

SURVEY METHODS IN  
SOCIAL INVESTIGATION

C.A. MOSER  
AND G. KALTON

---

*Survey Methods in Social Investigation*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

---

# *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*

by

SIR CLAUS MOSER

*Director of the Central Statistical Office and Head of the  
Government Statistical Service from 1967–1978*

and

GRAHAM KALTON

*Program Director, Survey Research Center, and  
Professor of Biostatistics, University of Michigan*

*SECOND EDITION*

*(with Supplementary Bibliography, 1979)*

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1971 by Ashgate Publishing

Published 2016 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

Copyright © C. A. Moser and G. Kalton 1971

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

### **British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

Moses, Sir, Claus

Survey Methods in social investigation.—2nd ed.

1. Social surveys

I. Title II. Kalton, Graham

300'.723 HN29

ISBN 13: 978-1-855-21472-9 (pbk)

---

## *Contents*

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION	ix
PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION	xi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xv
GUIDE FOR THE READER	xvii
1. THE NATURE OF SOCIAL SURVEYS, AND SOME EXAMPLES	
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Historical background	6
1.3. The classical poverty surveys	7
1.4. Regional planning surveys	11
1.5. The Government Social Survey—now part of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys	13
1.6. Market, audience and opinion research	15
1.7. Some other surveys	20
2. THE PLANNING OF SOCIAL SURVEYS	
2.1. Preliminary study	41
2.2. The main planning problems	43
2.3. Pre-tests and pilot surveys	47
3. THE COVERAGE OF SURVEYS	
3.1. Definition of the population	53
3.2. Censuses and sample surveys	54
3.3. The idea and the advantages of sampling	56
3.4. The use of sampling in Great Britain	58

<b>4. BASIC IDEAS OF SAMPLING</b>	
4.1. Introduction	61
4.2. Estimation and testing of hypotheses	62
4.3. Accuracy, bias and precision	63
4.4. Sampling distributions and standard errors	69
4.5. Significance tests	74
4.6. Summary of simplifications	76
<b>5. TYPES OF SAMPLE DESIGN</b>	
5.1. Introduction	79
5.2. Random sampling	80
5.3. Stratification	85
5.4. Cluster and multi-stage sampling	100
5.5. Sampling with varying probabilities	111
5.6. Concluding remarks	116
<b>6. FURTHER TYPES OF SAMPLE DESIGN</b>	
6.1. Area sampling	118
6.2. Multi-phase sampling	121
6.3. Replicated sampling	124
6.4. Quota sampling	127
6.5. Panel and longitudinal studies	137
6.6. Master samples	143
<b>7. OTHER ASPECTS OF SAMPLING</b>	
7.1. Sample size	146
7.2. Random numbers	152
7.3. Sampling frames	154
7.4. Non-response	166
<b>8. AN EXAMPLE OF A NATIONAL RANDOM SAMPLE DESIGN</b>	188
<b>9. EXPERIMENTS AND INVESTIGATIONS</b>	
9.1. Causality	211
9.2. Validity of experiments	214
9.3. Controlling for the effects of extraneous variables	220
9.4. Other designs	224
9.5. Examples of investigations	226
9.6. Factorial designs	230
9.7. Sample designs for experiments and investigations	233

10. METHODS OF COLLECTING THE INFORMATION I	
—DOCUMENTS AND OBSERVATION	
10.1. Introduction	238
10.2. The use of documentary sources	240
10.3. Observation	244
11. METHODS OF COLLECTING THE INFORMATION II	
—MAIL QUESTIONNAIRES	
11.1. The role of direct questioning	256
11.2. The advantages of mail questionnaires	257
11.3. The limitations of mail questionnaires	260
11.4. Non-response in mail surveys	262
12. METHODS OF COLLECTING THE INFORMATION III	
—INTERVIEWING	
12.1. Types of interviewing	270
12.2. The nature of the survey interview	271
12.3. The interviewer's task	273
12.4. Selection and training	282
12.5. Some practical points	291
12.6. Informal interviewing	296
13. QUESTIONNAIRES	
13.1. General principles of design	303
13.2. Question content	310
13.3. Question wording	318
13.4. Open and pre-coded questions	341
13.5. Question order	346
13.6. Concluding remarks	347
14. SCALING METHODS	
14.1. Introduction	350
14.2. Types of scales	352
14.3. Reliability and validity	353
14.4. General procedures in attitude scaling	357
14.5. Rating scales	358
14.6. Thurstone scales	360
14.7. Likert scales	361
14.8. Guttman scales	366
14.9. Semantic differential	373
14.10. Concluding remarks	376



<b>15. RESPONSE ERRORS</b>	
15.1. Response bias and response variance	378
15.2. Sources of response errors	385
15.3. Operation of response errors	388
15.4. Detection of response errors	392
15.5. Control and measurement of response errors	403
<b>16. PROCESSING OF THE DATA</b>	
16.1. Editing	410
16.2. Coding	414
16.3. Tabulation	428
<b>17. ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND PRESENTATION</b>	
17.1. Introduction	439
17.2. Statistical description	440
17.3. Population estimates and sampling errors	442
17.4. Interpreting relationships	447
17.5. Causal models	458
17.6. Index construction	464
17.7. Presentation	467
<b>18. CONCLUDING REMARKS</b>	480
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	489
<b>SUPPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	525
<b>INDEX OF NAMES AND ORGANIZATIONS</b>	533
<b>INDEX OF SUBJECTS</b>	544

---

## *Preface to the Second Edition*

**S**INCE THE First Edition of this book was published there has been a considerable increase in survey activity throughout the world, and methods have become more rigorous and well-developed. We have tried to reflect these changes in this new edition. Examples of more recent surveys have been given in many places and particularly in Chapter 1 which has been entirely rewritten. Even so, we have not hesitated to retain as examples many early surveys, since they help to illustrate the development of methods, and are often still the best examples of their type.

As to methods, changes have been made throughout the book so as to reflect the latest developments, including for instance recent research on mail questionnaires and the use of computers for processing survey data. Furthermore there are the following major additions to the First Edition: Chapter 1 has been expanded considerably with examples of a wide range of surveys and methods; the chapter in the first edition entitled Types of Sample Design has been enlarged and divided into two chapters—Chapters 5 and 6—with the second chapter containing fuller descriptions of several sample designs; a special chapter, Chapter 9, dealing with Experiments and Investigations has been added; the section in the first edition on scaling methods has been enlarged into a full chapter, Chapter 14; and Chapter 17 has two new sections, Section 17.4 on Interpreting Relationships and Section 17.5 on Causal Models.

The net effect is to make a few parts of the book harder. This reflects the fact that techniques have become more rigorous and is in line with the teaching of the subject; courses on survey methods in universities and technical colleges have become notably more sophisticated in a technical sense. We have, however, kept the harder sections down to an absolute minimum and only a small part of the book is above the technical level of the First Edition. More-

over, in order to make it easy for the reader who does not need these sections to identify them, they are printed in a smaller type.

We have been helped by a number of people in the preparation of this new edition. Our greatest debt is to Dr Tessa Blackstone who undertook most of the work needed for the up-to-date survey of surveys which appears as Chapter 1. We believe that this chapter will be valuable in its own right, and we are most grateful to Dr Blackstone.

We would also like to thank the following who have helped us either by providing information about their organization's survey practices or by commenting on various parts of the book: Miss J. Atkinson, Miss L. R. Austen, Mr B. A. Bates, Mr J. Bibby, Dr B. Cooper, Dr H. Durant, Mr B. P. Emmett, Professor L. Kish, Mr F. F. Land, Mr L. Marchant, Dr A. C. McKennell, Mrs S. B. Quinn, Mr C. Scott, Dr J. C. Scott, Dr A. P. E. L. Sealy, Mr R. Sherwood, Professor A. Stuart, Mr H. J. F. Taylor, Mr P. J. Wakeford and Mr J. H. Westergaard.

We are grateful to Miss C. Martin, Miss A. Usher and Miss M. Vaughan for their part in typing the manuscript, to Mr A. C. Jhavary and Mr A. J. Deacon who worked on the bibliography, and to Mr P. Marks who checked the calculations. Above all, we should like to thank Mrs F. H. Kalton, without whose excellent work in typing, reading and proof-reading we would not have completed the task.

Finally, we wish to thank Mr A. Hill (Chairman and Managing Director of Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.) for his interest and help throughout the production of the book, and Professor D. G. MacRae for his most helpful advice and encouragement.

C. A. MOSER  
G. KALTON

*January, 1971*

---

## *Preface to the First Edition*

THIS BOOK has grown out of a course of lectures given at the London School of Economics during the last few years. It is intended primarily as an introduction to the methodology of surveys for students in the social sciences but I hope that it may also be useful to the many whose work requires an understanding of the methods of surveys, including those who commission them and have to evaluate their results. The book is concerned primarily with what one thinks of as 'large scale' surveys rather than with case studies of individuals, small groups or institutions.

Another type of reader whose needs have been particularly in my mind is the research worker in the social sciences who wishes to conduct an *ad hoc* survey but has little idea of the principles of sampling or questionnaire design or how to go about the processing and analysing of the results. He, unlike the professional surveyor with an established organization of specialists, field workers and routine staff at his call, has to start from scratch, probably doing a good deal of the work himself and usually with very limited resources. My hope is that this book will provide research workers so placed with a groundwork of knowledge about general ideas; for instruction on practical details they can then turn to a survey manual or to a specialist for advice.

With such a potential readership in mind, I have tried not to overload the book with detail and technicalities, for the study of these without a sound understanding of general methodology can all too easily lead to the application of methods to situations for which they are ill-suited. I have tried, also, to stress the limitations of the survey approach and to caution potential users against an uncritical faith in its power. Not every research programme needs a survey, and indeed many questions can be dealt with as satisfactorily by 'desk research' as by fact-collecting. With the social

survey, as with any scientific method, part of the skill lies in knowing when to use it at all.

A good deal of space is given to the subject of sampling, for this, I have found, is the aspect of surveys which is the most difficult for the non-specialist to grasp.

The discussion is in the main confined to work carried out in Great Britain and some of the examples derive from surveys with which I have been connected either at the London School of Economics or as a consultant to market research agencies. Many of the references on methodological advances, on the other hand, come from the American literature.

As the total literature on the subject now runs into thousands of items, some guidance on reading is essential. I have given, at the end of each chapter, the references that seem to me most useful on its contents. References to general textbooks are given at the end of Chapter 1.

I have cause to be grateful to a number of people who have helped me in one way or another in the writing of this book. I owe a great deal to the advice and encouragement I have received throughout from Professor R. G. D. Allen, Professor D. V. Glass and Professor M. G. Kendall, all of the London School of Economics, and I must also, more formally, thank Professor Kendall for permitting me to draw for examples on the research projects carried out under his direction within the Research Techniques Unit at the School.

I am deeply indebted to three other colleagues of mine, H. S. Booker, J. Durbin and A. Stuart, who were each good enough to read through a draft of the book and from whose many penetrating criticisms and constructive suggestions I have benefited more than I can say.

Several survey practitioners have kindly given me assistance. I am grateful to Dr H. Durant (Director of the British Institute of Public Opinion), Mr L. Moss (Director of the Government Social Survey) and Mr R. J. Silvey (Head of B.B.C. Audience Research), who read various sections of the book and made a number of valuable suggestions. Above all, I want to thank Mr T. Cauter (Director of the British Market Research Bureau) and Mr J. Downham (a senior research officer of the same organization) who both gave much precious time to the reading of a draft of the book and who offered many constructive suggestions of the utmost value. The book in its final form is of course entirely my own responsibility and, in expressing my sincere thanks to all these gentlemen, I must emphasize that none of them necessarily agree with its final form or content.

I gratefully acknowledge a grant from the Social Research Division at the London School of Economics which covered some of the

typing cost and the help of Mrs D. W. Cleather and Miss J. A. Mathews (of the Typing Department) in this part of the work. Other parts of the typing were carried out by Miss J. A. Castle and Miss F. H. Johnson (of the Statistics Department) and I am grateful to them for their assistance. By far the major share of all the typing, however, has been done—and done superbly well—by Mrs E. M. Strudwick, Secretary of the Statistics Department, and I wish to express to her my sincere gratitude for the enormous amount of help she has given me.

