productive, because it makes possible the "achievement of ends that would not be attainable in its absence" (Putnam, 1993a, p167). Thus, Grootaert (1998) argues that social capital can be considered as a shift

factor as it has the capacity to increase remuneration from the investment of both human and physical capital.

Putnam (1993b) articulates the notion of social capital in terms of features of social organizations, namely, networks, norms and trust, that activate coordination and cooperation between individuals. On this view the outcome of social capital is mutual benefit. In Coleman's (Kahne et al., 2001, p431) theoretical model, three types of social capital are identified, namely "trusting relationships, social networks, and norms with effective sanctions". Falk (2001) also discusses social capital in terms of values, networks and trust. Similarly, Stone & Hughes (2002) identify social capital as a multidimensional concept comprised of social networks based on trust, reciprocity and norms or values. Social capital, then, is about individuals' developing and becoming encompassed within networks based on trusting relationships and shared norms and values, with appropriate sanctions for indiscretions, in order to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes.

Notably, research commonly attributes only benign affects to social capital. In contrast, Temple (2000) contends that there may be costs associated with social capital. For example, a social network may be based on conforming to a dominant discourse, perhaps resulting in the restriction of creative thought and exploration of new ideas and new ways of thinking. Florida, Cushing and Gates (2001, p20) claim that innovative and creative people are choosing to live in places that are not dominated by high social capital. They argue that in communities where strong social networks abound, relationships may become restrictively close, insulating members from "outside information and challenges".

RESOURCES OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

According to (Caspi et al., 1998) social capital refers to social networks or relationships that influence use and control over resources. The resources associated with social capital can be utilised by individuals, networks and institutions engaging in a specific social network. (Kahne et al., 2001) argue that resources accredited to social capital have functional value as they allow members of social networks to meet mutual needs and pursue mutual interests. (Khattab, 2002,

np) further argues that resources are a function of social relations and interactions, and as such include the “channelling of information, support and expectation of knowledge”. In this way, social capital exists within the context and structure of relationships. Therefore, “it exists neither within a given individual or apart from a set of social relations” (Kahne et al., 2001, p431). Rather, social capital develops and grows as a result of a variety of relationships between people (Caspi et al., 1998). This group dimension is a distinguishing feature of ‘social’ as opposed to other forms of capital. Even though human capital can refer to an entire nation’s stock of knowledge and skill, this conception presumes an aggregation of autonomous individuals pursuing self interest independently as opposed to socially pursuing mutual interests as is the case with social capital.

TPOLOGY OF SOCIAL CAPITAL

A key to understanding the multi - dimensional nature of social capital, lies in understanding the complex nature of social networks. Social networks can be thought of in terms of their characteristics, types, layers and features. In turn, the features of trust, sociability reciprocity and social norms become even more complex when the possible layers, types and characteristics of networks are considered. In this section of the paper a conceptual framework of social capital is presented. Firstly, the features of social capital, namely, social norms, trust, reciprocity and sociability, are described. The discussion then moves to outline three characteristics of social networks, three layers of social networks and two types of social networks.

Features of Social Capital

In this section, the features of social capital are examined. The perceived intrinsic influence of social capital that individuals achieve through access to resources credited to the concept, is attributed to the features of social networks. These features include social norms, reciprocity, sociability and the complexity of trust that the individual engage in. It is through unpacking the features that a better understanding of how to measure social capital can be attained. Being able to measure the worth of social capital allows it to become an effective instrument for informing public and economic policy.

Social Norms and Sociability

The effectiveness of a social network is dependant upon agreed norms, either implicitly or explicitly. Norms have a strong impact on behaviour, actions and attitudes, providing a commonly understood way of acting and behaving. This may result in positive, productive and rewarding social networks. However, in asserting the notion of agreed norms, participants within the social network must also agree to support these and sanction other, aberrant, norms. Thus “the accompanying accountability structures and sanctions can also constrain members of the community and may lead some to withdraw from a particular community network” (Kahne et al., 2001, p436). This practice suggests a potential negative side of social capital.

