

Appendix B. Statistical modelling analyses

As stated in the main part of the report, to ensure that any differences observed between the cities for any of the questions/topics included in the survey were not simply the result of differences in the characteristics of the sample (e.g. age, gender, social class), all the main topics were analysed by means a series of multivariate regression models.

In all models the ‘outcome’ (or dependent) variable was the particular questionnaire topic or question (for example, each respondent’s score in the ‘sense of coherence’ scale, or for one of the social capital questions, whether or not the respondent said that ‘most people in the neighbourhood could be trusted’), and the ‘predictor’ (or independent) variables were the city of residence (Glasgow, Liverpool or Manchester) and the following sample characteristics: age, gender, ethnicity, social class, area deprivation quintile, educational attainment, employment status, marital status, health status, and length of residence in the city. For models examining answers to questions about the 1980s (limited to those who were aged at least 16 by 1990, and who were resident in the same city in that decade), a derived variable relating to employment status in the 1980s was additionally included as an independent variable. All the independent variables and their categories are shown in Table B1 below.

Table B1. Predictor/independent variables used in regression modelling analyses.

Variable	Categories († denotes reference category)
City of residence	Glasgow†
	Liverpool
	Manchester
Gender	Male†
	Female
Age	16-29†
	30-44
	45-64
	65 and older
Social grade	A (higher managerial, administrative or professional) and B (intermediate managerial, administrative or professional) ^{†i}
	C1 (supervisory, clerical and junior managerial, administrative or professional)
	C2 (skilled manual workers)
	D (semi and unskilled manual workers)
	E (on state benefits/unemployed/lowest grade workers)
Employment status	Employed (PT/FT)†
	Unemployed
	Ill/disabled
	Retired

ⁱ Note that Social Grades ‘A’ and ‘B’ were combined into one single category because of the very small number of respondents in each city classed as Social Grade ‘A’.

Variable	Categories († denotes reference category)
	Looking after home/family
	In education/training (PT/FT)
Educational attainment	No qualifications†
	Some qualifications, but not degree level ⁱⁱ
	1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent) ⁱⁱⁱ
Deprivation quintile^{iv}	1 (Most deprived)†
	2
	3
	4
	5 (Least deprived)
Ethnicity	Not a member of ethnic minority group†
	Member of ethnic minority group ^v
Marital status	Never married†
	Married/civil partnership
	Separated/divorced
	Widowed/surviving partner
Long-term limiting illness	None†
	Limited a little
	Limited a lot
Self-assessed health	Good/very good†
	Fair
	Bad/very bad
Length of residence	Time in city not known†

ⁱⁱ No degree level qualifications but one of the following categories: O Grade, Standard Grade, O Level, Access 3 Cluster, Intermediate 1 or 2, GCSE, CSE, Senior Certificate or equivalent; SCE Higher Grade, Higher, Advanced Higher, CSYS, A level, AS Level, Advanced Senior Certificate or equivalent; GNVQ/GSVQ Foundation or Intermediate, NVQ/SVQ Level 1 or 2, SCOTVEC Module, City and Guilds Craft or equivalent; GNVQ/GSVQ Advanced, NVQ/SVQ Level 3, ONC, OND, SCOTVEC National Diploma, City and Guilds Advanced Craft or equivalent; HNC, HND, NVQ/SVQ level 4 or equivalent; Professional qualifications; Other school qualifications not already mentioned (including foreign qualifications); Other post-school but pre-Higher Education qualifications not already mentioned (including foreign qualifications); Other Higher Education qualifications not already mentioned (including foreign qualifications); Other vocational/work related qualifications.

ⁱⁱⁱ Full list on questionnaire: First Degree, Postgraduate qualifications, Masters, PhD, NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent.

^{iv} Based on 'income deprivation'; in 2005, the measure used in the 2010 report of deprivation and mortality in Glasgow, Liverpool and Manchester (cited at various points within this report), and defined in detail within that report.

^v Includes the following categories: White and Black Caribbean; White and Black African; White and Asian; Any other mixed or multiple ethnic groups; Indian; Pakistani; Bangladeshi; Chinese; Any other Asian background; African; Caribbean; Black; Any other Black / African / Caribbean background; Arab; Any other ethnic group. The full list of all categories included in the question are available in Appendix E.

Variable	Categories († denotes reference category)
(approximate)	Possibly long-term resident ^{vi}
Age (1980s 'political effects' models only)	36-49†
	50-64
	65 and older
Employment status (1980s 'political effects' models only) ^{vii}	Employed (PT/FT)/in education/training†
	Unemployed
	Ill/disabled
	Retired
	Looking after home/family
Employment status in 1980s (1980s 'political effects' models only)	Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†
	Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship
	Looking after family/working and looking after family
	In employment
	Other & other combinations

Models were either based on linear regression or logistic regression, depending on the type of outcome variable being examined: linear regression was used for 'continuous' outcome variables such as the sense of coherence score, while logistic regression was used for 'binary' outcomes (0 or 1) such as whether or not respondents recorded that they thought people in their neighbourhood could be trusted (e.g. recorded as '1' if the respondent said people could be trusted, or recorded as '0' if they did not).

Models were built incrementally, but only significant variables were included in the final models. All models were run using SPSS statistical software. For logistic regression models, categorical predictor variables were included as shown in Table C1 above; for the linear regression models, 'dummy' variables were derived matching the above categories.

Models were run using weighted and unweighted data. The results of the weighted analyses only are presented in this report^{viii}.

^{vi} In analysing the data it seemed important to distinguish the views of those who had been resident in their city for a long time and those who had not. However, no specific question on length of residence in the city was included in the survey. Thus, a crude measure of likely length of residence was derived from other available information: respondents were asked how long they had lived in their neighbourhood as part of the social capital questions (with options ranging from 'under six months' to 'over five years', and those who lived through the 1980s (i.e. were aged at least 36 at the time of the survey) were additionally asked in which city they were resident for most of that decade. From those two questions, respondents were categorised as being 'Possibly long-term resident' (based on either being resident in their neighbourhood for five years or more, or having been in the same city in the 1980s) or 'length of residence in city unknown'.

^{vii} Due to the reduced sample size available for the 1980s modelling analyses, the categories of 'Employed (PT/FT)' and 'in education/training' were combined (less than ten respondents across all three cities who had lived through the 1980s (and who were resident in the same city then as at the time of the survey) were in education or training).

^{viii} Modelling of the unweighted data was undertaken as a precaution as the use of weights in some regression analyses can complicate interpretation of the results. Generally, however, there were very little differences

A number of tests were employed and statistics checked to ensure accuracy and ‘robustness’ of the models (for example, checking the ‘goodness of fit’ of the data in the models, checking that required assumptions had been met, and that the results were not overly influenced by specific cases). These are listed briefly below.

Linear regression models:

- The assumption of normally distributed errors^{1,2} was checked through examination of histograms and normal probability plots of the residuals in each model.
- The independent errors assumption^{2,3} (i.e. the independence of the residuals in the models) was checked by means of the Durbin-Watson test³, ensuring values were close to 2². However, the test could only be run with unweighted data (although, as stated, the results of weighted and unweighted models were broadly very similar).
- All variables were checked beforehand to ensure there was ‘non-zero variance’².
- The assumption of homoscedasticity² (i.e. that the variance of the residuals in the model should be constant) was checked by means of plotting the standardised residuals with the standardised predicted values of the outcome variable.
- All predictor variables were tested for co-linearity by means of calculation and checking of the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and ‘Tolerance’ statistics: any VIF values greater than 10 or Tolerance statistics less than 0.1 or 0.2 would potentially indicate problematic levels of co-linearity^{2,4,5}.
- The fit of the model was checked through the value of R² and adjusted R² statistics, and the value and significance of the *F* ratio statistic in the analysis of variance (ANOVA). The potential for cases exerting undue influence in the model was checked by means of: examining the distribution of the standardised residuals to ensure that no more than approximately 5% had values above 2, and no more than 1% had values above 2.5²; ensuring values of the Cook’s Distance statistic was less than 1⁶; checking for values two or three times the average leverage^{7,8}; checking the DFBeta statistic (the standardised version of the Cook’s Distance) for any values greater than 1²; examining the covariance ratio (CVR) (for any values outside the acceptable range)^{ix,9}.

Logistic regression models:

- The ‘goodness of fit’ of the data in the logistic regression models was checked by means of: the -2 x log-likelihood statistic and its Chi-square statistic (a Chi-square value of <0.05 indicating a significant fit); the Homer & Lemeshow test (a significant value suggesting a poor goodness of fit); and the value of the Cox & Snell R² statistic². A number of the same tests and statistics listed above were used to identify cases with undue influence i.e. Cook’s Distance, distribution of standardised residuals, average leverage and DFBeta.

between the values (coefficients or odds ratios) obtained for the cities in the weighted compared with the unweighted models.

^{ix} i.e. 1 plus three times the average leverage (for upper limit), and 1 minus three times the average leverage.

- The Tolerance and VIF statistics were again checked to assess any problems with co-linearity among the independent variables.

The values of these various tests and checks associated with each statistical model are not reported here; however, they are available on request.

For the main topics included in the questionnaire, a series of additional models was run for the Glasgow sample only. This was to show which characteristics of the sample were significantly associated with differences in the outcomes (survey questions) within a specifically Glasgow context.