Mr Alan Hill, of William Heinemann Ltd., has throughout been most considerate and helpful and I have much cause to be grateful to him, as also to Mr A. R. Beal of the Education Department. Mr C. R. Howe undertook the technical editing of the book and I should like to express my admiration for his skill and my thanks for the many improvements in literary presentation which he suggested.

My greatest debt of all is to my wife who, besides assisting me in many of the more tedious tasks of producing the book, helped me more than I can say by her unfailing encouragement and patience.

*London School of Economics*  
*September, 1957*

C. A. MOSER



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

---

## Acknowledgements

OUR THANKS are due to the Director of the Gallup Poll for permission to reproduce in slightly changed form the questionnaire on pages 332–9 (the changes, which were necessary to fit the questionnaire to the book size, were kept to the minimum); to the Editors of the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* for permission to reproduce from a paper by Moser and Stuart (1953) the questionnaire that appears on pages 312–4, as well as some other material, also to quote from papers by Durbin and Stuart (1951 and 1954a), and to reproduce from a paper by Gray and Corlett (1950) the material used in Table 7.3; to the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office for permission to reproduce material used in Table 7.2 (Gray and Gee, 1967), and for permission to quote several extracts from *A Handbook for Interviewers* (Atkinson, 1967); to the Central Office of Information for permission to reproduce material from the Radio and Television Enquiry on pages 305–7; to John Wiley and Sons for permission to reproduce (in slightly changed form) from W. E. Deming's *Some Theory of Sampling* (1950) the diagram that appears on page 68; to the Cambridge University Press for permission to print in Chapter 7 an extract from *Tables of Random Sampling Numbers* by Kendall and Smith (1939); to the University of Oxford Institute of Statistics for permission to reproduce in Chapters 7 and 8 two tables from *British Incomes and Savings* (Lydall, 1955); to the Director of the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, for permission to give in Chapter 12 extracts from a conference report published by the Institute (Survey Research Center, 1951); to the American Marketing Association for permission to quote extensively from an article by Durbin and Stuart (1954b) which appeared in the *Journal of Marketing*; to International Business Machines for permission to reproduce the punched card on page 420; to the McGraw-Hill Book Company for permission to quote in



Chapter 17 a paragraph from *Methods in Social Research* by Goode and Hatt (1952); to the U.S. Social Science Research Council for permission to quote in Chapter 17 two paragraphs from Appendix A of *Pre-Election Polls of 1948* (Mosteller and others, 1949); to the Director of the United Nations Statistical Office for permission to give in Chapter 17 extensive extracts from *Recommendations for the Preparation of Sample Survey Reports (Provisional Issue)* (United Nations Statistical Office, 1964); to the Editor of *The Times* for permission to quote in Chapter 18 from the fourth leader that appeared on August 3rd 1955; to the Editor of the *Incorporated Statistician* for permission to reproduce material used in Tables 7.3 and 7.6; to the Oxford University Press for permission to reproduce the attitude scale on page 363; to the University of Illinois Press for permission to reproduce the scales on page 373; and to the Editor of the *American Journal of Sociology* for permission to reproduce the figure on page 461.

---

## *Guide for the Reader*

A FEW parts of this book are rather more difficult than the rest, involving a greater use of mathematical notation, and these parts have been so arranged that they can be passed over without a loss of continuity. The parts involved are: the ends of Sections 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5; the latter part of Chapter 8; the end of Section 15.1; the end of Section 17.4; and the whole of Section 17.5. At the start of each of these parts there is a distinguishing mark ●, and the more difficult material is also indicated by the use of a smaller print.

Since the appearance of this second edition in 1971 there has been a vast expansion in the literature on survey methodology, including reports on a number of important developments. With this 1979 reprinting the opportunity has been taken to add a supplementary bibliography to cover a selection of the more recent literature, this bibliography being given on pages 525–532. Brief notes have been added at the ends of chapters to direct the reader to references in the supplementary bibliography relevant to the chapters' contents. The numbers to these notes have been prefixed by the letter S to indicate that the references are to be found in the supplementary bibliography.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

## CHAPTER 1

---

### *The Nature of Social Surveys, and some Examples*

#### 1.1. Introduction

IT WOULD be pleasant to be able to open this chapter with a straightforward definition of what is meant by a 'social survey'. In fact such a definition would have to be so general as to defeat its purpose, since the term and the methods associated with it are applied to an extraordinarily wide variety of investigations, ranging from the classical poverty surveys of sixty years ago to Gallup Polls, town-planning surveys, market research, as well as the innumerable investigations sponsored by research institutes, universities and government.

As regards purpose, the range is equally wide. A survey may be occasioned simply by a need for administrative facts on some aspect of public life; or be designed to investigate a cause-effect relationship or to throw fresh light on some aspect of sociological theory. When it comes to subject matter, all one can say is that surveys are concerned with the demographic characteristics, the social environment, the activities, or the opinions and attitudes of some group of people.

We can thus see that a satisfactory definition would have to be couched in much more general terms than that introduced by Wells (1935) when he defined a social survey as a 'fact-finding study dealing chiefly with working-class poverty and with the nature and problems of the community'. This might have covered the classical community and poverty studies but would hardly be adequate, the first part at any rate, for the modern forms of survey mentioned above.

But although we shall use the term 'social survey' in a wider sense than that of Wells' definition, we shall not attempt to cover all types of social investigation. The methods described in this book are most relevant to the type of approach one associates with official surveys, market and opinion research, and, to a considerable extent, with sociological research. This does not necessarily mean the use of

standardized, formal methods and the coverage of large representative samples. A researcher wishing to investigate certain aspects of family life may choose to confine himself to a handful of families, studying them intensively, rather than to make a more superficial examination of a large-scale sample.

These two approaches usually serve different ends and use different methods: the intensive study of a few cases will tend to dig deeper, but may lose something in generality; it will probably use less formal interviewing techniques than the other, and in the analysis of results will give more prominence to non-quantified material. This is an important difference, but the methodology used for such 'field studies' or 'field experiments' is in many respects so similar to that of the social survey proper that we shall refer to them from time to time.

We hope, in fact, that the distinction between different kinds of surveys will be made clear by the context, and we will now refer briefly to some major aspects in which surveys differ from each other. These are purpose, subject matter, coverage, and source of information.

### *The purposes of surveys*

The purpose of many surveys is simply to provide someone with information. That someone may be a government department wanting to know how much people spend on food; a business concern interested in finding out what detergents people are using; a research institute studying the housing of old-age pensioners. Whether the 'client' in each case is well-advised to want these facts, or to seek them through a survey, need not worry us here. We are only concerned with noting that to him, as well as to the surveyor, the survey has a clear *descriptive* purpose.

To a social scientist, a survey may equally have a purely descriptive purpose, as a way of studying social conditions, relationships and behaviour. The sort of information needed may be how families of different size, composition and social status spend their incomes; how people are reacting to the latest productivity drive; what relationship there appears to be between education and the possibility of moving up the social ladder. In this early fact-finding stage of much work in the social sciences there is virtually no limit to the range of topics covered by surveys.

It must not be thought, however, that the purpose of surveys, whether in social research or elsewhere, is always so straightforward. Many enquiries aim to *explain* rather than to describe. Their function may be theoretical—to test some hypothesis suggested by sociological theory—or severely practical—to assess the influence of various factors, which can be manipulated by public action, upon some

phenomenon. But, whichever be the case, the purpose is to explain the relationships between a number of variables. This may lead to extreme complexities in interpretation. The problems of 'causal' surveys are so important that we devote a separate chapter to them.

The usefulness of surveys (descriptive or explanatory) in social research is often debated, and one does sometimes suspect social scientists of being excessively eager to use them—to leap into the field as soon as they have a problem, collect data, tabulate answers, write a report and regard the research as finished. It is the ill-considered launching of surveys, leading to the waste of much time and money and the accumulation (often) of unwanted data, that has given rise to the scepticism with which some sociologists regard 'door-knocking' research.

It must be stressed that fact-collecting is no substitute for thought and desk research, and that the comparative ease with which survey techniques can be mastered is all the more reason why their limitations as well as their capabilities should be understood. Sound judgement in their use depends on this. It is no good, for instance, blindly applying the formal standardized methods generally used in official or market research enquiries to many of the more complex problems in which sociologists are interested.

Sometimes good judgement requires the deliberate sacrifice of quantitative precision for the greater depth attainable by more intensive methods of attack. An example will make this clear. There has been much discussion of the problem of 'early leaving' from grammar schools—pupils leaving before the end of the grammar-school course. To get the facts about this the Central Advisory Council for Education (England) (1954) conducted a national sample survey, collecting a wealth of information about the problem: its dimensions, its association with social background, and so forth. One of the vital questions arising from this survey was *why* children from 'working-class' backgrounds do so much less well at grammar schools than others. The official report put forward several possible explanations, among them the subtle influence of the parents' own attitude to education, the tradition and facilities of the home, and the character of the neighbourhood.

Now to assess the influence of these factors on a child's achievement at his grammar school calls, not for another national sample survey, but for intensive study, preferably over a number of years, of a few carefully selected schools. There would have to be interviews, possibly along informal lines, with children, parents, teachers and employment officers; and the interviewers would have to be chosen as much for their understanding of education as for their more routine professional skill.

Whether one could rightly call such further enquiry a social survey (rather than, for example, a field study) is a matter of terminology. What we want to emphasize is simply that there are types of field research that do not call for the apparatus of the large-scale sample survey.

To say this is not to underrate the usefulness of such surveys for many research programmes. In fact in the majority of such programmes they are invaluable *at some stage*. One occasionally hears a survey criticized on the grounds that it did not test a hypothesis or relate to any underlying theory. While there is often substance in this, the criticism is irrelevant to many surveys such as, for instance, the examples of straightforward factual enquiries mentioned before. Even these should always be preceded by carefully thought-out decisions about what is, and what is not, worth asking. But only in a trivial sense could it be said that this amounts to a set of hypotheses; in the narrower sense, implying the testing of a postulated relationship between two or more variables, the formulation of hypotheses is irrelevant to—and impossible for—many fact-collecting enquiries.

We must, after all, remember that the social sciences are still at an early stage of knowledge regarding human behaviour and social environment. To insist that a sociologist must not collect facts until he has a hypothesis would merely encourage the use of arbitrary hypotheses, which can be as bad as indiscriminate fact-collecting. The sociologist should look upon surveys as one way, and a supremely useful one, of exploring the field, of collecting data *around* as well as directly *on* the subject of study, so that the problem is brought into focus and the points worth pursuing are suggested. With such pilot information as a guide, a series of hypotheses can be formulated and tested by further empirical investigation.

Surveys thus have their usefulness both in leading to the formulation of hypotheses and, at a more advanced stage, in putting them to the test. Their function in a given research depends on how much is already known about the subject and on the purpose for which the information is required.

### *The subject matter of surveys*

Even the highly selective set of examples of surveys given in the remainder of this chapter shows that there are few aspects of human behaviour that have not at some time attracted the social surveyor's attention. A full catalogue of them is out of the question here, but it will be helpful to distinguish four broad types of subject matter:<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We should make clear that since this book is concerned broadly with social rather than economic surveys, little will be said about surveys of shops, business firms or similar economic units.

the demographic characteristics of a set of people;  
 their social environment;  
 their activities;  
 their opinions and attitudes.

By demographic characteristics we mean matters such as family or household composition, marital status, fertility, age, and so on. Some surveys, for example the Family Census conducted for the Royal Commission on Population, described by Glass and Grebenik (1954), are entirely on the demographic aspects of life, but almost all surveys include some questions in this field.

Social environment is taken to cover all the social and economic factors to which people are subject, including occupation and income as well as housing conditions and social amenities. These are subjects which cover, in the widest sense, the question 'How do people live?' The classical poverty surveys addressed themselves almost exclusively to answering this, as do many modern surveys.

