Appendixes to DWP research report no. 599

This document provides additional technical information to the main report Attitudes to age in Britain 2004-08.

List of Contents

Appendix A: Further details

A.1 Further details about the surveys (Chapter 1)

For the ACE and NSP surveys the data were collected through Taylor Nelson Sofres' (TNS) weekly face to face Omnibus. The ACE 2004 survey was fielded twice in consecutive weeks. The 2005 NSP age attitudes survey was fielded once as part of the NSP and again two months later. The May survey asked certain questions of the entire sample but the majority of items for this report come from the module focusing on age. In order to maximise statistical power for the 2005 surveys the May and July data sets are combined for this report. A further ACE survey was conducted in 2006 with a double sample.

In 2008, ACE sponsored a module within the British Market Research Bureau's (BMRM) weekly face-to-face Omnibus, a fully integrated youth and adult multimedia survey. Half of the respondents were randomly allocated to answer the age-related items with a target of 500 respondents. Fieldwork was carried out during the week 22-27 February 2008, and the total number of completed interviews was 487. Across all the surveys items were rotated and scale endpoints were counterbalanced between respondents so as to control for order and anchoring effects.

A.2 Further details about previous research surveys (Chapter 2)

The first EB survey was conducted between April and May 1992 with a sample of 12,800 people. The second survey was a special follow up survey of 400 people aged 60 and over in each member state, with the exception of 200 people in Luxembourg and 800 people in Germany. A total of 5,000 respondents took part.

Sample size and methodology used is that of Euro-Barometer surveys as carried out by the Directorate General for Communication, Research and Political Analysis Unit. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm

A large sample of the English population aged 50 and over took part in the first wave which took place during 2002 and 2003. The second wave involved a total of 9,432 interviews. Of these, 8,780 (93 per cent) were respondents from the previous wave. At wave three a total of 9,771 interviews were completed, of which 7,535 (77.1 per cent) were from the original cohort. The 2002 report was based on the 57th EB survey conducted in spring 2002 in the 15 European member states.

A.3 Further details about the analysis (Chapter 3)

The model we tested at first was a hierarchical regression analysis composed of three cumulative blocks. In the first block we examined whether respondents' age was related to the dependent variable. In the second block we examined the effect of relatively fixed personal and demographic characteristics of the respondents. These are gender, social class and ethnicity. Because there are several different survey years in the analyses and because these represent both different years and different cohorts we also include survey year in this block. The final block included demographic characteristics that are less fixed over time but that could still have a significant impact on people's perceptions and experiences concerning ageing. These were respondents' working status, housing tenure and marital status. The full details of these sequential analyses are provided in the appendices.

In the multiple regression analysis B coefficients describe the probability that a change in the independent variable will correspond to a change in the dependent variable. The β coefficients are simply standardised B coefficients. SE refers to the standard error. In binomial regression odds ratios served the same purpose as Bs. The closer an odds ratio is to 1, the smaller the effect of the given independent variable.

A positive B value or an odds ratio above 1 indicate that increases in the independent variable will lead to increase in the dependent variable, whereas a negative B value or an odds ratio below 1 indicate that increases in the independent variable correspond to a decrease in the dependent variable. For example, when the age of a respondent increases by one year, the probability of them indicating that old age starts after the age of 70 years increases by 4.3 per cent (odds ratio = 1.043; a small effect size). The odds ratios are also interpretable as a measure of the effect size and were therefore converted into Cohen's d, and then further into η2, which makes it possible to evaluate the effect size (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007).

In the analyses of covariance, year and age group (16-24, 25-49, 50-64, 65-79, and 80+) were entered as categorical independent variables. Gender, social class, ethnicity, working status, tenure and marital status were included as covariates, dummy coded where relevant. The main effects and interactions between year and age group were analysed. Wilks' Lambda was used as a test statistic for the multivariate tests of mean differences among groups.

The statistics for the overall regression model are included with the relevant tables. The test statistic is an F or a Chi Square (for binomial regression). Based on the size of the sample this statistic first allows us to estimate both how well the model accounts for the dependent variable. The effect size or percentage of variance accounted for in the dependent variable (R2 or η2) can range from 0 to 1, where 0 means that the independent variables do not explain any of the differences in the dependent variable and 1 means they explain all of the differences. With these two statistics it is conventional to describe effect sizes of .01 as 'small', .09 as "medium" effect, and .25 and above as "large" (Cohen, 1988). Effect sizes and significance levels are given to 3 decimal places where possible. If these are less than .001 we have written .000.

In tables of means, we have shown significant ($p < .05$) pairwise differences using superscripts. Means with different superscripts within a row are significantly different from one another. Any means sharing the same superscript do not differ from one another. Means with no superscript do not differ from any others.

We also describe the statistical significance of the results. This is an indication of the probability (p) that the result might have occurred by chance rather than accurately reflecting the true relationship between independent and dependent variables. This statistic can also range from 1 (any relationship is wholly unreliable) to 0 (the relationship is fully reliable). Conventionally a p value of less than .05 is conventionally regarded as 'significant'. However, with large samples and when conducting many statistical tests it is also conventional to require a smaller value of p before attaching importance to a finding. We only describe differences between groups as significant if the p value is less than .05, but in tables we also indicate whether the p values are less than .01 or less than .001 (i.e. a less than 1 in 1000 probability that the finding does not reflect the relationship between the independent and dependent variable in the general population. We report which independent variables had a significant unique effect and which effects are largest. The tables for regression analyses and analyses of covariance are given in Appendix B, means and standard errors for all items are reported in Appendix C.

Appendix B: Tables for the analyses

B.1 Tables on age categorisation and identification (Chapter 4)

Table B.1.1 Age self-categorisation; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		8600.214	28	307.151	198.465	.000	.566
Intercept		6985.601	1	6985.601	4513.737	.000	.514
Independent variables							
Survey year		32.658	2	16.329	10.551	.000	.005
Age group		2047.937	4	511.984	330.818	.000	.237
Survey year * Age group		189.596	8	23.699	15.313	.000	.028
Covariates							
Gender	Female	23.923	1	23.923	15.458	.000	.004
Social class	A	.529	1	.529	.342	.559	.000
	B	3.046	1	3.046	1.968	.161	.000
	C2	2.539	1	2.539	1.641	.200	.000
	D	.681	1	.681	.440	.507	.000
	E	16.078	1	16.078	10.389	.001	.002
Ethnicity	Non-white	5.994	1	5.994	3.873	.049	.001

Working status	Working PT	.001	1	.001	.001	.981	.000
	Not working	4.128	1	4.128	2.667	.102	.001
	Retired	38.427	1	38.427	24.829	.000	.006
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	1.297	1	1.297	.838	.360	.000
	Rented from council	.035	1	.035	.023	.881	.000
	Rented privately	10.133	1	10.133	6.548	.011	.002
Marital status	Not married	.002	1	.002	.001	.969	.000
Error		6599.100	4264	1.548			
Total		112500.000	4293				
Corrected Total		15199.314	4292				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed significant differences both between age groups; $F(4, 4264) = 330.82$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^{2} = .237$, and between survey years; $F(2, 4264) = 10.55$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^{2} = .005$. A significant interaction also revealed that the differences between age groups was not constant across survey years; $F(8, 4264) = 15.31$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^{2} = .028$. The difference between survey years, however, did not change in a linear fashion and therefore does not indicate a trend for age self-categorisation having changed over time.

Table B.1.2 Age self-categorization; Means and standard errors for survey years and age groups

	Survey Year			Age Group				
Survey year	**2004**	**2006**	**2008**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	5.14[a]	4.93[b]	5.19[a]	2.62[a]	4.15[bc]	5.26[bde]	6.22[bdfg]	7.18[bdfh]
SE	*.04*	*.04*	*.07*	*.07*	*.04*	*.05*	*.07*	*.11*

Table B.1.3 Age self-categorization; Means and standard error according to survey years and age groups overall

Survey Year	**2004**					**2006**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	2.21[a]	4.14[bc]	5.49[bde]	6.58[bdfg]	7.29[bdfh]	2.92[a]	4.11[bc]	5.09[bde]	5.81[bdfg]	6.73[bdfh]
SE	*0.09*	*0.05*	*0.06*	*0.08*	*0.14*	*0.08*	*0.05*	*0.06*	*0.08*	*0.14*

Survey Year	**2008**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	2.73[a]	4.21[bc]	5.22[bde]	6.28[bdfg]	7.53[bdfh]
SE	*.17*	*.09*	*.13*	*.15*	*.22*

Table B.1.4 Age self-categorisation; a multiple linear regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.075	.001	.767	.010	78.338	.000
2	Age		.075	.001	.772	.010	75.891	.000
	Survey year	2006	-.181	.039	-.048	.010	-4.666	.000
		2008	.002	.063	.000	.010	.025	.980
	Gender	Female	-.172	.037	-.046	.010	-4.653	.000
	Social class	A	-.082	.107	-.008	.010	-.761	.447
		B	.065	.060	.012	.011	1.079	.281
		C2	.073	.054	.016	.012	1.353	.176
		D	.027	.059	.005	.011	.458	.647
		E	.149	.057	.031	.012	2.627	.009
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.193	.066	.029	.010	2.911	.004
3	Age		.075	.002	.763	.016	46.505	.000
	Study year	2006	-.182	.039	-.048	.010	-4.684	.000
	Survey year	2008	.008	.063	.001	.010	.124	.901

(continued)

Table B.1.4 Continued

Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
Gender	Female	-.154	.039	-.041	.010	-3.938	.000
Social class	A	-.079	.108	-.007	.010	-.730	.466
	B	.066	.060	.013	.011	1.096	.273
	C2	.070	.054	.015	.012	1.294	.196
	D	.023	.060	.005	.012	.386	.700
	E	.141	.065	.029	.014	2.160	.031
Ethnicity	Non-white	.199	.067	.030	.010	2.979	.003
Working status	Working PT	-.079	.064	-.014	.011	-1.245	.213
	Not working	-.074	.057	-.016	.013	-1.288	.198
	Retired	.056	.070	.014	.017	.793	.428
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.072	.054	.018	.014	1.317	.188
	Rented from council	.104	.059	.022	.013	1.743	.081
	Rented privately	.055	.068	.010	.012	.803	.422
Marital status	Not married	.001	.040	.000	.010	.020	.984

NOTE. N = 4293;. The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant and accounted for a substantial amount of the variance; $F(17,4276) = 370.01$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .595$.

Table B.1.5 Estimated age at which people stop being young and when the old age starts; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	Young age stops	257217.330	28	9186.333	40.642	.000	.285
	Old age starts	109011.468	28	3893.267	35.022	.000	.256
Intercept	Young age stops	350667.012	1	350667.012	1551.419	.000	.352
	Old age starts	709991.821	1	709991.821	6386.698	.000	.691
Survey year	Young age stops	52632.709	2	26316.355	116.429	.000	.075
	Old age starts	9828.776	2	4914.388	44.207	.000	.030
Age group	Young age stops	37780.949	4	9445.237	41.788	.000	.055
	Old age starts	12462.453	4	3115.613	28.026	.000	.038
Survey year * Age group	Young age stops	5204.381	8	650.548	2.878	.003	.008
	Old age starts	2337.351	8	292.169	2.628	.007	.007
Error	Young age stops	644863.306	2853	226.030			
	Old age starts	317160.248	2853	111.167			
Total	Young age stops	7170381.000	2882				
	Old age starts	11757855.000	2882				

(continued)

Table B.1.5 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Total	Young age stops	902080.636	2881				
	Old age starts	426171.716	2881				

NOTE. For the age at which people are perceived to stop being young the MANCOVA revealed significant difference between age groups ; $F(4, 2853) = 41.79$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .055$, and between survey years; $F(2, 2853) = 116.43$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .075$ as well as a significant interaction showing that differences between age groups were not constant across survey years; $F(8, 2853) = 2.88$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .008$.

For the age at which old age is perceived to start the MANCOVA revealed significant differences both between age groups; $F(4, 2853) = 28.03$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .038$, and between survey years; $F(2, 2853) = 44.21$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .030$. A significant interaction also revealed that the differences between age groups were not constant across survey years; $F(8, 2853) = 2.63$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .007$, see tables in section 4.4 for means.

Table B.1.6 The estimated age at which people are perceived to stop being young; means and standard errors for survey years and age groups overall

	Survey Year			Age Group				
	2004	**2006**	**2008**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	51.81[a]	49.37[bc]	35.13[bd]	32.71[a]	41.84[bc]	47.43[bde]	50.47[bdfg]	54.73[bdfh]
SE	*.73*	*.56*	*.94*	*.99*	*.59*	*.75*	*1.14*	*1.71*

Table B.1.7 The estimated age at which people are perceived to stop being young; Means and standard errors according to survey years and age groups

Survey Year 2004						**2006**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	39.13[a]	49.00[bc]	53.51[bde]	55.59[bde]	61.80[bdf]	33.13[a]	45.98[bc]	53.33[bde]	56.56[bdf]	57.87[bdf]
SE	*1.36*	*0.80*	*1.11*	*1.51*	*2.78*	*1.11*	*0.68*	*0.84*	*1.23*	*2.08*

Survey Year	**2008**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	25.86[a]	30.56[bc]	35.44[bde]	39.26[bd]	44.52[bdf]
SE	*2.12*	*1.16*	*1.72*	*2.02*	*3.12*

Table B.1.8 Estimated age at which people stop being young; a binomial logistic regression analysis

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		.058	121.726	.000	1.059	1.048	1.070	0.000
Survey year	2006	-.141	1.139	.286	.869	.671	1.125	0.002
	2008	-1.946	153.698	.000	.143	.105	.194	0.224
Gender	Female	.582	23.906	.000	1.790	1.417	2.260	0.025
Social class	A	-.452	1.791	.181	.636	.328	1.234	0.015
	B	.130	.471	.492	1.139	.786	1.649	0.001
	C2	-.182	1.264	.261	.834	.608	1.144	0.003
	D	-.191	1.264	.261	.826	.591	1.153	0.003
	E	-.223	1.169	.280	.800	.534	1.199	0.004
Ethnicity	Not white	-.359	5.367	.021	.698	.516	.946	0.010
Working status	Working PT	-.435	5.688	.017	.647	.453	.925	0.014
	Not working	-.348	5.184	.023	.706	.523	.953	0.009
	Retired	-.630	6.303	.012	.532	.326	.871	0.029

(continued)

Table B.1.8 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.206	1.378	.240	1.229	.871	1.735	0.003
	Rented from council	.123	.407	.523	1.131	.775	1.649	0.001
	Rented privately	.296	2.158	.142	1.345	.906	1.997	0.007
Marital status	Not married	-.381	9.757	.002	.683	.538	.868	0.011

NOTE. [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio. The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant, $\chi^2(17, N = 2987) = 547.96$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .281$

Table B.1.9 The estimated start of the old age; means and standard errors for survey years and age groups overall

	Survey Year			Age Group				
	2004	**2006**	**2008**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	65.63[a]	64.19[bc]	58.27[bd]	55.54[a]	60.36[bc]	63.91[bde]	64.97[bdeg]	68.71[bdfh]
SE	*0.51*	*0.39*	*0.66*	*0.70*	*0.41*	*0.53*	*0.80*	*1.20*

NOTE. See Table B.4.3 for model statistics for the start of old age.

Table B.1.10 The estimated start of the old age; means and standard errors according to survey year and age group

Survey Year	**2004**					**2006**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	57.58[a]	62.13[bc]	66.06[bde]	67.54[bde]	74.87[bdf]	56.04[a]	61.91[bc]	66.92[bd]	68.06[bd]	68.00[bd]
SE	*0.96*	*0.56*	*0.78*	*1.06*	*1.95*	*0.78*	*0.48*	*0.59*	*0.87*	*1.46*

(continued)

Table B.1.10 Continued

Survey Year	**2008**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	53.00[a]	57.03[bc]	58.75[b]	59.32[b]	63.26[bd]
SE	*1.49*	*0.82*	*1.21*	*1.42*	*2.19*

Table B.1.11 Estimated age at which old age starts; binomial logistic regression analysis

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		.043	147.745	.000	1.044	1.037	1.051	0.000
Survey year	2006	-.278	11.810	.001	.758	.647	.888	0.006
	2008	-1.312	76.647	.000	.269	.201	.361	0.116
Gender	Female	.939	123.743	.000	2.558	2.168	3.018	0.063
Social class	A	.441	4.105	.043	1.555	1.015	2.383	0.015
	B	.307	6.350	.012	1.360	1.071	1.727	0.007
	C2	-.092	.663	.415	.912	.732	1.138	0.001
	D	-.344	7.281	.007	.709	.552	.910	0.009
	E	-.455	10.725	.001	.634	.483	.833	0.016
Ethnicity	Non-white	-.873	24.553	.000	.417	.296	.590	0.055
Working status	Working PT	.107	.677	.411	1.112	.863	1.434	0.001
	Not working	.052	.178	.673	1.054	.826	1.344	0.000
	Retired	-.294	4.198	.040	.745	.562	.987	0.007

(continued)

Table B.1.11 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.114	1.055	.304	.893	.719	1.109	0.001
	Rented from council	-.257	4.325	.038	.773	.607	.985	0.005
	Rented privately	-.323	4.583	.032	.724	.539	.973	0.008
Marital status	Not married	-.238	7.854	.005	.788	.667	.931	0.004

NOTE. [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio. The test of overall regression model was statistically significant; $\chi^2(17, N = 3652) = 743.27$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .253$.