The results of the main regression analyses are presented in the following pages of this appendix. Results from the key Glasgow-only analyses are included within Appendix C.

Any modelling analyses from the survey not presented within these Appendices are available on request.

References for Appendix B.

1. Altman DG. *Practical Statistics for Medical Research*. London: Chapman & Hall; 1991.
2. Field A. *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd edition). London, UK: SAGE Publications; 2005.
3. Durbin J, Watson GS. Testing for Serial Correlation in Least Squares Regression, II. *Biometrika* 1951;38:159-179.
4. Myers R. *Classical and modern regression with applications* (2nd Edition). Boston, MA, USA: Duxbury; 1990.
5. Menard S. Applied logistic regression analysis. Series: quantitative applications in the social sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications; 1995.
6. Cook RD, Weisberg S. *Residuals and influence in regression*. New York, NY, USA: Chapman & Hall; 1982.
7. Hoaglin D, Welsch R. The hat matrix in regression and ANOVA. *American Statistician* 1978;32:17-22.
8. Stevens JP. *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (2nd Edition). Hillside, NJ, USA: Erlbaum; 1992.
9. Belsey DA, Kuh E, Welsch R. *Regression diagnostics: identifying influential data and sources of collinearity*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley; 1980.

Sense of Coherence (SoC-13)

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

Sense of Coherence (SoC)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	66.08			
Liverpool	61.09	-4.99 (-5.95 to -4.03)	-10.16	****
Manchester	57.98	-8.10 (-9.06 to -7.14)	-16.56	****
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	66.08			
4	67.82	1.75 (0.74 to 2.75)	3.40	***
5 (Least deprived)	67.72	1.64 (0.60 to 2.68)	3.08	**
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	66.08			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	68.70	2.62 (1.64 to 3.60)	5.25	****
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	70.39	4.31 (2.92 to 5.70)	6.08	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	66.08			
Unemployed	59.58	-6.50 (-7.78 to -5.21)	-9.93	****
Ill/disabled	59.39	-6.69 (-8.54 to -4.84)	-7.08	****
Retired	69.26	3.18 (1.52 to 4.85)	3.75	***
Married/civil partnership	67.67	1.59 (0.77 to 2.41)	3.81	***
Self-assessed health				
Good/very good†	66.08			
Fair	61.13	-4.94 (-6.05 to -3.84)	-8.78	****
Bad/very bad	58.84	-7.23 (-8.90 to -5.57)	-8.51	****
Age group				
16-29†	66.08			
65+	68.51	2.43 (0.69 to 4.17)	2.73	**

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

SoC (manageability)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	20.52			
Liverpool	19.14	-1.37 (-1.71 to -1.04)	-8.12	****
Manchester	18.07	-2.44 (-2.77 to -2.11)	-14.50	****
Gender				
Male†	20.52			
Female	20.18	-0.33 (-0.61 to -0.06)	-2.38	*
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	20.52			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	21.14	0.62 (0.29 to 0.95)	3.65	***
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	21.34	0.82 (0.36 to 1.28)	3.47	***
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	20.52			
Unemployed	18.38	-2.13 (-2.58 to -1.69)	-9.42	****
Ill/disabled	18.86	-1.65 (-2.29 to -1.02)	-5.08	****
Retired	22.17	1.65 (1.24 to 2.06)	7.95	****
Marital status				
Never married†	20.52			
Married/civil partnership	20.94	0.42 (0.14 to 0.70)	2.92	**
Self-assessed health				
Good/very good†	20.52			
Fair	18.74	-1.78 (-2.16 to -1.40)	-9.19	****
Bad/very bad	18.34	-2.17 (-2.74 to -1.60)	-7.43	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

SoC (meaningfulness)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	20.99			
Liverpool	19.77	-1.23 (-1.58 to -0.88)	-6.96	****
Manchester	18.07	-2.93 (-3.27 to -2.58)	-16.60	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	20.99			
E (On state benefit/unemployed/lowest grade workers)	20.51	-0.48 (-0.94 to -0.02)	-2.05	*
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	20.99			
3	21.60	0.60 (0.21 to 1.00)	2.98	**
4	22.00	1.01 (0.62 to 1.39)	5.07	****
5 (Least deprived)	21.61	0.62 (0.22 to 1.02)	3.02	**
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	20.99			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	22.05	1.05 (0.70 to 1.41)	5.85	****
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	23.02	2.03 (1.52 to 2.53)	7.88	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	20.99			
Unemployed	18.69	-2.31 (-2.82 to -1.79)	-8.83	****
Ill/disabled	18.41	-2.58 (-3.27 to -1.9)	-7.37	****
Retired	22.13	1.14 (0.71 to 1.56)	5.22	****
Marital status				
Never married†	20.99			
Married/civil partnership	21.41	0.41 (0.12 to 0.71)	2.75	**
Self-assessed health				
Good/very good†	20.99			
Fair	19.53	-1.47 (-1.86 to -1.07)	-7.25	****
Bad/very bad	18.53	-2.47 (-3.06 to -1.87)	-8.08	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model
 2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model
 3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001
- † - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

SoC (comprehensibility)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	25.02			
Liverpool	22.60	-2.42 (-2.83 to -2.00)	-11.43	****
Manchester	22.28	-2.74 (-3.15 to -2.32)	-13.01	****
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	25.02			
4	25.60	0.58 (0.15 to 1.02)	2.64	**
5 (Least deprived)	25.92	0.90 (0.45 to 1.35)	3.92	****
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	25.02			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	25.81	0.79 (0.37 to 1.21)	3.69	***
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	26.35	1.33 (0.73 to 1.93)	4.35	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	25.02			
Unemployed	23.13	-1.89 (-2.44 to -1.33)	-6.68	****
Ill/disabled	22.70	-2.32 (-3.12 to -1.53)	-5.72	****
Retired	26.15	1.13 (0.40 to 1.85)	3.06	**
Marital status				
Never married†	25.02			
Married/civil partnership	25.82	0.80 (0.44 to 1.16)	4.39	****
Self-assessed health				
Good/very good†	25.02			
Fair	23.39	-1.63 (-2.10 to -1.15)	-6.72	****
Bad/very bad	22.45	-2.57 (-3.29 to -1.85)	-7.03	****
Age group				
16-29†	25.02			
30-44	24.49	-0.53 (-0.95 to -0.12)	-2.52	*
65+	26.10	1.07 (0.32 to 1.83)	2.80	**

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Social Capital

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

views of neighbourhood - where people help each other

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	53.73	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	20.99	****	1.56 (1.29 to 1.88)
Manchester	10.59	**	0.69 (0.56 to 0.86)
Gender	10.03	**	
Male†			1.00
Female	10.03	**	1.32 (1.11 to 1.56)
Ethnicity	32.94	****	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	32.94	****	2.13 (1.65 to 2.76)
Deprivation quintile	16.28	**	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	3.20		1.29 (0.98 to 1.70)
3	4.78	*	1.37 (1.03 to 1.81)
4	8.11	**	1.50 (1.13 to 1.97)
5 (Least deprived)	15.38	****	1.75 (1.32 to 2.32)
Socio-economic group	12.97	*	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	1.29		0.85 (0.65 to 1.12)
C2 (skilled manual)	0.05		0.97 (0.73 to 1.29)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.63		1.12 (0.84 to 1.50)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	5.32	*	0.66 (0.46 to 0.94)
Employment status	47.50	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	1.75		0.80 (0.58 to 1.11)
Ill/disabled	0.58		1.15 (0.80 to 1.65)
Retired	4.51	*	1.28 (1.02 to 1.61)
Looking after home/family	1.70		0.81 (0.59 to 1.11)
In education/training (PT/FT)	35.80	****	0.36 (0.26 to 0.50)
Length of residence	8.56	**	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	8.56	**	1.33 (1.10 to 1.62)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

views of neighbourhood - where people go their own way

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Age group	12.58	**	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	0.46		0.93 (0.76 to 1.14)
45-64	7.25	**	1.40 (1.10 to 1.79)
65+	0.92		1.16 (0.86 to 1.55)
Deprivation quintile	32.57	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	4.65	*	0.78 (0.62 to 0.98)
3	1.22		0.88 (0.70 to 1.10)
4	10.62	**	0.68 (0.54 to 0.86)
5 (Least deprived)	27.70	****	0.52 (0.41 to 0.66)
Educational attainment	8.82	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.05		1.02 (0.86 to 1.21)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	6.20	*	0.71 (0.55 to 0.93)
Length of residence	17.19	****	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	17.19	****	0.65 (0.53 to 0.80)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

belief that return of lost wallet/purse is very or quite likely

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	37.77	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	35.75	****	1.73 (1.44 to 2.07)
Manchester	3.07		1.18 (0.98 to 1.43)
Gender	5.36	*	
Male†			1.00
Female	5.36	*	1.19 (1.03 to 1.39)
Age group	14.04	**	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	3.46		0.80 (0.64 to 1.01)
45-64	1.65		1.20 (0.91 to 1.60)
65+	1.62		1.25 (0.89 to 1.76)
Socio-economic group	29.81	****	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	14.50	***	0.63 (0.5 to 0.80)
C2 (skilled manual)	20.19	****	0.55 (0.42 to 0.71)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	6.81	**	0.70 (0.54 to 0.92)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	22.83	****	0.50 (0.37 to 0.66)
Deprivation quintile	47.74	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.34		1.08 (0.83 to 1.40)
3	2.35		1.22 (0.95 to 1.57)
4	14.92	***	1.63 (1.27 to 2.08)
5 (Least deprived)	32.77	****	2.09 (1.62 to 2.68)
Marital status	13.92	**	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	4.24	*	1.23 (1.01 to 1.51)
Separated/divorced	3.01		0.76 (0.56 to 1.04)
Widowed/surviving partner	0.09		0.94 (0.64 to 1.38)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	11.76	**	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	0.62		1.11 (0.86 to 1.43)
Limited a lot	11.60	***	1.82 (1.29 to 2.56)
Self-assessed health	7.80	*	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	5.51	*	0.76 (0.60 to 0.96)
Bad/very bad	5.16	*	0.65 (0.45 to 0.94)
Length of residence	6.57	*	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	6.57	*	1.31 (1.07 to 1.62)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

views of neighbourhood - likelihood of recording at least one very or fairly big problem