Data on demographic factors and social environment are factual and their collection presents relatively few problems. They are less open to error (if definitions have been clear) than information on behaviour and opinions, because they are more objective. Furthermore, their accuracy can more often be checked.

Then there is the type of survey primarily concerned with 'what people do'—their behaviour and activities. By this is not meant occupation (which forms part of social environment) but, for instance, use of leisure, travelling habits, expenditure patterns, television-viewing, radio-listening and newspaper-reading. Much of the work of the Government Social Survey<sup>1</sup> lies in this field, and so does a good deal of market research.

Finally there is the type of survey concerned with people's opinions and attitudes. Opinion polls, as the name suggests, deal mainly with these; in many other surveys they are of marginal importance. Opinion questions have their own peculiar problems, and these are examined in a subsequent chapter.

### *Coverage of surveys and sources of data*

Surveys differ markedly in the way they cover a given population—this term being used in the statistical sense to mean the aggregate of persons or objects under investigation. Thus one can speak of the population of people over twenty years of age in England and Wales; the population of miners in South Wales; the population of people travelling to work on the London Underground; the population of desks in a building.

<sup>1</sup> The Government Social Survey is now part of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys.



The coverage of a survey can range from a few case-studies to a complete enumeration, from carefully selected samples to arbitrary collections of volunteers; so it is clear that in considering coverage a surveyor must settle first the extent to which he wishes to generalize from his findings. There are surveys in which representativeness is of minor importance, but in most the intention is to draw population inferences. This intention, when it exists, must be recognized explicitly and the survey designed accordingly.

In social surveys as here interpreted the main methods of data collection are observation, mail questionnaire and personal interview. Surveys also generally make some use of documentary information, but studies based predominantly on statistical data, documents and historical records are not dealt with here.

### 1.2. Historical background

The historian of social surveys in Great Britain has a relatively easy task. His main subject matter is encompassed within about the last eighty years, and there is no lack of records and documentary sources to guide him. He could, it is true, go further back and open his story with Cobbett or Defoe or even the Domesday Book, but it would be more sensible to begin with Eden, Mayhew and Booth. Of these Mayhew's (1861-62) fascinating book *London Labour and the London Poor* makes particularly entertaining reading and has been enjoying a considerable literary vogue in recent years; but it is Booth who should be considered the father of scientific social surveys.

In the eighty-odd years since Booth began his enquiry into the *Labour and Life of the People of London* (Booth, 1889-1902) great changes have occurred, both in the amount and character of survey activity and in the public interest shown in it. At the turn of the century two pioneers—Booth and Rowntree—were conducting large-scale surveys, stimulated by their concern about the living conditions of a large section of the population. During the next twenty years one or two others, notably Bowley, followed their example. By the late twenties and early thirties social surveys were being conducted in London, Tyneside, Sheffield, Southampton, Merseyside and many other cities. These, while differing in details of scope and method, all followed the broad pattern established by the pioneers. Subsequently, surveys began to be used in conjunction with town planning and various government activities, and the techniques were adapted to the needs of market and public opinion research. Today a government organization is wholly occupied undertaking social surveys, market research has become a large-scale industry, social scientists regard the social survey as one of their basic

techniques, and courses on survey methodology are given in many universities.

A brief historical account of these developments will be a useful preliminary to the description of present-day methods, which is the main purpose of this book. With this in mind, surveys will be mentioned either for their methodological interest or for the importance of their results. It also needs saying that the examples relate almost exclusively to Britain. Needless to say there is a great deal of survey activity in other countries, notably the United States. For the latter, a useful general reference is the symposium on *Survey Research in the Social Sciences* edited by Glock (1967), with discussions of the role of surveys in sociology, political science, psychology, economics, anthropology, education, social work, and public health and medicine.

### 1.3. The classical poverty surveys

Charles Booth's<sup>1</sup> monumental survey was begun in 1886 and published, in a seventeen-volume edition, in 1902. Booth, a rich Liverpool shipowner, had been deeply disturbed by the poverty and living conditions of the working class, and set out to obtain 'two series of facts—first, the relative destitution, poverty or comfort of the home and, secondly, the character of the work from which the various bread-winners in the family derived their livelihood' (Booth, 1889, i, p. 13). His main problem was how to collect the information about the huge working-class population of London. 'The root idea with which I began to work', he says, 'was that every fact I needed was known to someone, and that the information had simply to be collected and put together.' He consequently applied what Beatrice Webb later termed the 'method of wholesale interviewing', collecting the information from School Attendance Officers—the people who possessed the most detailed knowledge of the parents of school-children and their living conditions. Booth's approach is best illustrated by the following quotation:

Of the wealth of my material I have no doubt. I am indeed embarrassed by its mass and by my resolution to make use of no fact to which I cannot give a quantitative value. The materials for sensational stories lie plentifully in every book of our notes: but, even if I had the skill to use my material in this way—that gift of the imagination which is called 'realistic'—I should not wish to use it here. There is struggling poverty, there is destitution, there is hunger, drunkenness, brutality and crime; no one doubts that it is so. My object has been to show the numerical relation which poverty, misery and depravity bear to regular earnings and comparative comfort, and to describe the general conditions under which each class lives. (Booth, 1889, i, p. 5.)

On the basis of his data Booth put each family into one of eight

classes, of which four were below and four above the poverty line. His definitions of the various classes were vague: 'My "poor" may be described as living under a struggle to obtain the necessities of life and make both ends meet, while the "very poor" live in a state of chronic want' (Booth, 1889, i, p. 33). It was to be left to Rowntree to give these concepts greater precision. The study, as a whole, was largely descriptive and sacrificed some generality through its exclusion of families without schoolchildren. Nevertheless, its startling results drew attention to the extent and severity of poverty and, as Beatrice Webb has shown, its political results were considerable. It was a pioneering contribution to the science of social study.

A decade after the start of Booth's investigation, Rowntree set out on his first survey of York, published under the title *Poverty: a Study of Town Life* (Rowntree, 1902). His approach varied in three important methodological aspects from that of Booth.

First, he set out to obtain information about the housing, occupation and earnings of every wage-earning family in York.

Secondly, he obtained his information *directly* from the families by using interviewers.

Thirdly, and most important, Rowntree gave greater precision to the concept of poverty, originating the distinction between 'primary' and 'secondary' poverty. If a family had 'total earnings insufficient to obtain the minimum necessities for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency', it was regarded as living in 'primary' poverty (Rowntree, 1902, p. 86). If its 'earnings would be sufficient for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency were it not that some portion of it then is absorbed by other expenditure, either useful or wasteful', then it was deemed as living in 'secondary' poverty (Rowntree, 1902, p. 87). The cost of minimum requirements of food and clothing etc. was ascertained, it being assumed that the food would be purchased as cheaply as possible and selected with a careful consideration for nutritive values. This was called the poverty-line standard. It excluded any clothing not deemed essential, and did not allow for 'expenditure needful for the development of the mental, moral and social sides of human nature' (Rowntree, 1902, p. 87). Rowntree purposely made his poverty-line standards precise and very stringent, so that they might be generally acceptable as a minimum.

The method of defining 'secondary' poverty was more debatable. The number of households in which poverty was evidenced by obvious want and squalor, by the appearance of the children and from talks with the neighbours was noted; and from this total the number deemed to be living in primary poverty was subtracted. Those remaining were regarded as being in 'secondary' poverty. This calculation contained a crucial subjective element, but some distinc-

tion between the two types of poverty was undoubtedly valuable.

More than a decade elapsed before the next important survey was begun. In 1912, Bowley made a study of working-class conditions in Reading, the first of the Five-Towns surveys which also covered Northampton, Stanley, Warrington and Bolton and was published as *Livelihood and Poverty* (Bowley and Burnett-Hurst, 1915). Bowley's great methodological contribution was his use of sampling, which came to act as a decisive stimulus to social surveys. Nearly all the later poverty surveys followed this example. Both in this early survey and its follow-up study ten years later—*Has Poverty Diminished?* (Bowley and Hogg, 1925)—Bowley took care with the selection of the sample and the possible introduction of bias through refusals and non-contacts. Bowley confined himself to 'primary' poverty but used a more realistic standard, based on actual spending habits, than Rowntree. He also took into account, as his predecessors had not, the varying food needs of children of different ages.

In the early thirties survey activity increased. Ford's investigation in Southampton, begun in 1928 and published under the title *Work and Wealth in a Modern Port* (Ford, 1934) largely followed the methods of Bowley, keeping the two types of poverty separate and indeed introducing a third type—'potential' poverty. This denied the usual assumption that all family income was pooled, and was based on the income of the head of the household.

The year 1928 also saw the beginning of the monumental *New Survey of London Life and Labour*, published in a series of volumes (Smith, 1930–35). This was planned as a sequel to Booth's survey of forty years earlier and one part of it—the street survey—was aimed to provide a direct comparison with Booth's results. The other part was an enquiry among a sample of one in fifty of all persons living in private houses or as families.

In 1934 a survey of Merseyside was published, with D. Caradog Jones as its editor, under the title *The Social Survey of Merseyside* (Jones, 1934). An interesting feature was the special study of sub-normal groups. A social survey of Sheffield, published as a series of pamphlets by the Sheffield Social Survey Committee (1931–33), set out to give a historical and contemporary picture of social life in Sheffield. Different pamphlets dealt with subjects such as milk supply, housing, licensing, unemployment, adult education, juvenile employment and welfare, transport, and the standard of living.

Of the many other investigations of working-class poverty only three need be referred to, two of them initiated by Rowntree. In 1935 he directed a second survey of York, which was published as *Poverty and Progress* (Rowntree, 1941). In this he abandoned his previous poverty standard as being too stringent and unrealistic, and replaced

it by his well-known 'Human Needs Standard', developed in 1918 and brought up to date in 1937 (Rowntree, 1937). He did not repeat his attempt to measure 'secondary' poverty. The survey report contained an illuminating analysis of the causes of poverty and the periods of life at which it was most acute, and also had sections on housing, health, education and leisure-time activities. In an interesting supplementary chapter Rowntree attempted to measure the accuracy of sampling; all the survey schedules were arranged in street order and the results of different sizes of samples—1 in 10, 1 in 20, 1 in 30, 1 in 40 and 1 in 50—were compared. Practical sampling difficulties arising from non-response were of course by-passed in this analysis.

In 1950 Rowntree, this time in collaboration with G. R. Lavers, conducted yet another follow-up survey of York, *Poverty and the Welfare State* (Rowntree and Lavers, 1951a). The book received a good deal of public attention, both because it was the first post-war survey wholly concerned with working-class poverty, and also because its findings suggested that the magnitude of the problem, which had been so startling in 1900 and even in 1935, had been reduced almost to vanishing point.

One or two comments on the methodology of this survey should be made. First, there is the question of how representative York was of urban Britain. Rowntree and Lavers affirmed their belief in the views expressed in *Poverty and Progress*:

On the whole, we may safely assume that from the standpoint of the earnings of the workers, York holds a position not far from the median, among the towns of Great Britain. If on the one hand there is no important industry employing a large number of highly skilled and highly paid workers, on the other hand there are no large industries (though unfortunately there are isolated small businesses) where wages are exceptionally low. (Rowntree and Lavers, 1951a, p. 6).

The crucial part of this statement is the last; it implies that there is a small spread around the average earnings, with few very high and few very low earnings. In this case, one would expect less poverty here than in towns where there are substantial numbers of low-wage workers. This does not affect the validity of the comparison of the results for the three York surveys, but cautions against the tendency, which was evident in public discussion of the last survey, to regard the problem of poverty as having disappeared.

Secondly, it is fair to point out that the poverty line, as adapted for this survey, is open to some criticism.<sup>1</sup> The determination of the

<sup>1</sup> We cannot discuss here the concept of the poverty line *per se*, but must refer to the difficulty of relating this line to *actual* living conditions. Many commodities not allowed for in the classical poverty line calculations are in effect felt, by consumers, to be as necessary as food and rent. A discussion of the problem is given by Townsend (1954, 1962a).

non-food amounts was arbitrary and there has been some suggestion that the line was unduly low and the amount of poverty consequently understated (see, for instance, *Poverty: Ten Years after Beveridge* by Political and Economic Planning, 1952).