Table B.1.12 Difference between estimated age at which people to stop being young and old age starts; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		64635.518	28	2308.411	9.377	.000	.084
Intercept		62719.536	1	62719.536	254.767	.000	.082
Independent variables							
Survey year		17090.821	2	8545.411	34.711	.000	.024
Age group		7192.962	4	1798.241	7.304	.000	.010
Survey year * Age group		3263.860	8	407.983	1.657	.104	.005
Covariates							
Gender	Female	549.461	1	549.461	2.232	.135	.001
Social class	A	1041.289	1	1041.289	4.230	.040	.001
	B	3489.733	1	3489.733	14.175	.000	.005
	C2	4.816	1	4.816	.020	.889	.000
	D	17.026	1	17.026	.069	.793	.000
	E	25.524	1	25.524	.104	.747	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	1948.167	1	1948.167	7.913	.005	.003

(continued)

Table B.1.12 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	98.840	1	98.840	.401	.526	.000
	Not working	32.029	1	32.029	.130	.718	.000
	Retired	40.235	1	40.235	.163	.686	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	455.358	1	455.358	1.850	.174	.001
	Rented from council	744.324	1	744.324	3.023	.082	.001
	Rented privately	362.201	1	362.201	1.471	.225	.001
Marital status	Not married	406.184	1	406.184	1.650	.199	.001
Error		702363.152	2853	246.184			
Total		1511076.000	2882				
Corrected Total		766998.670	2881				

NOTE. The main effects of age group; $F(4, 2853) = 7.30$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .010$, and survey year ; $F(2, 2853) = 34.71$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .024$, were significant. The interaction between age group and survey year was not significant.

Table B.1.13 Difference between the age at which youth is perceived to end and old age is perceived to start; means and standard errors for survey years and age groups overall

	Survey Year			Age Group				
	2004	**2006**	**2008**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	14.07[a]	14.77[ac]	22.42[bd]	22.34[a]	18.72[bc]	16.50[bde]	5.04[bde]	12.84[bdf]
SE	*0.84*	*0.59*	*1.04*	*0.93*	*0.59*	*0.79*	*1.27*	*2.00*

Table B.1.14 Age-group identification; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		298.359	28	10.656	9.201	.000	.057
Intercept		3029.227	1	3029.227	2615.601	.000	.380
Independent variables							
Survey year		26.815	2	13.407	11.577	.000	.005
Age group		67.135	4	16.784	14.492	.000	.013
Survey year * Age group		16.269	8	2.034	1.756	.081	.003
Covariates							
Gender	Female	18.746	1	18.746	16.187	.000	.004
Social class	A	2.121	1	2.121	1.831	.176	.000
	B	8.654	1	8.654	7.472	.006	.002
	C2	4.165	1	4.165	3.596	.058	.001
	D	13.689	1	13.689	11.820	.001	.003
	E	.189	1	.189	.164	.686	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	33.880	1	33.880	29.254	.000	.007

(continued)

Table B.1.14 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	.256	1	.256	.221	.638	.000
	Not working	.065	1	.065	.056	.812	.000
	Retired	.033	1	.033	.028	.867	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.841	1	.841	.726	.394	.000
	Rented from council	1.785	1	1.785	1.541	.215	.000
	Rented privately	.627	1	.627	.541	.462	.000
Marital status	Not married	.623	1	.623	.538	.463	.000
Error		4934.826	4261	1.158			
Total		52262.000	4290				
Corrected Total		5233.185	4289				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed significant differences both between age groups; $F(4, 4261) = 14.49$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .013$, and between survey years; $F(2, 4261) = 11.58$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$. The interaction between age group and survey year was not significant; $F(8, 4261) = 1.76$, $p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$.

Table B.1.15 Age-group identification; means and standard errors for survey years and age groups overall

	Survey year			Age group				
	2004	**2006**	**2008**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.48[a]	3.35[bc]	3.17[bd]	3.57[a]	3.22[bc]	3.04[bde]	3.30[bcfg]	3.53[adfh]
SE	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.06*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.06*	*0.09*

Table B.1.16 Age-group identification; a multiple linear regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.004	.001	-.062	.015	-4.073	.000
2	Age		-.002	.001	-.038	.016	-2.423	.015
	Survey year	2006	-.100	.035	-.045	.016	-2.828	.005
		2008	-.284	.057	-.079	.016	-4.970	.000
	Gender	Female	-.147	.034	-.066	.015	-4.369	.000
	Social class	A	-.138	.097	-.022	.016	-1.416	.157
		B	-.153	.055	-.049	.018	-2.799	.005
		C2	.091	.049	.034	.018	1.866	.062
		D	.198	.053	.066	.018	3.735	.000
		E	.088	.051	.031	.018	1.712	.087
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.334	.060	.086	.015	5.546	.000
3	Age		-.007	.001	-.125	.025	-4.950	.000
	Survey year	2006	-.107	.035	-.049	.016	-3.054	.002

(continued)

Table B.1.16 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2008	-.284	.057	-.079	.016	-4.974	.000
	Gender	Female	-.152	.035	-.068	.016	-4.301	.000
	Social class	A	-.132	.097	-.021	.016	-1.354	.176
		B	-.147	.055	-.047	.018	-2.684	.007
		C2	.102	.049	.038	.018	2.083	.037
		D	.189	.054	.063	.018	3.517	.000
		E	.016	.059	.006	.021	.269	.788
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.319	.060	.082	.016	5.287	.000
	Working status	Working PT	.007	.057	.002	.017	.127	.899
		Not working	.017	.052	.006	.020	.328	.743
		Retired	.316	.063	.131	.026	4.978	.000
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.018	.049	.008	.021	.369	.712
		Rented from council	.049	.054	.018	.020	.913	.361
		Rented privately	.017	.062	.005	.019	.282	.778
	Marital status	Not married	.104	.036	.047	.016	2.894	.004

NOTE. N = 4292. The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant; F(17, 4275) = 10.75, p <.001, R^2 = .041.

B.2 Tables on perceived age prejudice (Chapter 5)

Table B.2.1 Over 50 as 'old'; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		159.645	23	6.941	4.058	.000	.024
Intercept		1980.350	1	1980.350	1157.730	.000	.233
Independent variables							
Survey year		6.484	1	6.484	3.790	.052	.001
Age group		30.018	4	7.505	4.387	.002	.005
Survey year * Age group		7.321	4	1.830	1.070	.370	.001
Covariates							
Gender	Female	27.108	1	27.108	15.848	.000	.004
Social class	A	16.048	1	16.048	9.382	.002	.002
	B	11.965	1	11.965	6.995	.008	.002
	C2	.000	1	.000	.000	.987	.000
	D	2.034	1	2.034	1.189	.276	.000
	E	.508	1	.508	.297	.586	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	11.228	1	11.228	6.564	.010	.002

Table B.2.1 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	4.915	1	4.915	2.873	.090	.001
	Not working	1.052	1	1.052	.615	.433	.000
	Retired	2.017	1	2.017	1.179	.278	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	1.594	1	1.594	.932	.334	.000
	Rented council	2.671	1	2.671	1.562	.211	.000
	Rented privately	3.459	1	3.459	2.022	.155	.001
Marital status	Not married	2.047	1	2.047	1.197	.274	.000
Error		6520.601	3812	1.711			
Total		38684.000	3836				
Corrected Total		6680.246	3835				

NOTE. The ANCOVA showed significant differences among age groups; $F(4, 3812) = 4.39$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$.

Table B.2.2. Over 50 as 'old'; means and standard errors for age groups

	Age group				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.07[a]	2.91[b]	2.83[bc]	2.77[be]	3.10[df]
SE	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.11*

Table B.2.3 Over 50 as 'old'; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.000	.001	-0.007	.016	-0.408	.684
2	Age		-.002	.001	-.024	.017	-1.447	.148
	Survey year	2006	-.118	.042	-.045	.016	-2.784	.005
	Gender	Female	.190	.043	.071	.016	4.424	.000
	Social class	A	.376	.121	.053	.017	3.102	.002
		B	.187	.070	.050	.019	2.679	.007
		C2	-.008	.063	-.002	.020	-0.125	.900
		D	-.092	.068	-.026	.019	-1.354	.176
		E	-.031	.065	-.009	.020	-0.470	.638
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.205	.078	-.044	.017	-2.637	.008
3	Age		-.003	.002	-.051	.027	-1.847	.065
	Survey year	2006	-.117	.042	-.044	.016	-2.755	.006
	Gender	Female	.176	.045	.066	.017	3.893	.000

(continued)

Table B.2.3 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	A	.374	.121	.052	.017	3.082	.002
		B	.190	.070	.051	.019	2.711	.007
		C2	.007	.063	.002	.020	.116	.908
		D	-.072	.069	-.020	.019	-1.038	.299
		E	.050	.075	.015	.023	.659	.510
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.199	.078	-.042	.017	-2.545	.011
	Working status	Working PT	.133	.074	.033	.018	1.803	.072
		Not working	-.049	.067	-.015	.021	-0.730	.466
		Retired	.129	.081	.045	.028	1.587	.113
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.065	.062	.023	.022	1.033	.302
		Rented from council	-.081	.068	-.025	.021	-1.178	.239
		Rented privately	.110	.079	.028	.020	1.388	.165
	Marital status	Not married	-.017	.046	-.006	.017	-0.373	.709

NOTE. N = 3835. The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant, $F(16, 3819) = 4.61$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .019$

Table B.2.4 Perceived frequency of prejudice against people over 70 years over the previous year; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		66.229	18	3.679	4.804	.000	.023
Intercept		761.283	1	761.283	994.031	.000	.214
Independent variable							
Age group		14.025	4	3.506	4.578	.001	.005
Covariates							
Gender	Female	6.703	1	6.703	8.753	.003	.002
Social class	A	1.905	1	1.905	2.488	.115	.001
	B	2.476	1	2.476	3.233	.072	.001
	C2	.000	1	.000	.000	.985	.000
	D	.696	1	.696	.909	.340	.000
	E	.003	1	.003	.004	.951	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	16.895	1	16.895	22.060	.000	.006
Working status	Working PT	.018	1	.018	.024	.877	.000
	Not working	.513	1	.513	.670	.413	.000
	Retired	.056	1	.056	.074	.786	.000

(continued)

Table B.2.4 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.153	1	.153	.199	.655	.000
	Rented from council	.714	1	.714	.933	.334	.000
	Rented privately	.454	1	.454	.593	.441	.000
Marital status	Not married	.660	1	.660	.862	.353	.000
Error		2796.899	3652	.766			
Total		15660.000	3671				
Corrected Total		2863.128	3670				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed that the age groups differed significantly from each other; $F(4, 3652) = 4.58$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .005$.

Table B.2.5 Perceived frequency of prejudice against people over 70 years over the previous year; means and standard errors for age groups

	Age group				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	1.87[a]	1.90[c]	1.96[e]	1.74[df]	1.62[bdf]
SE	*0.04*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.06*	*0.09*

Table B.2.6 Perceived frequency of prejudice against people over 70 over the previous year; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.001	.001	-.029	.017	-1.766	.077
2	Age		-.002	.001	-.049	.017	-2.910	.004
	Gender	Female	.087	.029	.04	.016	2.968	.003
	Social class	A	.169	.095	.030	.017	1.771	.077
		B	.095	.049	.037	.019	1.931	.054
		C2	.000	.043	.000	.020	.010	.992
		D	-.056	.046	-.024	.019	-1.215	.224
		E	-.052	.043	-.024	.020	-1.210	.226
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.247	.049	-.086	.017	-5.065	.000
3	Age		-.001	.001	-.011	.027	-.412	.680
	Gender	Female	.094	.031	.053	.017	3.069	.002
	Social class	A	.163	.095	.029	.017	1.711	.087
		B	.089	.049	.034	.019	1.796	.073

(continued)

Table B.2.6 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
		C2	.001	.044	.001	.020	.032	.974
		D	-.042	.047	-.018	.020	-.894	.372
		E	.010	.051	.005	.024	.203	.839
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.237	.049	-.082	.017	-4.854	.000
	Working status	Working PT	-.008	.049	-.003	.019	-.165	.869
		Not working	-.049	.044	-.024	.022	-1.099	.272
		Retired	-.149	.056	-.073	.028	-2.633	.008
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.011	.043	.006	.023	.255	.799
		Rented from council	-.058	.047	-.028	.023	-1.224	.221
		Rented privately	-.062	.056	-.023	.021	-1.120	.263
	Marital status	Not married	.008	.031	.004	.018	.246	.806

NOTE. N = 3670.The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant; $F(15, 3655) = 4.54$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .018$

Table B.2.7 Perceived seriousness of age-discrimination; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		69.864	23	3.038	5.175	.000	.031
Intercept		1482.872	1	1482.872	2526.392	.000	.406
Independent variables							
Survey year		9.422	1	9.422	16.052	.000	.004
Age group		2.439	4	0.610	1.039	.386	.001
Survey year * Age group		2.452	4	0.613	1.045	.383	.001
Covariates							
Gender	Female	3.082	1	3.082	5.251	.022	.001
Social class	A	.120	1	0.120	.205	.651	.000
	B	.006	1	0.006	.010	.922	.000
	C2	11.035	1	11.035	18.800	.000	.005
	D	4.306	1	4.306	7.337	.007	.002
	E	.087	1	0.087	.147	.701	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	2.883	1	2.883	4.911	.027	.001

(continued)

Table B.2.7 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	.193	1	0.193	.328	.567	.000
	Not working	.399	1	0.399	.681	.409	.000
	Retired	7.167	1	7.167	12.211	.000	.003
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.075	1	0.075	.128	.720	.000
	Rented from council	1.150	1	1.150	1.959	.162	.001
	Rented privately	.555	1	0.555	.945	.331	.000
Marital status	Not married	1.119	1	1.119	1.907	.167	.001
Error		2168.202	3694	0.587			
Total		26044.000	3718				
Corrected Total		2238.066	3717				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed that survey years significantly differed from each other; $F(1, 3694) = 16.05$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$.

Table B.2.8 Perceived seriousness of age-discrimination; means and standard errors

Survey year	**2004**	**2006**
Mean	2.61[a]	2.48[b]
SE	*0.02*	*0.02*

Table B.2.9 Perceived seriousness of age-discrimination; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.002	.001	.051	.016	3.124	.002
2	Age		.003	.001	.068	.017	3.989	.000
	Survey year	2006	-.118	.025	-.075	.016	-4.637	.000
	Gender	Female	-.062	.026	-.040	.016	-2.432	.015
	Social class	A	-.028	.071	-.007	.017	-0.394	.694
		B	.005	.041	.002	.019	0.109	.913
		C2	.166	.037	.088	.020	4.444	.000
		D	.124	.040	.059	.019	3.063	.002
		E	.040	.039	.020	.020	1.037	.300
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.108	.047	.039	.017	2.317	.021
3	Age		-.002	.001	-.051	.027	-1.866	.062
	Survey year	2006	-.121	.025	-.078	.016	-4.790	.000
	Gender	Female	-.062	.027	-.040	.017	-2.317	.021

(continued)

Table B.2.9 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	A	-.030	.071	-.007	.017	-0.426	.670
		B	.007	.041	.003	.019	0.163	.870
		C2	.165	.037	.088	.020	4.433	.000
		D	.115	.041	.055	.019	2.803	.005
		E	.023	.045	.011	.023	0.505	.614
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.103	.047	.037	.017	2.188	.029
	Working status	Working PT	.026	.043	.011	.019	0.605	.545
		Not working	-.035	.040	-.019	.021	-0.881	.378
		Retired	.253	.048	.149	.028	5.238	.000
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.019	.037	-.011	.023	-0.501	.616
		Rented from council	.054	.041	.028	.021	1.325	.185
		Rented privately	.041	.047	.018	.020	0.878	.380
	Marital status	Not married	-.036	.027	-.023	.017	-1.315	.189

NOTE. N = 3717. The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant; $F(16, 3701) = 7.16$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .030$.

Table B.2.10 Perceptions of media bias against older people; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		34.560	18	1.920	2.687	.000	.013
Intercept		10.670	1	10.670	14.931	.000	.004
Independent variable							
Age group		3.965	4	.991	1.387	.236	.002
Covariates							
Gender	Female	3.635	1	3.635	5.087	.024	.001
Social class	A	.180	1	.180	.252	.616	.000
	B	.084	1	.084	.117	.732	.000
	C2	.407	1	.407	.570	.450	.000
	D	.125	1	.125	.175	.676	.000
	E	.205	1	.205	.287	.592	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	19.524	1	19.524	27.323	.000	.008
Working status	Working PT	.325	1	.325	.454	.500	.000
	Not working	.109	1	.109	.152	.696	.000
	Retired	.186	1	.186	.260	.610	.000

(continued)

Table B.2.10 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.842	1	.842	1.178	.278	.000
	Rented from council	3.436	1	3.436	4.809	.028	.001
	Rented privately	2.470	1	2.470	3.457	.063	.001
Marital status	Not married	.077	1	.077	.108	.743	.000
Error		2555.349	3576	.715			
Total		2751.000	3595				
Corrected Total		2589.909	3594				

NOTE. The ANCOVA did not show significant differences between age groups.