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	96.57	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	81.81	****	2.26 (1.90 to 2.70)
Manchester	66.44	****	2.09 (1.75 to 2.49)
Deprivation quintile	196.72	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	1.24		0.88 (0.71 to 1.10)
3	18.03	****	0.62 (0.50 to 0.78)
4	57.34	****	0.43 (0.35 to 0.53)
5 (Least deprived)	150.13	****	0.22 (0.17 to 0.28)
Marital status	28.36	****	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	5.08	*	0.84 (0.71 to 0.98)
Separated/divorced	9.23	**	1.46 (1.15 to 1.87)
Widowed/surviving partner	9.30	**	0.63 (0.47 to 0.85)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

whether taken action to solve a problem in last 12 months

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Age group	16.22	**	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	15.46	****	3.02 (1.74 to 5.23)
45-64	11.13	***	2.80 (1.53 to 5.11)
65+	10.22	**	3.06 (1.54 to 6.07)
Socio-economic group	12.20	*	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	4.95	*	0.61 (0.39 to 0.94)
C2 (skilled manual)	5.98	*	0.53 (0.32 to 0.88)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	8.56	**	0.43 (0.24 to 0.75)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	8.11	**	0.40 (0.22 to 0.75)
Educational attainment	8.13	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	2.43		1.41 (0.92 to 2.16)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	8.00	**	2.22 (1.28 to 3.85)
Length of residence	9.98	**	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	9.98	**	2.13 (1.33 to 3.41)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with: perception of neighbourhood - people do not share same values (very/fairly strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Educational attainment	6.84	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	4.36	*	0.84 (0.72 to 0.99)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	0.21		1.05 (0.84 to 1.32)
Length of residence	26.81	****	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	26.81	****	1.48 (1.28 to 1.72)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

having volunteered in last 12 months

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	55.53	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	47.68	****	2.60 (1.98 to 3.41)
Manchester	43.36	****	2.52 (1.92 to 3.33)
Socio-economic group	34.80	****	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	1.56		0.84 (0.63 to 1.11)
C2 (skilled manual)	19.54	****	0.44 (0.30 to 0.63)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	9.01	**	0.56 (0.38 to 0.82)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	21.29	****	0.37 (0.24 to 0.56)
Deprivation quintile	18.37	**	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.14		0.93 (0.63 to 1.37)
3	0.01		1.02 (0.70 to 1.48)
4	2.19		1.31 (0.92 to 1.86)
5 (Least deprived)	8.75	**	1.70 (1.20 to 2.41)
Educational attainment	25.41	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	10.83	***	1.63 (1.22 to 2.18)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	25.31	****	2.49 (1.75 to 3.56)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	14.87	***	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	14.02	***	1.86 (1.34 to 2.58)
Limited a lot	4.24	*	1.69 (1.03 to 2.77)
Self-assessed health	7.43	*	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	0.31		0.91 (0.67 to 1.25)
Bad/very bad	7.34	**	0.43 (0.24 to 0.79)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

reciprocity - likelihood of exchanging favours with neighbours

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	83.18	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	69.18	****	2.10 (1.76 to 2.50)
Manchester	0.22		1.04 (0.88 to 1.24)
Gender	9.49	**	
Male†			1.00
Female	9.49	**	1.26 (1.09 to 1.47)
Age group	8.52	*	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	4.93	*	1.27 (1.03 to 1.57)
45-64	0.01		0.98 (0.76 to 1.28)
65+	0.61		1.17 (0.78 to 1.76)
Socio-economic group	26.97	****	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.86		0.89 (0.69 to 1.14)
C2 (skilled manual)	3.79		0.77 (0.58 to 1.00)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.38		0.92 (0.69 to 1.21)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	19.06	****	0.49 (0.36 to 0.67)
Educational attainment	7.40	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	1.98		1.14 (0.95 to 1.38)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	7.34	**	1.46 (1.11 to 1.93)
Employment status	29.25	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	5.35	*	0.72 (0.55 to 0.95)
Ill/disabled	0.06		1.05 (0.72 to 1.52)
Retired	1.24		1.20 (0.87 to 1.67)
Looking after home/family	0.00		1.00 (0.75 to 1.32)
In education/training (PT/FT)	22.46	****	0.53 (0.41 to 0.69)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	6.72	*	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	5.57	*	1.36 (1.05 to 1.75)
Limited a lot	3.48		1.39 (0.98 to 1.96)
Self-assessed health	7.83	*	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	5.38	*	0.77 (0.62 to 0.96)
Bad/very bad	5.46	*	0.65 (0.45 to 0.93)
Length of residence	55.43	****	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	55.43	****	2.12 (1.74 to 2.58)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

no-one to ask for help (shopping/advice/support/to borrow money)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	54.37	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	7.39	**	0.61 (0.43 to 0.87)
Manchester	24.11	****	2.00 (1.52 to 2.64)
Gender	7.31	**	
Male†			1.00
Female	7.31	**	0.72 (0.57 to 0.91)
Ethnicity	8.17	**	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	8.17	**	1.54 (1.15 to 2.07)
Socio-economic group	10.98	*	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.46		1.16 (0.75 to 1.81)
C2 (skilled manual)	0.76		1.23 (0.77 to 1.96)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.73		1.23 (0.76 to 1.99)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	6.92	**	1.82 (1.16 to 2.84)
Deprivation quintile	17.97	**	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	2.90		0.74 (0.52 to 1.05)
3	9.80	**	0.56 (0.39 to 0.81)
4	10.68	**	0.54 (0.38 to 0.78)
5 (Least deprived)	12.24	***	0.50 (0.34 to 0.74)
Length of residence	13.69	***	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	13.69	***	0.63 (0.49 to 0.80)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

belief that most people can be trusted

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	12.52	**	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	10.82	**	1.37 (1.14 to 1.66)
Manchester	7.92	**	1.32 (1.09 to 1.59)
Deprivation quintile	11.54	*	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.50		1.10 (0.84 to 1.44)
3	4.88	*	1.34 (1.03 to 1.74)
4	5.65	*	1.36 (1.06 to 1.76)
5 (Least deprived)	8.38	**	1.46 (1.13 to 1.89)
Educational attainment	50.55	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	16.98	****	1.49 (1.23 to 1.81)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	50.54	****	2.49 (1.94 to 3.20)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	6.25	*	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	4.18	*	1.28 (1.01 to 1.61)
Limited a lot	3.23		1.29 (0.98 to 1.70)
Length of residence	11.93	***	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	11.93	***	1.34 (1.14 to 1.58)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

belief that most people in neighbourhood can be trusted

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	28.44	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	27.80	****	1.71 (1.40 to 2.09)
Manchester	12.36	***	1.45 (1.18 to 1.78)
Deprivation quintile	38.82	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.02		1.02 (0.76 to 1.38)
3	10.91	***	1.61 (1.21 to 2.13)
4	9.59	**	1.55 (1.18 to 2.05)
5 (Least deprived)	25.86	****	2.04 (1.55 to 2.69)
Educational attainment	34.23	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	2.56		1.19 (0.96 to 1.47)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	29.54	****	2.14 (1.63 to 2.82)
Employment status	23.11	***	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	2.41		0.78 (0.58 to 1.07)
Ill/disabled	0.91		0.82 (0.54 to 1.24)
Retired	6.83	**	1.41 (1.09 to 1.83)
Looking after home/family	4.73	*	0.69 (0.49 to 0.96)
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.00		1.00 (0.78 to 1.30)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	7.72	*	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	7.61	**	1.47 (1.12 to 1.93)
Limited a lot	1.96		1.31 (0.90 to 1.91)
Length of residence	9.81	**	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	9.81	**	1.36 (1.12 to 1.66)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

no religious affiliation

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	104.20	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	102.88	****	0.38 (0.31 to 0.46)
Manchester	28.28	****	0.60 (0.5 to 0.72)
Gender	50.20	****	
Male†			1.00
Female	50.20	****	0.56 (0.48 to 0.66)
Age group	39.25	****	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	12.92	***	0.66 (0.53 to 0.83)
45-64	33.94	****	0.46 (0.36 to 0.6)
65+	23.41	****	0.32 (0.21 to 0.51)
Ethnicity	133.86	****	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	133.86	****	0.19 (0.15 to 0.25)
Socio-economic group	15.23	**	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	6.49	*	1.43 (1.09 to 1.88)
C2 (skilled manual)	1.42		1.20 (0.89 to 1.62)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	7.04	**	1.52 (1.12 to 2.08)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	11.27	***	1.83 (1.28 to 2.60)
Educational attainment	35.21	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	5.04	*	0.79 (0.65 to 0.97)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	9.43	**	1.58 (1.18 to 2.12)
Employment status	16.56	**	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	0.99		1.15 (0.87 to 1.53)
Ill/disabled	0.14		0.94 (0.67 to 1.32)
Retired	5.28	*	0.65 (0.45 to 0.94)
Looking after home/family	0.09		0.95 (0.69 to 1.31)
In education/training (PT/FT)	9.06	**	1.52 (1.16 to 2.00)
Marital status	18.34	***	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	16.96	****	0.65 (0.53 to 0.80)
Separated/divorced	0.41		0.91 (0.67 to 1.22)
Widowed/surviving partner	1.08		0.79 (0.51 to 1.23)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Political effects