As a final comment, it is regrettable that the authors did not avail themselves of the improvements in survey methods, and particularly in sampling techniques, which had taken place since the previous York survey.

More recent work has cast doubts on the results of the Third York Survey. Abel-Smith and Townsend (1965) in *The Poor and the Poorest* show that affluence was by no means universal in mid-twentieth-century Britain. This study led to two new surveys into aspects of poverty. One was *Circumstances of Families* published by the U.K. Ministry of Social Security (1967), which sought to establish whether families with children were receiving an adequate subsistence income, taking the minimum requirements under the National Assistance Acts as a basis for comparison. The other is a large-scale national survey conducted by Abel-Smith and Townsend; at the time of writing only one part of the survey's findings, that concerned with large families, has been published (Land, 1969).

#### 1.4. Regional planning surveys

Because of their historical place in the development of surveys, it is worth devoting a brief section to surveys in the field of town planning and reconstruction, which were important by the middle of the thirties. Housing development had formerly been carried out in an unplanned and chaotic manner, resulting in ugly and sprawling cities. This was the background and stimulus to surveys such as that initiated in Birmingham in 1935 by the Bournville Village Trust (1941) and published under the title *When We Build Again*. The aim of the survey was to study the housing situation in and around Birmingham; the location of work and the workers' journey to it; the number of open spaces and parks, and other amenities of the city and its surroundings.

Surveys prior to 1939 in this field had had a different emphasis. That of *Becontree and Dagenham* carried out by Young in 1931-33 was inspired by the hope that 'people, after studying the facts, will be better able to consider what should be done in the development of an estate such as Becontree, and that a report such as this should help in the formulation of policies to deal with the housing of working-class people in general' (Young, 1934, p. 18). The central interest of *Watling—A Survey of Social Life on a New Housing Estate* (Durant, 1939), conducted by Ruth Glass (then Ruth Durant) in 1932, was again different. Her enquiry was focused on two questions.

Had the new estate of Watling grown into a community, in the sense of 'a territorial group of people with a common mode of living, striving for common objectives'? And, secondly, what part was the community centre playing in local life?

Social surveys in town planning did not, however, come into their own until after the Second World War, when the need for widespread planned reconstruction gave them crucial importance. One of the most interesting of these was *Report on Luton* by Grundy and Titmuss (1945), a report on the town's population and housing, and on the social aspects of its public services.

Also interesting was *Middlesbrough: Survey and Plan* (Lock and others, 1947), which gave special weight to sociological factors. The feature of greatest methodological interest here was the use of a more precise concept of neighbourhoods. These were defined, demarcated and graded in terms of a multiple index of living conditions, based on six factors: net population density, number of houses per acre, percentage of houses with a rateable value less than £11, percentage of non-owner occupiers, percentage of chief wage-earners with incomes of less than £5 per week, and number of retail shops per 1,000 people. A book on *The Social Background of a Plan* relating to this survey was published by Ruth Glass (1948). The Midlands have also been the scene of a useful group of surveys completed in the forties: the planning survey of Herefordshire, *English County* (West Midland Group on Post-War Reconstruction and Planning, 1946), the survey of Birmingham and the Black Country entitled *Conurbation* (West Midland Group on Post-War Reconstruction and Planning, 1948) and that of Wolverhampton entitled *Midland City* (Brennan, 1948).

More recently there have been an increasing number of surveys for planning purposes, and a greater willingness on the part of planning authorities to let themselves be influenced by survey results. Part of the growing importance of survey work in town planning is due to the 1966 Town and Country Planning Act, which lays down that all local authorities have a statutory duty to carry out surveys at regular intervals. The Development Corporations have also commissioned surveys. For example, the Economist Intelligence Unit has been doing a sample survey for Harlow every two years, and the Opinion Research Centre has been doing surveys among people living in Milton Keynes.

The Centre for Urban Studies (1964) at University College has developed a bibliography entitled *Land Use Planning and the Social Sciences* which refers to the various surveys. The Centre has also carried out surveys itself, evaluating the success of town planning schemes and their effects on the lives of the inhabitants of the areas

concerned. Examples of these are the sample surveys of the population of Lansbury and of the London County Council housing estates in South-West Hertfordshire, published in *London: Aspects of Change* (Glass and others, 1964).

Survey work in regional planning is frequently directed less towards social than economic questions, such as industrial linkages, involving questionnaires to firms. Some surveys cover both fields, for example *Central Lancashire New Town Proposal: Impact on Northeast Lancashire* carried out by a firm of economic consultants for the U.K. Ministry of Housing and Local Government (1968). Others impinge on the field of population studies, such as the survey of industrial mobility and population migration in the North East by House and Knight (1965).

Finally, mention should be made of the U.K. Royal Commission on Local Government in England (1969) which sponsored a national sample survey on people's attitudes to their local community. Included in this survey were some interesting questions on what people knew about local government.

### **1.5. The Government Social Survey—now part of the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys**

Probably more surveys are done for and by the government than in any other sphere. This has not always been so, and is due in large measure to the work of the Government Social Survey. Founded in 1941, the Government Social Survey has probably become the leading organization of its type, and has exerted an unquestionable influence in raising the standard of survey methods and in persuading policy-makers in government to pay attention to survey results.

The Survey has been through a variety of organizational phases. It started as, and for long remained, part of the Central Office of Information, and was then an independent department under the Treasury from 1967 to 1970, when it was merged with the General Register Office for England and Wales into a single Office of Population Censuses and Surveys. The idea behind this latest move is that surveys and censuses concerned with individuals, families and households should be planned and conducted on an integrated basis, and in association with the Central Statistical Office, which will share responsibility for planning the policy of the Office. Survey work for the government will (and should) continue to grow, and will, as in the past, rest in large measure on the highly experienced staff of the Government Social Survey, now within the new Office. One imagines that the present tradition will continue, whereby the Survey will, subject to resources, undertake enquiries requested by government departments and other official bodies, such as Royal Commissions,



but the precise procedures for settling plans and priorities in the new Office are only now being worked out.

The range of subject matter covered by the Survey is extremely wide. The Central Statistical Office, the Board of Trade, the General Register Office, the Department of Health and Social Security and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government have been some of the Survey's main clients, but virtually every Government department has used it. In addition, practically every Royal Commission and official committee of recent years has conducted social enquiries, usually through the Survey. Detailed lists are given by Gray and Corlett (1950) and by Moss (1953), under whose direction over many years the Survey was built up. The Survey also maintains a regular *List of Published Reports and Papers*, and items from the 1969 list include: for the Department of Education and Science a survey of attitudes of undergraduates towards teaching; for the Ministry of Housing and Local Government a housing survey in England and Wales; for that Ministry and the Department of Health and Social Security a survey of social welfare for the elderly; for the Department of Employment and Productivity a survey of workers' employment, and one on labour mobility; for the Road Research Laboratory a survey on drivers' understanding of road traffic signs; for the Schools Council a study among young school-leavers; and so forth. Many dozens of other, equally varied, examples could be quoted, many of them—such as the studies on predicting the success of Borstal training by Mannheim and Wilkins (1955)—of great methodological interest. There is also an impressive list of technical papers by the Survey's staff.

It is worth mentioning separately four *series* of enquiries. One was the Survey of Sickness (for the General Register Office) which for six years provided useful data on the nation's health until, in 1952, it became a casualty of a government economy campaign. Another series still continuing is that on family expenditure. This has included reports on expenditure on gambling, laundry, holidays, household textiles, house repairs and domestic service, meals in restaurants, hairdressing and cosmetics; and a number of general reports. The importance of these enquiries lies in the use of their results for the estimates of national income and expenditure, and for the retail price index. They are referred to again below. A third continuing enquiry is the National Food Survey carried out for the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. This provides valuable information on the adequacy of the diet available to families of different size and composition, in different parts of the country and in various social groups (see U.K. National Food Survey Committee, 1968). In addition, preparatory work has been going on for a new system of multi-

purpose household surveys on a continuous basis. These will cover a range of social and economic data about households and provide a continuous and flexible survey instrument for the government. They began in the last part of 1970.

Enough has been said to show the importance of the Government Social Survey's work in undertaking *ad hoc* and continuous surveys for official purposes. It is safe to say, even though such statements are hard to substantiate, that the Survey has had a great effect in improving the level of information and understanding that goes into policy deliberations in government, both in the administrative departments and in official committees. The Survey has also come to participate increasingly in social and economic research, in association with universities and research institutes.

References to the Survey's work, and to other surveys done for the government, will be found throughout this chapter and later parts of the book, including references to its more important technical publications, for example the paper on its sampling methods by Gray and Corlett (1950).

## 1.6. Market, audience and opinion research

### *Market research*<sup>1</sup>

Market research in its widest sense has been a feature of commerce for decades. Whether through its executives, salesmen or professional advisers, every firm tries to study its market and its marketing methods. But since the 1930's the approach has become much more scientific. The market research survey, using substantially the methods described in this book, has in turn given much of the stimulus to their development.

Market research in its modern form is enjoying a great vogue in Great Britain, and, no doubt, with modern mass-production of consumer goods and the increasing competition between brands, its importance will grow rather than decrease. Already many firms have market research departments, and some employ their own field staff. But this latter scale of operation is mostly confined to the largest firms and most consumer surveys are still done by specialist research agencies. There are many of these, and professional standards are generally high.

Such agencies are usually engaged simultaneously on surveys commissioned by a number of clients, covering different populations,

<sup>1</sup> This brief sketch should be supplemented by reading the (introductory) chapter by Downham, Shankleman and Treasure in *Readings in Market Research* edited by Edwards (1956). In addition, the publications of the Market Research Society, and above all its Journal, should be referred to for further details. The Society also issues a list of organizations providing market research services in Great Britain.

products and types of question. Their association with clients is of varying degrees of closeness and is at its most useful when the agency is able to go beyond merely submitting survey reports, and can advise the management, for instance, on the value of particular types of research, on the meaning of the research results, and on their implications for the firm's marketing and distribution policy. Market research surveys proper find their most obvious role in the study of the public's buying habits, in assessing the effects of different forms of promotion, in brand research, and so forth. In all this they fill important gaps in the manufacturer's knowledge, supplementing information gleaned from such sources as sales statistics and the reports of sales representatives.

The manufacturer naturally knows his total sales, and usually how this is split up between wholesalers and retailers. But he may know little about the purchases and views of individual retailers, let alone the eventual consumers. And without market research he will know nothing about retailers' stocks. Hence the importance of the so-called 'retail audit technique', by which details of stock levels, of counter sales and so on are obtained at regular intervals from a panel of retailers.<sup>1</sup> The technique is discussed by Treasure (1953) and by Melhuish (1954).

Manufacturers often wish to know more about what *types* of people are buying or not buying their product, what they think of its quality, its presentation, its price; and how their attitudes are changing. Such knowledge is invaluable for guiding advertising policy, and many of the research organizations are in fact linked to advertising agencies.

Special problems arise with new products. A manufacturer may wish to test out a proposed product in various forms, colours, flavours and so on, and can avail himself of techniques of experimental design to assess the likely popularity of various alternatives. When the final choice is reduced to a few possibilities, the market researcher often tests their comparative sales appeal by placing them on the market, perhaps at varying prices, in different test areas.

Where the problem is to find the best form of an advertisement, market research methods can be used to assess the relative effectiveness of several alternatives. Equally important is the question of *where* advertising space is to be bought, for, clearly, the more people who read a particular publication, and the better-off they are, the more valuable is the advertising space. Readership surveys are used for this purpose, the best known being those conducted by the Joint Industry Committee for National Readership Surveys

<sup>1</sup> The use of panels—which are important in market research—is discussed in Section 6.5 below.