Table B.2.11 Perceptions of media bias against older people; a multiple linear regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.000	.001	.002	.017	.121	.903
2	Age		.001	.001	.023	.017	1.311	.190
	Gender	Female	-.071	.028	-.042	.017	-2.500	.012
	Social class	A	.031	.093	.006	.017	.335	.737
		B	.007	.048	.003	.019	.152	.879
		C2	.030	.042	.014	.020	.701	.483
		D	.031	.045	.014	.020	.689	.491
		E	.013	.042	.006	.020	.312	.755
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.248	.047	.090	.017	5.266	.000
3	Age		.001	.001	.030	.028	1.089	.276
	Gender	Female	-.069	.030	-.040	.017	-2.313	.021
	Social class	A	.043	.093	.008	.017	.462	.644
		B	.015	.048	.006	.019	.318	.750

(continued)

Table B.2.11 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	C2	.031	.043	.015	.020	.735	.462
		D	.018	.045	.008	.020	.397	.691
		E	-.029	.050	-.014	.024	-.573	.567
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.247	.047	.090	.017	5.225	.000
	Working status	Working PT	-.030	.048	-.012	.019	-.627	.531
		Not working	-.012	.043	-.006	.022	-.288	.773
		Retired	.025	.055	.013	.028	.462	.644
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.043	.042	.024	.024	1.010	.313
		Rented from council	.100	.046	.051	.023	2.189	.029
		Rented privately	.101	.054	.039	.021	1.849	.065
	Marital status	Not married	.022	.031	.013	.018	.704	.482

NOTE. N = 3594.The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant; $F(15, 3579) = 2.93$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .012$.

B.3 Tables on experiences of discrimination (Chapter 6)

Table B.3.1 Experience of discrimination against age, gender and ethnicity; a mixed analysis of covariance (within subject effects)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Experienced Prejudice	8.810	1.939	4.544	55.104	0.000	0.007
Experienced Prejudice * Survey year	5.776	5.817	0.993	12.043	0.000	0.004
Experienced Prejudice * Age group	13.468	7.756	1.736	21.059	0.000	0.010
Experienced Prejudice * Survey * Age groups	4.070	23.268	0.175	2.121	0.001	0.003
Error(Experienced Prejudice)	1298.743	15750.263	0.082			

NOTE. Greenhouse-Geisser correction reported. Mixed analysis of covariance revealed a significant differences between experienced age, gender and ethnicity related discrimination F (1.939, 15750.263) = 55.104, p < .001 partial η^2 =.007, significant differences between age-groups F (7.756,,15750.263) = 21.059, p=<.001 partial η^2 =.01, survey year F (5.817, 15750.263) = 12.043, p=<.001 partial η^2 =.004.

Table B.3.2 Experience of discrimination against age, gender and ethnicity; analysis of covariance (between subjects effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Intercept		41.572	1	41.572	157.75	0.000	0.019
Gender	Female	1.502	1	1.502	5.700	0.017	0.001
Independent variables							
Survey year		22.600	3	7.533	28.586	0.000	0.010
Age group		30.876	4	7.719	29.291	0.000	0.014
Survey * Age group		5.314	12	0.443	1.680	0.064	0.002
Covariates							
Social Class	A	0.257	1	0.257	0.974	0.324	0.000
	B	1.122	1	1.122	4.256	0.039	0.001
	C2	0.670	1	0.670	2.543	0.111	0.000
	D	0.324	1	0.324	1.228	0.268	0.000
	E	0.529	1	0.529	2.006	0.157	0.000
Ethnicity	Not-white	31.610	1	31.610	119.95	0.000	0.015

(continued)

Table B.3.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	PT	0.006	1	0.006	0.023	0.879	0.000
	Not working	0.305	1	0.305	1.157	0.282	0.000
	Retired	0.014	1	0.014	0.053	0.818	0.000
Tenure	Brought on mortgage	0.068	1	0.068	0.258	0.612	0.000
	Rented from council	0.262	1	0.262	0.993	0.319	0.000
	Rented private	0.262	1	0.262	0.994	0.319	0.000
Marital status	Not-married	3.970	1	3.970	15.066	0.000	0.002
Error		2140.634	8123	0.264			

NOTE. The mixed ANCOVA revealed significant differences between age-groups F (4, 8123) = 29.291, p=<.001 partial η^2 =.014, survey year F (3, 8123) = 28.586, p=<.001 partial η^2 =.01.

Table B.3.3 Experience of prejudice and discrimination because of age, gender, ethnicity, religion, disability and sexual orientation; a mixed analysis of covariance (within subjects effects)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Experienced Prejudice	14.219	4.074	3.491	44.215	0.000	0.006
Experienced Prejudice * Survey year	6.313	8.147	0.775	9.815	0.000	0.003
Experienced Prejudice * Age group	31.796	16.294	1.951	24.718	0.000	0.013
Experienced Prejudice * Survey * Age groups	5.940	32.588	0.182	2.309	0.000	0.002
Error(Experienced Prejudice)	2467.500	31256.075	0.079			

NOTE. Greenhouse-Geisser correction reported. The mixed ANCOVA including all forms of discrimination revealed forms of discrimination differed significantly *F* (4.07, 31256.075) = 44.215, *p*<.001 partial η^2 =.006, and differed by age group *F* (16.294, 31256.075) = 24.718, *p*=<.001 partial η^2 =.013 and survey year *F* (8.147, 31256.075) = 9.815, *p*=<.001 partial η^2 =.003.

Table B.3.4 Experience of discrimination against age, gender, ethnicity, religion, disability and sexual orientation; a mixed analysis of covariance (between subjects effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Intercept		29.416	1	29.416	87.285	0.000	0.011
Gender	Female	0.001	1	0.001	0.003	0.957	0.000
Independent variables							
Survey year		34.954	2	17.477	51.859	0.000	0.013
Age group		27.261	4	6.815	20.222	0.000	0.010
Survey year*Age group		5.314	8	0.664	1.971	0.046	0.002
Covariates							
Social Class	A	0.144	1	0.144	0.426	0.514	0.000
	B	0.671	1	0.671	1.992	0.158	0.000
	C2	0.303	1	0.303	0.900	0.343	0.000
	D	0.647	1	0.647	1.921	0.166	0.000
	E	0.074	1	0.074	0.218	0.640	0.000
Ethnicity	Not-white	26.690	1	26.690	79.195	0.000	0.010

(continued)

Table B.3.4 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	PT	0.103	1	0.103	0.306	0.580	0.000
	Not working	1.140	1	1.140	3.381	0.066	0.000
	Retired	0.042	1	0.042	0.124	0.724	0.000
Tenure	Brought on mortgage	0.047	1	0.047	0.139	0.709	0.000
	Rented from council	1.049	1	1.049	3.114	0.078	0.000
	Rented private	0.163	1	0.163	0.485	0.486	0.000
Marital status	Not married	5.096	1	5.096	15.123	0.000	0.002
Error		2585.893	7673	0.337			

NOTE. The mixed ANCOVA revealed all forms of discrimination differed by age-group F (4, 7673) = 20.222, p=<.001 partial η^2 =.01, and survey year F (2, 7673) = 51.859, p=<.001 partial η^2 =.013, also a significant interaction between survey year and age group shows the effect of age group varies by survey year F (8, 7673) = 1.971, p=<.046 partial η^2 =.002.

Table B.3.5 Experiences of discrimination against age, gender and ethnicity; means and standard errors according to survey years

	Survey year											
	2004			**2005**			**2006**			**2008**		
	Age	**Gender**	**Ethnicity**	**Age**	**Gender**	**Ethnicity**	**Age**	**Gender**	**Ethnicity**	**Age**	**Gender**	**Ethnicity**
Mean	0.28[a]	0.20[a]	0.17[a]	0.25[a]	0.18[ac]	0.14[bc]	0.24[a]	0.0[bc]	0.07[bde]	0.35[b]	0.23[d]	0.21[df]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.02*

Table B.3.6 Experiences of discrimination against age, gender and ethnicity; means and standard errors for age groups

	Age group														
	16-24			25-49			50-64			65-79			80+		
	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Age	Gender	Ethnicity
Mean	0.52[a]	0.26[a]	0.23[a]	0.26[bc]	0.23[bc]	0.17[bc]	0.24[bc]	0.15[bde]	0.12[bd]	0.21[b]	0.13[bd]	0.11[bd]	0.17[bd]	0.09[bdf]	0.11[bd]
SE	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.01*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.02*

Table B.3.7 Experiences of all forms of discrimination; means and standard errors for survey years

	Survey year 2004					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.28	0.20[a]	0.17[a]	0.15[a]	0.13[a]	0.11[a]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*

	Survey year 2005					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.25	0.18[a]	0.14[bc]	0.10[bc]	0.10[bc]	0.07[bc]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*

(continued)

Table B.3.7 Continued

	Survey year 2006					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.24	0.0[b]	0.07[bd]	0.03[bd]	0.05[bd]	0.01[bd]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*

Table B.3.8 Experiences of all forms of discrimination; Means and standard errors for age groups

	Age group					
	16-24					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.52[a]	0.26[a]	0.23[a]	0.15[a]	0.09[a]	0.11[a]
SE	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*

	Age group					
	25-49					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.26[bc]	0.23[bc]	0.17[bc]	0.12[c]	0.13[bc]	0.08[bc]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*

(continued)

Table B.3.8 Continued

	Age group					
	50-64					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.24[bc]	0.15[bde]	0.12[bd]	0.08[bd]	0.12[bc]	0.06[bd]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.01*

	Age group					
	65-79					
	Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.21[b]	0.13[bd]	0.11[bd]	0.07[bd]	0.08[d]	0.04[bd]
SE	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.01*	*0.07*	*0.08*	*0.04*

(continued)

Table B.3.8 Continued

	Age group					
	80 + Age	**Ethnicity**	**Gender**	**Religion**	**Disability**	**Orientation**
Mean	0.[17bd]	0.09[bdf]	0.11[bd]	0.05[bd]	0.04[bd]	0.04[bd]
SE	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.02*	*002*	*0.02*	*0.02*

Table B.3.9 Experience of prejudice and discrimination because of age; a binomial logistic regression analysis

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		-0.028	150.536	0.000	0.972	0.968	0.976	0.000
Survey	2005	-0.170	6.639	0.010	0.844	0.741	0.960	0.002
	2006	-0.305	16.016	0.000	0.737	0.635	0.856	0.007
	2008	0.307	7.252	0.007	1.360	1.087	1.700	0.007
Gender	Female	-0.038	0.479	0.489	0.963	0.865	1.072	0.000
Social Class	A	0.058	0.132	0.716	1.060	0.774	1.453	0.000
	B	0.080	0.873	0.350	1.083	0.916	1.281	0.000
	C2	-0.073	0.910	0.340	0.929	0.799	1.081	0.000
	D	-0.107	1.667	0.197	0.898	0.763	1.057	0.001
	E	-0.230	6.291	0.012	0.794	0.663	0.951	0.004
Ethnicity	Not-white	-0.091	1.111	0.292	0.913	0.771	1.081	0.001
Working status	PT	-0.013	0.020	0.888	0.988	0.829	1.176	0.000
	Not working	0.159	4.277	0.039	1.173	1.008	1.364	0.002
	Retired	0.522	25.283	0.000	1.685	1.375	2.066	0.020

(continued)

Table B.3.9 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Tenure	Brought on mortgage	-0.132	2.806	0.094	0.877	0.752	1.023	0.001
	Rented from council	-0.097	1.262	0.261	0.908	0.767	1.075	0.001
	Rented private	-0.079	0.674	0.412	0.924	0.766	1.115	0.000
Marital status	Not married	0.285	26.143	0.000	1.330	1.192	1.483	0.006

NOTE. [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio. The binomial logistic regression model was significant; $\chi^2(18, N = 8162) = 347.69$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .061$.

B.4 Tables on age stereotypes (Chapter 7)

Table B.4.1 Age stereotypes; a mixed factorial analysis of variance (within subjects effects)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Old versus Young Comparison						
Warmth	63.204	1.000	63.204	74.960	.000	.019
Competence	19.770	1.000	19.770	20.983	.000	.005
Admiration	30.072	1.000	30.072	31.165	.000	.008
Pity	47.392	1.000	47.392	44.667	.000	.011
Envy	61.784	1.000	61.784	56.949	.000	.014
Moral	299.064	1.000	299.064	274.853	.000	.065
Comparison * Age Group						
Warmth	8.998	4.000	2.250	2.668	.031	.003
Competence	33.710	4.000	8.428	8.945	.000	.009
Admiration	13.400	4.000	3.350	3.472	.008	.003
Pity	18.552	4.000	4.638	4.371	.002	.004
Envy	5.337	4.000	1.334	1.230	.296	.001
Moral	17.719	4.000	4.430	4.071	.003	.004

Table B.4.1 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Comparison * Survey year							
	Warmth	0.636	2.000	.318	.377	.686	.000
	Competence	1.803	2.000	.902	.957	.384	.000
	Admiration	7.747	2.000	3.874	4.014	.018	.002
	Pity	0.631	2.000	.315	.297	.743	.000
	Envy	3.924	2.000	1.962	1.808	.164	.001
	Moral	0.488	2.000	.244	.224	.799	.000
Error							
	Warmth	3339.804	3961.000	.843			
	Competence	3731.953	3961.000	.942			
	Admiration	3822.160	3961.000	.965			
	Pity	4202.633	3961.000	1.061			
	Envy	4297.345	3961.000	1.085			
	Moral	4309.911	3961.000	1.088			

NOTE. Greenhouse-Geisser correction reported. The multivariate within-subject effect of the old versus young comparison was significant F (6,3956) = 66.93, $p < .001$, η^2 = .092 . Univariate tests revealed that the difference was significant on all item pairs (e.g., perceptions of friendliness of the under 30s versus over 70s. More importantly, there was also a significant comparison x age group interaction F (24, 15836) = 4.46, $p < .001$, η^2 = .007 showing that comparisons of people under 30 and over 70 were

not consistent between age-groups. Univariate tests revealed significant comparison x age group interactions for all items except envy. This means that evaluations (stereotypes) of older and younger people change depending on the age of the respondent. There was no effect of survey year suggesting evaluations (stereotypes) of older and younger people are fairly consistent thought out survey years.

Table B.4.2 Age stereotypes; a mixed factorial analysis of covariance (between subject effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Intercept	Warmth	5878.941	1	5878.941	5003.251	.000	.558
	Competence	5419.035	1	5419.035	4640.254	.000	.539
	Admiration	4411.295	1	4411.295	3656.573	.000	.480
	Pity	3078.182	1	3078.182	2035.486	.000	.339
	Envy	2873.030	1	2873.030	2032.149	.000	.339
	Moral	5915.560	1	5915.560	6475.708	.000	.620
Age Group	Warmth	22.711	4	5.678	4.832	.001	.005
	Competence	20.929	4	5.232	4.480	.001	.005
	Admiration	14.226	4	3.557	2.948	.019	.003
	Pity	30.633	4	7.658	5.064	.000	.005
	Envy	5.983	4	1.496	1.058	.376	.001
	Moral	7.088	4	1.772	1.940	.101	.002

(continued)

Table B.4.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Survey year	Warmth	28.272	2	14.136	12.030	.000	.006
	Competence	25.496	2	12.748	10.916	.000	.005
	Admiration	136.972	2	68.486	56.769	.000	.028
	Pity	158.453	2	79.226	52.389	.000	.026
	Envy	131.008	2	65.504	46.332	.000	.023
	Moral	36.841	2	18.420	20.165	.000	.010
Age Groups* Survey year							
	Warmth	4.738	8	.592	.504	.854	.001
	Competence	10.487	8	1.311	1.122	.344	.002
	Admiration	5.915	8	.739	.613	.768	.001
	Pity	2.060	8	.258	.170	.995	.000
	Envy	33.826	8	4.228	2.991	.002	.006
	Moral	5.079	8	.635	.695	.696	.001

(continued)

Table B.4.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Error	Warmth	4654.271	3961	1.175			
	Competence	4625.781	3961	1.168			
	Admiration	4778.556	3961	1.206			
	Pity	5990.060	3961	1.512			
	Envy	5600.017	3961	1.414			
	Moral	3618.374	3961	.914			

NOTE. The between-subject effect of age group was significant for all items except moral and envy, indicating that ratings of both age groups varied as a function of respondents' age.