Wilkinson & Bittman (2002) describe sociability as the key ingredient of social networks. Sociability highlights the potential benefits and negatives of social capital. The notion of sociability refers to the need individuals’ display for other people’s company and the satisfaction they attain from this interaction. Once again, Wilkinson & Bittman (2002) stress the importance of mutual involvement and satisfaction of needs as opposed to engaging in a relationship of patronage, as patronage creates unequal relationships of dependency. Further, sociability is the precursor to making connections with other people and forming trusting relationships.

Reciprocity and Trust

Wilkinson & Bittman (2002, p5) idealistically define reciprocity as *an explicitly sociable impulse, rather than an individualistic one since it is built on feelings of optimism and confidence about forms of social interaction involving the giving and receiving fair treatment from other members of society.*

In contrast, Putnam (2000) simply defines reciprocity as the implied notion of returning a favour for a favour granted. He further elaborates on the concept of generalised reciprocity as incorporating the notion of enacting a favour without a direct and reciprocal favour forthcoming, content in the knowledge that at some later time a good turn will be returned. Putnam (2000) maintains that an efficient society readily engages generalised reciprocity as a more effective form of reciprocity, as it eliminates the formal expectation to ‘repay’ the deeds immediately.

Participation in social networks inherently presumes a degree of trust. Putnam (2000) maintains that “trustworthiness lubricates social life”. Participation is the manifestation of trust, which instigates “understanding, commitment and obligation among participants in a given community” (Kahne et al., 2001). Further, Cocklin & Alston (2003, p4) argue that the degree and depth of trust are invariably the “key to economic vitality and social prosperity”. The ability to participate and collaborate effectively in a social network facilitates the sharing of knowledge, information, potential prospects and risk.

Layers of Social Networks

To further understand the complexity of social capital it is necessary to now explore the layers of relationships and roles individuals engage with, in their daily lives (Stone & Hughes, 2002). Social capital is inherent within the layers of the different social worlds in which people live. The various layers consist of the i) informal relationship of friendships; ii) interactions of groups within the community; and iii) formal interactions with governing institutions (Stone & Hughes, 2002). Noticeably, in Stone and Hughes schema the level of social capital attributed to individuals within the various social layers is unpredictable and not dependent on the degrees of social capital experienced in the different layers. That is, a high level of engagement in social capital at the informal level will not necessarily influence the level of social capital experienced at the generalised or the formal level.

The first layer of social networks, informal relationships, can be considered as families, friendships and personal contacts. Stone & Hughes (2002) articulate a strong positive correlation between trust and reciprocity in informal relationship. The second layer of social networks can be attributed to community and civic groups; the relationships between people within a community. This layer is referred to as generalised social capital. It is characterised by generalised trust, reciprocity and the “extent to which local people share the same values” (Stone & Hughes, 2002, p11). The third layer refers to the relationships individuals form with governing institutions. These are identified as the relationships people engage in with government institutions and government or corporations per se. These networks are bonded through

power relationships with members displaying an inherent trust for the institution.

Types of Social Networks

Putnam (1993b) identifies two types of social networks, namely horizontal and vertical networks. These types of networks invoke different forms of social capital. Vertical networks are hierarchical in their organization and are grounded on dependency. Examples of networks that espouse this type of social networking include the Mafia and the Klu Klux Klan. It is in this type of social networking that the “dark side” of social capital can be seen as most prevalent. Putnam (1993b, np) asserts that vertical networks can manifest “defection, distrust, shirking, exploitation, isolation, disorder and stagnation”.

In contrast, Wilkinson & Bittman (2002) describe horizontal networks as having a democratic internal structure based on individuals perceiving themselves as equal. The notion of being equal is the main determinant of building trusting relationships in horizontal networking. Further, Wilkinson & Bittman (2002) argue that social preconditions, such as sociability, underpin the formation of horizontal networking.

Characteristics of Social Networks

Three characteristics of networks are size and effectiveness; density; and diversity (Stone & Hughes, 2002). The first characteristic, size and effectiveness, can range from limited to extensive. The increasing size of a network may positively influence a network's effectiveness, depending on the quality of the relationships within and across networks, by enabling access to accumulating stocks of social capital.

Stone & Hughes (2002, p4) describe the second characteristic of density as “one in which network members overlap and know one another and a closed network is one in which social relations exist between all parties”.