(JICNARS).<sup>1</sup> There is also substantial activity in relation to television viewing, and a parallel body, the Joint Industry Committee for Television Advertising Research (JICTAR), which conducts surveys to measure television audiences (see p. 248).

A certain amount of secretiveness regarding their work is to be expected of market research bodies, since theirs is a highly competitive business. Even so, there are now many conferences, meetings and journals to which market research practitioners contribute papers, and it is a fair bet that market researchers contribute as much as any other group to developments in survey methods. The Journal of the Market Research Society illustrates this.

### *BBC Audience Research*

In 1936 the British Broadcasting Corporation set up a Listener Research Department to collect information about the listening habits and tastes of the British public, an attempt to establish some kind of substitute in the world of radio for the box-office of the theatre. When television came in, the Department changed its name to Audience Research.

To ascertain the amount of listening and viewing, a national quota sample (see Chapter 6) of 2,250 men and women is asked each day which of the programmes broadcast the previous day they have listened to (or viewed); *opinions* on these programmes are not sought. Interviewers use the 'aided-recall' method, i.e. they remind respondents of the programmes in question. This enables the BBC to estimate what percentage of the population (aged five and over) listens to (or views) their various programmes of the previous day's broadcasts. Apart from the usefulness to the producers of knowing trends in audience size, these surveys produce much information of interest about the factors affecting listening numbers: time of broadcast, season, competing broadcasts, nature of broadcast preceding and following it, regularity of broadcast, content, general quality, publicity, and so on.

Even ignoring the fundamental difficulty of radio research, that of distinguishing between 'listening to' a programme and merely 'hearing' it as a sort of background noise,<sup>2</sup> sheer size of audience is not the best, certainly not the only, criterion of a programme's quality. The BBC accordingly has volunteer panels of some 6,000 listeners and viewers whose opinions on programmes are regularly sought and analysed.

<sup>1</sup> The Market Research Society (1954a) has published an account of the development, application and problems of readership surveys.

<sup>2</sup> Audience Research does not regard a person as having 'listened' to a programme if he heard less than half of it (news bulletins apart). 'Background listening' is accepted unless the respondent has not even a vague memory of the programme.

One can never of course be confident that volunteer panels are representative of the particular population one is interested in, and the only safeguards—both used by the BBC—are to ensure that different age, sex and social class groups are correctly represented and that checks of representativeness, for example comparing results with those from *ad hoc* surveys, are made whenever possible. A description of the Department's work is given in *BBC Audience Research in the United Kingdom* (British Broadcasting Corporation, 1966), a booklet available on request from the Audience Research Department of the BBC.

### *Public opinion polls*

Opinion questions figure in the Government Social Survey's work, in market research, in audience research, indeed in surveys of practically every kind; but in this section we will concentrate on some survey bodies that conduct regular surveys of public opinion.

One of these bodies is Social Surveys (Gallup Poll) Ltd, which was founded in 1936 as the British Institute of Public Opinion and is one of the international chain of Gallup Institutes—see Durant (1954) for a discussion of its methods. Its monthly survey findings on questions of the day and its forecasts of general and by-election results are regularly published in the *Daily Telegraph*.

Until 1959 the Gallup Poll was the only regular public opinion survey in Britain, but there are now also three other monthly polls and a quarterly one: National Opinion Polls Ltd (NOP) runs a monthly survey and publishes the results in the *Daily Mail*; Opinion Research Centre conducts a monthly survey and reports findings in the *Sunday Times* and a number of evening newspapers; Louis Harris (Research) Ltd has recently established a monthly survey, which is reported in the *Daily Express*; and Marplan Ltd publishes its results quarterly in *The Times*. The existence of several polls provides the stimulus of competition, and thus encourages developments in opinion poll methodology. One aspect in which the polls differ noticeably is their sample designs: quota sampling is used in two of the polls—those of Gallup Poll and the Opinion Research Centre—while random sampling is used in the others;<sup>1</sup> the sample sizes and the numbers of areas in which survey interviews are conducted also differ considerably.

Election forecasts, although the most publicized of polling activities, are in a sense the least valuable; there is, after all, little point in knowing approximately today what will be known accurately tomorrow—apart from the fact that forecasts of any kind appeal to our sporting instincts and that it is of some value to the parties to

<sup>1</sup> See Section 6.4 for a discussion of the differences between these methods.

know the *trends* in opinion. To the pollster, the value of election forecasts is that they offer one of the few opportunities of demonstrating that their methods are sound. No wonder, then, that a failure like that of the 1948 U.S. election forecasts (see Mosteller and others, 1949), or that of the 1970 British general election forecasts, creates such concern.

What happened in 1948 was that the figures from the polls showed such close running as not to justify a prediction one way or another. But past prediction successes and the general mood of the day beguiled the pollsters into making an over-confident, and undoubtedly unwarranted, prediction. Unfortunately, this failure then made them over-cautious in forecasting the 1952 election when, looked at after the event, their poll results showed convincing evidence of the impending Eisenhower victory. But success in predicting elections is in many ways an unfair criterion of the value of survey methods generally, for this sort of forecasting faces special problems, notably the uncertainty of the voting turnout and of what the 'undecided voter' will do. British general elections have in the past been somewhat easier to predict than American because a larger proportion of the electorate have turned out to vote, because there have been fewer undecided voters and because the Register of Electors provides a complete list of persons entitled to vote whereas no comparable list exists in the United States; until 1970 the general election prediction record of British polls had been good.

In the 1970 general election, all the polls — with the exception of the Opinion Research Centre's — pointed to a resounding Labour victory, whereas in the event a Conservative government was returned. There may of course have been a strong swing in the days between the last poll and the election, but most commentators rule this out as the main explanation. It may also be that the size of the predicted Labour majority encouraged apathy amongst Labour voters or even led some marginal voters to move to the Conservatives (a tendency opposite to the more conventional 'bandwaggon theory', and more plausible with the British 'back the loser' psychology). But on the face of it, a more likely explanation of the failure of most of the polls is that they did not allow for 'determination to vote', that is to say turnout; and it is no excuse to say that the figures are meant only to reflect current opinion, not to predict voting, since their inevitable use is for the latter. In addition, in what was perhaps an unusually subtle election situation, the nature of the questions and the treatment of the 'Don't knows' were probably too superficial. These are old problems and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the polls could and should have used more sophisticated techniques. The 1970 experience has shaken confidence in opinion polls and

perhaps in surveys generally. It is important that it should be subjected to the kind of high-level investigation which followed the 1948 failure in the United States (see Mosteller and others, 1949).

The aim of everyday opinion surveys is modest and unobjectionable. All political policies directly or indirectly affect the public, who in turn have views on them. Whether these views are well- or ill-informed, strong or mild, emotional or rational, only good can come from the law-maker and the administrator knowing what they are, and opinion surveys endeavour to inform them. An article by Taylor (1970) discusses the political effects of public opinion polls.

### 1.7. Some other surveys

We must now try to illustrate the miscellaneous surveys, past and present, which do not fit into any of the classifications of the previous five sections. They range from major Government-commissioned national enquiries to small groups of cases studied by the individual sociologist, anthropologist or psychologist. They cover all types of subject matter and use in varying form all the techniques available to the surveyor.

It is difficult to do justice to such a range, and all we can do is to mention a few selected surveys on each of a few selected subjects. The choice is arbitrary, as are the dividing lines between topics.

(a) *Population.* Pride of place in this field must go to the biggest survey of all, the Population Census, which has normally been carried out every ten years, except that the sample census in 1966 has recently made it into a five-yearly event. The Census is conducted on an enumerator basis (not, as in some countries, postal), and the Census volumes describe the methods used (see also Benjamin, 1970).

A Family Census was conducted for the Royal Commission on Population in 1946, and published under the title *The Trend and Pattern of Fertility in Great Britain* (Glass and Grebenik, 1954). Its purpose was to fill the main gaps in our knowledge of fertility and family-building habits, and to this end a sample of over a million married women was questioned. The report sets a high standard in its detailed discussion of all aspects of the survey's methods, including the sampling. The same Royal Commission sponsored an enquiry on family limitation (Lewis-Faning, 1949), in which information on habits of birth control and attitudes to it was obtained from a sample of married women patients in the general wards of hospitals; the interviewing was done by doctors.

Since then the Population Investigation Committee has carried out two major surveys into patterns of fertility. The results of the first, the Marriage Survey in 1959 and 1960, were published in articles

by Rowntree and Pierce (1961) and Pierce and Rowntree (1961); the second, a national sample survey of 2,300 marriages which enquired into fertility and birth-control practice in Great Britain, has not yet been published.

In 1967 the Government Social Survey carried out on behalf of the Registrar-General the Family Intentions Survey, a major survey of family-size expectations of married women. This work is important from the point of view of improving population forecasting. Among smaller-scale studies of fertility one can mention Cartwright's (1970) *Parents and the Family Planning Services*. A new official survey of family-planning practices is to be carried out by the Government Social Survey.

Migration, another aspect of population change, has also been subjected to survey work, including the Government Social Survey's enquiries into labour mobility in the late 1940's and in the 1960's. On international migration, there is the large-scale international passenger transport survey, carried out for the Board of Trade, which members of the public encounter when they are interviewed in airport lounges and the like (U.K. Board of Trade, 1969).

(b) *Housing*. Inadequate housing perhaps causes more widespread distress than any other social problem, and there is a substantial literature on the subject, some of it involving surveys. The Rowntree Trust sponsored a number of surveys in the late fifties, including Donnison and others' (1961) *Housing since the Rent Act* and Cullingworth's (1965) *English Housing Trends*. The exposure of various malpractices by slum landlords, which came to be known as *Rachmanism* in the early sixties, resulted in the setting up of the Milner Holland Committee on London's housing (U.K. Committee on Housing in Greater London, 1965). Several surveys were commissioned by the Committee, covering landlords, a very difficult group to survey from the point of view of both sampling and response, and tenants. One of these surveys was carried out by Glass and Westergaard (1965) of the Centre for Urban Studies, and is summarized in a study entitled *London's Housing Needs*.

More recently the Centre has undertaken a large survey for the London Borough of Camden, published as the *Report on the Housing Rents Study by the Centre for Urban Studies* (London Borough of Camden, 1969). This consisted of a sample survey in the private sector of three thousand households, and a census of all council tenants' households, covering between thirteen and fourteen thousand households. A smaller-scale study of this kind was done by the Greater London Council as a basis for deciding on its rent policy. A national study excluding London was undertaken by the U.K.



National Board for Prices and Incomes (1968) to help them to decide whether rent increases could be approved. This study illustrates the difficulties differential response rates can cause.

Survey methods have been used to discover the housing needs of special groups such as old people (Hole and Allen, 1962, 1964) and the disabled (Sainsbury, 1970); Sainsbury carried out intensive interviews with the disabled, investigating their problems with respect to finance and employment as well as housing. Surveys have also been used to assess the quality of new housing such as high-rise flats. An example of a study of this kind is the Centre for Urban Studies' survey of the occupants of tall flats in Pimlico (Glass and others, 1964).

(c) *Community studies.* Sociologists and social anthropologists have carried out many general community studies of urban and rural life. Readers interested in early work in this area may like to refer to the work of Brennan, who carried out a sociological survey of south-west Wales in the early fifties (Brennan and others, 1954) and prior to this did a study of a town in the Midlands (Brennan, 1948) based on surveys. Another early study using survey methods is Kuper and others' (1953) *Living in Towns*, which contains a series of studies of life in urban communities in the Midlands. Studies of rural life do not generally use formal survey methods to the same extent as those covering large population units like cities. A complete census of an area is often taken, and in collecting the information there is usually more scope for the skill and insight of the individual investigator than for interviewers and questionnaires. Nevertheless some such studies have made use of social surveys, such as Stewart's (1948) *The Village Surveyed* and Rees' (1951) *Life in a Welsh Countryside*.