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

UK govt helping me through policies/acions (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Ethnicity	16.81	****	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	16.81	****	1.70 (1.32 to 2.19)
Marital status	10.79	*	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	9.46	**	1.43 (1.14 to 1.80)
Separated/divorced	0.67		1.18 (0.79 to 1.76)
Widowed/surviving partner	4.31	*	1.60 (1.03 to 2.49)
Self-assessed health	22.44	****	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	21.01	****	0.47 (0.34 to 0.65)
Bad/very bad	3.31		0.68 (0.44 to 1.03)
Length of residence	9.83	**	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	9.83	**	0.69 (0.55 to 0.87)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

local council helping me through policies/acions (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	42.26	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	32.25	****	1.81 (1.47 to 2.22)
Manchester	0.00		0.99 (0.79 to 1.25)
Ethnicity	9.74	**	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	9.74	**	1.50 (1.16 to 1.94)
Socio-economic group	15.66	**	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.00		1.01 (0.77 to 1.33)
C2 (skilled manual)	3.41		0.76 (0.56 to 1.02)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.69		0.88 (0.65 to 1.19)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	9.91	**	0.54 (0.37 to 0.79)
Employment status	17.14	**	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	1.24		1.22 (0.86 to 1.71)
Ill/disabled	0.06		1.06 (0.66 to 1.72)
Retired	7.41	**	1.47 (1.11 to 1.93)
Looking after home/family	0.06		1.04 (0.75 to 1.45)
In education/training (PT/FT)	10.57	**	1.62 (1.21 to 2.16)
Marital status	13.93	**	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	10.87	***	1.45 (1.16 to 1.80)
Separated/divorced	0.20		0.92 (0.64 to 1.32)
Widowed/surviving partner	1.29		1.28 (0.84 to 1.95)
Self-assessed health	15.78	***	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	15.68	****	0.58 (0.45 to 0.76)
Bad/very bad	1.62		0.78 (0.53 to 1.14)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that UK govt. supporting community (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Age group	16.20	**	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	11.91	***	0.58 (0.43 to 0.79)
45-64	12.87	***	0.53 (0.38 to 0.75)
65+	2.56		0.64 (0.38 to 1.10)
Ethnicity	13.73	***	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	13.73	***	1.66 (1.27 to 2.16)
Deprivation quintile	10.30	*	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	2.15		0.79 (0.58 to 1.08)
3	7.56	**	0.63 (0.46 to 0.88)
4	2.08		0.80 (0.59 to 1.08)
5 (Least deprived)	7.23	**	0.65 (0.47 to 0.89)
Employment status	13.89	*	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	8.36	**	0.58 (0.4 to 0.84)
Ill/disabled	1.49		0.75 (0.47 to 1.19)
Retired	0.28		0.89 (0.57 to 1.38)
Looking after home/family	7.21	**	0.59 (0.41 to 0.87)
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.21		0.92 (0.66 to 1.30)
Marital status	11.18	*	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	9.67	**	1.57 (1.18 to 2.09)
Separated/divorced	3.55		1.50 (0.98 to 2.29)
Widowed/surviving partner	0.18		1.12 (0.66 to 1.91)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that local council supporting my community (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	47.84	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	47.53	****	1.95 (1.61 to 2.35)
Manchester	9.80	**	1.38 (1.13 to 1.68)
Socio-economic group	14.75	**	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.11		0.96 (0.74 to 1.24)
C2 (skilled manual)	3.54		0.76 (0.57 to 1.01)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.14		0.95 (0.71 to 1.26)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	9.25	**	0.58 (0.40 to 0.82)
Educational attainment	26.23	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.01		0.99 (0.80 to 1.22)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	15.52	****	1.77 (1.33 to 2.35)
Employment status	11.82	*	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	0.29		0.92 (0.67 to 1.26)
Ill/disabled	0.13		0.93 (0.64 to 1.36)
Retired	6.78	**	1.36 (1.08 to 1.72)
Looking after home/family	0.16		0.94 (0.69 to 1.28)
In education/training (PT/FT)	2.98		1.24 (0.97 to 1.58)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that UK govt undermining city (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	124.41	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	107.73	****	2.45 (2.07 to 2.91)
Manchester	2.12		1.15 (0.95 to 1.37)
Age group	100.57	****	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	16.22	****	1.49 (1.23 to 1.80)
45-64	98.02	****	2.54 (2.12 to 3.06)
65+	28.18	****	1.80 (1.45 to 2.23)
Ethnicity	20.92	****	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	20.92	****	0.57 (0.45 to 0.72)
Deprivation quintile	29.34	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.31		1.07 (0.85 to 1.33)
3	4.60	*	0.78 (0.62 to 0.98)
4	16.21	****	0.63 (0.50 to 0.79)
5 (Least deprived)	6.54	*	0.75 (0.60 to 0.93)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that city council undermining city (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	47.69	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	30.77	****	1.70 (1.41 to 2.05)
Manchester	0.58		0.92 (0.75 to 1.13)
Age group	51.39	****	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	16.52	****	1.58 (1.27 to 1.96)
45-64	50.22	****	2.17 (1.75 to 2.68)
65+	7.65	**	1.44 (1.11 to 1.87)
Deprivation quintile	29.06	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.12		1.04 (0.82 to 1.33)
3	5.52	*	0.74 (0.58 to 0.95)
4	5.27	*	0.75 (0.59 to 0.96)
5 (Least deprived)	18.18	****	0.57 (0.44 to 0.74)
Self-assessed health	7.20	*	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	7.20	**	1.32 (1.08 to 1.61)
Bad/very bad	0.32		1.09 (0.81 to 1.45)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that able to influence decisions affecting local area (definitely/tend to a