Table B.4.3 Age stereotypes; means and standard errors

	Warmth	Competence	Admiration	Pity	Envy	Moral
People over 70						
Mean	3.71[a]	3.07[bc]	3.21[bde]	2.80[bdfg]	2.09[bdfhi]	4.06[bdfhj]
SE	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*
People under 30						
Mean	3.15[a]	3.54[bc]	2.82[bde]	2.09[bdfg]	2.69[bdfhi]	2.69[bdfhj]
SE	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.03*

Table B.4.4 Age stereotypes for people over 70; Means and standard errors

	Warmth					Competence				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.76[a]	3.61[b]	3.56[bc]	3.73[d]	3.88[a]	2.81[a]	2.94[c]	3.03[be]	3.17[bdg]	3.39[bdfh]
SE	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.10*	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.10*

	Admiration					Pity				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.30[a]	3.21	3.14	3.09[b]	3.31[a]	3.14[a]	2.99[a]	2.75[bc]	2.62[b]	2.49[bd]
SE	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.10*	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.11*

Table B.4.4 Continued

	Envy					Moral				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	2.08	2.02	2.10	2.13	2.14	3.91[a]	4.01	4.07[b]	4.09[b]	4.20[b]
SE	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.10*	*0.06*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.09*

Table B.4.5 Age stereotypes for people under 30; means and standard errors

	Warmth					Competence				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.12[a]	2.98[bc]	3.15[d]	3.23[d]	3.28[d]	3.75[a]	3.40[b]	3.43[b]	3.50[b]	3.59
SE	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.09*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.06*	*0.10*

	Admiration					Pity				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	2.83[a]	2.65[bc]	2.75[c]	2.93[d]	2.96[d]	2.20	2.06	2.12	2.06	2.03
SE	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.06*	*0.09*	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.10*

(continued)

Table B.4.5 Continued

	Envy					Moral				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	2.80[a]	2.66	2.59[b]	2.65	2.72	2.87[a]	2.60[b]	2.63[b]	2.61[b]	2.74
SE	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.08*	*0.11*	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.10*

Table B. 4.6 Age stereotype difference scores; analysis of variance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	Warmth	90.971 28	3.249	1.927	0.002	0.013	
	Competence	225.569	28	8.056	4.275	0.000	0.029
	Admiration	196.155	28	7.006	3.630	0.000	0.025
	Pity	293.828	28	10.494	4.945	0.000	0.034
	Envy	157.847	28	5.637	2.598	0.000	0.018
	Moral	423.768	28	15.135	6.955	0.000	0.047
Intercept	Warmth	126.408	1	126.408	74.960	0.000	0.019
	Competence	39.540	1	39.540	20.983	0.000	0.005
	Admiration	60.144	1	60.144	31.165	0.000	0.008
	Pity	94.783	1	94.783	44.667	0.000	0.011
	Envy	123.569	1	123.569	56.949	0.000	0.014
	Moral	598.128	1	598.128	274.853	0.000	0.065
Age group	Warmth	17.996	4	4.499	2.668	0.031	0.003
	Competence	67.420	4	16.855	8.945	0.000	0.009

(continued)

Table B.4.6 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
	Admiration	26.800	4	6.700	3.472	0.008	0.003
	Pity	37.104	4	9.276	4.371	0.002	0.004
	Envy	10.674	4	2.668	1.230	0.296	0.001
	Moral	35.438	4	8.859	4.071	0.003	0.004
Survey year	Warmth	1.272	2	0.636	0.377	0.686	0.000
	Competence	3.606	2	1.803	0.957	0.384	0.000
	Admiration	15.495	2	7.747	4.014	0.018	0.002
	Pity	1.262	2	0.631	0.297	0.743	0.000
	Envy	7.847	2	3.924	1.808	0.164	0.001
	Moral	0.976	2	0.488	0.224	0.799	0.000
Age groups * Survey year							
	Warmth	5.347	8	0.668	0.396	0.923	0.001
	Competence	24.289	8	3.036	1.611	0.116	0.003
	Admiration	23.043	8	2.880	1.493	0.154	0.003
	Pity	19.879	8	2.485	1.171	0.313	0.002

(continued)

Table B.4.6 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
	Envy	19.093	8	2.387	1.100	0.360	0.002
	Moral	10.859	8	1.357	0.624	0.759	0.001
Error	Warmth	6679.608	3961	1.686			
	Competence	7463.906	3961	1.884			
	Admiration	7644.320	3961	1.930			
	Pity	8405.266	3961	2.122			
	Envy	8594.689	3961	2.170			
	Moral	8619.822	3961	2.176			
Total	Warmth	8027.000	3990				
	Competence	8677.000	3990				
	Admiration	8418.000	3990				
	Pity	11052.000	3990				
	Envy	10105.000	3990				
	Moral	16783.000	3990				

(continued)

Table B.4.6 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Total	Warmth	6770.579	3989				
	Competence	7689.475	3989				
	Admiration	7840.475	3989				
	Pity	8699.094	3989				
	Envy	8752.537	3989				
	Moral	9043.589	3989				

NOTE. The multivariate ANCOVA revealed the effect of survey year was not significant.

Table B.4.7 Age stereotype difference scores; means and standard errors by survey year

	Warmth			**Competence**			**Admiration**		
	2004	2006	2008	2004	2006	2008	2004	2006	2008
Mean	0.53	0.58	0.56	-0.46	-0.52	-0.42	0.38	0.27[a]	0.51[b]
SE	*0.047*	*0.040*	*0.077*	*0.049*	*0.042*	*0.082*	*0.050*	*0.042*	*0.083*

	Pity			**Envy**			**Moral**		
	2004	2006	2008	2004	2006	2008	2004	2006	2008
Mean	0.71	0.67	0.73	-0.61	-0.51	-0.66	1.38	1.39	1.33
SE	*0.052*	*0.044*	*0.087*	*0.053*	*0.045*	*0.088*	*0.053*	*0.045*	*0.088*

Table B.4.8 To what extent do you think that people over 70 are viewed as friendly; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.003	.001	.063	.013	4.956	.000
2	Age		.003	.001	.064	.013	4.816	.000
	Survey year	2005	.074	034	.033	.015	2.147	.032
		2006	.079	.034	.036	.015	2.344	.019
		2008	.308	.054	.078	.014	5.704	.000
	Gender	Female	-.098	.026	-.047	.013	-3.714	.000
	Social Class	A	.032	.079	.005	.013	.406	.685
		B	-.086	.044	-.030	.015	-1.984	.047
		C2	.023	.039	.009	.015	.584	.559
		D	.119	.042	.043	.015	2.852	.004
		E	.117	.040	.046	.016	2.950	.003
	Ethnicity	Non white	-.007	.046	-.002	.013	-.144	.886
3	Age		.001	.001	.026	.021	1.219	.223
	Survey year	2005	.072	.034	.032	.015	2.100	.036

(continued)

Table B.4.8 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	.075	.034	.034	.015	2.223	.026
		2008	.307	.054	.078	.014	5.668	.000
	Gender	Female	-.096	.028	-.046	.013	-3.442	.001
	Social Class	A	.038	.079	.006	.013	.484	.629
		B	-.082	.044	-.028	.015	-1.875	.061
		C2	.027	.039	.011	.016	.695	.487
		D	.111	.043	.040	.015	2.607	.009
		E	.063	.047	.024	.018	1.343	.179
	Ethnicity	Non white	-.017	.046	-.005	.013	-.381	.703
	Working status	Working PT	-.034	.045	-.011	.015	-.746	.456
		Not working	.020	.041	.008	.017	.501	.616
		Retired	.136	.051	.059	.022	2.678	.007
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.008	.039	-.004	.018	-.216	.829
		Rented from council	.043	.043	.017	.017	1.019	.308
		Rented privately	.037	.049	.012	.016	.743	.458
	Marital status	Not married	.031	.028	.015	.014	1.104	.270

NOTE. N = 6113. Multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18,6045) = 6.21$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .018$.

Table B.4.9 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people over 70 as capable; multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.008	.001	.143	.013	11.293	.000
2	Age		.008	.001	.146	.013	11.105	.000
	Survey year	2005	-.001	.036	.000	.015	-.022	.983
		2006	.018	.035	.008	.015	.525	.599
		2008	.286	.056	.070	.014	5.109	.000
	Gender	Female	.015	.027	.007	.013	.550	.582
	Social class	A	-.248	.081	-.040	.013	-3.052	.002
		B	-.104	.045	-.034	.015	-2.317	.021
		C2	.072	.041	.027	.015	1.785	.074
		D	.141	.043	.048	.015	3.243	.001
		E	.138	.041	.052	.015	3.353	.001
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.021	.048	.006	.013	.439	.661
3	Age		.007	.001	.133	.021	6.270	.000
	Survey year	2005	-.004	.036	-.002	.015	-.124	.901

(continued)

Table B.4.9 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	.017	.035	.008	.015	.495	.621
		2008	.287	.056	.070	.014	5.125	.000
	Gender	Female	.020	.029	.009	.013	.693	.488
	Social class	A	-.249	.082	-.041	.013	-3.058	.002
		B	-.106	.045	-.035	.015	-2.345	.019
		C2	.066	.041	.025	.015	1.619	.106
		D	.132	.044	.046	.015	2.992	.003
		E	.108	.048	.040	.018	2.233	.026
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.019	.048	.005	.013	-.969	.333
		Not working	.000	.042	.000	.017	.001	.999
		Retired	.010	.053	.004	.022	.183	.855
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.035	.041	-.015	.018	-.852	.394
		Rented from council	.041	.044	.016	.017	.932	.352
		Rented privately	-.078	.051	-.025	.016	-1.531	.126
	Marital status	Not married	-.008	.029	-.003	.014	-.259	.796

NOTE. N = 6101. Multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18, 6045) = 12.23$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .035$.

Table B.4.10 To what extent do you think that others view people over 70 with admiration; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.005	.001	-.078	.013	-6.082	.000
2	Age		-.004	.001	-.077	.013	-5.859	.000
	Survey year	2005	.018	.037	.007	.015	.479	.632
		2006	-.146	.036	-.062	.015	-4.076	.000
		2008	.473	.058	.112	.014	8.168	.000
	Gender	Female	-.023	.028	-.010	.013	-.814	.416
	Social class	A	-.079	.084	-.012	.013	-.938	.348
		B	-.111	.047	-.035	.015	-2.393	.017
		C2	.086	.042	.031	.015	2.055	.040
		D	.115	.045	.038	.015	2.561	.010
		E	.198	.043	.071	.015	4.635	.000
	Ethnicity	Non white	.008	.049	.002	.013	.164	.869
3	Age		-.003	.001	-.056	.021	-2.627	.009
	Survey year	2005	.017	.037	.007	.015	.474	.636

(continued)

Table B.4.10 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	-.145	.036	-.062	.015	-4.042	.000
		2008	.478	.058	.113	.014	8.242	.000
	Gender	Female	.005	.030	-.002	.013	-.172	.863
	Social class	A	-.076	.084	-.012	.013	-.907	.364
		B	-.110	.047	-.035	.015	-2.356	.018
		C2	.081	.042	.030	.015	1.923	.054
		D	.111	.046	.037	.015	2.436	.015
		E	.218	.050	.079	.018	4.362	.000
	Ethnicity	Non white	.016	.049	.004	.013	.328	.743
	Working status	Working PT	-.065	.049	-.019	.014	-1.339	.181
		Not working	-.088	.044	-.034	.017	-2.016	.044
		Retired	-.073	.055	-.029	.022	-1.339	.181
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.057	.042	.024	.018	1.357	.175
		Rented from council	.080	.046	.030	.017	1.755	.079
	Tenure	Rented privately	.083	.053	.025	.016	1.566	.117
	Marital status	Not married	-.024	.030	-.011	.014	-.792	.428

NOTE. N = 6081. Multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18,5883) = 12.30$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .035$.

Table B.4.11 To what extent do you think others view people over 70 with pity; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.013	.001	-.209	.013	-16.631	.000
2	Age		-.013	.001	-.206	.013	-15.924	.000
	Survey year	2005	-.036	.040	-.014	.015	-.902	.367
		2006	-.164	.039	-.064	.015	-4.235	.000
		2008	.462	.063	.100	.013	7.386	.000
	Gender	Female	.062	.031	.025	.013	2.016	.044
	Social class	A	.093	.091	.013	.013	1.027	.305
		B	.019	.050	.006	.015	.385	.700
		C2	-.048	.045	-.016	.015	-1.067	.286
		D	-.059	.048	-.018	.015	-1.229	.219
		E	-.036	.046	-.012	.015	-.789	.430
	Ethnicity	Non white	.041	.053	.010	.013	.775	.438
3	Age		-.010	.001	-.160	.021	-7.659	.000
	Survey year	2005	-.035	.040	-.013	.015	-.886	.376

(continued)

Table B.4.11 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	-.163	.039	-.063	.015	-4.202	.000
		2008	.459	.063	.099	.014	7.330	.000
	Gender	Female	.072	.032	.030	.013	2.244	.025
	Social class	A	.101	.091	.015	.013	1.114	.265
		B	.024	.050	.007	.015	.476	.634
		C2	-.051	.046	-.017	.015	-1.111	.267
		D	-.067	.049	-.020	.015	-1.353	.176
		E	-.044	.054	-.014	.018	-.815	.415
	Ethnicity	Non white	.044	.053	.011	.013	.833	.405
	Working status	Working PT	-.049	.053	-.013	.014	-.925	.355
		Not working	-.032	.047	-.011	.016	-.677	.498
		Retired	-.130	.059	-.048	.022	-2.202	.028
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.054	.046	.021	.018	1.183	.237
		Rented from council	.066	.049	.022	.017	1.329	.184
		Rented privately	.115	.057	.032	.016	2.011	.044
	Marital status	Not married	.015	.033	.006	.013	.466	.641

NOTE. N = 6074. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18,5883) = 21.97$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .063$.

Table B.4.12 To what extent do you think others view people over 70 with envy; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.002	.001	-.034	.013	-2.618	.009
2	Age		-.001	.001	-.015	.013	-1.160	.246
	Survey year	2005	.003	.036	.001	.015	.080	.936
		2006	-.059	.035	-.026	.015	-1.681	.093
		2008	.386	.057	.094	.014	6.828	.000
	Gender	Female	-.109	.028	-.050	.013	-3.936	.000
	Social class	A	-.002	.082	.000	.013	-.029	.977
		B	-.022	.046	-.007	.015	-.484	.628
		C2	.048	.041	.018	.015	1.160	.246
		D	.125	.044	.043	.015	2.851	.004
		E	.170	.042	.063	.016	4.068	.000
	Ethnicity	Non white	.316	.048	.086	.013	6.545	.000
3	Age		.000	.001	-.005	.021	-.235	.814
	Survey year	2005	-.001	.036	.000	.015	-.015	.988

(continued)

Table B.4.12 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	-.061	.035	-.027	.015	-1.751	.080
		2008	.383	.057	.093	.014	6.766	.000
	Gender	Female	-.099	.029	-.045	.013	-3.384	.001
	Social class	A	.014	.082	.002	.013	.172	.864
		B	-.010	.046	-.003	.015	-.228	.820
		C2	.041	.041	.033	.015	2.182	.029
		E	.087	.049	.032	.018	1.786	.074
	Ethnicity	Non white	.306	.048	.083	.013	6.320	.000
	Working status	Working PT	-.069	.048	-.021	.015	-1.454	.146
		Not working	-.005	.043	-.002	.017	-.124	.901
		Retired .017	.053	.007	.022	.312	.755	
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.022	.041	.010	.018	.538	.591
		Rented from council	.164	.045	.063	.017	3.678	.000
		Rented privately	.136	.052	.043	.016	2.638	.008
	Marital status	Not married	.008	.030	.004	.014	.276	.783

NOTE. N = 6054;.A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18,5883) = 9.65$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .029$.

Table B.4.13 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people over 70 as moral; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.006	.001	.117	.013	9.202	.000
2	Age		.005	.001	.092	.013	6.979	.000
	Survey year	2005	-.279	.034	-.123	.015	-8.123	.000
		2006	.037	.033	.017	.015	1.093	.274
		2008	.262	.054	.066	.014	4.867	.000
	Gender	Female	.030	.026	.014	.013	1.136	.256
	Social class	A	.091	.078	.015	.013	1.159	.246
		B	-.023	.043	-.008	.015	-.540	.589
		C2	-.045	.039	-.018	.015	-1.151	.250
		D	-.097	.042	-.035	.015	-2.321	.020
		E	-.040	.040	-.015	.015	-1.007	.314
	Ethnicity	Non white	-.249	.046	-.070	.013	-5.417	.000
3	Age		.005	.001	.083	.021	3.936	.000
	Survey year	2005	-.275	.034	-.122	.015	-8.012	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.13 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	.037	.033	.017	.015	1.106	.269
		2008	.268	.054	.068	.014	4.959	.000
	Gender	Female	.038	.028	.018	.013	1.081	.280
	Social class	A	.085	.078	.014	.013	1.081	.280
		B	-.028	.043	-.010	.015	-.654	.513
		C2	-.036	.039	-.014	.015	-.927	.354
		D	-.077	.043	-.027	.015	-1.803	.071
		E	.035	.047	.013	.018	.751	.453
	Ethnicity	Non white	-.241	.046	-.068	.013	-5.215	.000
	Working status	Working PT	-.003	.045	-.001	.014	-.068	.946
		Not working	-.072	.041	-.029	.017	-1.772	.076
		Retired	-.028	.051	-.012	.022	-.556	.578
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.009	.039	-.004	.018	-.236	.814
		Rented from council	-.103	.043	-.041	.017	-2.422	.015
		Rented privately	-.017	.049	-.006	.016	-.350	.727
	Marital status	Not married	.007	.028	.003	.013	.239	.811

NOTE. N = 6056.A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18,5883) = 15.89$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .047$.