The best source for a description of community studies undertaken since that time is Frankenberg's (1966) *Communities in Britain*, which summarizes the findings from a number of studies. Of the studies of urban communities, Stacey's (1960) *Tradition and Change: a Study of Banbury* should be mentioned. More than ten years later the author returned to Banbury to record the changes that had taken place since the original study. Among other community studies are the surveys carried out on urban housing estates, such as Willmott's (1963) study of Dagenham, and the work of Spencer (1964) in Bristol.

(d) *Family life.* This is an area which sometimes presents difficulty for the conventional survey approach. Aspects of intimate social relations, decisions about family size, the way children are brought up, and other such matters are perhaps more likely to be resisted than many other survey subjects. These are also areas in which it is difficult to distinguish between objective appraisal and subjective

interpretation in replies to a questionnaire. Nevertheless, since the mid-fifties there have been some interesting surveys of aspects of family life in Britain.

A recent survey of child upbringing, based on a sample of seven hundred one-year-olds in Nottingham, is that of Newson and Newson (1963, 1965). It collected information about infant feeding, toilet training, and discipline, and studied the role fathers play in caring for their children. The study demonstrated the value of using interviewers rather than health visitors for this kind of purpose. The authors subsequently produced a further book entitled *Four Years Old in an Urban Community* (Newson and Newson, 1968) which is based on a follow-up of the same sample. They intend to study these children for some years, in order to provide information on such questions as the relationship between early upbringing and later schooling.

The Institute of Community Studies in Bethnal Green has carried out some more general studies of family life, such as Townsend's (1957) *The Family Life of Old People* and two studies of family relationships in the contrasting areas of Bethnal Green (Young and Willmott, 1957) and Woodford (Willmott and Young, 1960). A more recent study was Rosser and Harris's (1965) *The Family and Social Change*, which amongst other things looked at the incidence of close contacts with kin in a sample of families in Swansea. Another study in Swansea was Bell's (1968) *Middle Class Families*, which combined a survey with a more anthropological approach, involving both participant observation in the community and a detailed investigation of the number of known kin in a small number of families. The social networks of families were investigated in a rather different way by Bott (1957), whose study of roles within the family, and the way these were associated with relationships with kin, is a good example of a survey with a small number of cases treated in great depth. Gavron (1966) took a larger sample of mothers of young children in order to investigate the problems women face while housebound with very young children. Marsden's (1969) survey *Mothers Alone* studies the serious difficulties faced by mothers who lack the support of a husband.

(e) *Sexual behaviour*. There have been no surveys of sexual behaviour in Britain comparable to the Kinsey Reports in the United States, but two studies, both by Schofield, are worth mentioning. One dealt with *The Sexual Behaviour of Young People* (Schofield, 1965a) and gives the findings from interviews with a large random sample of teenagers.<sup>1</sup> The other was his study of homosexuality (Schofield,

<sup>1</sup> This study provides an amusing example of an unclassifiable response to a survey question. When asked 'Are you a virgin?', one girl replied 'Not yet'.

1965b), with an interesting research design covering samples of homosexuals in prisons, homosexual patients undergoing hospital treatment, and other homosexuals, with control groups for the last two groups.

Some of the fertility surveys mentioned in (a) above included questions on contraceptive techniques and attitudes to birth control.

(f) *Family expenditure.* Family expenditure is one of the most obvious fields for the use of traditional survey methods. At the official level these studies originate primarily from the need to revise the weighting basis of retail price indices. Such was the case with the U.K. Ministry of Labour and National Service's (1940-41) survey of the *Weekly Expenditure of Working-Class Households in the United Kingdom in 1937-38* and the enquiry into household expenditure conducted in 1953-54 by the same Ministry (1957) in collaboration with the Central Statistical Office. This latter enquiry combined two methods of data collection, interviewing and record-keeping, questions relating to the household as a whole being dealt with by the interviewer, while records of personal expenditure were completed by the individuals.

The Household Expenditure Survey was followed by the Family Expenditure Survey (U.K. Ministry of Labour, 1961-1967; U.K. Department of Employment and Productivity, 1969, 1970) which has been in continuous operation since 1957. A paper by Kemsley and Nicholson (1960) describes some of the experimental work connected with the two surveys. The survey now has an annual sample of over 10,000 addresses with a rotating sample design. A detailed account of the sampling, fieldwork and coding procedures currently used is given by Kemsley (1969).

In the Family Expenditure Survey individuals are asked to keep a record of expenditure over a particular fortnight. In relation to purchases of durable goods, such as cars and refrigerators, this is a short period, so that there is a relatively high degree of variability in the estimates of expenditure on such goods. In their survey concentrating on purchases of consumer durables, Audits of Great Britain Ltd approach a large number of households and make up to four visits to each at intervals of three months to note products acquired since the last visit.

Many other institutes and researchers have worked on the subject of family expenditure. A pre-1939 investigation of the cost of living of middle-class families was carried out by Massey (1942). This was based on a sample of some 3,000 civil servants, government officials and teachers, and was arranged to be broadly comparable with the official 1937-38 enquiry. The Oxford University Institute of Statistics

carried out a series of surveys on the expenditure and nutrition of small samples of households. A summary of these surveys is given by Schulz (1952). Subsequently Lydall (1955), at the same Institute, conducted a number of interview surveys on the difficult subject of savings; his findings threw a good deal of new light on income distribution, asset structure and so forth. A survey of personal savings conducted in 1955 by the Central Statistical Office with the help of the Government Social Survey and in consultation with the Institute is described by Erritt and Nicholson (1958).

The Department of Applied Economics at Cambridge used household budget surveys as part of its project on the social accounts of Cambridgeshire. This work has been described by Utting and Cole (1953, 1954).

(g) *Nutrition*. A noteworthy nutrition survey was Orr's (1936) *Food, Health and Income*. Unlike most previous and later investigators, Orr concerned himself with optimum, not minimum, dietary requirements. He asked what proportion of the population had a diet adequate for perfect health. To this end he divided the population into six income groups and studied family budget and diet records from twelve regional surveys. Other data on pre-war nutrition are given in a report by the Rowett Research Institute (1955).

In 1941 the Oxford University Institute of Statistics began a series of surveys designed to assess the cost of a 'human needs' diet, which would supply a family of five persons—an unskilled male worker, wife and three children under 14 years of age—with the minimum adequate nutrition. This work followed closely the lines of enquiry adopted with respect to the cost of food by Rowntree (1937) in *The Human Needs of Labour*. Food prices were collected from shops and stores, mainly at Oxford but also in London and Reading. An article by Schulz (1949) summarizes the results up to 1949, and reports on later surveys have been published in the Institute's Bulletin.

The major official survey is the National Food Survey (U.K. National Food Survey Committee, 1968) mentioned on page 14. This was introduced during the Second World War, but gradually its emphasis has shifted from nutritional to economic considerations. A distinctive feature is that housewives are asked to record for one week both the cost and the quantities of the food which enters their households. The Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food uses this dual information in forecasting the demand for agricultural products.

The National Food Survey seeks the quantity of food acquired by the household, rather than the amount eaten by each individual. The U.K. Ministry of Health's (1968) *Pilot Survey of the Nutrition of*

*Young Children in 1963* was carried out to gain experience of the problems of recording individual diets. This is being followed by extensive surveys of the nutrition of children under school age and of expectant mothers.

(h) *Health*. In the past the major concern in the statistical study of health was with mortality, but nowadays the study of morbidity is becoming increasingly important. A number of countries have at one time or another studied morbidity through national health surveys, the most notable of these being the continuing U.S. National Health Survey which, besides providing data on many aspects of the health status of the American people, has been the stimulus for a good deal of methodological research; a description of the Survey's programme is given by the U.S. National Center for Health Statistics (1963). In Britain the Government Social Survey's monthly Survey of Sickness, which began in the Second World War, was terminated in 1952; a description and appraisal of the Survey is given by Logan and Brooke (1957).

Another source of morbidity statistics is provided by general practitioners' clinical records, and many practitioners have analysed their records to chart the morbidity experience of their practice populations and the resulting demands for medical care. In 1955-56 a study was carried out jointly by the College of General Practitioners and the General Register Office in which 171 doctors in 106 practices collaborated in keeping medical information about their patients on specially designed survey record cards for a period of a year; the survey is reported in three volumes (Logan and Cushion, 1958; Logan, 1960; Research Committee of the Council of the College of General Practitioners, 1962). A pre-Second World War study involving the collaboration of 6,000 general practitioners was that of Hill (1951); this was mainly concerned with workloads and pay, and the practitioners were asked to keep records of surgery attendances and home visits for a period of one month. More recently, Shepherd and others (1966) have carried out a survey of psychiatric illness in general practice with the collaboration of the doctors in forty-six general practices in London, who kept medical records for a year on a one-in-eight sample of their adult practice populations.

In the field of mental health, Morris (1969) has recently published a study of institutions for the mentally retarded and the patients in them. Another study of the mentally ill is Walker and McCabe's survey of 1,200 cases made the subject of orders under Part V of the Mental Health Act 1959, which authorizes either guardianship or detentions in hospital. So far only the preliminary findings have been published (de Reuck and Porter, 1968). Rutter and Graham (1966)

report on psychiatric disorders in ten- and eleven-year-old children, based on a survey in the Isle of Wight, and Kay and others (1964) describe old-age disorders, based on a survey in Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Another type of health enquiry is the epidemiological survey, which is a study of an explanatory rather than a descriptive nature. There have been numerous surveys of this sort: we will mention just two areas of enquiry for illustrative purposes. First, perhaps the best-known studies are those investigating the relationship between smoking and cancer; references to some of these studies are given in Chapter 9. Secondly, there are the investigations of the relationship between coronary heart disease and physical activity. Examples here are the comparisons between drivers and conductors on London double-decker buses, and between Government clerks and postmen, for deaths from coronary heart disease, reported by Morris and others (1953); and the analysis of a national necropsy survey by Morris and Crawford (1958) to compare the amount of physical activity involved in a man's last job between three groups, Group A being deaths from coronary heart disease, Group B deaths in a high coronary-artery disease group, and Group C deaths from other conditions (the basal group). Further good examples of the epidemiological approach are given by Hill (1962), who also describes some clinical and field trials. Methods and applications of medical surveys and clinical trials are discussed by Witts (1964).

A health survey of impressive methodological achievement was originally sponsored by the Population Investigation Committee to obtain data on the social and economic aspects of childbearing, expenditure on childbirth, and the use made of maternity services. The enquiry was addressed to all women who were delivered of children in England, Wales and Scotland in a particular week in March 1946, and successful interviews were made with 90 per cent of them (Joint Committee of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and the Population Investigation Committee, 1948; Douglas and Blomfield, 1958). The study has since grown into the National Survey of Health and Development and is currently sponsored by the Medical Research Council. A large number of the original babies—now adults—are still included in the investigation and records of their health, physical development, progress in school, reading, intelligence and occupational choices have been kept; information is now being collected on *their* children.

In 1947 a similar type of survey was undertaken in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, covering all the births in the city in the months of May and June. The children involved have also been followed for a number of years in order to study the diseases of childhood. The

major findings are reported by Spence and others (1954) and Miller and others (1960).

In 1958 a second national survey of births—the Perinatal Mortality Survey—was carried out, again covering all the babies born in England, Wales and Scotland in a particular week in March. The survey was sponsored by the National Birthday Trust Fund and two books have been published on its results, *Perinatal Mortality* by Butler and Bonham (1963) and *Perinatal Problems* by Butler and Alberman (1968). The children are currently being followed in the National Child Development Study (1958 Cohort) and a first report on them at the age of seven has been published by Pringle, Butler and Davie (1966).

A further national survey of births—the British Births Survey—has just been conducted, covering all births in the United Kingdom in the week beginning 5 April 1970. The aim of this new enquiry, which is under the joint auspices of the National Birthday Trust and the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists, is to examine all the factors affecting the well-being of the mother and baby in pregnancy, childbirth and the time immediately after delivery.

