

The Condition of the British People

Mark Abrams and John Hall

Survey Unit, Social Science Research Council, March 1971

Working paper reporting on a pilot survey¹ using self-reporting scales

This paper is a preliminary report on the first pilot survey of a research programme intended eventually to produce a questionnaire which could be used in large scale sample surveys to measure, in social matters, *the aspirations, disappointments, grievances, expectations and values*² of the British people as a whole. Any single survey using this questionnaire would also reveal differences that may exist between various parts of the population in their assessments of their “quality of life”, and a series of surveys at regular intervals would measure changes in these assessments. It is also possible that the same questionnaire and methods of analysis could be used in other countries to produce cross-national comparisons.

We accepted as our starting point the contention by Campbell and Converse³ that “*the quality of life must be in the eye of the beholder, and it is only through an examination of the experience of life as our people perceive it that we will understand the human meaning of the great social and institutional changes which characterise our time.*”

After a handful of unstructured pilot interviews with members of the public it was decided to build the questionnaire around eleven social domains:

Housing	Financial situation	Education
Neighbourhood	Leisure	Police and courts
Health	Family life	Welfare services
Job	Friendships	

On each domain respondents were asked:

- (a) to indicate on an 11-point scale (from 0 to 10) how satisfied or dissatisfied they were⁴;
- (b) what changes would be needed to make them more satisfied;
- (c) what changes could happen to make them less satisfied.

In addition to these satisfaction/dissatisfaction ratings in each domain, respondents were asked to give:

- (i) an overall self-rating on ‘things in general’
- (ii) an overall rating for their position on the scale ‘about 4 or 5 years ago’
- (iii) where they expected to be on the scale ‘about 4 or 5 years from now’
- (iv) where on the scale they felt that people like themselves were ‘entitled to be’.

¹ Available as SPSS portable file, facsimile questionnaire/ user manual in pdf format and unweighted frequency count in SPSS output format (also as raw data matrix) from UK Data Archive ref: **SN247 Quality of Life: Pilot 1, March 1971**. See also Appendix 2

² Angus Campbell and Philip Converse: **Monitoring the Quality of American Life** (mimeo from the authors) at ISR Ann Arbor Michigan, Jan 1970). Our preliminary thinking in this field has been greatly stimulated by this paper and also by Norman Bradburn’s **The Structure of Psychological Wellbeing** (Aldine Press Chicago 1969).

³ See 2 above

⁴ The questionnaire actually has only “satisfied” here, but interviewers were instructed to ask “satisfied or dissatisfied” for this and similar questions throughout.

In addition to these points of reference across time, in order to obtain points of reference across social classes, respondents were asked to use the same 0-10 scale to indicate where they thought various socio-economic groups currently stood. These were:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Unskilled manual workers | Office workers |
| Skilled manual workers | Professional people (eg doctors, teachers) |
| Company directors, business executives | Investors and shareholders |
| Shopkeepers and small businessmen | Old age pensioners |

Each of the respondents was then asked to indicate to which one of these groups he considered he belonged.

In an attempt to relate responses to socio-psychological circumstances, the questionnaire also included a modified Srole-Christie scale to measure anomie and alienation.

Finally the classification material collected related mainly to the domains dealt with in the body of the questionnaire, i.e. it recorded respondent's occupation, income, educational background, household composition, use of the welfare services, housing accommodation.

The pilot was carried out with 213 respondents interviewed by Research Services Ltd. Although well spread geographically throughout Britain, the sample was intentionally biased to produce more middle class respondents than would have been found in a simple probability sample of all persons aged 15 and over: thus 48% of respondents were middle class instead of the national proportion of 35%. This meant that we were dealing with a sample of above-average levels of higher education, income, durable consumer goods, home-ownership etc. The bias was introduced so as to provide a minimum base of 100 middle class respondents for analysis.⁵ The interviews were completed in the week ending March 14th 1971 and at the time of writing (March 23rd) only a first and simple analysis of the data is available. This is the material presented here as a guide to the eventual practicability of the pilot questionnaire.

Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction 'in general self-rating

Whole sample

Respondents had very little difficulty in using the 0-10 numerical scale to indicate their levels of satisfaction with life. On each of the four main perspectives offered them (now, 4-5 years past, 4-5 years future, and 'entitled') at least 96% of respondents chose for themselves specific points on the scale. Table A groups and summarises for the whole sample the responses which are given in detail in Summary Table 1

Table A Satisfaction Ratings – whole sample

Scale point	0,1 %	2,3 %	4,5 %	6,7 %	8,9 %	10 %	Average √
Perspective							
Self NOW	6	14	29	27	20	4	5.53
Self 4-5 years PAST	3	9	36	27	18	7	5.86
Self 4-5 years FUTURE	8	14	14	24	26	14	6.17
Self ENTITLED	1	3	20	51	10	15	7.45

⁵ Much of the analysis for Dr Abrams' contribution to this paper was done by Research Services Ltd. using Donovan Data Systems. In 2004 it is no longer possible to check what, if any, weighting was used. Further analysis on the original data may be needed to verify some figures reported here.

The present is seen (felt?) to be a little less satisfactory than the past, the future is expected to be better than both the past and the present, but the most striking gap is between what one currently has in the way of a satisfactory life and what one feels entitled to – the average NOW rating is only 74% of the average ENTITLED score.

Sub-sample groups

The various sub-samples can be grouped into three categories: those with an average self-rating of at least 6.0, those with an average rating of 5.0 or less, and the remainder. Those coming within the two extreme categories are:

Satisfaction NOW

Self-rating 6.00 or more		Self-rating 5.00 or less	
Business executives	6.84	Unskilled workers	4.75
Income £2000 and over	6.70	Old age pensioners	4.74
AB Social Grade	6.64	DE Social Grade	4.73
TEA 19+	6.39	Small shopkeepers	4.10
Office workers	6.04	Widowed	4.08
Unmarried	6.00		

The remainder category contained the following groups: men 5.52 women 5.53 married 5.66 age 15-34 5.48 age 35-54 5.76 age 55 & over 5.32 TEA 15 or under 5.26 TEA 16-18 5.79 C1 Social Grade 5.56 C2 Social Grade 5.37 all those with incomes under £2000pa 5.25 skilled manual workers 5.64 and professional workers 5.91.

Within each of the two extremes there is, of course, much overlapping of the groups; in the high satisfaction category AB grade people (middle class) tend also to be those with the highest incomes, with a high incidence of higher education, and are often employed as business executives. At the other extreme those in the lower working class are often unskilled manual workers, old age pensioners and elderly widows of manual workers.

NOW and the PAST

One rough measure of satisfaction with life is indicated when respondents gave to their present conditions a higher rating than the rating they gave to their conditions as of 4 to 5 years ago. On this basis, as we have seen, the sample as a whole felt that the quality of life had declined in recent years – from an average rating of 5.86 with things as they were 4 or 5 years ago to 5.53 with conditions today – a fall of 6 percentage points. But this sense of decline was not common to all sub-sections of the sample; in some it was much greater than 6 points and in others there was no decline at all but instead a feeling that NOW was appreciably better than the recent PAST.

Those groups where comparative past and present ratings indicated a sense of improvement in life over the past few years were the young (aged 15-34) the unmarried, those who had received schooling beyond the age of 19 and those in the middle class (ie with relatively high incomes and with executive jobs in business and industry). Those indicating on the same basis a more than average sense of deterioration were the elderly (mainly old age pensioners and widows) and the lower middle class (shopkeepers and owners of small businesses).

NOW rated *higher* than PAST by at least 5%

Unmarried	+15%
Age 15-34	+8%
£2000 pa or more	+8%
Business execs	+8%
TEA 19+	+5%
AB Social Grade	+5%

NOW rated *lower* than PAST by at least 15%

Widows	-35%
Pensioners	-32%
Shopkeepers	-29%
Under £650 pa	-24%
C1 Social Grade	-23%
Age 55 or older	-22%
DE Social Grade	-16%

Again there is much overlapping of the groups within each category and additionally it is clear that for the most part those who had given themselves a high NOW rating were also the groups most likely to register improvents over the past 4 to 5 years. And, conversely, those registering low NOW ratings were also the groups who felt that their decline had been greatest over recent years.

NOW and the FUTURE

For the sample as a whole the average score on the 0-10 ladder when they were asked, “Where would you put yourself as you expect to be about 4 or 5 years from now?” was 6.17. The highest average levels (7.00 or more) were recorded by the unmarried (7.00), those with a TEA of 19 or more (7.15) AB grade (7.35) and business executives (7.37). The lowest average future scores (5.35 or less) came from widows (4.85) DE grade (5.21) those with incomes below £650 pa (5.35) shopkeepers (4.90) and old age pensioners (4.91).