Table B.4.14 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people under 30 as friendly; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.002	.001	.043	.015	2.768	.006
2	Age		.003	.001	.056	.016	3.475	.001
	Survey year	2006	-.027	.032	-.014	.016	-.846	.398
		2008	.198	.052	.062	.016	3.817	.000
	Gender	Female	.039	.031	.019	.015	1.261	.208
	Social class	A	.020	.089	.004	.016	.228	.820
		B	.048	.050	.017	.018	.955	.340
		C2	.116	.045	.048	.019	2.592	.010
		D	.160	.049	.060	.018	3.294	.001
		E	.087	.047	.034	.019	1.850	.064
	Ethnicity	Non white	.173	.055	.049	.016	3.128	.002
3	Age		.002	.001	.048	.026	1.851	.064
	Survey year	2006	-.032	.032	-.016	.016	-.976	.329
		2008	.191	.052	.060	.016	3.664	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.14 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	.040	.032	.020	.016	1.230	.219
	Social class	A	.030	.090	.005	.016	.329	.742
		B	.052	.050	.019	.018	1.039	.299
		C2	.124	.045	.052	.019	2.753	.006
		D	.157	.049	.058	.018	3.174	.002
		E	.039	.054	.015	.021	.715	.475
	Ethnicity	Non white	.157	.056	.045	.016	2.813	.005
	Working status	Working PT	-.029	.053	-.010	.018	-.557	.577
		Not working	.042	.047	.018	.020	.890	.373
		Retired	.050	.058	.023	.027	.850	.395
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.023	.045	-.011	.022	-.518	.604
		Rented from council	-.019	.050	-.008	.020	-.381	.703
		Rented privately	.050	.056	.017	.019	.888	.375
	Marital status	Not married	.068	.033	.034	.016	2.066	.039

NOTE. N = 4204. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(17,4169) = 3.76$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .015$.

Table B.4.15 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people under 30 as capable; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.002	.001	-.036	.015	-2.336	.020
2	Age		-.002	.001	-.033	.016	-2.066	.039
	Survey year	2006	.055	.033	.027	.016	1.652	.099
		2008	.212	.053	.065	.016	3.996	.000
	Gender	Female	.044	.031	.022	.015	1.395	.163
	Social class	A	.002	.091	.000	.016	.019	.985
		B	.038	.051	.013	.018	.747	.455
		C2	.075	.046	.030	.019	1.635	.102
		D	.128	.050	.047	.018	2.578	.010
		E	.123	.048	.048	.019	2.567	.010
	Ethnicity	Non white	.078	.056	.022	.016	1.383	.167
3	Age		-.003	.001	-.062	.026	-2.400	.016
	Survey year	2006	.050	.033	.025	.016	1.524	.127
		2008	.211	.053	.065	.016	3.968	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.15 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	.060	.033	.030	.016	1.817	.069
	Social class	A	.000	.091	.000	.016	.003	.998
		B	.035	.051	.013	.018	.696	.486
		C2	.083	.046	.034	.019	1.810	.070
		D	.137	.051	.050	.018	2.702	.007
		E	.090	.055	.035	.021	1.625	.104
	Ethnicity	Non white	.070	.057	.020	.016	1.237	.216
	Working status	Working PT	-.107	.054	-.036	.018	-2.004	.045
		Not working	.008	.048	.003	.020	.157	.876
		Retired	.102	.059	.046	.027	1.715	.086
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.028	.046	.013	.022	.609	.542
		Rented from council	.001	.051	.000	.020	.022	.982
		Rented privately	.029	.058	.010	.019	.498	.618
	Marital status	Not married	.050	.034	.024	.016	1.473	.141

NOTE. N = 4213. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(17,4169) = 3.02$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .012$.

Table B.4.16 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people under 30 with admiration; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.001	.001	-.013	.015	-.871	.384
2	Age		.000	.001	.005	.016	.292	.770
	Survey year	2006	-.094	.033	-.046	.016	-2.819	.005
		2008	.320	.053	.098	.016	5.992	.000
	Gender	Female	.025	.032	.012	.015	.792	.429
	Social class	A	.149	.091	.026	.016	1.628	.104
		B	.022	.051	.008	.018	.440	.660
		C2	.132	.046	.053	.019	2.882	.004
		D	.126	.050	.045	.018	2.521	.012
		E	.162	.048	.062	.018	3.345	.001
	Ethnicity	Non white	.345	.056	.096	.016	6.120	.000
3	Age		-.001	.001	-.012	.026	-.471	.637
	Survey year	2006	-.101	.033	-.049	.016	-3.043	.002
		2008	.312	.053	.095	.016	5.838	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.16 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	.030	.033	.015	.016	.918	.359
	Social class	A	.171	.091	.030	.016	1.870	.062
		B	.034	.051	.012	.018	.666	.506
		C2	.132	.046	.053	.019	2.868	.004
		D	.099	.051	.036	.018	1.962	.050
		E	.067	.056	.026	.021	1.208	.227
	Ethnicity	Non white	.320	.057	.089	.016	5.652	.000
	Working status	Working PT	-.047	.054	-.015	.018	-.876	.381
		Not working	.016	.048	.007	.020	.331	.740
		Retired	.061	.060	.027	.027	1.017	.309
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.065	.046	-.030	.022	-1.402	.161
		Rented from council	.073	.051	.029	.020	1.438	.150
		Rented privately	.072	.058	.024	.019	1.251	.211
	Marital status	Not married	.079	.034	.038	.016	2.345	.019

NOTE. N = 4177. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(17,4062) = 8.16$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .034$.

Table B.4.17 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people under 30 with pity; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.003	.001	-.051	.015	-3.268	.001
2	Age		-.002	.001	-.038	.016	-2.375	.018
	Survey year	2006	-.104	.036	-.047	.016	-2.884	.004
		2008	.469	.058	.131	.016	8.075	.000
	Gender	Female	-.086	.034	-.038	.015	-2.505	.012
	Social class	A	.008	.099	.001	.016	.081	.936
		B	-.098	.055	-.032	.018	-1.774	.076
		C2	-.007	.050	-.003	.019	-.142	.887
		D	.076	.054	.025	.018	1.404	.160
		E	.114	.053	.040	.018	2.172	.030
	Ethnicity	Non white	.214	.062	.055	.016	3.479	.001
3	Age		-.002	.001	-.027	.026	-1.040	.298
	Survey year	2006	-.105	.036	-.047	.016	-2.912	.004
		2008	.467	.058	.131	.016	8.032	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.17 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	.063	.036	-.028	.016	-1.734	.083
	Social class	A	.023	.099	.004	.016	.229	.819
		B	-.089	.056	-.029	.018	-1.609	.108
		C2	-.016	.050	-.006	.019	-.325	.745
		D	.058	.055	.019	.018	1.044	.297
		E	.072	.060	.025	.021	1.194	.232
	Ethnicity	Non white	.201	.062	.051	.016	3.246	.001
	Working status	Working PT	-.098	.058	-.030	.018	-1.684	.092
		Not working	-.029	.053	-.011	.020	-.552	.581
		Retired	-.042	.065	-.017	.027	-.650	.516
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.035	.050	-.015	.021	-.688	.491
		Rented from council	.107	.055	.039	.020	1.937	.053
		Rented privately	.141	.063	.043	.019	2.248	.025
	Marital status	Not married	-.062	.037	-.027	.016	-1.680	.093

NOTE. N = 4170. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(17,4062) = 9.22$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .038$.

Table B.4.18 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people under 30 with envy; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.008	.001	-.134	.015	-8.727	.000
2	Age		-.008	.001	-.129	.016	-8.174	.000
	Survey year	2006	-.096	.039	-.040	.016	-2.451	.014
		2008	.443	.063	.113	.016	7.024	.000
	Gender	Female	-.102	.037	-.042	.015	-2.735	.006
	Social class	A	.106	.108	.016	.016	.986	.324
		B	-.033	.060	-.010	.018	-.555	.579
		C2	-.021	.054	-.007	.018	-.384	.701
		D	-.055	.059	-.017	.018	-.927	.354
		E	-.051	.057	-.016	.018	-.899	.369
	Ethnicity	Non white	.004	.067	.001	.016	.061	.951
3	Age		-.005	.002	-.072	.025	-2.851	.004
	Survey year	2006	-.095	.039	-.039	.016	-2.429	.015
		2008	.435	.063	.111	.016	6.890	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.18 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	-.086	.039	-.035	.016	-2.187	.029
	Social class	A	.115	.108	.017	.016	1.068	.286
		B	-.030	.060	-.009	.018	-.498	.619
		C2	-.019	.054	-.006	.019	-.346	.730
		D	-.050	.060	-.015	.018	-.839	.401
		E	-.086	.066	-.028	.021	-1.314	.189
	Ethnicity	Non white	-.002	.067	-.001	.016	-.032	.975
	Working status	Working PT	-.110	.063	-.030	.017	-1.727	.084
		Not working	.040	.057	.014	.020	.694	.488
		Retired	-.109	.070	-.041	.026	-1.552	.121
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.104	.055	.041	.021	1.898	.058
		Rented from council	.055	.060	.018	.020	.923	.356
		Rented privately	.149	.068	.042	.019	2.184	.029
	Marital status	Not married	.024	.040	.010	.016	.608	.543

NOTE. N = 4195.A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(17,4062) = 9.94$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .041$

Table B.4.19 To what extent do you think that others in this country view people under 30 as moral; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.005	.001	-.095	.015	-6.193	.000
2	Age		-.005	.001	-.082	.016	-5.128	.000
	Survey year	2006	.024	.034	.012	.016	.708	.479
		2008	.299	.055	.088	.016	5.410	.000
	Gender	Female	-.052	.033	-.024	.015	-1.581	.114
	Social class	A	-.027	.095	-.005	.016	-.286	.775
		B	-.009	.053	-.003	.018	-.177	.860
		C2	.161	.047	.063	.019	3.389	.001
		D	.236	.052	.082	.018	4.576	.000
		E	.184	.050	.068	.018	3.664	.000
	Ethnicity	Non white	.203	.059	.054	.016	3.466	.001
3	Age		-.004	.001	-.072	.026	-2.809	.005
	Survey year	2006	.021	.034	.010	.016	.609	.543
		2008	.290	.055	.085	.016	5.236	.000

(continued)

Table B.4.19 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	-.052	.034	-.025	.016	-1.518	.129
	Social class	A	-.013	.095	-.002	.016	-.137	.891
		B	-.001	.053	.000	.018	-.028	.978
		C2	.155	.048	.060	.019	3.243	.001
		D	.213	.053	.074	.018	4.052	.000
		E	.095	.058	.035	.021	1.640	.101
	Ethnicity	Non white	.183	.059	.049	.016	3.113	.002
	Working status	Working PT	-.032	.056	-.010	.018	-.569	.570
		Not working	.062	.050	.025	.020	1.239	.215
		Retired	.001	.062	.000	.027	.008	.993
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.039	.048	-.018	.022	-.814	.416
		Rented from council	.081	.053	.031	.020	1.535	.125
		Rented privately	.037	.060	.012	.019	.622	.534
	Marital status	Not married	.037	.035	.017	.016	1.055	.291

NOTE. N = 4176. A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(17,4062) = 7.71$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .032$.

B.5 Tables on ageing as a perceived threat (Chapter 8)

Table B.5.1 Perceived threat to economic well-being: 2004 and 2006; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		62.293	23	2.708	3.741	.000	.028
Intercept		1880.580	1	1880.580	2597.875	.000	.463
Independent variables							
Survey year		0.050	1	.050	0.070	.792	.000
Age group		20.736	4	5.184	7.161	.000	.009
Survey year * Age group		3.431	4	.858	1.185	.315	.002
Covariates							
Gender	Female	2.649	1	2.649	3.659	.056	.001
Social class	A	1.252	1	1.252	1.729	.189	.001
	B	0.572	1	.572	0.790	.374	.000
	C2	0.167	1	.167	0.231	.631	.000
	D	0.057	1	.057	0.078	.780	.000
	E	1.554	1	1.554	2.146	.143	.001
Ethnicity	Non-white	10.417	1	10.417	14.390	.000	.005

Table B.5.1 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	0.555	1	.555	0.767	.381	.000
	Not working	0.033	1	.033	0.045	.831	.000
	Retired	0.037	1	.037	0.051	.822	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	0.097	1	.097	0.134	.714	.000
	Rented council	0.651	1	.651	0.899	.343	.000
	Rented privately	0.084	1	.084	0.116	.733	.000
Marital status	Not married	2.385	1	2.385	3.294	.070	.001
Error		2181.085	3013	.724			
Total		32098.000	3037				
Corrected Total		2243.379	3036				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed significant differences between age groups; $F(4, 3013) = 7.16$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .009$.

Table B.5.2 Perceived threat to economic well-being: 2004 and 2006; Means and standard errors for age groups

Age group	16-24	25-49	50-64	65-79	80+
Mean	2.88[a]	3.15[b]	3.17[b]	3.22[b]	3.09[b]
SE	*0.05*	*0.02*	*0.03*	*0.05*	*0.08*

Table B.5.3 Perceived threat to economic well-being: 2004 and 2006; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.003	.001	.074	.018	4.090	.000
2	Age		.002	.001	.054	.019	2.871	.004
	Survey year	2006	-.006	.031	-.004	.018	-0.207	.836
	Gender	Female	.074	.031	.043	.018	2.379	.017
	Social class	A	-.110	.088	-.024	.019	-1.248	.212
		B	.041	.051	.017	.021	0.815	.415
		C2	.028	.045	.014	.022	0.625	.532
		D	.009	.050	.004	.021	0.178	.859
		E	.056	.048	.026	.022	1.169	.242
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.242	.059	-.076	.019	-4.077	.000
3	Age		.004	.001	.078	.031	2.517	.012
	Survey year	2006	-.001	.031	-.001	.018	-0.034	.973
	Gender	Female	.072	.033	.042	.019	2.183	.029
	Social class	A	-.115	.089	-.025	.019	-1.303	.193

Table B.5.3 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	B	.042	.051	.018	.021	0.832	.406
		C2	.016	.046	.008	.022	0.353	.724
		D	.009	.051	.004	.022	0.177	.859
		E	.093	.055	.042	.025	1.678	.094
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.228	.060	-.071	.019	-3.812	.000
	Working status	Working PT	.033	.054	.013	.021	0.621	.534
		Not working	-.021	.050	-.010	.023	-0.434	.664
		Retired	-.063	.059	-.034	.032	-1.067	.286
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.025	.046	.014	.025	0.556	.578
		Rented from council	.053	.050	.025	.023	1.053	.293
		Rented privately	-.014	.058	-.005	.023	-0.237	.813
	Marital status	Not married	-.102	.034	-.059	.019	-3.044	.002

NOTE. N = 3036. The multiple linear regression analysis showed that the overall model was significant, $F(16, 3020) = 3.84$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .020$.

Table B.5.4 Perceived threat to economic well-being: 2005 and 2008; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		58.671	23	2.551	4.031	.000	.041
Intercept		668.317	1	668.317	1056.058	.000	.325
Independent variables							
Survey year		8.834	1	8.834	13.960	.000	.006
Age group		5.500	4	1.375	2.173	.070	.004
Survey year * Age group		5.575	4	1.394	2.202	.066	.004
Covariate							
Gender	Female	1.883	1	1.883	2.975	.085	.001
Social class	A	0.013	1	0.013	0.020	.886	.000
	B	0.048	1	0.048	0.076	.783	.000
	C2	4.835	1	4.835	7.641	.006	.003
	D	2.637	1	2.637	4.167	.041	.002
	E	0.804	1	0.804	1.270	.260	.001
Ethnicity	Non-white	5.378	1	5.378	8.499	.004	.004

(continued)

Table B.5.4 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	0.179	1	0.179	0.283	.595	.000
	Not working	0.016	1	0.016	0.026	.873	.000
	Retired	0.501	1	0.501	0.791	.374	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	0.190	1	0.190	0.300	.584	.000
	Rented from council	0.087	1	0.087	0.137	.712	.000
	Rented privately	0.131	1	0.131	0.207	.649	.000
Marital status	Not married	0.004	1	0.004	0.007	.935	.000
Error		1385.289	2189	0.633			
Total		13705.000	2213				
Corrected Total		1443.960	2212				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed a main effect of survey year; $F(1, 2189) = 13.96$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$.

Table B.5.5 Perceived threat to economic well-being: 2005 and 2008; Means and standard errors for survey year

Survey Year	**2005**	**2008**
Mean	2.40[a]	2.21[b]
SE	*.03*	*.05*

Table B.5.6 Perceived threat to economic well-being: 2005 and 2008; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.005	.001	.129	.021	6.134	.000
2	Age		.005	.001	.119	.022	5.465	.000
	Survey year	2008	-.144	.042	-.072	.021	-3.419	.001
	Gender	Female	.059	.034	.036	.021	1.713	.087
	Social class	A	.025	.108	.005	.022	.232	.817
		B	-.008	.057	-.004	.024	-.149	.881
		C2	.143	.051	.071	.025	2.803	.005
		D	.115	.053	.054	.025	2.157	.031
		E	.075	.051	.038	.026	1.486	.137
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.159	.057	-.061	.022	-2.812	.005
3	Age		.006	.001	.144	.035	4.151	.000
	Survey year	2008	-.146	.042	-.073	.021	-3.428	.001
	Gender	Female	.058	.036	.036	.022	1.624	.104

(continued)

Table B.5.6 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	A	.024	.108	.005	.022	.225	.822
		B	-.006	.057	-.003	.025	-.106	.915
		C2	.137	.051	.068	.026	2.673	.008
		D	.100	.055	.047	.026	1.831	.067
		E	.068	.061	.035	.031	1.123	.262
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.156	.057	-.060	.022	-2.748	.006
	Working status	Working PT	.018	.058	.007	.024	.306	.760
		Not working	-.018	.051	-.010	.028	-.347	.729
		Retired	-.039	.067	-.021	.036	-.589	.556
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.013	.052	.008	.030	.259	.796
		Rented from council	.061	.056	.032	.030	1.084	.278
		Rented privately	.084	.065	.035	.027	1.296	.195
	Marital status	Not married	-.027	.037	-.017	.022	-.744	.457

NOTE. N = 2215. The multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model $F(16, 2199) = 4.89$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .034$.