The third characteristic of networks, diversity, refers to the extent and mix of ethnic, cultural and educational diversity amongst the network members. (Stone & Hughes, 2002) further elaborate on the combination of characteristics in terms of how they influence the overall capability of social capital, describing the effects as bonding, bridging

and linking social capital. Closed networks can facilitate bonding or “getting by” social capital. In contrast, overlapping networks can be characterized by a “getting ahead” notion. That is, linking social capital can be “used to garner resources or power” by developing social relations with those in power (Stone & Hughes, 2002, p4).

The Outcomes of Social Capital

In communities where the features of social networks, norms, trust and reciprocity combine, social capital is purported to be high. The most observable outcome of networks rich in social capital is the pursuit of mutual values and the fulfilment of mutual needs. Putnam (1993b) asserts that in a community rich in social capital, where norms and networks are visible and strong, progressive economic development is apparent. He argues that civic and community engagements are a pre-cursor for economic growth. This view postulates that social connectedness is fundamental to the development of effective social, economic and public policy. Therefore, Putnam (1993b) maintains that social capital is a mandatory ingredient in developing effective social, public and economic policy. Winch (2000, p7) also asserts that social capital constitutes an important part of the “economic potential of any society”. This is particularly apparent within the networks within the informal layer of society, especially the family. Low levels of economic well-being are an indicator of low levels of social capital. Bullen & Onynx (1999, p14) maintain that “a minimum level of material conditions may be a prerequisite for the development of social capital”. This indicates that the basic needs for survival are required before individuals are able to engage in activities that develop social capital.

DEFINING COMMUNITIES

Social capital can be considered ordinarily a public good (Putnam, 1993a), and as such is publicly owned. It is produced as a result of the social interaction of people. This interaction can be on multiple levels of the social hierarchy. In this section the concept of community is explored in terms of the development and outcomes of social capital.

Stayner (2003, p38) defines communities “as complex social systems that provide economic, social, environmental, and cultural goods and services (both market and non-market) that in turn

contribute to several dimensions of their residents' well-being". Winter (2000) maintains that in order to create sustainable communities, the nature and quality of social relations should display particular characteristics and features. For example, social relationships that display a high degree of trust and reciprocity, and feature agreed norms that allow members to take collective action, are loaded with social capital. Communities that exhibit such social networks "are argued to sustain better outcomes in the economy, democracy and civil society" (Winter, 2000, p 1).

Relationship between schools, jobs and social capital

As individuals' progress through adolescence and into adulthood their access to and involvement with social networks changes and potentially expands, providing different opportunities to foster social capital. The social capital attributed to the social networks in a school, for example, provides the individual with the potential to align themselves with the norms and values that are inherent within the organisational and social culture of the school. Access to these networks can lead to the mutual development of trust and reciprocity. This in turn may result in improved employment opportunities in adulthood. Conversely, non-association or non-participation within social networks may lead to alienation, as the individual may not be able to access the resources of social capital.

A key principle for developing engagement with social capital is to provide the end resources of social capital for communities and families. That is, providing reciprocal support allows children to achieve their full potential in life. Thus, Israel, Beaulieu, & Hartless (2001, p1) argue that "families and communities must be engaged in helping youths develop the knowledge and skills they need to function effectively in tomorrow's workplace".

Lee & Croninger (2001) discuss Coleman's study of social capital in Catholic schools. Coleman attributes the success of the students within Catholic systems to the vast wealth within the school community of social capital. Lee & Croninger (2001) maintain that such an environment has a strong functional community. A functional community is based on friendships and interactions between people.

Lee & Croninger (2001, p2) state that the “the thicker the networks of social connectedness among students and between students and adults within their community, the more opportunities the greater the likelihood that generalised reciprocity will develop”. Lee & Croninger (2001, p 2) utilise the term “service learner” to encapsulate this process, arguing that the way to strengthen this type of social capital is to actively encourage interactions between students and adults. This paper now turns to an outline of the methodology used to collect data about the existence or otherwise of social capital in and around North Rockhampton State High School and its impact on school retention.

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of this paper, the first phase of an ongoing research project is discussed. The larger research project *The Impact of Social Capital on Regional Early School Leaving* is a funded research project. Its main aim is to determine factors that contribute to students leaving state schools in Rockhampton district before completing 12 years of schooling or equivalent. The project involves students who are at school and in work, and, former students who left state schools before completing Year 12 or equivalent. The project is designed to inform policy aimed at boosting state school retention.