However when FUTURE ratings are related to NOW ratings it appears that every group, even old age pensioners, expects to be more satisfied with life in 4 or 5 years’ time than it is today. Those expecting the highest relative increase in satisfaction with ‘things in general’ over the next few years were often those who had given a low rating to their present position. Thus widows looking ahead raised their expected ratings by 19%, unskilled workers by 32% and small shopkeepers by 44%. The outstanding exception to this widespread optimism among the underprivileged was found among the elderly: those aged 55 or more gave themselves a FUTURE rating of 5.42 as against their NOW rating of 5.32, a mere 2 percentage point improvement.

NOW and ENTITLEMENT

When respondents were asked to use the 0-10 ladder to indicate the level of satisfaction with life that they thought people like themselves were entitled to there was a substantial jump in ratings. The average worked out at 7.45 – 35% higher than they had rated their present level of satisfaction. This substantial gap between ‘reality’ and entitlement was most marked among those who had given themselves low NOW scores: the gap was usually at its lowest among those well satisfied with present conditions. Every group, however, said that NOW fell short of ENTITLEMENT.

ENTITLEMENT at least 40% higher than NOW

Widows	62
C2 grade	42
DE grade	45
Unskilled	49
Shopkeepers	56
Pensioners	46

ENTITLEMENT 25% or less than NOW

Unmarried	23
TEA 19+	15
AB grade	23
£2000 + pa	14
Business execs	21

Other people's satisfaction

As another basis for comparison each respondent was given a card on which were listed eight types of persons and asked, using the 0-10 scale, to indicate how satisfied or dissatisfied each group is today. Broadly, the middle class types were thought to be highly satisfied, while the working class types were thought to be fairly satisfied: rated sharply at the bottom in terms of putative satisfaction came old age pensioners.

The respondent was then asked to indicate to which of the eight groups he thought he belonged (all but two people were able to do this matching). This step enabled us to compare the whole sample's assessment of a social category the the assessment given to themselves by those in the category when asked: "Where on the ladder would you put yourself nowadays?" The discrepancies were sometimes quite striking. For example, the sample as a whole gave old age pensioners a satisfaction rating of only 2.48, but people who identified themselves as pensioners gave themselves a satisfaction rating of 4.74. By contrast, the sample gave professional people a satisfaction score of 7.01, but those who identified themselves as professional people turned in a satisfaction self-rating of only 5.91 for themselves.

Social categories	(a) Rating by whole sample Mean	(b) Self-rating by those in category Mean	(b) as % of (a) %
Business executives	8.02	6.84	85
Professional people	7.01	5.91	84
Investors & shareholders	6.38	6.00	94
Office workers	5.89	6.04	102
Skilled manual workers	5.59	5.64	101
Shopkeepers	4.92	4.10	83
Unskilled manual workers	4.30	4.75	110
Old age pensioners	2.48	4.74	191

The Domains

The eleven domains were all dealt with in the same way: the respondent was asked (Using the 0-10 ladder):

- How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with ..X..?
- What changes would be needed in ..X.. to make you more satisfied?
- What sort of things could happen in ..X.. to you less satisfied?

After this stage had been completed the respondent was then shown a card which listed the 11 domains , asked if he wished to add any more which were important in affecting his satisfaction with life, and then from the total list asked to indicate which one he thought was most important in determining his general satisfaction with life, which next most important for him, and finally which he thought least important. (In fact, very few additions were made to the list by rrespondents). To arrange the replies to these supplementary questions in a ranking order, 2 points were awarded for each 'most important', 1 point for each 'next most important' and -1 for each 'least important'.

The findings are summarised in the table below:

Satisfaction ratings for domains

	Completely Dissatisfied					Completely satisfied		Mean	Rank by		Discrep index ⁶
	0,1 %	2,3 %	4,5 %	6,7 %	8,9 %	10 %	Sat		Imp		
Family life	1	2	6	10	27	54	8.77	1	2	10	
Friendships	1	4	9	17	31	38	8.09	2	7	4	
Health	1	3	8	19	38	31	8.05	3	1	7	
Housing	1	3	7	25	30	34	7.89	4	5	3	
Job	2	1	11	25	36	25	7.83	5	4	2	
District	2	6	14	18	32	28	7.44	6	9	0	
Leisure	2	8	13	18	33	26	7.33	7	11	0	
Children's education	3	8	12	21	32	24	7.23	8	8	-2	
Police & courts	3	6	18	26	29	18	6.91	9	10	-1	
Welfare services	4	12	18	24	28	14	6.51	10	6	-5	
Financial situation	10	12	25	25	24	4	5.48	11	3	-9	