Finally, it is worth noting that surveys, besides being used to investigate the community's health, are also used to examine the working of the health services and the public's satisfaction with them. The British Medical Association (1953), for instance, sponsored an enquiry into general practice, one part of which was a field study of a sample of 158 general practices, the other a postal enquiry directed to the remaining 17,616 general-practitioner Principals in the National Health Service. Some 70 per cent of these co-operated. A fuller qualitative appraisal of 'good' general practices was carried out by Taylor (1954) under the sponsorship of the Nuffield Foundation. Cartwright (1964) carried out a survey of people who had been in hospital to discover their satisfaction with the care they received, and she has also carried out a survey of the public and their doctors, the results being presented in *Patients and their Doctors* (Cartwright, 1967).

(i) *Education*. Much of the early survey work on education was concerned with intelligence tests. In the forties and early fifties there were many small-scale surveys into the relationship between intelligence test performance and social background, family size and composition; and to these a paper by Burt (1950) and memoranda presented to the U.K. Royal Commission on Population (1950) serve as guides. A large-scale survey on the trend of intelligence was carried out during this period by the Population Investigation Committee and the Scottish Council for Research in Education (1949). Based on a sample of Scottish schoolchildren of a particular

age group, this was designed to throw light on the question of whether national intelligence was falling. A follow-up volume by the Scottish Council for Research in Education (1953) discusses, among other things, the relationships of measured intelligence to height, weight and social background. In the last ten years there has been a great increase in research on many different aspects of education, but little of this has been concerned with intelligence tests as such. Where some evaluation of pupils' performance is required, measures of attainment and of ability have replaced them.

The wealth of interesting surveys on education makes selection particularly hard, but a few examples can be given. Some of the largest surveys have been undertaken on behalf of government committees investigating various aspects of education. The reports of three of these committees are particularly noteworthy in terms of their uses of surveys. The Crowther Report (Central Advisory Council for Education (England), 1959-1960) throws new light on the nature of early leaving in secondary education, through large surveys of National Servicemen and school leavers. The Robbins Committee (U.K. Committee on Higher Education, 1964) made very extensive use of surveys. Surveys of students in universities, technical colleges, and colleges of education, and of university teachers were undertaken, but perhaps the most interesting of the empirical studies was the sample survey of an entire age group, which presented difficult problems of sampling. The surveys for the Plowden Report on primary education (Central Advisory Council for Education (England), 1967) covered parents, teachers and children, and of these probably the most important were the National and Manchester surveys of children. Both these surveys collected material about the schools and children in the samples, and used interesting methods of analysis to predict attainment among primary school children.

In spite of the relative ease of sampling in surveys concerned with education, and the consequent wealth of examples, there have been few longitudinal studies. The value of such studies is, however, amply demonstrated by the National Survey of Health and Development referred to above (p. 27). This survey, directed by Douglas, is now investigating such matters as the occupational choices and marriage problems of part of the original sample of births in 1946, but since its inception it has produced several books and papers on education (Douglas, 1964, and Douglas, Ross and Simpson, 1968). In due course it will be interesting to compare the findings obtained in the second survey of this type—the National Child Development Study (1958 Cohort), see p. 28—with those of Douglas.

There have been many smaller-scale studies of educational



questions, some of which have been able to collect detailed and valuable information from the respondents concerned. Jackson and Marsden's (1962) study of eighty-eight members of the working class who had successfully overcome the barriers to high achievement that working-class children face is an example of this type of survey. It is also an example of a survey in which much of the information was collected retrospectively. Another small-scale study worth mentioning is Hargreaves' (1967) study of the effects of the organisation and structure of a secondary-modern school on the attitudes, values, behaviour and friendship patterns of its pupils. In this study within a single institution survey methods were combined with participant observation and sociometric techniques.

Finally, we should mention some regular surveys. The first of these is the U.K. Department of Education and Science's (1969) annual School Leavers' Survey, in which information is obtained from head teachers on the qualifications and destinations of a 10 per cent sample of all school leavers. Other examples are the national surveys of attainment carried out by the National Foundation for Educational Research on reading and mathematics in 1956 and 1960 (Pidgeon, 1960, and Jones, 1969), and the Department of Education and Science's surveys of reading ability (U.K. Ministry of Education, 1950, 1957; U.K. Department of Education and Science, 1966). Another survey of reading ability is being conducted in 1970 by the National Foundation to continue both the Department's and its own series. These surveys provide information on the extent to which standards in education are rising. An article by Peaker (1953) describes some of the sampling problems involved in the Ministry of Education's survey.

(j) *Social mobility.* Most surveys of human populations are directly or indirectly concerned with differences in environment, behaviour and attitudes between various social strata. But social scientists have also been specifically interested in movement between strata, both from the point of view of measuring the overall extent of upward or downward mobility, and with a view to understanding the causes of mobility and its consequences for the individual. The conceptual and methodological problems involved in measuring social mobility and making international comparisons have been described by Miller (1960) in an important survey article which includes an extensive bibliography. There are articles on the relationships between education and social mobility, some based on survey findings, in Halsey, Floud and Anderson's (1961) volume *Education, Economy, and Society*. Further evidence on this topic is provided in the surveys published as appendixes to the Robbins Report (U.K. Committee

on Higher Education, 1964). The only British survey to date whose major focus has been social mobility is the study by research workers at the London School of Economics under the direction of Glass (1954). This provided data about the social origin, education and occupational achievement of a national sample of some 10,000 adults. Ancillary investigations included enquiries into the social prestige of occupations, the relationships between education and social mobility, child upbringing and social class, social mobility and marriage, recruitment in a number of professions, and the structure of voluntary organizations. Halsey and Floud at Oxford are planning a new survey on social mobility intended to provide information for comparisons with Glass's findings for the early fifties. It is also hoped to make comparisons with a recent large-scale American study (Blau and Duncan, 1967).

(k) *Occupations and special groups*. There have been interesting surveys of particular occupations carried out to investigate the labour market for the occupation, to study the profession from a sociological viewpoint, or to investigate the effects of the change in status of routine white-collar jobs. The growth of interest in manpower planning, and in industrial relations and industrial organization, has accentuated the demand for surveys of people in relation to their jobs. One of the earliest examples in this field is Bakke's (1933) *The Unemployed Man*. To date no other major survey specially concerned with the unemployed seems to have been published.

Surveys concerned with human relations in industry often rely on informal methods of interviewing and on observational techniques, as for example in Lupton's (1963) study *On the Shop Floor*. The reports by Liverpool University on industrial relations and morale, such as its study of dock workers (Liverpool University, Social Science Department, 1954), provide some interesting examples of early work in this field. Flanders, Pomeranz and Woodward's (1968) more recent study of the John Lewis partnership made use of standard survey methods.

A different kind of group was surveyed by Kelsall (1955), and his book *Higher Civil Servants in Britain from 1870 to the Present Day* provides a good deal of information about the social origins and education of this group. Since then the Fulton Committee has sponsored another survey of civil servants, which covers a wide range of topics including political attitudes and allegiances (Halsey and Crewe, 1969).

Many other groups of public employees have been the subject of surveys. The Government Social Survey interviewed a sample of personnel in the fire service in order to provide the Home Office with information on management at the various levels of command

(Thomas, 1969). Martin and Wilson (1969) carried out a survey on the use of manpower in the police force. Other studies such as the Home Office's *Workloads in Children's Departments* (Grey, 1969) have been concerned to discover the allocation of time between different aspects of a job. A similar study in a different profession is being attempted by the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, which is anxious to cost the different parts of higher education among university teachers. They have asked a sample of one in three university teachers to keep a diary for a week at three different times of the year. University teachers have also been studied in two other recent surveys. Halsey and Trow (1971) used the same sample as the Robbins Committee, one in four of all university teachers, in their study of the attitudes of academics to their work. The Higher Education Research Unit at the London School of Economics has been making a study of the pay and labour market of university staff, and this includes a mail survey of three thousand academics, as well as interviews with a large sub-sample (U.K. National Board for Prices and Incomes, 1970).

The medical profession has also been studied from the point of view of pay. The U.K. Royal Commission on Doctors' and Dentists' Remuneration (1960) sponsored a survey on this subject. Other surveys of doctors include Abel-Smith and Gales' (1964) *British Doctors at Home and Abroad* and Backett and others' (1953, 1954) studies of general practice. Cartwright (1967) has also studied general practitioners, with an interesting sample design. A survey of medical students was carried out for the U.K. Royal Commission on Medical Education (1968).

Moving away from specific occupations to wider groups of people, two large surveys of graduates have been undertaken recently. Rudd and Hatch (1968) took a cohort of students who began graduate work in 1957-58 and investigated the outcome of their studies in terms of qualifications, jobs and pay. Kelsall has also carried out a sample survey of recent graduates, which is in the process of publication. Various surveys of students have been undertaken in connection with student protest in the sixties. One such survey was conducted by members of the academic staff at the London School of Economics (Blackstone and others, 1970), and investigated the extent of participation in the conflict at L.S.E. in 1967; this was based on a complete coverage of the school's full-time students. A survey with definite policy aims was designed to assist the Department of Education and Science to recruit more graduates to the teaching profession (Morton-Williams and others, 1966). Teachers have been the subject of a number of surveys, including Kelsall's (1963) study of women teachers, which was based on a national sample and

analysed some of the facts involved in wastage. The special problems faced by working women were investigated on a wider scale by Hunt (1968) of the Government Social Survey. The survey involved a national random sample of ten thousand households, in which attempts were made to contact all women between 16 and 64.

(1) *Leisure*. There have been many surveys concerned with leisure activities such as cinema-going, reading, gambling and so forth. In the field of television, increasing emphasis is being placed on the effects of particular sorts of programmes on the community, especially on children and young people and on the family. The Nuffield Foundation has sponsored two surveys, the results of which are published by Himmelweit and others (1958) in the book *Television and the Child*, and by Belson (1959a) in *Television and the Family*; both surveys contain some interesting aspects of methodology. As mentioned earlier, the BBC and JICTAR carry out regular surveys to measure audiences for particular programmes, and the Television Research Committee at Leicester University, in its role as 'initiator and co-ordinator of research into the part which television plays or could play as a medium of communications and fostering of attitudes', has also sponsored a number of surveys.

Two major national surveys outlining leisure patterns are *The Pilot National Recreation Survey*, carried out jointly by the British Travel Association and the University of Keele (Rodgers, 1967, 1969), which was concerned with outdoor recreation in the context of the total time spent on leisure, and the Government Social Survey's *Planning for Leisure* by Sillitoe (1969), which examined the recreation patterns of urban populations. In addition there have been numerous surveys of particular regions and resources. Examples of more specialized surveys are *Recreation and Tourism in the Loch Lomond Area* by Nicholls and Young (1968) and *Outdoor Leisure Activities in the Northern Region*, a report by the Northern Region Planning Committee (1969). In addition, the British Travel Association (1969)—now called the British Tourist Authority—regularly studies the holiday patterns of the British at home and of foreign tourists in the United Kingdom.

Among more sociologically oriented studies, we may mention Rowntree and Lavers' (1951b) book *English Life and Leisure*, which took its material from a large number of informal interviews and some 1,000 case histories, about a fifth of which are recorded. Another book giving an interesting view of leisure habits and urban life generally is Cauter and Downham's (1954) *The Communication of Ideas*. The bulk of the material came from a sample survey in Derby, which investigated elements of modern life connected with the

communication and spread of ideas—education, reading, radio and television, the cinema, religion, travelling, and so forth.

A vivid picture of the leisure pursuits of working-class people is drawn in Zweig's (1948) *Labour, Life and Poverty*. Zweig developed successfully a mode of social study that owes little to the formal techniques of surveys, such as sampling, standardized interviewing and questionnaires, and a great deal to his personality, his ability to get people talking, and his skill in knitting their remarks and his observations into a coherent picture. A skilled investigator using this informal approach (which was, in a sense, originated by Mayhew) can provide a fuller, more lively picture than the complex apparatus of the representative sample survey. However, the two approaches achieve different ends and can rarely be considered as alternatives.