Table B.5.7 Perceived material threat; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		116.881	23	5.082	7.754	.000	.047
Intercept		2210.962	1	2210.962	3373.583	.000	.485
Independent variables							
Survey year		37.360	1	37.360	57.006	.000	.016
Age group		6.171	4	1.543	2.354	.052	.003
Survey year * Age group		5.966	4	1.491	2.276	.059	.003
Covariates							
Gender	Female	0.117	1	0.117	0.179	.672	.000
	A	0.499	1	0.499	0.761	.383	.000
	B	1.515	1	1.515	2.311	.129	.001
	C2	0.152	1	0.152	0.233	.630	.000
	D	0.043	1	0.043	0.066	.797	.000
	E	0.836	1	0.836	1.276	.259	.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	2.250	1	2.250	3.434	.064	.001

(continued)

Table B.5.7 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	0.063	1	0.063	0.096	.756	.000
	Not working	0.141	1	0.141	0.215	.643	.000
	Retired	0.022	1	0.022	0.033	.855	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	0.008	1	0.008	0.013	.910	.000
	Rented council	0.810	1	0.810	1.235	.266	.000
	Rented privately	1.917	1	1.917	2.925	.087	.001
Marital status	Not married	1.588	1	1.588	2.422	.120	.001
Error		2344.931	3578	0.655			
Total		36637.000	3602				
Corrected Total		2461.813	3601				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed a main effect of survey year was significant; $F(1, 3578) = 57.01$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .016$.

Table B.5.8 Perceived material threat; Means and standard errors for survey year

Survey year	2004	2005
Mean	2.98[a]	3.24[b]
SE	.03	.03

Table B.5.9 Perceived material threat; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.001	.001	.022	.017	1.349	.177
2	Age		.002	.001	.038	.017	2.202	.028
	Survey year	2005	.306	.027	.185	.016	11.234	.000
	Gender	Female	-.009	.027	-.005	.016	-.330	.741
	Social class	A	.066	.081	.014	.017	.814	.416
		B	-.072	.045	-.030	.019	-1.586	.113
		C2	.020	.041	.010	.020	.482	.630
		D	.022	.043	.010	.019	.508	.612
		E	.082	.040	.041	.020	2.030	.042
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.090	.045	.034	.017	2.009	.045
3	Age		.000	.001	.010	.028	.351	.725
	Survey year	2005	.307	.027	.185	.016	11.247	.000
	Gender	Female	-.015	.029	-.009	.017	-.538	.591

(continued)

Table B.5.9 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	A	.066	.081	.014	.017	.811	.417
		B	-.068	.046	-.029	.019	-1.498	.134
		C2	.019	.041	.009	.020	.458	.647
		D	.011	.044	.005	.020	.244	.807
		E	.046	.048	.023	.024	.950	.342
	Ethnicity	Non-white	.083	.045	.031	.017	1.843	.065
	Working status	Working PT	.020	.047	.008	.019	.427	.670
		Not working	.030	.042	.015	.022	.707	.480
		Retired	.108	.053	.058	.028	2.039	.042
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.001	.041	.000	.023	-.017	.986
		Rented from council	.051	.044	.026	.023	1.151	.250
		Rented privately	.090	.051	.037	.021	1.768	.077
	Marital status	Not married	-.028	.029	-.017	.018	-.955	.340

NOTE. N = 3601. The multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant model overall, $F(16, 3585) = 10.02$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .043$.

Table B.5.10 Perceived symbolic threat; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Correted model		695.793a	33	21.085	30.270	0.000	0.139
Intercept		4355.736	1	4355.736	6253.311	0.000	0.502
Independent variables							
Survey year		410.450	3	136.817	196.421	0.000	0.087
Age group		15.097	4	3.774	5.419	0.000	0.003
Survey year *Age group		35.278	12	2.940	4.221	0.000	0.008
Covariate							
Gender	Female	0.957	1	0.957	1.374	0.241	0.000
Social class	A	0.056	1	0.056	0.080	0.778	0.000
	B	0.098	1	0.098	0.140	0.708	0.000
	C2	2.075	1	2.075	2.979	0.084	0.000
	D	0.673	1	0.673	0.967	0.326	0.000
	E	1.865	1	1.865	2.677	0.102	0.000
Ethnicity	Non-white	0.192	1	0.192	0.276	0.599	0.000

(continued)

Table B.5.10 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	0.139	1	0.139	0.199	0.655	0.000
	Not working	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	0.998	0.000
	Retired	1.720	1	1.720	2.469	0.116	0.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	3.685	1	3.685	5.290	0.021	0.001
	Rented from council	0.928	1	0.928	1.333	0.248	0.000
	Rented privately	0.572	1	0.572	0.821	0.365	0.000
Marital status	Not married	0.198	1	0.198	0.284	0.594	0.000
Error		4323.478	6207	0.697			
Total		71629.000	6241				
Corrected total		5019.271	6240				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed a main effect of survey year; $F(3, 6207) = 196.42$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .087$, a main effect of age group $F(4, 6207) = 5.419$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .003$ and a significant interaction showing that age group differences were not consistent over time; $F(12, 6207) = 4.22$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .008$.

Table B. 5.11 Perceived symbolic threat; Means and standard errors for survey year and age group

Survey Year	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**Age group**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.53[bd]	3.45[bd]	2.84[ad]	3.73[bc]		3.25[a]	3.31[a]	3.42[b]	3.52[b]	3.45
SE	*0.025*	*0.026*	*0.025*	*0.048*		*0.041*	*0.024*	*0.029*	*0.042*	*0.061*

Table B.5.12 Perceived symbolic threat; Means and standard errors according to survey year and age group

Survey Year	**2004**					**2005**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.45[a]	3.364[c]	3.445[c]	3.586[ad]	3.827[bd]	3.279[a]	3.413[bc]	3.493[b]	3.571[bd]	3.509[b]
SE	*0.061*	*0.034*	*0.042*	*0.054*	*0.089*	*0.052*	*0.032*	*0.041*	*0.055*	*0.096*

Survey Year	**2006**					**2008**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	2.876	2.812	2.812	2.846	2.853	3.401[a]	3.648[a]	3.926[b]	4.089[b]	3.596[a]
SE	*0.054*	*0.032*	*0.040*	*0.050*	*0.092*	*0.116*	*0.060*	*0.090*	*0.100*	*0.152*

Table B. 5.13 Perceived symbolic threat; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		0.002	0.001	0.049	0.013	3.894	0.000
2	Age		0.003	0.001	0.059	0.012	4.747	0.000
	Survey year	2005	-0.011	0.027	-0.006	0.014	-0.400	0.689
		2006	-0.632	0.027	-0.331	0.014	-23.315	0.000
		2008	0.279	0.044	0.080	0.013	6.308	0.000
	Gender Female		0.025	0.021	0.014	0.012	1.179	0.239
	Social class	A	-0.029	0.064	-0.006	0.012	-0.450	0.652
		B	-0.020	0.035	-0.008	0.014	-0.577	0.564
		C2	0.060	0.032	0.027	0.014	1.910	0.056
		D	0.047	0.034	0.019	0.014	1.377	0.168
		E	0.081	0.032	0.036	0.014	2.511	0.012
	Ethnicity	Non-white	0.020	0.037	0.007	0.012	0.543	0.587
3	Age		0.003	0.001	0.070	0.020	3.530	0.000
	Survey year	2005	-0.011	0.028	-0.006	0.014	-0.409	0.683
		2006	-0.631	0.027	-0.331	0.014	-23.260	0.000
		2008	0.278	0.044	0.080	0.013	6.277	0.000

(continued)

Table B.5.13 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Gender	Female	0.021	0.023	0.011	0.013	0.913	0.361
	Social class	A	-0.025	0.064	-0.005	0.012	-0.392	0.695
		B	-0.016	0.035	-0.006	0.014	-0.463	0.643
		C2	0.056	0.032	0.025	0.014	1.756	0.079
		D	0.037	0.034	0.015	0.014	1.082	0.279
		E	0.054	0.038	0.024	0.017	1.427	0.154
	Ethnicity	Non-white	0.020	0.037	0.007	0.012	0.542	0.588
	Working status	Working PT	0.018	0.037	0.007	0.014	0.500	0.617
		Not working	0.023	0.033	0.011	0.016	0.697	0.486
		Retired	0.020	0.041	0.010	0.021	0.483	0.629
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	0.050	0.032	0.026	0.017	1.569	0.117
		Rented from council	0.080	0.034	0.037	0.016	2.317	0.021
		Rented privately	0.053	0.040	0.020	0.015	1.332	0.183
	Marital status	Not married	-0.013	0.023	-0.007	0.013	-0.576	0.565

NOTE. N =6243.A multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant overall model, $F(18, 6225) = 52.18$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .131$

B.6 Tables on expressions of age prejudice (Chapter 9)

Table B.6.1 Indirect prejudice against people over 70; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		110.630	28	3.951	6.397	.000	.033
Intercept		4062.357	1	4062.357	6576.762	.000	.556
Independent variables							
Survey year		23.719	2	11.859	19.200	.000	.007
Age group		3.984	4	.996	1.612	.168	.001
Survey year * Age group		12.141	8	1.518	2.457	.012	.004
Covariates							
Gender	Female	0.174	1	.174	0.282	.595	.000
Social class	A	5.072	1	5.072	8.212	.004	.002
	B	3.989	1	3.989	6.457	.011	.001
	C2	7.385	1	7.385	11.956	.001	.002
	D	0.755	1	.755	1.222	.269	.000
	E	5.366	1	5.366	8.687	.003	.002
Ethnicity	Non-white	1.230	1	1.230	1.991	.158	.000

Table B.6.1 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	0.026	1	.026	0.041	.839	.000
	Not working	0.562	1	.562	0.909	.340	.000
	Retired	0.052	1	.052	0.084	.772	.000
Tenure	Bought on mortgage	0.795	1	.795	1.287	.257	.000
	Rented from council	1.120	1	1.120	1.813	.178	.000
	Rented privately	1.081	1	1.081	1.750	.186	.000
Marital status	Not married	0.065	1	.065	0.106	.745	.000
Error		3239.132	5244	.618			
Total		64829.000	5273				
Corrected Total		3349.761	5272				

NOTE. The ANCOVA showed significant differences between survey years; $F(2, 5244) = 19.20$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .007$. The interaction between survey year and age group suggest that the differences between age groups were not consistent over time; $F(8, 5244) = 2.46$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$.

Table B.6.2 Indirect prejudice against people over 70; Means and standard errors for survey years

Survey year	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Mean	3.37[a]	3.35[c]	3.54[bd]
SE	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.02*

Table B.6.3 Indirect prejudice against people over 70; means and standard errors according to survey year and age group

Survey Year	**2004**					**2005**					**2006**				
Age Group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.29	3.36	3.41	3.43	3.38	3.21[a]	3.25[c]	3.31[e]	3.48[bdf]	3.48[bd]	3.50	3.58	3.55	3.52	3.54
SE	*0.06*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.09*	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.10*	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.09*

Table B.6.4 Indirect prejudice against people over 70; a multiple linear regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.002	.001	.040	.014	2.899	.004
2	Age		.001	.001	.028	.014	2.003	.045
	Study year	2005	-.065	.027	-.038	.016	-2.371	.018
		2006	.173	.027	.104	.016	6.501	.000
	Gender	Female	.014	.022	.009	.014	0.663	.507
	Social class	A	.171	.063	.039	.014	2.715	.007
		B	.089	.036	.039	.016	2.466	.014
		C2	-.111	.032	-.056	.017	-3.412	.001
		D	-.034	.035	-.016	.016	-0.975	.330
		E	-.096	.033	-.049	.017	-2.928	.003
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.051	.039	-.018	.014	-1.319	.187
3	Age		.003	.001	.066	.023	2.848	.004
	Study year	2005	-.064	.027	-.038	.016	-2.353	.019

(continued)

Table B.6.4 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	.175	.027	.105	.016	6.556	.000
	Gender	Female	.013	.023	.008	.014	0.557	.578
	Social class	A	.173	.063	.039	.014	2.747	.006
		B	.092	.036	.041	.016	2.552	.011
		C2	-.114	.033	-.058	.017	-3.492	.000
		E	-.117	.039	-.059	.020	-3.034	.002
	Ethnicity Non-white		-.051	.039	-.018	.014	-1.302	.193
	Working status	Working PT	.002	.038	.001	.016	0.059	.953
		Not working	.031	.034	.017	.018	0.924	.356
		Retired	-.033	.042	-.019	.024	-0.791	.429
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.046	.032	.027	.019	1.420	.156
		Rented from council	.054	.035	.028	.018	1.530	.126
		Rented privately	.066	.041	.028	.017	1.611	.107
	Marital status	Not married	-.010	.023	-.006	.015	-0.413	.680

NOTE. N = 5272.The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant; $F(17, 5255) = 9.50$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .030$.

Table B.6.5 Internal and external control of prejudice; analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	Internal control	271.444	18	15.080	2.346	.001	.087
	External control	305.448	18	16.969	2.264	.002	.084
Intercept	Internal control	1947.876	1	1947.876	303.028	.000	.405
	External control	1410.647	1	1410.647	188.199	.000	.297
Age group	Internal control	28.562	4	7.140	1.111	.351	.010
	External control	30.220	4	7.555	1.008	.403	.009
Error	Internal control	2860.478	445	6.428			
	External control	3335.498	445	7.496			
Total	Internal control	34812.000	464				
	External control	33257.000	464				
Corrected Total	Internal control	3131.922	463				
	External control	3640.946	463				

NOTE. The ANCOVA revealed no significant differences

Table B.6.6 Internal control of prejudice; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.004	.006	.032	.047	.685	.494
2	Age		.001	.007	.008	.047	.168	.867
	Gender Female		.125	.261	.023	.047	.478	.633
	Social class	A	-.573	.989	-.027	.047	-.579	.563
		B	.481	.403	.064	.053	1.193	.233
		C2	-.139	.361	-.021	.055	-.384	.701
		D	-.806	.389	-.112	.054	-2.072	.039
		E	-.507	.411	-.068	.055	-1.233	.218
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-1.332	.421	-.150	.047	-3.160	.002
3	Age		.003	.010	.018	.072	.251	.802
	Gender Female		.233	.277	.042	.050	.840	.401
	Social class	A	-.633	.996	-.030	.047	-.635	.526

(continued)

Table B.6.6 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	B	.440	.412	.058	.055	1.067	.287
		C2	-.091	.367	-.014	.056	-.248	.804
		D	-.791	.404	-.110	.056	-1.957	.051
		E	-.032	.467	-.004	.062	-.068	.945
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-1.236	.428	-.139	.048	-2.891	.004
	Working status	Working PT	-.096	.437	-.012	.055	-.220	.826
		Not working	-.694	.374	-.115	.062	-1.858	.064
		Retired	-.057	.488	-.009	.077	-.117	.907
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.406	.393	.070	.068	1.034	.302
		Rented from council	-.156	.422	-.023	.062	-.370	.712
		Rented privately	.543	.468	.073	.063	1.161	.246
	Marital status	Not married	.042	.276	.008	.050	.151	.880

NOTE. N = 460. The test of overall regression model was significant; $F(15, 445) = 1.92$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .061$.

Table B.6.7 External control of prejudice; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.001	.007	.007	.047	.151	.880
2	Age		-.002	.007	-.011	.048	-.228	.820
	Gender	Female	.539	.278	.093	.048	1.943	.053
	Social class	A	.264	1.049	.012	.048	.252	.801
		B	.735	.430	.092	.054	1.710	.088
		C2	.173	.384	.025	.056	.451	.652
		D	-.188	.415	-.025	.054	-.454	.650
		E	-.278	.436	-.035	.056	-.637	.525
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.999	.447	-.107	.048	-2.233	.026
3	Age		-.005	.011	-.037	.072	-.517	.605
	Gender	Female	.614	.293	.106	.051	2.093	.037
	Social class	A	.294	1.051	.013	.048	.279	.780

(continued)

Table B.6.7 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	B	.769	.437	.096	.055	1.760	.079
		C2	.215	.387	.031	.056	.555	.579
		D	-.390	.428	-.051	.056	-.911	.363
		E	.049	.493	.006	.063	.099	.921
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.864	.451	-.092	.048	-1.914	.056
	Working status	Working PT	.598	.461	.071	.055	1.296	.196
		Not working	-.763	.396	-.120	.062	-1.926	.055
		Retired	.562	.515	.084	.077	1.090	.276
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.628	.416	.103	.068	1.509	.132
		Rented from council	.639	.447	.089	.062	1.431	.153
		Rented privately	.667	.495	.085	.063	1.347	.179
	Marital status	Not married	.187	.292	.032	.050	.639	.523

NOTE. N = 458. The test of overall regression model was significant; $F(15, 443) = 1.72$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .055$.