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Deprivation quintile	26.17	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	11.02	***	1.60 (1.21 to 2.11)
3	0.50		1.11 (0.83 to 1.48)
4	14.28	***	1.68 (1.28 to 2.20)
5 (Least deprived)	13.84	***	1.68 (1.28 to 2.20)
Educational attainment	66.85	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	6.02	*	1.27 (1.05 to 1.54)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	61.56	****	2.69 (2.10 to 3.44)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that able to influence decisions affecting city (definitely/tend to agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	19.94	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	4.28	*	0.81 (0.66 to 0.99)
Manchester	19.92	****	0.61 (0.49 to 0.76)
Deprivation quintile	19.93	***	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	12.37	***	1.69 (1.26 to 2.26)
3	0.02		0.98 (0.72 to 1.34)
4	3.40		1.32 (0.98 to 1.76)
5 (Least deprived)	4.17	*	1.36 (1.01 to 1.82)
Educational attainment	47.65	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	9.47	**	1.40 (1.13 to 1.73)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	46.65	****	2.59 (1.97 to 3.40)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception that able to influence decisions affecting UK (definitely/tend to agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	27.92	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	10.93	***	0.67 (0.53 to 0.85)
Manchester	25.76	****	0.53 (0.41 to 0.68)
Deprivation quintile	20.40	***	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	16.72	****	2.02 (1.44 to 2.83)
3	3.04		1.37 (0.96 to 1.94)
4	1.06		1.20 (0.85 to 1.71)
5 (Least deprived)	2.84		1.35 (0.95 to 1.92)
Educational attainment	7.91	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	1.33		1.16 (0.90 to 1.48)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	7.65	**	1.59 (1.15 to 2.21)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	9.80	**	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	8.17	**	0.58 (0.40 to 0.84)
Limited a lot	2.65		0.71 (0.47 to 1.07)
Length of residence	4.55	*	
Time in city not known†			1.00
Possibly long-term resident	4.55	*	0.80 (0.65 to 0.98)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - I felt hard done by (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Gender	14.02	***	
Male†			1.00
Female	14.02	***	0.60 (0.46 to 0.78)
City	13.67	**	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	3.13		0.79 (0.60 to 1.03)
Manchester	13.58	***	0.56 (0.42 to 0.76)
Employment status	19.87	***	
Employed (PT/FT)/in education/training†			1.00
Unemployed	6.40	*	1.69 (1.13 to 2.55)
Ill/disabled	0.00		0.99 (0.64 to 1.54)
Retired	0.02		0.98 (0.73 to 1.32)
Looking after home/family	10.55	**	0.34 (0.18 to 0.65)
Employment status in 1980s	58.55	****	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	43.84	****	0.16 (0.09 to 0.28)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	8.33	**	0.51 (0.32 to 0.81)
In employment	38.51	****	0.28 (0.19 to 0.42)
Other & other combinations	12.47	***	0.41 (0.25 to 0.67)
Self-assessed health	11.85	**	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	1.09		1.16 (0.88 to 1.55)
Bad/very bad	11.79	***	1.87 (1.31 to 2.67)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - I was optimistic about the future (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Gender	15.35	****	
Male†			1.00
Female	15.35	****	1.60 (1.27 to 2.03)
City	40.95	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	39.26	****	2.18 (1.71 to 2.78)
Manchester	14.70	***	1.70 (1.30 to 2.24)
Socio-economic group	23.86	****	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	1.51		0.78 (0.53 to 1.16)
C2 (skilled manual)	2.71		0.71 (0.48 to 1.07)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	1.93		0.74 (0.49 to 1.13)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	17.85	****	0.38 (0.25 to 0.60)
Deprivation quintile	17.09	**	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.38		0.90 (0.65 to 1.25)
3	10.10	**	1.74 (1.24 to 2.46)
4	0.96		1.18 (0.85 to 1.66)
5 (Least deprived)	1.01		1.20 (0.84 to 1.70)
Educational attainment	9.10	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	3.57		1.25 (0.99 to 1.57)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	8.33	**	1.90 (1.23 to 2.93)
Employment status in 1980s	45.41	****	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	6.18	*	1.91 (1.15 to 3.19)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	19.79	****	3.06 (1.87 to 5.00)
In employment	34.33	****	3.81 (2.43 to 5.95)
Other & other combinations	18.88	****	3.21 (1.90 to 5.44)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - area I lived in got worse (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Gender	11.95	***	
Male†			1.00
Female	11.95	***	0.65 (0.51 to 0.83)
Age group	20.43	****	
36-49†			1.00
50-64	2.19		0.80 (0.60 to 1.07)
65+	18.43	****	0.50 (0.37 to 0.69)
Ethnicity	10.73	**	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	10.73	**	0.36 (0.20 to 0.67)
Deprivation quintile	28.91	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	3.86	*	1.39 (1.00 to 1.93)
3	0.37		1.11 (0.79 to 1.56)
4	0.22		1.08 (0.77 to 1.52)
5 (Least deprived)	11.29	***	0.52 (0.35 to 0.76)
Self-assessed health	12.27	**	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	9.87	**	1.50 (1.17 to 1.93)
Bad/very bad	5.83	*	1.47 (1.08 to 2.02)
Employment status in 1980s	20.81	***	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	17.61	****	0.34 (0.21 to 0.57)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	1.46		0.76 (0.48 to 1.19)
In employment	6.25	*	0.61 (0.41 to 0.90)
Other & other combinations	8.31	**	0.49 (0.30 to 0.79)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - I felt I could change things (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	15.89	***	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	14.29	***	1.68 (1.28 to 2.20)
Manchester	0.55		1.12 (0.82 to 1.53)
Educational attainment	18.29	***	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	1.66		1.18 (0.92 to 1.51)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	18.23	****	2.28 (1.56 to 3.34)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - I felt the govt. did not support people like me (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	14.75	***	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	1.33		1.15 (0.91 to 1.45)
Manchester	7.75	**	0.69 (0.53 to 0.89)
Deprivation quintile	29.66	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.12		1.06 (0.78 to 1.44)
3	1.27		0.83 (0.60 to 1.15)
4	2.07		0.79 (0.58 to 1.09)
5 (Least deprived)	20.70	****	0.46 (0.32 to 0.64)
Employment status	17.50	**	
Employed (PT/FT)/in education/training†			1.00
Unemployed	1.81		0.77 (0.52 to 1.13)
Ill/disabled	1.93		0.77 (0.54 to 1.11)
Retired	3.79		0.79 (0.62 to 1.00)
Looking after home/family	16.54	****	0.39 (0.25 to 0.62)
Employment status in 1980s	44.29	****	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	30.42	****	0.24 (0.15 to 0.40)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	0.35		0.88 (0.57 to 1.35)
In employment	0.61		0.86 (0.58 to 1.26)
Other & other combinations	1.13		0.78 (0.49 to 1.24)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with: perception of 1980s - I felt the govt cared about my local community (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Deprivation quintile	10.27	*	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.29		0.89 (0.58 to 1.36)
3	0.13		1.08 (0.71 to 1.65)
4	0.01		1.02 (0.67 to 1.56)
5 (Least deprived)	5.16	*	1.60 (1.07 to 2.41)
Employment status	17.38	**	
Employed (PT/FT)/in education/training†			1.00
Unemployed	0.64		0.79 (0.44 to 1.41)
Ill/disabled	7.01	**	1.82 (1.17 to 2.83)
Retired	9.79	**	1.63 (1.20 to 2.20)
Looking after home/family	0.01		1.02 (0.60 to 1.75)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - the govt. were working to make the country better (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Socio-economic group	9.83	*	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof,	2.13		1.36 (0.90 to 2.06)
C2 (skilled manual)	0.52		1.17 (0.76 to 1.81)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.00		1.00 (0.63 to 1.57)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	1.51		0.72 (0.43 to 1.21)
Age group	11.32	**	
36-49†			1.00
50-64	0.06		1.04 (0.75 to 1.45)
65+	7.42	**	1.65 (1.15 to 2.36)
Ethnicity	7.77	**	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	7.77	**	1.99 (1.23 to 3.23)
Educational attainment	9.75	**	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.00		1.01 (0.76 to 1.33)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	8.02	**	1.90 (1.22 to 2.97)
Employment status in 1980s	12.88	*	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	2.84		0.59 (0.32 to 1.09)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	0.31		1.16 (0.69 to 1.95)
In employment	0.02		1.04 (0.64 to 1.68)
Other & other combinations	3.35		0.56 (0.31 to 1.04)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - local council stood up for city's best interests (agree/strongly agree)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	9.61	**	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	6.13	*	1.37 (1.07 to 1.75)
Manchester	0.28		0.93 (0.70 to 1.23)
Age group	19.01	****	
36-49†			1.00
50-64	0.20		0.93 (0.69 to 1.26)
65+	9.54	**	1.64 (1.20 to 2.25)
Deprivation quintile	11.40	*	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.42		0.89 (0.64 to 1.26)
3	1.18		1.21 (0.86 to 1.69)
4	3.62		0.71 (0.50 to 1.01)
5 (Least deprived)	1.92		0.78 (0.54 to 1.11)
Educational attainment	24.13	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	1.19		0.87 (0.68 to 1.12)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	15.69	****	2.23 (1.50 to 3.32)
Self-assessed health	11.80	**	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	11.36	***	0.63 (0.49 to 0.83)
Bad/very bad	2.36		0.77 (0.56 to 1.07)
Employment status in 1980s	22.60	***	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	8.84	**	0.42 (0.24 to 0.75)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	0.16		0.91 (0.57 to 1.45)
In employment	0.78		1.21 (0.79 to 1.85)
Other & other combinations	0.15		1.11 (0.66 to 1.84)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - trusted local council (a lot/fair amount)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Educational attainment	8.34	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.32		1.07 (0.84 to 1.36)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	8.05	**	1.79 (1.20 to 2.68)
Employment status	33.64	****	
Employed (PT/FT)/in education/training†			1.00
Unemployed	3.69		1.51 (0.99 to 2.29)
Ill/disabled	0.01		1.02 (0.67 to 1.56)
Retired	28.12	****	2.11 (1.60 to 2.78)
Looking after home/family	1.72		1.33 (0.87 to 2.05)
Employment status in 1980s	25.87	****	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	5.75	*	0.49 (0.28 to 0.88)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	3.36		1.55 (0.97 to 2.47)
In employment	1.24		1.28 (0.83 to 1.98)
Other & other combinations	2.88		1.56 (0.93 to 2.60)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - trusted local MP (a lot/fair amount)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Employment status in 1980s	37.61	****	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	1.67		0.66 (0.35 to 1.24)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	11.28	***	2.45 (1.45 to 4.14)
In employment	8.65	**	2.10 (1.28 to 3.44)
Other & other combinations	7.83	**	2.26 (1.28 to 3.99)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

perception of 1980s - trusted UK government (a lot/fair amount)

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Age group	45.06	****	
36-49†			1.00
50-64	11.09	***	1.85 (1.29 to 2.67)
65+	43.75	****	3.49 (2.41 to 5.05)
Ethnicity	12.50	***	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	12.50	***	2.50 (1.50 to 4.16)
Educational attainment	8.04	*	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	2.96		1.30 (0.96 to 1.74)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	7.43	**	1.89 (1.20 to 3.00)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