In terms of respondents' satisfactions with conditions, the domains can be looked at in four groups:

- (a) The three where very high satisfaction is recorded: family life, friendships and personal health. Of these three the respondents attach very high importance to health and family life: the other (friendships) while rated highly satisfactory is considered to be less important in any overall assessment of satisfaction with life.
- (b) The four where high satisfaction is enjoyed: housing, job, district and leisure; two of these – housing and job – are also rated high on importance in determining the respondent's general satisfaction with life, but the other two – district and health – rate very low in importance.
- (c) The next three where satisfaction is comparatively low: children's education, the police and courts, and the welfare services; the first two of these, however, have a low ranking of importance in the eyes of the respondents and even the welfare services are said by respondents to be of only moderate importance to them in overall life-satisfaction.
- (d) The one – respondent's financial situation – where satisfaction is low; and this is a domain which is judged by respondents to be very high in importance – not far behind health and family life - in determining overall satisfaction.

⁶ Note: * Dr Aubrey McKennell suggested a first crude stab at a measure of the discrepancy between the importance attached to domains and satisfaction ratings within the domains would be:

$$D = (6 - S) (12 - I) / 5$$

This formula brings domains ranking low on importance to the centre of the scale and scores high positive for satisfaction and high negative for dissatisfaction on the domains ranking high in importance. Division by 5 gives a more convenient scale.

Domains: Circumstances which would affect satisfaction

The following notes describe the main types of answers received when respondents were asked what would make them more satisfied (but not put to those already indicating a score of 10 on the ladder) or less satisfied (but not put to those already indicating a score of 0 on the ladder).

The district you live in

The changes mentioned here by respondents were as follows:

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
66 (gain)	Physical Amenties	(lose) 22
35 (lose)	Physical disamenities	(gain) 90
14 (gain)	Socially good assets	(lose) 10
13 (lose)	Socially bad assets	(gain) 48
16	Other	15
8	Don't know	17

NB Figures in all domain tables are raw because of varying numbers rating 10 or 0 and multiple response was allowed.

It is noticeable in this and other domains that the changes which would bring dissatisfaction are not necessarily the opposite of those which would bring more satisfaction. One is reminded of Bradburn's (1969) positive and negative affect, and the two main factors arising from the Survey Unit's Futures Survey (optimistic material and pessimistic moral). For instance, greater satisfaction would derive from the acquisition of open space, better shops, entertainment, transport, rather than from the removal of vandalism, tall flats and caravans. On the other hand, greater dissatisfaction would result from the building of factories, flats and motorways, or from an influx of socially undesirable populations than from loss of open space or the moving away of friends and neighbours.

In this and other domains, there were many informants who rated themselves high on satisfaction but were hard put to think of anything which would take away this satisfaction.

The house/flat you live in

The mean satisfaction score on accommodation for the whole sample was 7.89. Owners were more satisfied than renters. Responses to the open-ended questions tend to be stereotyped since most people wanted to make some kind of improvement to their accommodation such as provision of extra rooms, a garage, or central heating, and these account for the bulk of "more satisfied" responses. The "less satisfied" responses were also stereotyped in that many responses are rather obvious ones of the "house fall down, plane crash, get dry rot" variety. A wider range of responses was given to the "less satisfied" question and these included social and financial concerns such as overcrowding, rent or rate rises, notices to quit and redevelopment.

The house/flat you live in

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
103	Physical building	23
17	Building defects/accidents	51
2	Social environment	18
2	Physical environment	19
3	Financial burdens	21
6	Other	24
2	Don't know	28

Your general state of health

Whilst the bulk of the sample declared themselves to be in excellent or reasonably good health, the responses to the open-ended questions would appear to give the lie to this face-value impression.

Q12 What about your general state of health? Would you say it was...?