Table B.6.8 Direct prejudice against people under 30 and over 70: comparisons between types (old vs. young) of prejudice; a mixed factorial analysis of covariance (within-subjects effects)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Type of prejudice	9.831	1	9.831	24.119	.000	.007
Type of prejudice * Survey year	.860	2	.430	1.055	.348	.001
Type of prejudice * Age group	13.847	4	3.462	8.493	.000	.009
Type of prejudice * Survey year * Age group	8.194	8	1.024	2.513	.010	.006
Error	1447.825	3552	.408			

NOTE. Greenhouse-Geisser corrected A significant difference in levels of prejudice toward people over 70 versus those under 30 was found; $F(1,3552) = 24.12$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .007$. Significant interaction effects also indicated that this difference was dependent on the age group of respondents; $F(4,3552) = 8.49$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .009$. The interaction between age group and survey year suggests that these differences were not consistent over time; $F(8,3552) = 2.51$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$.

Table B.6.9 Direct prejudice against people under 30 and over 70: comparisons between types (over 70 and under 30) of prejudice; analysis of covariance (between-subjects effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	Over 70	164.553	28	5.877	9.631	.000	.071
	Under 30	188.358	28	6.727	9.050	.000	.067
Intercept	Over 70	3748.619	1	3748.619	6143.267	.000	.634
	Under 30	3225.305	1	3225.305	4338.819	.000	.550
Survey year	Over 70	48.350	2	24.175	39.618	.000	.022
	Under 30	57.609	2	28.805	38.749	.000	.021
Age group	Over 70	13.124	4	3.281	5.377	.000	.006
	Under 30	10.308	4	2.577	3.467	.008	.004
Survey year * Age group	Over 70	10.297	8	1.287	2.109	.032	.005
	Under 30	16.868	8	2.108	2.836	.004	.006
Error	Over 70	2167.429	3552	.610			
	Under 30	2640.415	3552	.743			

continued

Table B.6.9 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Total	Over 70	59564.000	3581				
	Under 30	49783.000	3581				
	Over 70	2331.982	3580				
	Under 30	2828.772	3580				

Table B.6.10 Direct prejudice against people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors for age groups

Prejudice type	**Over 70**					**Under 30**				
Age group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	3.95[a]	4.00[c]	4.07[be]	4.28[bdfg]	4.09[h]	3.87[a]	3.66[b]	3.73	3.69[b]	3.63[b]
SE	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.08*	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.08*

Table B.6.11 Direct prejudice against people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors for age groups according survey year

Prejudice type	2005					2006					2008				
	16-24	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Direct prejudice against people over 70															
Mean	4.03[a]	4.07[c]	4.25[bd]	4.51[bd]	4.29	3.74[a]	3.82[c]	3.84[d]	4.04[b]	4.05[b]	4.07	4.10	4.13	4.28[a]	3.93[b]
SE	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.12*	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.09*	*0.11*	*0.06*	*0.08*	*0.09*	*0.14*
Direct prejudice against people under 30															
Mean	4.04[a]	3.83[b]	3.83[b]	3.93[c]	3.61[bd]	3.53	3.41[a]	3.42[c]	3.47[e]	3.71[bdf]	4.03[a]	3.75[b]	3.95[c]	3.67[bd]	3.57[bd]
SE	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.08*	*0.13*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.10*	*0.12*	*0.06*	*0.09*	*0.10*	*0.16*

Table B.6.12 Direct prejudice against people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors for comparisons between survey years according to age groups

Age group	**16-24**			**25-49**			**50-64**			**65-79**			**80+**		
Survey year	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**
Direct prejudice against people over 70															
Mean	4.03[a]	3.74[b]	4.07	4.07[a]	3.82[bc]	4.10[d]	4.25[a]	3.84[bc]	4.13[d]	4.51[a]	4.04[bc]	4.28[bd]	4.29[a]	4.05	3.93[b]
SE	*0.07*	*0.05*	*0.11*	*0.04*	*0.03*	*0.06*	*0.05*	*0.04*	*0.08*	*0.07*	*0.05*	*0.09*	*0.12*	*0.09*	*0.14*
Direct prejudice against people under 30															
Mean	4.04[a]	3.53[bc]	4.03[d]	3.83[a]	3.41[bc]	3.75[d]	3.83[a]	3.42[bc]	3.95[d]	3.93[a]	3.47[b]	3.67[b]	3.61	3.71	3.57
SE	*0.07*	*0.06*	*0.12*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.06*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.09*	*0.08*	*0.06*	*0.10*	*0.13*	*0.10*	*0.16*

Table B.6.13 Direct prejudice towards people over 70; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		.007	.001	.136	.012	10.924	.000
2	Age		.007	.001	.130	.013	10.165	.000
	Gender	Female	.163	.025	.081	.012	6.545	.000
	Social class	A	.041	.078	.007	.013	.525	.600
		B	-.011	.041	-.004	.014	-.261	.794
		C2	.044	.037	.018	.015	1.191	.234
		D	-.042	.039	-.016	.015	-1.073	.283
		E	-.006	.037	-.002	.015	-.151	.880
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.041	.042	-.012	.013	-.960	.337
3	Age		.006	.001	.120	.021	5.804	.000
	Gender	Female	.166	.026	.083	.013	6.373	.000
	Social class	A	.039	.078	.006	.013	.494	.622

(continued)

Table B.6.13 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	B	-.010	.041	-.003	.014	-.238	.812
		C2	.039	.037	.016	.015	1.067	.286
		D	-.044	.040	-.017	.015	-1.117	.264
		E	-.015	.043	-.006	.018	-.337	.736
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.046	.043	-.014	.013	-1.080	.280
	Working status	Working PT	-.016	.042	-.005	.014	-.381	.703
		Not working	.017	.038	.007	.016	.447	.655
		Retired	.052	.048	.023	.021	1.081	.280
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	.011	.037	.005	.018	.289	.773
		Rented from council	.040	.040	.017	.017	1.015	.310
		Rented privately	.073	.046	.025	.016	1.571	.116
	Marital status	Not married	-.071	.026	-.035	.013	-2.674	.008

NOTE. N = 6379. The test of the overall regression model for direct prejudice against people over 70 was statistically significant; $F(15, 6364) = 11.98$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .027$

Table B.6.14 Direct prejudice towards people under 30; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-.002	.001	-.043	.017	-2.596	.009
2	Age		-.002	.001	-.042	.017	-2.445	.015
	Gender	Female	.106	.034	.053	.017	3.147	.002
	Social class	A	.152	.101	.026	.017	1.500	.134
		B	.044	.055	.016	.020	.806	.420
		C2	-.048	.049	-.020	.020	-.976	.329
		D	-.022	.053	-.008	.020	-.413	.680
		E	-.148	.051	-.059	.020	-2.920	.004
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.021	.061	-.006	.017	-.336	.737
3	Age		-.004	.001	-.074	.028	-2.651	.008
	Gender	Female	.119	.035	.059	.018	3.383	.001
	Social class	A	.148	.101	.025	.017	1.456	.146

(continued)

Table B.6.14 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Social class	B	.042	.055	.015	.020	.767	.443
		C2	-.040	.050	-.016	.020	-.801	.423
		D	-.008	.054	-.003	.020	-.157	.875
		E	-.104	.060	-.042	.024	-1.745	.081
	Ethnicity	Non-white	-.022	.062	-.006	.017	-.352	.725
	Working status	Working PT	-.046	.057	-.015	.019	-.806	.420
		Not working	-.042	.052	-.018	.022	-.807	.420
		Retired	.032	.065	.015	.029	.496	.620
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-.058	.050	-.028	.024	-1.169	.242
		Rented from council	-.084	.054	-.035	.023	-1.542	.123
		Rented privately	-.001	.062	.000	.021	-.013	.989
	Marital status	Not married	-.037	.036	-.018	.018	-1.038	.299

NOTE. N = 3584. The test of overall regression model for direct prejudice against people under 30 was significant; $F(15, 3569) = 2.61$, $p < 01$, $R^2 = .011$.

Table B.6.15 Employment relationships with people over 70 and under 30 years of age; a mixed factorial analysis of covariance (within-subjects effects)

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Boss70_30	.908	1	.908	1.625	.202	.000
Boss70_30 * Survey year	3.906	2	1.953	3.495	.030	.002
Boss70_30 * Age group	42.554	3	14.185	25.385	.000	.016
Boss70_30 * Survey year * Age group	4.987	6	.831	1.488	.178	.002
Error (Boss70_30)	2561.424	4584	.559			

NOTE. Greenhouse-Geisser corrected. The factorial multivariate analysis revealed significant differences in employment relations from people over 70 and under 30 between age groups; $F(3, 4584) = 25.39$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .016$ and survey years; $F(2, 4584) = 3.50$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .002$.

Table B.6.16 Employment relationships with people over 70 and under 30 years of age; analysis of covariance (between-subjects effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model	Over 70	129.869	25	5.195	6.064	.000	.032
	Under 3	109.832	25	4.393	4.098	.000	.022
Intercept	Over 70	1705.548	1	1705.548	1991.044	.000	.303
	Under 30	1818.664	1	1818.664	1696.400	.000	.270
Survey year	Over 70	45.538	2	22.769	26.580	.000	.011
	Under 30	16.750	2	8.375	7.812	.000	.003
Age group	Over 70	22.290	3	7.430	8.674	.000	.006
	Under 30	51.817	3	17.272	16.111	.000	.010
Survey year * Age group	Over 70	20.856	6	3.476	4.058	.000	.005
	Under 30	19.910	6	3.318	3.095	.005	.004
Error	Over 70	3926.701	4584	.857			
	Under 30	4914.381	4584	1.072			

(continued)

Table B.6.16 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Total	Over 70	28711.000	4610				
	Under 30	35039.000	4610				
Corrected Total	Over 70	4056.570	4609				
	Under 30	5024.213	4609				

Table B. 6.17 Employment relationships with people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors according to survey years

	Employment relationship with over 70s			Employment relationship with under 30s		
Survey year	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Mean	2.05[a]	2.44[bc]	2.23[bd]	2.28[a]	2.56[bc]	2.45[d]
SE	*0.08*	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.09*	*0.03*	*0.03*

Table B.6.18 Employment relationships with people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors according to age groups

	Employment relationship with over 70s				Employment relationship with under 30s			
Age group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**
Mean	2.46[a]	2.32[bc]	2.23[bde]	1.95[bdf]	2.31[a]	2.64[bc]	2.62[be]	2.17[df]
SE	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.03*	*0.10*	*0.05*	*0.03*	*0.04*	*0.11*

Table B.6.19 Employment relationships with people over 70; means and standard errors by survey year and age groups

Survey year	**2004**				**2005**				**2006**			
Age group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**
Mean	2.39[a]	2.23[c]	2.13[be]	1.44[bdf]	2.67a	2.52[bc]	2.35[bd]	2.21[bd]	2.31	2.21	2.20	2.21
SE	*0.10*	*0.04*	*0.07*	*0.27*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.07*

Table B.6.20 Employment relationships with people over 70; means and standard errors for comparisons between survey years according to age groups

Age group	**16-24**			**25-49**			**50-64**			**65-79**		
Survey year	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Mean	2.39[a]	2.67[bc]	2.31[d]	2.23[a]	2.52[bc]	2.21[d]	2.13[a]	2.35[bc]	2.20[d]	1.44[a]	2.21[b]	2.21[b]
SE	*0.10*	*0.06*	*0.06*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.07*	*0.05*	*0.04*	*0.27*	*0.07*	*0.07*

Table B.6.21 Employment relationships with people under 30; means and standard errors by survey year and age group

Survey year	2004				2005				2006			
Age group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**
Mean	2.16[a]	2.64[bc]	2.64[be]	1.71[df]	2.55	2.69[a]	2.62[c]	2.39[bd]	2.23[a]	2.57[b]	2.60[bc]	2.40[d]
SE	*0.12*	*0.05*	*0.08*	*0.30*	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.08*	*0.07*	*0.04*	*0.05*	*0.07*

Table B.6.22 Employment relationships with people under 30; means and standard errors for comparisons between survey years according to age groups

Age group	**16-24**			**25-49**			**50-64**			**65-79**		
Survey year	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Mean	2.16[a]	2.55[bc]	2.23[d]	2.64	2.69[a]	2.57[b]	2.64	2.62	2.60	1.71[a]	2.39[b]	2.40[b]
SE	*0.12*	*0.07*	*0.07*	*0.05*	*0.04*	*0.04*	*0.08*	*0.05*	*0.05*	*0.30*	*0.08*	*0.07*

Table B.6.23 Employment relationships with people over 70; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		-0.004	0.001	-0.062	0.015	-4.298	0.000
2	Age		-0.003	0.001	-0.062	0.015	-4.150	0.000
	Survey year	2005	0.244	0.039	0.127	0.020	6.279	0.000
		2006	0.021	0.038	0.011	0.020	0.546	0.585
	Gender	Female	-0.039	0.027	-0.020	0.014	-1.414	0.157
	Social class	A	0.001	0.074	0.000	0.015	0.012	0.991
		B	-0.009	0.039	-0.004	0.016	-0.218	0.828
		C2	-0.028	0.038	-0.012	0.016	-0.732	0.464
		D	-0.028	0.046	-0.009	0.016	-0.599	0.549
		E	-0.027	0.049	-0.009	0.016	-0.557	0.578
	Ethnicity	Non-white	0.091	0.047	0.029	0.015	1.959	0.050
3	Age		-0.006	0.001	-0.099	0.022	-4.444	0.000
	Survey year	2005	0.246	0.041	0.128	0.021	6.075	0.000

(continued)

Table B.6.23 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	0.024	0.040	0.012	0.021	0.589	0.556
	Gender	Female	-0.033	0.029	-0.018	0.015	-1.151	0.250
	Social class	A	-0.013	0.074	-0.003	0.015	-0.179	0.858
		B	-0.018	0.039	-0.008	0.016	-0.463	0.644
		C2	-0.024	0.038	-0.010	0.017	-0.626	0.531
		D	-0.004	0.047	-0.001	0.016	-0.077	0.938
		E	0.036	0.056	0.012	0.018	0.634	0.526
	Ethnicity	Non-white	0.104	0.047	0.033	0.015	2.212	0.027
	Working status	Working PT	-0.024	0.043	-0.009	0.016	-0.560	0.575
		Not working	-0.035	0.045	-0.014	0.018	-0.770	0.441
		Retired	0.007	0.055	0.003	0.022	0.134	0.893
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	-0.069	0.040	-0.036	0.021	-1.734	0.083
		Rented from council	-0.129	0.049	-0.051	0.019	-2.656	0.008
		Rented privately	-0.205	0.052	-0.074	0.019	-3.952	0.000
	Marital status	Not married	-0.015	0.030	-0.008	0.015	-0.493	0.62

NOTE. N = 4737.The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant for employment relationships with people over 70; $F(17, 4720) = 6.74$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .024$.

Table B.6.24 Employment relationships with people under 30; a multiple regression analysis

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
1	Age		0.005	0.001	0.077	0.014	5.319	0.000
2	Age		0.005	0.001	0.082	0.015	5.484	0.000
	Survey year	2005	0.054	0.044	0.025	0.020	1.234	0.217
		2006	-0.058	0.043	-0.028	0.020	-1.359	0.174
	Gender	Female	-0.027	0.031	-0.013	0.015	-0.875	0.382
	Social class	A	0.157	0.083	0.029	0.015	1.901	0.057
		B	0.063	0.044	0.024	0.016	1.444	0.149
		C2	0.026	0.042	0.010	0.017	0.612	0.541
		D	0.029	0.052	0.009	0.016	0.557	0.577
		E	0.050	0.054	0.015	0.016	0.913	0.361
	Ethnicity	Non-white	0.131	0.052	0.037	0.015	2.520	0.012
3	Age		0.005	0.001	0.082	0.022	3.637	0.000
	Survey year	2005	0.067	0.045	0.031	0.021	1.484	0.138

(continued)

Table B.6.24 Continued

Step	Predictor		*B*	*B SE*	β	β *SE*	*t*	*p*
	Survey year	2006	-0.042	0.045	-0.020	0.021	-0.928	0.353
	Gender	Female	-0.005	0.032	-0.002	0.015	-0.152	0.880
	Social class	A	0.134	0.083	0.024	0.015	1.616	0.106
		B	0.049	0.044	0.018	0.016	1.107	0.268
		C2	0.021	0.042	0.008	0.017	0.499	0.618
		D	0.058	0.053	0.018	0.016	1.098	0.272
		E	0.122	0.063	0.036	0.019	1.942	0.052
	Ethnicity	Non-white	0.150	0.052	0.043	0.015	2.866	0.004
	Working status	Working PT	-0.087	0.048	-0.029	0.016	-1.803	0.071
		Not working	-0.015	0.050	-0.006	0.018	-0.302	0.762
		Retired	-0.073	0.061	-0.027	0.023	-1.193	0.233
	Tenure	Bought on mortgage	0.020	0.045	0.009	0.021	0.447	0.655
		Rented from council	-0.050	0.054	-0.018	0.019	-0.916	0.360
		Rented privately	-0.092	0.058	-0.030	0.019	-1.585	0.113
	Marital status	Not married	-0.121	0.033	-0.056	0.016	-3.635	0.000

NOTE. N = 4736. The test of the overall regression model was statistically significant for employment relationships with people under 30; $F(17, 4719) = 4.710$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .017$.