Case Study

A case study approach will be utilized to examine the development, characteristics, layers and features of social capital accessed by post-compulsory secondary students also working in paid employment. Yin (1994, p13) describes a case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real – life context”. According to Jaegar (1988)), a case study is an exploration of a ‘bounded system’, which gives emphasis to the unity and wholeness of the system. Using a case study approach will allow the focus of the study to be confined to the central concepts of the research problem and to a specified timeframe.

The purpose of studying a ‘bounded system’ is to identify regularities and consistencies, and to search for patterns of meaning. In this study the bounded system can be considered as a community

within Rockhampton, in which an identified group of secondary students work and attend school.

The research method discussed in this paper is the first phase of the data collection for the larger project. This phase is two fold. Firstly, the selection of the school community for the case study is of major importance. According to deVaus (2001) the strategic selection of the school community requires careful consideration and should be on the basis of meeting the requirements of the study, rather than being randomly selected. Consequently, discussions with Education Queensland, Rockhampton District Office, identified the potential school location for the study to be conducted, namely North Rockhampton State High School.

The assistance of the Principal of NRSHS was engaged to identify students who may be interested in participating in this study. The initial student sample incorporated a range of students engaged in full time study and paid work. Initially, information about the study, an invitation to participate, and consent forms were mailed to students and their parents. There were 105 expressions of interest and consent packages mailed. These consisted of 35 students each from years ten, eleven and twelve. The school also agreed to send out the packages at the same time as the end of semester reports were mailed to parents. It is hope that this strategy will increase the response rate from students and parents. It is envisaged that between 15 and 20 participants from each target group will be recruited.

For the purpose of the next phase of the case study, in-depth face-to-face structured interviews will be undertaken. These will be conducted with secondary students who have agreed, with parental consent, to be part of this study (see appendix one which shows provisionally the questions to be asked). The interviews will be the major source of information. They will be audiotaped. The face-to-face student interviews will be organized with the assistance of the participating school. They will be conducted on the school premises, during school time, over a period of a week, during August 2003.

Data obtained through the structured interview process will be transcribed and compiled into categories. The initial analysis will look for evidence of the development of and access to the characteristics

and layers of social capital. In order to do this, the presence and strength of the social networks that the students access and develop, will be closely examined. In addition, the benefits and limitations of these networks will be analysed in relation to employment opportunities within the Rockhampton District, students' school leaving and school staying intention, and the influence of family, peers and school personal on these intentions.

SUMMARY

In this paper, the concept of social capital has been explored. Social capital can be considered as an important form of capital. Until recently it has largely been ignored as an indicator to inform public, social and economic policy. The difficulty has been in understanding the complexity of the interactions that build social capital. Even more complex is a means of measuring social capital. However, like human capital, it is argued that social capital will become an accepted informant for policy, as the concept is further researched and understood.

The paper outlines a component of a research project in progress. The project will examine the impact social capital has on retention rates at North Rockhampton State High school. Recent state policy initiatives such as Education Queensland's, Education and Training Reforms for the Future Policy has as its key underpinning the aim of retaining post-compulsory students in full time study, work or a combination of both. The focus of this research is to examine the extent to which social capital hinders or aids school retention rates. The project will use a case study design to investigate the impact of social capital on a group of secondary students enrolled in years 10, 11 and 12 and who are currently working in paid employment. The project will examine aspect of social capital such as the features, layers and characteristics surrounding North Rockhampton State High School, in order to determine the impact these have on student's decision to remain in or leave school.

REFERENCES

- Bullen, P., & Onynx, J. (1999). *Social Capital: Family support services and neighbour and community centres in NSW*. Paper presented at the Pursuing Social Inclusion, Australia.