	%
Excellent	39.9
Reasonably good	49.3
Only fair	9.9
Poor	0.9

Mean satisfaction score 8.05

Whilst we would have liked to have used Bradburn's (1969) list of symptoms and had to omit it for space reasons, the people in the sample mentioned various symptoms they would like to ease up to give them greater satisfaction with their health. What seems to happen is that informants' reported satisfaction is based, not on perfect health as an anchorage, but on what they can expect at their age, and so older people in mediocre health are just as satisfied, if not more so, than younger people in better health. Asking informants what would make them less satisfied has attracted an obvious stereotyped response "To be ill" in a large number of cases. 63 people mentioned actual disabilities or diseases which they wished would ease, and 13 mentioned psychological manifestations. A large 'other' category includes a number of 'weight-watching' and 'idleness' responses.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
22	None	4
0	Prevent from work	6
32	General disability, limitation	124
31	Specific diseases, illnesses	51
13	Psychological, worries	13
8	Aging	5
48	Other	24
10	Don't know	17

Your (husband's) job⁷

Informants were asked if they personally had a full-time job. If not, all informants except married women were not asked about jobs. Married women whose husbands were retired were not asked either. Thus this question refers only to full-time jobs of either husband/male or wife/female, replies being obtained from 54% of the sample, ie 115 respondents.

The mean satisfaction score for jobs was 7.83 and the open-ended responses presented no particular difficulty for coding. One response which was quite frequent, concealed under 'working conditions', was a concern to cut working hours, or to avoid an increase in hours or a change to night-shift work, with or without any increase in payment. The principal concerns to bring greater satisfaction were to get more pay, promotion, and improve working conditions (usually a cut in hours); for less satisfaction job security was the most frequently mentioned potential source.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
38	Earnings	21
34	Pro-/Demotion	12
7	Job security	48
10	Self-fulfil, discretion	14
25	Working conditions	24
4	Management	5
8	Health	6
15	Other	18
5	Don't know	13

NB The 'other' category includes a few 'nearer home', 'dirty job' and 'strike' responses

Your general financial situation

In the pre-pilot this question was phrased about income, but it was felt after looking at the preliminary depth interviews that income levels were not nearly so important as a sense of financial security. We did not wish to appear to be asking about debts or savings and so left the phrase as 'financial situation'. This question always appeared after 'job' so that it would not be seen to refer to work, although many people did connect the two.

The mean score on satisfaction was 5.48 and this domain is the only one which approached a normal distribution on the scale. Other than increased earnings and pensions, informants claimed that decreases in taxation (including [local authority] rates), rent or mortgage costs, and cost-of-living would give more satisfaction, whereas lower satisfaction would result from redundancy (actual or threatened), loss of savings, and increases in the cost of living. 'Other' category is very miscellaneous including a shopkeeper who resented cut-price supermarkets and a boardinghouse keeper who wanted more lodgers. Surprisingly few informants offered any form of windfall as deliverance from financial stress.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
-------------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------

⁷ sic, nowadays **partner's** would be more pc

21	Taxation	14
32	Pensions	11
90	Earnings	35
4	Job security	50
23	Cost of living/mortgages	55
4	Savings	10
41	Other	24
7	Don't know	12

The things you can do in your leisure time

The phrasing of this question caused some difficulty as we wanted to avoid 'TV', 'Get feet up' and 'holiday' responses, whilst not excluding days out or DIY. Ideally we would have liked a list of activities, but we had insufficient data on leisure from the depth interviews and preferred to keep it open-ended. The most important constraints on leisure satisfactions are time, money and health, together with freedom from restrictions such as children or limited choice. By time, we mean more time free from work. Facilities were grouped into those in the home, including a car, those outside the home, but indoors, such as entertainment and sport (swimming, squash) and those outdoors whether organised in urban areas, or more natural areas of open countryside or sea.. Some respondents felt lonely and wanted to meet more people.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
38	Time from work	38
14	Health	50
7	Home facilities	20
19	Indoor facilities	5
9	Outdoor facilities	8
23	Money	28
16	Choice/freedom	24
12	Other	18
6	Don't know	15

Family life

54.4% placed themselves on the top scale point. Those who were not fully satisfied with their family lives would be more satisfied if they saw more of their families or had more money, and the blissful majority would be dissatisfied (apart from their families falling ill or dying) if they had to spend less time with their families, developed family problems, or had less money.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
23	Closer to/more time with	11
3	Further from/less time with	16
4	Housing/ environment	5
8	Children problems	15
6	Health, death, providence	108
5	Family problems	18
12	Money	13
18	Other	15
7	Don't know	15