1980s - whether attended demos etc

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	32.50	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	23.29	****	2.88 (1.88 to 4.43)
Manchester	0.01		0.97 (0.56 to 1.69)
Gender	5.81	*	
Male†			1.00
Female	5.81	*	0.61 (0.41 to 0.91)
Socio-economic group	11.54	*	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	6.33	*	0.51 (0.30 to 0.86)
C2 (skilled manual)	5.11	*	0.53 (0.30 to 0.92)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	9.01	**	0.38 (0.20 to 0.71)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	6.06	*	0.40 (0.19 to 0.83)
Educational attainment	21.12	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.04		0.96 (0.63 to 1.46)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	15.10	***	3.03 (1.73 to 5.30)
Employment status in 1980s	13.47	**	
Unemployed/sick/in & out of work†			1.00
Job creation/education/training/apprenticeship	0.54		1.61 (0.46 to 5.67)
Looking after family/working and looking after family	1.06		1.94 (0.55 to 6.80)
In employment	3.58		3.01 (0.96 to 9.40)
Other & other combinations	6.09	*	4.58 (1.37 to 15.36)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Human Values

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

tradition (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	-0.26			
Manchester	-0.31	-0.05 (-0.11 to 0.00)	-1.98 *	
Gender				
Male†	-0.26			
Female	-0.07	0.19 (0.14 to 0.24)	7.85 ****	
Ethnicity				
Not ethnic minority group†	-0.26			
Member of ethnic minority group	0.15	0.41 (0.34 to 0.49)	10.88 ****	
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	-0.26			
E (On state benefit/unemployed/lowest grade workers)	-0.15	0.11 (0.04 to 0.19)	3.05 **	
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	-0.26			
5 (Least deprived)	-0.34	-0.08 (-0.14 to -0.02)	-2.71 **	
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	-0.26			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	-0.35	-0.09 (-0.15 to -0.03)	-2.87 **	
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	-0.49	-0.22 (-0.31 to -0.14)	-5.24 ****	
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	-0.26			
Unemployed	-0.42	-0.16 (-0.25 to -0.08)	-3.72 ***	
In education/training (PT/FT)	-0.40	-0.14 (-0.23 to -0.06)	-3.39 ***	
Marital status				
Never married†	-0.26			
Married/civil partnership	-0.19	0.07 (0.01 to 0.12)	2.40 *	
Age group				
16-29†	-0.26			
30-44	-0.08	0.18 (0.11 to 0.25)	5.05 ****	
45-64	0.04	0.30 (0.23 to 0.37)	8.04 ****	
65+	0.23	0.49 (0.40 to 0.58)	10.93 ****	

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with: stimulation (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	0.23			
Liverpool	-0.04	-0.27 (-0.32 to -0.21)	-9.66	****
Gender				
Male†	0.23			
Female	0.09	-0.14 (-0.19 to -0.09)	-5.46	****
Ethnicity				
Not ethnic minority group†	0.23			
Member of ethnic minority group	-0.10	-0.33 (-0.41 to -0.26)	-8.70	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	0.23			
C1(Supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/admin/prof)	0.11	-0.12 (-0.18 to -0.05)	-3.39	***
C2 (Skilled manual)	0.14	-0.09 (-0.16 to -0.02)	-2.52	*
D (Semi-skilled/unskilled manual)	0.13	-0.10 (-0.17 to -0.03)	-2.69	**
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	0.23			
5 (Least deprived)	0.34	0.11 (0.05 to 0.17)	3.47	***
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	0.23			
Retired	0.08	-0.15 (-0.26 to -0.05)	-2.85	**
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.40	0.17 (0.08 to 0.26)	3.68	***
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)				
No LLI†	0.23			
Limited a little	0.11	-0.12 (-0.20 to -0.05)	-3.13	**
Limited a lot	-0.02	-0.25 (-0.34 to -0.15)	-5.19	****
Age group				
16-29†	0.23			
30-44	0.05	-0.18 (-0.26 to -0.11)	-5.03	****
45-64	-0.25	-0.49 (-0.56 to -0.41)	-12.61	****
65+	-0.31	-0.54 (-0.67 to -0.41)	-8.41	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model
 2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the mode
 3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001
- † - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

self-direction (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	0.08			
Liverpool	0.18	0.10 (0.05 to 0.15)	3.81 ***	
Manchester	0.22	0.14 (0.09 to 0.19)	5.34 ****	
Gender				
Male†	0.08			
Female	0.03	-0.06 (-0.10 to -0.02)	-2.70 **	
Ethnicity				
Not ethnic minority group†	0.08			
Member of ethnic minority group	-0.10	-0.18 (-0.25 to -0.12)	-5.62 ****	
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	0.08			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.20	0.12 (0.07 to 0.16)	4.66 ****	
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	0.35	0.27 (0.20 to 0.34)	7.89 ****	
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	0.08			
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.16	0.08 (0.01 to 0.14)	2.39 *	
Married/civil partnership	-0.01	-0.09 (-0.14 to -0.05)	-3.98 ****	
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)				
No LLI†	0.08			
Limited a little	0.16	0.07 (0.01 to 0.14)	2.33 *	

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the mode

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with: security (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	0.22			
Liverpool	0.35	0.13 (0.08 to 0.18)	5.32	****
Gender				
Male†	0.22			
Female	0.33	0.11 (0.06 to 0.15)	4.62	****
Length of residence				
Time in city not known†	0.22			
Possibly long-term resident	0.14	-0.08 (-0.15 to -0.02)	-2.63	**
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	0.22			
2	0.31	0.09 (0.03 to 0.15)	3.04	**
3	0.39	0.17 (0.11 to 0.23)	5.75	****
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	0.22			
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	0.06	-0.16 (-0.22 to -0.09)	-4.68	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	0.22			
Ill/disabled	0.32	0.10 (0.00 to 0.20)	2.02	*
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.12	-0.10 (-0.18 to -0.02)	-2.52	*
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)				
No LLI†	0.22			
Limited a lot	0.38	0.15 (0.07 to 0.24)	3.42	***
Age group				
16-29†	0.22			
30-44	0.33	0.11 (0.05 to 0.18)	3.29	**
45-64	0.46	0.24 (0.16 to 0.32)	5.86	****
65+	0.59	0.36 (0.27 to 0.46)	7.84	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model
 2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model
 3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001
- † - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with: **power (human values scale)**

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	-0.20			
Liverpool	-0.38	-0.18 (-0.24 to -0.13)	-6.46	****
Gender				
Male†	-0.20			
Female	-0.41	-0.21 (-0.27 to -0.16)	-8.08	****
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	-0.20			
2	-0.38	-0.18 (-0.25 to -0.11)	-4.81	****
3	-0.35	-0.15 (-0.22 to -0.08)	-4.14	****
4	-0.36	-0.16 (-0.23 to -0.09)	-4.63	****
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	-0.20			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	-0.27	-0.07 (-0.14 to -0.01)	-2.31	*
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	-0.39	-0.19 (-0.27 to -0.10)	-4.19	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	-0.20			
Ill/disabled	-0.39	-0.19 (-0.30 to -0.08)	-3.41	***
Retired	-0.40	-0.20 (-0.27 to -0.13)	-5.30	****
Age group				
16-29†	-0.20			
30-44	-0.29	-0.09 (-0.15 to -0.02)	-2.58	*
45-64	-0.29	-0.09 (-0.15 to -0.02)	-2.65	**

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model
 2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model
 3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001
- † - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

hedonism (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
Gender				
Male†	0.13			
Female	0.03	-0.10 (-0.16 to -0.05)	-3.79	***
Ethnicity				
Not ethnic minority group†	0.13			
Member of ethnic minority group	-0.19	-0.32 (-0.39 to -0.24)	-8.07	****
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	0.13			
3	0.05	-0.08 (-0.15 to -0.01)	-2.40	*
5 (Least deprived)	0.27	0.14 (0.07 to 0.21)	4.12	****
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	0.13			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.04	-0.09 (-0.15 to -0.02)	-2.70	**
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	-0.08	-0.21 (-0.30 to -0.12)	-4.68	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	0.13			
Looking after home/family	0.24	0.11 (0.02 to 0.20)	2.29	*
Married/civil partnership	0.03	-0.10 (-0.16 to -0.04)	-3.45	***
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)				
No LLI†	0.13			
Limited a little	-0.03	-0.16 (-0.24 to -0.08)	-3.81	***
Limited a lot	-0.04	-0.17 (-0.27 to -0.07)	-3.46	***
Age group				
16-29†	0.13			
30-44	-0.05	-0.18 (-0.25 to -0.11)	-4.97	****
45-64	-0.18	-0.31 (-0.38 to -0.23)	-7.93	****
65+	-0.36	-0.49 (-0.58 to -0.40)	-10.37	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

benevolence (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	0.26			
Liverpool	0.48	0.23 (0.18 to 0.27)	9.68	****
Manchester	0.09	-0.17 (-0.22 to -0.12)	-7.21	****
Gender				
Male†	0.26			
Female	0.36	0.10 (0.06 to 0.14)	5.28	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	0.26			
E (On state benefit/unemployed/lowest grade workers)	0.17	-0.09 (-0.14 to -0.03)	-3.24	**
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	0.26			
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	0.39	0.14 (0.08 to 0.19)	4.82	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	0.26			
Ill/disabled	0.40	0.15 (0.07 to 0.23)	3.63	***
Age group				
16-29†	0.26			
30-44	0.32	0.06 (0.01 to 0.11)	2.34	*
45-64	0.42	0.16 (0.11 to 0.21)	6.30	****
65+	0.45	0.19 (0.13 to 0.25)	6.36	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the mode