- Caspi, A., EnterWright, B. R., Moffat, T. E., & Silva, P. A. (1998). Early failure in the labor market: Childhood and adolescent predictors of unemployment in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 63(3), 424-451.
- Cocklin, C., & Alston, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Community sustainability in rural Australia: A Question of capital?* WaggaWagga, NSW: Centre for social science research.
- deVaus, D. (2001). *Research design in social research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Falk, I. (2001). *The future of work and the work of the future*. Retrieved 8 May, 2003
- Florida, R., Cushing, R., & Gates, G. (2001). When social capital stifles innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(8), 20.
- Grootaert, C. (1998). *Social capital: the missing link* (Working paper No. 3). Washington: The World Bank.
- Israel, G. D., Beaulieu, L. J., & Hartless, G. (2001). The influence of family and community social capital on educational achievement. *Rural sociology*, 66(1), 43-68.
- Jaegar, R. M. (Ed.). (1988). *Complementary methods for research in education*. Washington: AREA.
- Kahne, J., O'Brien, J., Brown, A., & Quinn, T. (2001). Leveraging social capital and school improvement: the case of a school network and a comprehensive community initiative in Chicago. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 37(4), 429-461.
- Khattab, N. (2002, November). *Social Capital, students' perceptions and educational aspirations among Palestinian students in Israel*. Retrieved 8 May, 2003, from <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?Did=000000256231371&Fmt=4&Del+1&Mtd+1&Idx=5&Sid=0&RQT=309&LDid+000000276216711&LSid+2&L=1>
- Lee, V. E., & Croninger, R. C. (2001). The elements of social capital in the context of six high schools. *Journal of socio-economics*, 30(2), 165-167.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993a). *Making democracy work*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Putnam, R. D. (1993b). *The prosperous community*. Retrieved 21 May, 2003, from <http://www.prospect.org/print-friendly/print/V4/13/putnam-r.html>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Stayner, R. (2003). Guyra, New South Wales. In C. Cocklin & M. Alston (Eds.), *Community sustainability in rural Australia: a question of capital?* (pp. 38-64). WaggaWagga, NSW: Centre for social science research.
- Stone, W., & Hughes, J. (2002). Social Capital. Empirical meaning and measurement validity. *Australian Institute of Family Studies, Research paper no27*, 1-47.

- Temple, J. (2000). *Growth Effects of education and social capital in the OECD countries* (Economic Department Working paper No. No.263): Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Wilkinson, J., & Bittman, M. (2002). *Volunteering: The human face of democracy* (SPRC Discussion Paper No. 114 No. No. 114). Sydney: Social Policy Research Centre.
- Winch, C. (2000). *Education, work and social capital: towards a new conception of vocational education*. London: Routledge.
- Winter, I. (2000). *Towards a theorised understanding of family life and social capital* (Working paper No. 21). Melbourne: Australian Institute of family studies.
- Yin, R., K. (1994). *Case study research: design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW SCEDULE

General questions

"Why did you get a job?"

'Why this particular job?'

'How did you go about getting a job?'

'Was it your own idea to get a job, or did someone suggest the idea to you?

If latter, 'Who suggested you should get a job?' 'Why?'

'Did anyone help you to get a job?'....'Who?'....'Why?'...'How?'

Specific questions

'Are any of your friends working?' (Friends at school? Friends at other school?...Friends not at school?)

'Do your friends think it is a good idea for you to be working?'

'Why?'...'Why not?'

'Do you parents think it is a good idea for you to be working?...'Why?'....'Why not?'

'Do any of your teachers know that you are working?'...'How do they know?'

'Do they think it's a good idea for you to be working?'

'Do you like working?' 'Why?'....'Why not?'

'Are you working in order to gain knowledge/skills/experience?'

'Other reasons?'

Do you like work more than school?'...'Why?'

'Does your job affect your schoolwork?'....'How?'...'How not?'

'Do you think work is more/equally/less important than school?'

'Why?'

'Do your friends think work is more/equally/less important than school?'.....'Why?'

'Do your parents think work is more/equally/less important than school?'...'Why?'

'Do you think you will complete Year 12 or equivalent?' 'Why?'

'Why not?'

'Has school helped you to get a job?' Why?...Why not?

Future

'Do you think school will help you get other jobs? Why?...Why not?'

'Do you think school will help you to get 'better' jobs...Why?...Why not?'

'What do you think you will do when you leave school?'
[Respondents who expect to leave early].... [Respondents that expect to complete Yr 12 or equivalent]

'Why?'

'How will you make this (what the student thinks they will do) happen?'

'Will anyone help you to make this happen?'

'Who?'

'Why?'

'How?'