Your friendships

Again, a very high mean score of 8.09 would suggest a stereotype response, and in any case the element of choice in friendships would lead one to expect a high satisfaction. The main concern of respondents was with number, proximity and amount of contact, and with quality of relationship.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
24	More time with	2
0	Less time with	25
13	More friends	0
2	Fewer friends	62
17	Quality of relationships	52
4	Money	0
0	Health/death	14
14	Other	9
8	Don't know	29

The education your children are getting

If respondents had no children they were asked how they would rate the education of hypothetical children, or if none at school or college then the education their children would get. 72.3% had children at school or college. The mean score on the scale was 7.23. On both positive and negative sides the principal concern was with those things that can be provided by increased capital and continuous expenditure (better schools, smaller classes, more teachers) quality (teacher orientation and ability, individual attention, general quality of education for children) and content (more interesting things to do, three R's, morals, discipline). On the negative side, a large number of parents were worried about under-achievement or over-pressuring of their children.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
-----------------------	---------	-----------------------

40	Capital, numbers	51
30	Quality	25
3	Parent choice	3
10	Elitist	24
8	Egalitarian	5
16	Content	12
7	Opportunities	11
17	Morals, discipline	14
1	Home (health, money)	5
25	Other	36
22	Don't know	31

Police and Courts

The actual phrasing used in this question was “..the way the police and courts do their job?” This was to avoid the kind of response we would have got to the emotive phrase “Law and Order”. The largest single group of responses, both positive and negative, related to punishment of offenders, but this was more of the “send robbers to prison” or “heavy fines for petty offences” variety rather than a “hang ‘em and flog ‘em” syndrome. Many informants wanted improvements in police numbers and pay, and in the quality of public relations, preferably by bringing back “the man on the beat” and stopping the police from “all driving round in cars”. A large group complained of inefficiency in the courts, either for long waits and inconsistent attitudes, or for amateur magistrates. Some mentioned police standards (corruption, brutality, victimization and wrong priorities), or unequal treatment for different groups. The ‘other’ category contains several requests for better communication with police when needed (kiosks that work), bureaucracy, petty officialdom and impersonal relations. A large number of respondents replied, “Stop persecuting motorists”. Only two people mentioned guns, and that was to disapprove of them.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
48	Punishment	45
24	Police numbers and conditions	20
17	Police standards	28
28	Crime control	16
38	Court inefficiency	20
19	Fair treatment	15
7	Change law	2
16	Other	20
5	Don't know	41

The welfare services

This domain was explained as referring to health, pensions, social workers, social security and the like since ‘welfare’ may have had pejorative connotations. The mean score on satisfaction was 6.51, which was the second lowest. There was a strong demand for better services all round, higher pensions, and prevention of abuses. Abuses included the stereotype “scroungers and strikers” response, but we also included “priorities all wrong” under this heading. Any reduction in quality of services would make people less satisfied, the largest single negative grouping being “Greater changes” or “Less money spent”. “Other services” were mostly a request for more people to visit the old and sick “so they wouldn’t be on their own”.

More satisfied (n)	Changes	Less satisfied (n)
35	More public money	5
11	Less public money	83
47	Abuses	27
71	Pensions. Old people	22
41	Other services	25
30	Other	24
5	Don't know	24

Respondents were also asked whether over the past twelve months they personally or anyone else in the household had made use of particular welfare services. The proportions saying 'Yes' are given below:

	%		%
Visit to doctor	83.6	Family planning clinic	2.8
Visit from doctor	44.1	Free school meals	1.9
Hospital as outpatient	42.3	Home or District Nurse	3.8
Hospital as in-patient	18.8	Home help	3.3
Dentist	66.2	Health Visitor	14.1
Maternity Benefit	9.4	Supplementary Benefit (N.A.)	9.9
Midwife	6.6	Unemployment Benefit	4.7
Day nursery	1.9	Old Age Pension	23.0
Childrens' Officer	0.9	Other state pension	8.5
Child Guidance Clinic	0.0		

Life change items

As an additional method of tapping the life-satisfaction dimension informants were asked whether they wanted to continue their lives in much the same way, or to change some or many things. The same question was asked of the past, if they could have their lives over again. About half the sample did not want to make any changes at all either now or in the past, and only 7.5% wanted to change many things in both.