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

achievement (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	0.26			
Liverpool	0.07	-0.19 (-0.25 to -0.13)	-6.28	****
Manchester	0.13	-0.13 (-0.19 to -0.07)	-4.31	****
Gender				
Male†	0.26			
Female	0.13	-0.13 (-0.18 to -0.08)	-5.16	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	0.26			
C1(Supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/admin/prof)	0.18	-0.08 (-0.15 to 0.00)	-1.98	*
C2 (Skilled manual)	0.13	-0.13 (-0.21 to -0.05)	-3.19	**
D (Semi-skilled/unskilled manual)	0.03	-0.23 (-0.31 to -0.15)	-5.47	****
E (On state benefit/unemployed/lowest grade workers)	0.11	-0.15 (-0.24 to -0.07)	-3.46	***
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	0.26			
Ill/disabled	0.01	-0.25 (-0.36 to -0.14)	-4.63	****
Retired	0.05	-0.21 (-0.31 to -0.10)	-3.87	***
Looking after home/family	0.11	-0.15 (-0.24 to -0.06)	-3.18	**
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.39	0.13 (0.04 to 0.22)	2.94	**
Marital status				
Never married†	0.26			
Widowed/surviving partner	0.13	-0.14 (-0.25 to -0.03)	-2.42	*
Age group				
16-29†	0.26			
30-44	0.10	-0.16 (-0.23 to -0.09)	-4.56	****
45-64	-0.01	-0.27 (-0.35 to -0.20)	-7.28	****
65+	-0.04	-0.30 (-0.42 to -0.17)	-4.70	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model
 2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model
 3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001
- † - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

universalism (human values scale)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	-0.01			
Liverpool	0.29	0.30 (0.26 to 0.35)	13.45	****
Manchester	0.19	0.20 (0.16 to 0.24)	8.91	****
Gender				
Male†	-0.01			
Female	0.07	0.08 (0.04 to 0.11)	4.15	****
Length of residence				
Time in city not known†	-0.01			
Possibly long-term resident	-0.06	-0.05 (-0.10 to 0.00)	-2.06	*
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	-0.01			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	0.08	0.09 (0.05 to 0.13)	4.08	****
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	0.21	0.22 (0.16 to 0.28)	7.14	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	-0.01			
Retired	0.12	0.13 (0.05 to 0.20)	3.28	**
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)				
No LLI†	-0.01			
Limited a little	0.09	0.10 (0.05 to 0.16)	3.54	***
Limited a lot	0.10	0.11 (0.04 to 0.18)	3.20	**
Age group				
16-29†	-0.01			
30-44	0.10	0.11 (0.06 to 0.16)	4.29	****
45-64	0.18	0.18 (0.12 to 0.25)	5.88	****
65+	0.13	0.14 (0.04 to 0.23)	2.77	**

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with: **conformity (human values scale)**

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	-0.32			
Liverpool	-0.49	-0.17 (-0.24 to -0.11)	-5.45	****
Manchester	-0.40	-0.08 (-0.14 to -0.01)	-2.38	*
Gender				
Male†	-0.32			
Female	-0.21	0.11 (0.06 to 0.16)	4.28	****
Ethnicity				
Not ethnic minority group†	-0.32			
Member of ethnic minority group	-0.04	0.28 (0.20 to 0.36)	6.87	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	-0.32			
D (Semi-skilled/unskilled manual)	-0.22	0.10 (0.03 to 0.17)	2.87	**
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	-0.32			
5 (Least deprived)	-0.52	-0.20 (-0.26 to -0.13)	-5.98	****
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	-0.32			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	-0.41	-0.09 (-0.15 to -0.03)	-2.80	**
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	-0.47	-0.15 (-0.24 to -0.07)	-3.40	***
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	-0.32			
Retired	-0.17	0.15 (0.04 to 0.26)	2.73	**
In education/training (PT/FT)	-0.51	-0.19 (-0.28 to -0.1)	-4.29	****
Marital status				
Never married†	-0.32			
Married/civil partnership	-0.16	0.16 (0.10 to 0.22)	5.07	****
Widowed/surviving partner	-0.11	0.21 (0.09 to 0.34)	3.35	***
Age group				
16-29†	-0.32			
30-44	-0.18	0.14 (0.07 to 0.22)	3.66	***
45-64	-0.02	0.29 (0.21 to 0.37)	7.20	****
65+	0.03	0.35 (0.21 to 0.48)	5.02	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Optimism: Life Orientation Test (Revised) (LOT-R)

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

Life Orientation Test (Revised)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	14.40			
Manchester	13.63	-0.76 (-1.01 to -0.51)	-5.95	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	14.40			
E (On state benefit/unemployed/lowest grade workers)	13.79	-0.61 (-1.01 to -0.21)	-2.99	**
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	14.40			
2	14.85	0.45 (0.07 to 0.83)	2.32	*
3	15.50	1.10 (0.72 to 1.48)	5.63	****
4	14.84	0.44 (0.06 to 0.82)	2.29	*
5 (Least deprived)	15.44	1.04 (0.65 to 1.43)	5.26	****
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	14.40			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	15.02	0.62 (0.34 to 0.91)	4.27	****
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	16.16	1.76 (1.35 to 2.18)	8.40	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	14.40			
Unemployed	13.07	-1.33 (-1.77 to -0.89)	-5.88	****
Ill/disabled	12.80	-1.59 (-2.17 to -1.02)	-5.47	****
Looking after home/family	13.67	-0.72 (-1.16 to -0.29)	-3.24	**
Marital status				
Never married†	14.40			
Married/civil partnership	14.81	0.42 (0.15 to 0.69)	3.04	**
Widowed/surviving partner	15.11	0.71 (0.21 to 1.21)	2.79	**
Self-assessed health				
Good/very good†	14.40			
Fair	13.35	-1.05 (-1.37 to -0.73)	-6.42	****
Bad/very bad	12.35	-2.05 (-2.54 to -1.57)	-8.29	****
Age group				
16-29†	14.40			
30-44	13.75	-0.65 (-0.95 to -0.35)	-4.19	****
45-64	13.78	-0.62 (-0.92 to -0.31)	-3.96	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Self-efficacy: Generalised Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)

Multivariate linear regression analysis of the factors associated with:

Generalised Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE)

Variable/category	Adjusted Mean ¹	$\Delta\mu^2$ (95% conf. ints)	t statistic	Significance ³
City				
Glasgow†	30.71			
Manchester	29.34	-1.37 (-1.75 to -0.99)	-7.00	****
Gender				
Male†	30.71			
Female	29.90	-0.81 (-1.18 to -0.44)	-4.26	****
Socio-economic group				
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†	30.71			
E (On state benefit/unemployed/lowest grade workers)	29.70	-1.01 (-1.62 to -0.41)	-3.28	**
Deprivation quintile				
1 (Most deprived)†	30.71			
5 (Least deprived)	31.49	0.78 (0.34 to 1.23)	3.43	***
Educational attainment				
No qualifications†	30.71			
Some qualifications, but not degree level	32.28	1.57 (1.13 to 2.02)	6.93	****
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	33.57	2.86 (2.22 to 3.50)	8.81	****
Employment status				
Employed (pt & ft)†	30.71			
Unemployed	28.83	-1.88 (-2.57 to -1.20)	-5.40	****
Ill/disabled	28.36	-2.35 (-3.24 to -1.45)	-5.14	****
Retired	31.39	0.68 (0.12 to 1.23)	2.40	*
Looking after home/family	29.71	-1.00 (-1.69 to -0.30)	-2.80	**
Self-assessed health				
Good/very good†	30.71			
Fair	28.86	-1.85 (-2.35 to -1.35)	-7.26	****
Bad/very bad	27.72	-2.99 (-3.75 to -2.24)	-7.78	****