(m) *Travel*. Most people spend a good deal of their lives travelling, whether for commuting, business or leisure purposes, and the subject is clearly of sociological interest. An early social and economic analysis fortified in part by survey data was Liepmann's (1944) *The Journey to Work*. More recently, extensive surveys of travel in Great Britain have been sponsored by the U.K. Ministry of Transport (1967) and, with Ministry support, by a number of major local authorities, including the Greater London Council (1969). Land-use transportation studies, many involving substantial household-interview surveys, have now been carried out in almost every major conurbation (including Merseyside, the West Midlands, West Yorkshire, Tyneside and South-East Lancashire—North-East Cheshire); the Merseyside study (Merseyside Area Land-Use Transportation Study, 1969) is a particularly good example of this type. The Teesside area, though not a conurbation, has also been the subject of a detailed study, with particular emphasis on urban planning (U.K. Ministry of Housing and Local Government and Ministry of Transport, 1969). References to surveys concerned with travel to and from the United Kingdom have been made above.

(n) *Political behaviour*. Opinion polls apart, until quite recently survey techniques have not been as fully exploited in studying political behaviour in Britain as one might have expected. Among the first informative election surveys was that by Milne and MacKenzie (1954) for the constituency of Bristol North-East at the general election of 1951. Two studies relating to the 1950 election can be mentioned: Birch and Campbell (1950) used survey techniques in an analysis of *Voting Behaviour in a Lancashire Constituency*, which they conducted immediately after the election, and Benney, Gray and Pear (1956) carried out a study of voting behaviour in Greenwich before and up to the 1950 election.

A book by Bonham (1954) analysed opinion-poll and other data to study the voting behaviour of the 'middle classes'. Since then, the only other major survey study focused on the political behaviour of the middle class is Parkin's (1968) work on *Middle Class Radicalism*. This is concerned with the social characteristics of the supporters of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and is based on a sample of approximately 850 adult members and youth supporters of the movement. There have been several studies of working-class political attitudes, and in particular of working-class conservatism. Runciman (1966) investigated this in his book *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice*, and since then there have been two important studies of this phenomenon using survey methods. The first is McKeuzie and Silver's (1968) work, based on interviews with samples of working-class voters. The second is the major study by Goldthorpe and others (1968a, 1968b) of the political and economic attitudes of affluent workers, more specifically employees of the motor industry in Luton.

Reference should be made to an early critical bibliography on electoral behaviour published by UNESCO (Dupeux, 1954-55) and to an expository article by Butler (1955a), who has also published analyses of every general election in Britain since 1951 (Butler, 1952, 1955b; Butler and Rose, 1960; Butler and King, 1965, 1966). A major work studying the forces shaping electoral choice during this century, *Political Change in Britain*, has recently been published by Butler and Stokes (1969). This includes a large interview survey of two thousand randomly selected electors, which provides a good example of the technique of re-interviewing the same sample over several years. The book also contains interesting examples of the way data from a survey may be interwoven with evidence from other sources to interpret human behaviour.

Two studies attempting to discover the effects of television on voting behaviour should also be mentioned. The first, based on surveys carried out in Leeds in 1959 (Trenaman and McQuail, 1961), failed to find any marked effect of television on attitudes or voting choice during the election campaign. But when the study was repeated in the same constituencies in 1964 the findings were different; exposure to television was found to relate to increased support for the Liberals (Blumler and McQuail, 1968).

Although there is now more survey work in studying general elections, survey research on local elections is still rare. Here there is more opportunity for secondary analysis by relating the voting returns to census data, since votes are counted by wards, rather than by constituencies as in parliamentary elections. Potentially, this should be a rewarding field for survey research.

(o) *Race relations and minority groups.* Until the late fifties relatively few surveys in Britain had concerned themselves specifically with race relations or minority groups. Then the wider interest in racial problems led to a rapid increase in survey activity. Among the earlier enquiries are those of Glass and Patterson, who both studied West Indians in Brixton; Glass's (1960) study made more use of formal survey techniques, whilst Patterson (1963) took a non-random sample and relied more heavily on participant observation. A few years before this, Robb (1954) carried out a survey in the East End of London on anti-semitic attitudes, and Banton (1959) investigated attitudes to racial minorities. Earlier still, in an enquiry making more marginal use of formal survey methods, Little (1948) employed anthropological techniques in a study of the coloured community in Liverpool.

The establishment of the Institute of Race Relations has led to the more extensive investigation of both prejudice and discrimination, and to studies involving the use of surveys on such questions as the education of immigrants. Readers should refer to the Institute's journal *Race* for short reports of surveys in this field. Three major studies must also be mentioned. Daniel's (1968) study for Political and Economic Planning, *Racial Discrimination in England*, is interesting for its revelations on the differences in attitudes towards white and coloured minority groups. It is also of methodological interest, since it attempts to set up an experimental situation by sending people from different ethnic minorities, with identical qualifications, to apply for the same jobs, and then tests the reactions of the employers. Rex and Moore (1967) studied race relations in a Birmingham community by means of a large sample survey of immigrants and local inhabitants, and concluded that the most important source of stress for both groups was poor housing. In investigating the incidence of prejudiced attitudes for the report *Colour and Citizenship*, Rose and others (1969) took a sample of five hundred white adults from five areas with a high concentration of immigrants, as well as a national sample of 2,250 people to serve as a control group.

(p) *Old age.* It is not surprising that the problems of old age have attracted the attention of social researchers, in view of the acute physical, social and economic hardships affecting old people. The Nuffield Foundation sponsored some early survey work in this area, such as *Old People* (Nuffield Foundation, 1947) and a follow-up enquiry to this, *The Social Medicine of Old Age* (Sheldon, 1948). In the late fifties and early sixties there were a number of studies of the economic situation in which old people found themselves, and of

these Cole and Utting's (1962) *The Economic Circumstances of Old People* and Townsend and Wedderburn's (1965) *The Aged in the Welfare State* are examples. Another type of study concerned with old age is Townsend's (1962b) *The Last Refuge*, a survey of institutions rather than individuals, which shows the great variations in the standards of old people's homes.

Since the elderly are major users of the social services, the government is also interested in surveying their needs. The survey sponsored by the U.K. Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance (1966) on *Financial and other Circumstances of Retirement Pensioners* is one example. A study published two years later *Social Welfare for the Elderly* (Harris, 1968), carried out on behalf of the National Corporation for the Care of Old People with the support of government departments, is another; it examined the unsatisfied need for local authority and other services, including housing for the elderly, by collecting information from officials, recipients of existing services and a general sample of the elderly. An earlier survey sponsored by the government was designed to find out why people retire or continue at work (U.K. Ministry of Pensions and National Insurance, 1954).

(q) *Crime and deviant behaviour.* The formal survey approach is often difficult to employ in the study of juvenile delinquency and criminal behaviour. Random samples of the population are rarely appropriate, and samples must usually be drawn from those actually committed to institutions of one kind or another or from those brought before the courts. Special care also has to be taken in eliciting the information required. A good deal of empirical work in this field is in fact based on a secondary analysis of existing data such as the criminal statistics. Some researchers have collected their own material, but in a way different to the conventional survey; Parker and Allerton have used unstructured taped interviews with offenders, which provide much illuminating material and throw light on the causes of deviance (Parker and Allerton, 1962; see Parker, 1967, 1968). But all this does not mean that formal surveys can never be of use. An early study, largely statistical, of juvenile delinquents was that of Carr-Saunders, Mannheim and Rhodes (1942). The material dated from 1938, when the first 1,000 juveniles brought to court after a particular date were studied, and their social and environmental characteristics compared with those of controls coming from the same age groups and schools as the delinquents. Another important pre-war study was Cyril Burt's (1944) *The Young Delinquent*. A further investigation of young delinquents was Ferguson's (1952) *The Young Delinquent in his Social Setting*, which was based on a study of a large number of boys in Glasgow.



The problems of longitudinal surveys in this field are illustrated by Martin Webster's (1971) *The Social Consequences of Conviction*. To discover the nature and extent of the social stigma experienced as a result of a conviction for a criminal offence, two hundred men convicted in Reading were followed for a number of years.

A number of studies have been carried out in penal institutions, several of them employing participant observation, the researcher either joining the prison staff or becoming an inmate. (This technique has also been used in the study of deviant sub-cultures outside prisons or other such institutions, such as drug-takers.) Other studies have sampled inmate populations in a more conventional way. Gibbens (1963) has studied Borstal boys, specially emphasizing psychological factors, and is now studying women offenders, interviewing every other entrant to Holloway at reception. An earlier example of a survey of a prison population is Roper's (1950, 1951) study of prisoners at Wakefield gaol. Pauline Morris's (1965) study *Prisoners and their Families* threw light on the special problems of prisoners' wives and children.

Two other studies in progress are worth mentioning. Willett and Hood are studying motoring offenders and a control group of non-offenders with the aim of discovering the effects of sentences and the characteristics of non-offenders. A very different kind of group, children in residential homes, which nevertheless in some sense falls into the category of deviants, is the subject of a study by Tizard, Akhurst and Rosen. The emphasis is on child-care practices in the homes and the major sampling unit is the institution. This is an example of a survey investigating various levels of a problem, since both the policies of the local authorities and the characteristics of the individual children will be studied.

The Home Office Research Unit has been responsible for a number of important surveys. One of the most interesting is the probation research project, whose major aim is to measure the success of probation for different types of offenders (Folkard and others, 1966; Barr, 1966; Barr and O'Leary, 1966; Davies, 1967). It has also carried out a number of studies of women offenders (Goodman and Price, 1967), including a study of girls appearing before a juvenile court, which involved interviewing the girls and their mothers. Three of the Unit's other current surveys should be mentioned. The first is a longitudinal study of juvenile offenders in Crawley, which includes a comparison with a control sample of non-delinquent children and a follow-up of the offenders until they are seventeen. The others are both concerned with the examination of penal methods: in the first, after-care units and prison welfare officers are surveyed, as well as ex-prisoners receiving after-care; the

second involves a survey of prisoners selected for parole compared with those rejected, and attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of parole and its relationship to recidivism.

The Survey Research Centre at the London School of Economics has carried out a series of studies on methodological questions concerned with the study of delinquency. The Centre has tried to develop special techniques for eliciting information from boys about matters like undetected criminal activity (Belson and others, 1968). The successful application of such techniques would be an important step forward in surveys of delinquency.

### *Concluding remark*

We again emphasize that this chapter is not to be taken as an exhaustive or critical survey of surveys. Its purpose has been simply to illustrate the evolution and range of social surveys in Great Britain and the wide variety of subject matter to which the techniques have been and are being applied.

## NOTES ON READING

1. Short and readable accounts of the development of surveys are given by JONES (1948) and ABRAMS (1951), and by RUTH and DAVID GLASS (1950). MADGE (1953) critically discusses a number of enquiries. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC PLANNING (1950) have published two broadsheets on the use of sample surveys in various fields. A much earlier book on social surveys, in the classical community-study sense, is that by WELLS (1935).

2. The student is recommended to read some of the original reports on the early surveys which have become classics in their field, combining factual usefulness with a wealth of material and a vividness of description absent from many of their modern successors.

3. This is the appropriate point for commenting on the book literature on surveys. There are a number of good textbooks on methods of social research in general, covering survey techniques. Perhaps the best of the modern texts is the book by SELTZ and others (1959). Other useful references are FESTINGER and KATZ (1953), GOODE and HATT (1952), MADGE (1953), RILEY (1963), DUVERGER (1964), PHILLIPS (1966), SIMON (1969), YOUNG (1966), DOBY (1967), MARK (1958) and SJOBERG and NETT (1968). A detailed account of practical survey procedures is given by PARTEN (1950), and there is a manual on survey methods by BACKSTROM and HURSH (1963). GALTUNG (1967) gives an interesting classificatory analysis of social research methods. FORCESE and RICHER (1970) and TUFTE (1970) have edited useful collections of articles on social research methodology. Shorter introductions to social research are provided by MANN (1968), SCHOFIELD (1969), STACEY (1969a) and THOMLINSON (1965). MOSTELLER and others (1949) give an authoritative post-mortem of the 1948 failure of the American pollsters and an important critical account of polling