Changes wanted in life now and in the past

	Now %	Past %
Change nothing	56.8	46.5
Change some things	35.7	45.1
Change many things	7.5	7.5

Those who wanted any change were asked what they would like to change. In their present way of life the highest number mentioned 'work' and 'finance' or 'living standards'. A smaller number mentioned 'housing' or 'environment', and 'family' or 'friends'. We suspect that the domain list was still remembered when the response was given. Reference to the past yielded a different structure. The largest number mentioned their education either for vocational or fulfilment reasons, closely followed by references work and family ("marry younger/older").

Changes wanted in life now and in the past

Now	Past
-----	------

	(n)		(n)
Work	30	Education	38
Finance/Living	26	Work	28
House/Environs	18	Family	20
Family/friends	14	House/environs	10
Leisure	8	Travel/variety	9
Political/economic	6	Childhood	8
Morals	5	Money/savings	8
Education	3	Political/economic	5
Other	22	Leisure	3
Don't know	2	Other	18
		Don't know	6

Methodological Note

Because of the way we asked the general satisfaction question, immediately after a list of obvious socio-economic groups, we feel that we may have biased the frame of reference for informants towards economic and financial factors, and away from family and self-esteem factors, and to some extent away from the general factor tapped by the anomie scale. We know this because other studies show higher correlations between family and self-esteem factors and the general satisfaction factor. (Bradburn's gamma for family and general satisfaction is 0.7 - equivalent to a correlation of 0.5 or higher – whereas our correlation is a mere 0.17).

However, two factors have emerged from preliminary statistical analysis, the second of which is of substantive interest since it consists of all those domain satisfactions which one might call the antithesis of the work situation and the wider economic situation. The first factor confirms our suspicions that an economic bias was present in the self-ratings with high loadings on all self-rating items and the domain 'financial situation' (Self now -0.83, Right level for me -0.71, Self past -0.66, Financial situation -0.48 Satisfaction of self-assigned group -0.45). The second factor has high loadings on home and non-work variables (Leisure +0.53, District +0.52, House +0.50, Friendships +0.48 and Family +0.45).

The next stage for us is to collect more data from much larger (probability) samples so that we can use more advanced statistical techniques, but to keep the general satisfaction items away from contamination by an economic context. We should also like to include some more psychological measures so that we can include as variables anxiety, self-esteem, misanthropy, achievement motivation and the like, instead of the open ended domain questions. Another possibility is the extension of the use of the scale to give self-ratings on role-performance and on progress towards life-goals. We must try also to find a method of scattering more widely the high satisfaction ratings in the domains, perhaps by a series of statements in addition to the overall ladder scale.

Retyped with minor amendments by John Hall 14 Jan 2004 from 1971 mimeo.

Checked and amended on 31 July 2004 (typo's, spelling, some table headings and change of some phrases to more pc form (eg respondent + he/his = respondents + they/their). Also on 22/23 Aug 2004 to reformat with proper footnotes and some tables in MS-Word Tables format

JFH 25 August 2004 (Liberation of Paris 1944)

pdf files for following tables added 21 May 2006 (Dell printer), but were corrupted so they are now captured as partial screenshots with MWSnap (25 July 2011)

CONJAIN TABLE 1

Mean Satisfaction Ratings

Plant 1, March 1971

(Scale 0 - 10)