Notes

1. Mean predicted by full fitted model

2. Difference in mean compared to reference category after adjustment for other factors in the model

3. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Self-esteem

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

having a high self-esteem - agree/strongly agree

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	42.81	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	6.64	**	0.78 (0.65 to 0.94)
Manchester	42.40	****	0.54 (0.45 to 0.65)
Gender	9.49	**	
Male†			1.00
Female	9.49	**	0.78 (0.67 to 0.91)
Age group	21.88	****	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	2.74		0.82 (0.65 to 1.04)
45-64	14.29	***	0.61 (0.47 to 0.79)
65+	0.02		1.03 (0.68 to 1.56)
Socio-economic group	12.03	*	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.40		1.09 (0.83 to 1.43)
C2 (skilled manual)	0.58		0.89 (0.67 to 1.19)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.70		1.14 (0.84 to 1.54)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	2.90		0.75 (0.53 to 1.05)
Deprivation quintile	29.83	****	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.00		0.99 (0.78 to 1.27)
3	1.63		1.17 (0.92 to 1.50)
4	0.07		0.97 (0.76 to 1.24)
5 (Least deprived)	13.60	***	0.62 (0.48 to 0.80)
Educational attainment	41.95	****	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	22.17	****	1.57 (1.30 to 1.90)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	39.50	****	2.62 (1.94 to 3.53)
Employment status	29.88	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	14.13	***	0.58 (0.44 to 0.77)
Ill/disabled	9.16	**	0.57 (0.39 to 0.82)
Retired	0.36		1.11 (0.79 to 1.54)
Looking after home/family	0.09		1.05 (0.78 to 1.41)
In education/training (PT/FT)	2.55		1.27 (0.95 to 1.71)
Never married†			
Marital status	12.61	***	
Married/civil partnership	12.61	***	1.46 (1.18 to 1.79)
Separated/divorced	2.32		1.26 (0.94 to 1.70)
Widowed/surviving partner	0.00		1.01 (0.68 to 1.48)
Self-assessed health	108.76	****	
Good/very good†			
Fair	99.98	****	0.35 (0.29 to 0.43)
Bad/very bad	33.72	****	0.40 (0.29 to 0.54)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

having a high self-esteem - strongly agree

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	61.07	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	12.76	***	0.68 (0.54 to 0.84)
Manchester	60.58	****	0.37 (0.29 to 0.48)
Gender	15.09	***	
Male†			1.00
Female	15.09	***	0.68 (0.56 to 0.82)
Age group	9.40	*	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	2.23		0.82 (0.63 to 1.06)
45-64	8.98	**	0.64 (0.48 to 0.86)
65+	0.58		0.82 (0.49 to 1.38)
Socio-economic group	14.48	**	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.38		1.10 (0.81 to 1.48)
C2 (skilled manual)	0.22		0.92 (0.66 to 1.29)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	0.56		1.14 (0.80 to 1.63)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	7.32	**	0.51 (0.31 to 0.83)
Educational attainment	10.78	**	
No qualifications†			1.00
Some qualifications, but not degree level	4.66	*	1.36 (1.03 to 1.80)
1st degree and above (includes NVQ/SVQ Level 5 or equivalent)	10.74	**	1.84 (1.28 to 2.64)
Employment status	10.94		
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	7.82	**	0.55 (0.36 to 0.83)
Ill/disabled	0.11		1.10 (0.61 to 1.99)
Retired	0.08		0.94 (0.59 to 1.48)
Looking after home/family	1.37		0.78 (0.51 to 1.18)
In education/training (PT/FT)	0.44		1.11 (0.82 to 1.51)
Self-assessed health	36.60	****	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	32.68	****	0.35 (0.24 to 0.50)
Bad/very bad	9.30	**	0.45 (0.27 to 0.75)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Early years

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

rating of childhood - very or fairly happy

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	6.32	*	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	0.00		1.01 (0.81 to 1.25)
Manchester	4.68	*	0.79 (0.64 to 0.98)
Employment status	85.70	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	28.99	****	0.49 (0.37 to 0.63)
Ill/disabled	15.08	***	0.50 (0.35 to 0.71)
Retired	1.75		1.21 (0.91 to 1.59)
Looking after home/family	13.04	***	0.58 (0.43 to 0.78)
In education/training (PT/FT)	11.13	***	1.84 (1.29 to 2.63)
Self-assessed health	35.09	****	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	31.08	****	0.52 (0.42 to 0.66)
Bad/very bad	14.80	***	0.52 (0.37 to 0.72)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

rating of childhood - very happy

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	86.90	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	0.30		0.95 (0.80 to 1.13)
Manchester	71.20	****	0.47 (0.40 to 0.56)
Age group	10.79	*	
16-29†			1.00
30-44	0.08		1.03 (0.84 to 1.26)
45-64	2.61		1.20 (0.96 to 1.48)
65+	10.08	**	1.82 (1.26 to 2.64)
Socio-economic group	23.90	****	
A (higher managerial/admin/prof) and B (intermed managerial/admin/prof)†			1.00
C1 (supervisory, clerical, junior managerial/ admin/ prof)	0.03		1.02 (0.80 to 1.31)
C2 (skilled manual)	2.30		0.82 (0.63 to 1.06)
D (semi-skilled/ unskilled manual)	7.81	**	0.68 (0.52 to 0.89)
E (on state benefit/ unemployed/ lowest grade workers)	11.61	***	0.59 (0.43 to 0.80)
Deprivation quintile	15.71	**	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	1.08		1.13 (0.90 to 1.42)
3	0.90		1.12 (0.89 to 1.41)
4	4.83	*	1.30 (1.03 to 1.64)
5 (Least deprived)	1.78		0.85 (0.67 to 1.08)
Employment status	16.63	**	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	4.55	*	0.75 (0.57 to 0.98)
Ill/disabled	3.78		0.71 (0.50 to 1.00)
Retired	0.06		1.04 (0.76 to 1.43)
Looking after home/family	1.62		1.19 (0.91 to 1.56)
In education/training (PT/FT)	2.81		1.25 (0.96 to 1.63)
Self-assessed health	45.18	****	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	43.13	****	0.51 (0.42 to 0.62)
Bad/very bad	11.33	***	0.59 (0.43 to 0.80)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

rating of childhood - very or fairly unhappy

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	16.42	***	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	9.28	**	1.57 (1.17 to 2.10)
Manchester	0.58		0.88 (0.64 to 1.22)
Deprivation quintile	11.08	*	
1 (Most deprived)†			1.00
2	0.46		0.87 (0.60 to 1.29)
3	0.59		1.16 (0.79 to 1.70)
4	3.30		0.68 (0.44 to 1.03)
5 (Least deprived)	1.52		1.27 (0.87 to 1.85)
Employment status	45.71	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	12.02	***	1.96 (1.34 to 2.87)
Ill/disabled	11.37	***	2.22 (1.40 to 3.52)
Retired	0.47		0.87 (0.59 to 1.29)
Looking after home/family	10.15	**	1.92 (1.29 to 2.88)
In education/training (PT/FT)	5.92	*	0.51 (0.29 to 0.88)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	16.15	***	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	11.04	***	1.84 (1.28 to 2.63)
Limited a lot	11.50	***	2.06 (1.36 to 3.12)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

rating of childhood - very unhappy

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	32.90	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	14.29	***	2.37 (1.52 to 3.71)
Manchester	4.50	*	0.49 (0.26 to 0.95)
Employment status	16.28	**	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	0.64		0.70 (0.29 to 1.68)
Ill/disabled	6.13	*	2.37 (1.20 to 4.71)
Retired	0.00		1.00 (0.54 to 1.82)
Looking after home/family	3.41		1.85 (0.96 to 3.56)
In education/training (PT/FT)	1.58		0.57 (0.24 to 1.36)
Longterm limiting illness (LLI)	11.34	**	
None†			1.00
Limited a little	9.68	**	2.46 (1.40 to 4.34)
Limited a lot	0.38		1.27 (0.60 to 2.67)
Self-assessed health	7.36	*	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	0.03		1.05 (0.59 to 1.85)
Bad/very bad	5.84	*	2.35 (1.18 to 4.71)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

rating of childhood relationship with parents - very or fairly good

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
City	47.59	****	
Glasgow†			1.00
Liverpool	4.05	*	1.29 (1.01 to 1.66)
Manchester	22.60	****	0.58 (0.47 to 0.73)
Employment status	70.98	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	30.39	****	0.46 (0.35 to 0.61)
Ill/disabled	15.72	****	0.47 (0.32 to 0.68)
Retired	1.21		1.22 (0.86 to 1.73)
Looking after home/family	7.42	**	0.64 (0.46 to 0.88)
In education/training (PT/FT)	4.59	*	1.47 (1.03 to 2.08)
Marital status	14.62	**	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	13.55	***	1.54 (1.22 to 1.94)
Separated/divorced	2.58		1.31 (0.94 to 1.82)
Widowed/surviving partner	4.53	*	1.68 (1.04 to 2.71)
Self-assessed health	43.19	****	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	40.84	****	0.45 (0.36 to 0.58)
Bad/very bad	14.42	***	0.49 (0.34 to 0.71)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable

Multivariate logistic regression analysis of the factors associated with:

rating of childhood relationship with parents - very or fairly bad

Variable/category	Wald statistic	Significance ¹	Odds ratio (95% conf. ints.)
Ethnicity	9.73	**	
Not a member of ethnic minority group†			1.00
Member of ethnic minority group	9.73	**	0.25 (0.11 to 0.60)
Employment status	38.12	****	
Employed (PT/FT)†			1.00
Unemployed	15.27	****	2.61 (1.61 to 4.23)
Ill/disabled	15.75	****	3.13 (1.78 to 5.50)
Retired	0.32		1.19 (0.66 to 2.14)
Looking after home/family	8.60	**	2.34 (1.33 to 4.14)
In education/training (PT/FT)	2.05		0.59 (0.28 to 1.22)
Marital status	13.23	**	
Never married†			1.00
Married/civil partnership	11.61	***	0.50 (0.33 to 0.74)
Separated/divorced	3.60		0.61 (0.36 to 1.02)
Widowed/surviving partner	3.68		0.48 (0.22 to 1.02)
Self-assessed health	23.74	****	
Good/very good†			1.00
Fair	11.93	***	2.05 (1.36 to 3.07)
Bad/very bad	21.72	****	3.38 (2.03 to 5.65)

Notes

1. Significance level: * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p<0.001; **** = p<0.0001

† - reference category of variable