	SELF-RATINGS				JOURNAL RATINGS										
	Past	Now	Future	Entitled	District	House	Health	Job	Finance	Leisure	Family	Friendships	Child Ed.	Police & Courts	Welfare
SEX:															
Male	5.7	5.5	6.2	7.5	7.4	7.9	8.4	7.9	5.8	7.5	8.9	8.0	7.2	6.5	6.4
Female	6.0	5.9	6.1	7.3	7.5	7.9	7.6	7.8	5.2	7.2	8.7	8.2	7.3	7.3	6.6
AGE:															
15 - 24	5.1	5.3	6.8	7.5	6.6	7.4	8.5	7.6	5.2	7.8	8.7	7.9	7.3	6.6	6.4
25 - 34	5.7	5.8	6.2	7.7	7.7	8.1	8.1	8.1	5.8	7.4	8.8	8.1	7.4	7.1	6.6
35+	6.8	5.3	5.4	7.1	8.1	8.3	7.5	7.9	5.5	7.6	8.8	8.3	7.0	7.1	6.6
SOCIAL GRADE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD															
AB	6.3	6.6	7.4	8.2	7.4	7.7	8.3	8.2	6.6	8.0	9.2	7.8	6.9	7.0	7.1
C1	7.2	5.6	6.1	7.4	7.8	8.4	8.2	8.0	5.7	7.2	8.7	8.5	7.3	6.8	6.8
C2	5.4	5.4	6.0	7.6	7.0	7.6	8.1	7.9	5.3	7.2	8.5	8.0	7.3	7.1	6.1
D8	5.6	4.7	5.2	6.9	7.7	7.8	7.6	7.0	4.6	7.2	8.7	7.9	7.3	6.7	6.2
HOUSEHOLD INCOME:															
\$450/650	6.8	5.2	5.4	6.7	8.5	8.7	7.0	8.0	4.5	7.5	8.3	8.5	7.3	6.8	6.2
\$650/1050	5.4	5.1	5.6	7.2	6.5	7.3	8.1	7.0	4.7	6.6	8.5	8.2	7.0	6.8	5.9
\$1250/1650	5.4	5.5	6.3	7.5	7.4	7.9	8.5	7.9	5.6	7.5	8.7	8.0	7.1	6.7	6.5
\$2000+	6.2	6.7	6.9	7.8	7.3	7.6	8.5	8.4	6.7	7.4	9.3	7.5	7.2	6.5	6.4

INTERITEM CORRELATIONS

SUBSCANT TABLE 2 (Pilot 1)

Changes	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q2/7	Q8	Q9	Q11	Q13	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q26a	Q26c	Q29
SELF NOW	3	-399	623	290	388	468	-319	031	-018	-139	-220	-304	-070	039	035	-194	-021	-155	098	-022	-049	
Difference - EAST	4	-525	623	290	388	468	-319	031	-018	-139	-220	-304	-070	039	035	-194	-021	-155	098	-022	-049	
between	5	076	250	-023	288	288	124	-023	073	057	-135	108	132	031	-007	-006	032	-025	-003	-039	091	003
WEST.	6	-161	588	445	288	288	270	-200	011	072	-058	149	245	098	033	040	072	076	221	-156	-017	095
S.A.O.	2/7	-326	468	414	124	270	270	-240	-032	010	121	328	416	150	127	083	104	156	162	-059	-011	061
ANONYM	8	109	-319	-225	-023	-200	-240	-109	-051	-116	008	-344	-179	-170	-095	-035	-120	-201	112	-090	-190	
DISTRICT	9	014	033	-100	073	011	-032	-109	429	052	-076	115	200	041	181	152	067	247	-183	-068	031	
HOUSE	11	-018	130	-044	057	072	010	-051	429	090	019	091	194	174	229	079	047	175	-181	-034	033	
HEALTH	13	-139	095	178	-135	-058	121	-116	052	090	265	225	249	273	272	092	092	090	214	-052	-045	-006
JOB	15	-220	239	318	108	149	328	008	-075	019	265	309	026	252	089	093	061	075	-002	-028	-145	
FINANCE	16	-304	522	365	132	285	416	-364	115	091	225	309	254	129	130	135	232	305	-214	119	126	
LEISURE	17	-070	239	100	031	098	150	-179	200	194	249	026	254	373	245	115	118	205	-248	-073	060	
FAMILY	18	039	174	099	-007	053	127	-170	041	174	273	252	129	373	235	036	112	175	-083	-082	145	
FRIENDS	19	035	077	-041	-006	040	083	-095	181	229	272	089	130	245	235	125	128	051	-192	-096	039	
CHILD'S ED.	21	-194	141	097	002	072	104	-035	152	079	092	093	135	115	036	125	132	257	-085	-145	-024	
POLICE	22	-021	-037	031	025	076	156	-120	067	047	090	061	232	118	112	128	132	285	176	-112	056	
WELFARE	23	-195	373	231	-003	221	162	-201	247	175	214	075	305	205	175	051	257	285	-179	-101	014	
CHANGE PRESBYT	25a	098	-174	-136	-039	-166	-069	112	-183	-181	-052	-002	-214	-248	-083	-192	-085	-176	-179	149	-133	
CHANGE EAST	26c	-022	061	003	091	-017	-011	-090	-068	-034	-045	-028	119	-073	-082	-036	-145	-112	-101	149	034	
PERSON LIKE TO BE	29	-049	069	066	003	095	061	-150	031	033	-006	-165	126	060	145	039	-024	066	014	-183	034	