B.7 Tables on intergenerational closeness (Chapter 10)

Table B.7.1 How much do people over 70 and under 30 have in common (survey year 2004); analysis of covariance

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model		12.292	18	0.683	1.583	0.056	0.017
Intercept		839.983	1	839.983	1947.584	0.000	0.538
Independent variable							
Survey year		0.970	4	0.243	0.563	0.690	0.001
Covariates							
Gender	Female	0.557	1	0.557	1.291	0.256	0.001
Ethnicity	Not-white	5.114	1	5.114	11.857	0.001	0.007
Working status	PT	0.276	1	0.276	0.640	0.424	0.000
	Not working	0.001	1	0.001	0.003	0.954	0.000
	Retired	0.216	1	0.216	0.501	0.479	0.000
Tenure	Brought on mortgage	0.005	1	0.005	0.011	0.915	0.000
	Rented from council	1.339	1	1.339	3.104	0.078	0.002
	Rented private	0.345	1	0.345	0.799	0.372	0.000

(continued)

Table B.7.1 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Social class	A	0.933	1	0.933	2.163	0.142	0.001
	B	0.045	1	0.045	0.104	0.747	0.000
	C2	0.150	1	0.150	0.347	0.556	0.000
	D	0.240	1	0.240	0.557	0.455	0.000
	E	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000
Marital status	Not married	0.014	1	0.014	0.031	0.859	0.000
Error		720.262	1670	0.431			
Total		13485.000	1689				
Corrected Total		732.554	1688				

Table B.7.2 In what way are people aged over 70 and under 30 viewed as different; multivariate analysis of variance

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Corrected Model						
One common group	8.323	28	.297	3.418	.000	.021
Separate groups	27.514	28	.983	6.210	.000	.037
Separate individuals	38.041	28	1.359	5.589	.000	.034
Groups in same community	36.545	28	1.305	8.382	.000	.050
Intercept						
One common group	3.858	1	3.858	44.361	.000	.010
Separate groups	6.930	1	6.930	43.796	.000	.010
Separate individuals	58.220	1	58.220	239.514	.000	.051
Groups in same community	22.877	1	22.877	146.927	.000	.032
Independent variables						
Survey year						
One common group	1.883	2	.941	10.826	.000	.005
Separate groups	9.475	2	4.737	29.938	.000	.013

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Separate individuals	14.477	2	7.238	29.778	.000	.013
Groups in same community	17.608	2	8.804	56.543	.000	.025
Age group						
One common group	1.053	4	.263	3.028	.017	.003
Separate groups	.556	4	.139	.878	.476	.001
Separate individuals	.510	4	.127	.524	.718	.000
Groups in same community	.203	4	.051	.327	.860	.000
Survey year * Age group						
One common group	.807	8	.101	1.159	.320	.002
Separate groups	2.187	8	.273	1.728	.087	.003
Separate individuals	2.373	8	.297	1.220	.282	.002
Groups in same community	1.532	8	.192	1.230	.277	.002

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Covariates							
Gender	Female						
One common group		.005	1	.005	.057	.812	.000
Separate groups		3.413	1	3.413	21.567	.000	.005
Separate individuals		4.012	1	4.012	16.506	.000	.004
Groups in same community		.007	1	.007	.047	.828	.000
Ethnicity	Not White						
One common group		.124	1	.124	1.428	.232	.000
Separate groups		.368	1	.368	2.323	.128	.001
Separate individuals		4.717	1	4.717	19.404	.000	.004
Groups in same community		1.471	1	1.471	9.450	.002	.002
Social class	A						
One common group		.008	1	.008	.092	.762	.000
Separate groups		.070	1	.070	.441	.507	.000

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Separate individuals	.008	1	.008	.031	.861	.000
Groups in same community	.071	1	.071	.458	.499	.000
B						
One common group	.042	1	.042	.481	.488	.000
Separate groups	.015	1	.015	.092	.761	.000
Separate individuals	.862	1	.862	3.547	.060	.001
Groups in same community	.714	1	.714	4.586	.032	.001
C						
One common group	.163	1	.163	1.875	.171	.000
Separate groups	.025	1	.025	.158	.691	.000
Separate individuals	.060	1	.060	.246	.620	.000
Groups in same community	.101	1	.101	.646	.422	.000

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
	D						
	One common group	1.054	1	1.054	12.121	.001	.003
	Separate groups	.632	1	.632	3.994	.046	.001
	Separate individuals	.792	1	.792	3.256	.071	.001
	Groups in same community	.869	1	.869	5.578	.018	.001
	E						
	One common group	.929	1	.929	10.680	.001	.002
	Separate groups	.011	1	.011	.070	.791	.000
	Separate individuals	.019	1	.019	.076	.782	.000
	Groups in same community	.522	1	.522	3.350	.067	.001
Working Status	Part-time						
	One common group	.004	1	.004	.051	.821	.000
	Separate groups	.009	1	.009	.055	.814	.000

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Separate individuals	.007	1	.007	.028	.868	.000
Groups in same community	.059	1	.059	.377	.539	.000
Not working						
One common group	.003	1	.003	.029	.865	.000
Separate groups	.520	1	.520	3.286	.070	.001
Separate individuals	1.432	1	1.432	5.893	.015	.001
Groups in same community	.181	1	.181	1.163	.281	.000
Retired						
One common group	.121	1	.121	1.396	.238	.000
Separate groups	.683	1	.683	4.314	.038	.001
Separate individuals	.102	1	.102	.419	.517	.000
Groups in same community	.025	1	.025	.162	.688	.000

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage						
	One common group	.035	1	.035	.402	.526	.000
	Separate groups	.450	1	.450	2.844	.092	.001
	Separate individuals	.334	1	.334	1.374	.241	.000
	Groups in same community	.009	1	.009	.057	.811	.000
	Rented from council						
	One common group	.001	1	.001	.009	.925	.000
	Separate groups	1.920	1	1.920	12.131	.001	.003
	Separate individuals	.855	1	.855	3.518	.061	.001
	Groups in same community	.187	1	.187	1.204	.273	.000
	Rented Privately						
	One common group	.058	1	.058	.667	.414	.000
	Separate groups	.386	1	.386	2.438	.119	.001

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
	Separate individuals	.002	1	.002	.009	.923	.000
	Groups in same community	.183	1	.183	1.175	.278	.000
Marital status	Not married						
	One common group	.151	1	.151	1.731	.188	.000
	Separate groups	.053	1	.053	.337	.561	.000
	Separate individuals	.051	1	.051	.208	.648	.000
	Groups in same community	.155	1	.155	.997	.318	.000
Error							
	One common group	390.445	4490	.087			
	Separate groups	710.506	4490	.158			
	Separate individuals	1091.415	4490	.243			
	Groups in same community	699.115	4490	.156			

(continued)

Table B.7.2 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Total							
	One common group	442.000	4519				
	Separate groups	929.000	4519				
	Separate individuals	2223.000	4519				
	Groups in same community	925.000	4519				
Corrected Total							
	One common group	398.768	4518				
	Separate groups	738.019	4518				
	Separate individuals	1129.455	4518				
	Groups in same community	735.661	4518				

NOTE. The multivariate ANCOVA revealed a significant effect of survey year for all similarity variables, Wilks' lambda, $F(6, 8976) = 31.46$ $p<.001$ $\eta^2=.021$. Differences in age groups were only found for viewing people aged over 70 and under 30 as one common group, there was no interaction between age groups and survey year.

Table B.7.3 In what way are people aged over 70 and under 30 viewed as different according to age groups

	One common group				
Age group	**16-24**	**25-49**	**50-64**	**65-79**	**80+**
Mean	0.11	0.08[a]	0.12[b]	0.16[b]	0.12
SE	*0.02*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.02*	*0.03*

Table B.7.4 In what way are people aged over 70 and under 30 viewed as different according to survey year

	One common group			Separate groups			Separate individuals			Groups in same community		
Survey year	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**	**2005**	**2006**	**2008**
Mean	0.08[a]	0.13[b]	0.14[b]	0.27[a]	0.15[b]	0.13[b]	0.48[a]	0.54[bc]	0.29[bd]	0.17[a]	0.19[a]	0.44[b]
SE	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.02*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.02*	*0.03*	*0.01*	*0.01*	*0.02*

Table B.7.5 Perceptions that people aged over 70 and under 30 are separate individuals; binomial logistic regression

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		-0.002	0.303	0.582	0.998	0.993	1.004	0.000
Sex	Female	0.270	17.234	0.000	1.310	1.153	1.488	0.006
Social class	A	0.089	0.286	0.593	1.093	0.789	1.516	0.001
	B	0.144	2.615	0.106	1.155	0.970	1.374	0.002
	C2	-0.046	0.275	0.600	0.955	0.805	1.133	0.000
	D	-0.239	4.877	0.027	0.788	0.637	0.974	0.004
	E	0.056	0.220	0.639	1.058	0.837	1.336	0.000
Ethnicity	Not white	-0.463	17.744	0.000	0.629	0.507	0.781	0.016
Working status	Working PT	-0.039	0.142	0.707	0.961	0.783	1.180	0.000
	Not working	-0.280	8.830	0.003	0.756	0.629	0.909	0.006
	Retired	-0.186	2.388	0.122	0.830	0.655	1.051	0.003
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage	-0.105	1.311	0.252	0.901	0.753	1.077	0.001
	Rented from council	-0.205	3.676	0.055	0.814	0.660	1.005	0.003
	Rented privately	-0.014	0.015	0.902	0.986	0.783	1.240	0.000

(continued)

Table B.7.5 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Marital status	Not married	0.026	0.157	0.692	1.027	0.902	1.169	0.000
Constant		0.119	0.515	0.473	1.126			

NOTE. N =6038; [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio; The test of overall regression model was statistically significant; $\chi^2(15, N = 8933) = 64.606$, $p = .002$, R^2(Nagelkerke) = .02.

Table B.7.6 Perceptions that people aged over 70 and under 30 are viewed as separate groups; binomial logistic regression

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		-0.003	0.890	0.346	0.997	0.990	1.003	0.000
Sex	Female	-0.379	22.374	0.000	0.685	0.585	0.801	0.011
Social class	A	0.110	0.291	0.589	1.116	0.749	1.662	0.001
	B	0.016	0.020	0.888	1.016	0.816	1.265	0.000
	C2	0.051	0.221	0.638	1.052	0.851	1.301	0.000
	D	0.183	2.000	0.157	1.201	0.932	1.547	0.003
	E	0.043	0.087	0.768	1.044	0.786	1.385	0.000
Ethnicity	Not white	0.215	2.939	0.086	1.239	0.970	1.584	0.004
Working status	Working PT	-0.029	0.047	0.828	0.971	0.746	1.265	0.000
	Not working	0.152	1.782	0.182	1.164	0.931	1.455	0.002
	Retired	0.306	4.155	0.042	1.358	1.012	1.821	0.007
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage	0.223	3.705	0.054	1.250	0.996	1.568	0.004
	Rented from council	0.414	10.158	0.001	1.513	1.173	1.951	0.013
	Rented privately	0.237	2.684	0.101	1.267	0.955	1.683	0.004

(continued)

Table B.7.6 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Marital status	Not married	-0.082	1.002	0.317	0.921	0.785	1.082	0.001
Constant		-1.341	43.038	0.000	0.262			

NOTE. N =6038; [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio; The test of overall regression model was statistically significant; $\chi^2(15, N = 8933) = 49.448$, $p<=.001$, R^2(Nagelkerke) = .018.

Table B.7.7 Perceptions that people aged over 70 and under 30 are two groups but part of the same community; binomial logistic regression

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		0.001	0.161	0.688	1.001	0.995	1.008	0.000
Sex	Female	-0.014	0.029	0.864	0.986	0.844	1.153	0.000
Social class	A	-0.267	1.582	0.208	0.766	0.506	1.160	0.005
	B	-0.185	2.891	0.089	0.831	0.671	1.029	0.003
	C2	-0.056	0.287	0.592	0.945	0.770	1.161	0.000
	D	-0.176	1.759	0.185	0.839	0.647	1.088	0.002
	E	-0.358	5.673	0.017	0.699	0.520	0.939	0.010
Ethnicity	Not white	0.348	7.897	0.005	1.416	1.111	1.805	0.009
Working status	Working PT	0.063	0.244	0.621	1.065	0.830	1.366	0.000
	Not working	0.155	1.870	0.172	1.167	0.935	1.457	0.002
	Retired	-0.031	0.045	0.832	0.969	0.725	1.296	0.000
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage	-0.003	0.001	0.981	0.997	0.802	1.241	0.000
	Rented from council	-0.100	0.572	0.450	0.904	0.697	1.173	0.001
	Rented privately	-0.147	1.031	0.310	0.863	0.650	1.147	0.002

(continued)

Table B.7.7 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Marital status	Not married	0.067	0.679	0.410	1.069	0.912	1.254	0.000
Constant		-1.341	43.805	0.000	0.262			

NOTE. N =6038; [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio; The test of overall regression model was not statistically significant; $\chi^2(15, N = 8933) = 21.142$, $p = .132$, R^2(Nagelkerke) = .008.

Table B.7.8 Perceptions that people aged over 70 and under 30 are one common group; binomial logistic regression

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		0.008	2.730	0.098	1.008	0.999	1.017	0.000
Sex	Female	-0.031	0.080	0.778	0.969	0.780	1.205	0.000
Social class	A	0.064	0.046	0.830	1.066	0.595	1.908	0.000
	B	-0.096	0.328	0.567	0.908	0.654	1.262	0.001
	C2	0.175	1.287	0.257	1.191	0.881	1.610	0.002
	D	0.617	13.363	0.000	1.854	1.331	2.580	0.028
	E	0.399	4.378	0.036	1.491	1.026	2.167	0.012
Ethnicity	Not white	0.160	0.786	0.375	1.174	0.823	1.674	0.002
Working status	Working Part time	0.036	0.038	0.846	1.037	0.722	1.489	0.000
	Not working	0.220	1.872	0.171	1.246	0.909	1.708	0.004
	Retired	0.030	0.022	0.883	1.030	0.694	1.529	0.000
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage	-0.110	0.492	0.483	0.896	0.659	1.218	0.001
	Rented from council	-0.017	0.010	0.920	0.983	0.702	1.376	0.000
	Rented privately	-0.112	0.312	0.576	0.894	0.605	1.323	0.001

(continued)

Table B.7.8 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Marital status	Not married	-0.057	0.258	0.612	0.944	0.757	1.178	0.000
Constant		-2.780	95.617	0.000	0.062			

NOTE. N =6038; [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio; The test of overall regression model was statistically significant; $\chi^2(15, N = 8933) = 35.713$, $p = .002$, R^2(Nagelkerke) = .018.

Table B.7.9 Contact with people over 70; a binomial logistic regression analysis

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		0.045	275.177	0.000	1.046	1.040	1.052	0.000
Survey year	2005	0.532	49.448	0.000	1.703	1.468	1.975	0.021
	2006	-1.458	352.106	0.000	0.233	0.200	0.271	0.140
	2008	-1.088	48.637	0.000	0.337	0.248	0.457	0.083
Sex	Female	0.160	6.242	0.012	1.173	1.035	1.330	0.002
Social class	A	0.278	2.388	0.122	1.321	0.928	1.880	0.006
	B	0.144	2.105	0.147	1.155	0.951	1.404	0.002
	C2	0.056	0.390	0.532	1.057	0.887	1.260	0.000
	D	-0.051	0.277	0.599	0.950	0.786	1.149	0.000
	E	0.040	0.138	0.710	1.041	0.843	1.284	0.000
Ethnicity	Not white	-0.369	12.409	0.000	0.691	0.563	0.849	0.010
Working status	Working PT	0.028	0.077	0.781	1.029	0.843	1.255	0.000
	Not working	0.195	4.462	0.035	1.216	1.014	1.458	0.003
	Retired	0.230	4.010	0.045	1.259	1.005	1.578	0.004

(continued)

Table B.7.9 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Tenure	Brought on mortgage	-0.339	14.725	0.000	0.713	0.599	0.847	0.009
	Rented from council	-0.279	8.200	0.004	0.756	0.625	0.916	0.006
	Rented privately	-0.273	5.930	0.015	0.761	0.611	0.948	0.006
Marital status	Not married	-0.013	0.041	0.839	0.987	0.869	1.121	0.000

NOTE. N =6038; [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio; The test of overall regression model was statistically significant; $\chi^2(18, N = 6038) = 1733.93$, $p < .001$, R^2(Nagelkerke) = .333.

Table B.7.10 Contact with people under 30; a binomial logistic regression analysis

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Age		-0.065	345.194	0.000	0.937	0.931	0.943	0.000
Survey year	2006	-0.633	67.643	0.000	0.531	0.456	0.617	0.030
	2008	-1.176	69.254	0.000	0.309	0.234	0.407	0.095
Sex	Female	-0.228	8.472	0.004	0.796	0.683	0.928	0.004
Social class	A	0.090	0.191	0.662	1.094	0.731	1.638	0.001
	B	-0.121	1.038	0.308	0.886	0.703	1.118	0.001
	C2	0.014	0.018	0.894	1.015	0.820	1.255	0.000
	D	-0.133	1.220	0.269	0.875	0.691	1.109	0.001
	E	-0.055	0.179	0.672	0.947	0.734	1.221	0.000
Ethnicity	Not white	-0.205	2.099	0.147	0.814	0.617	1.075	0.003
Working status	Working PT	-0.183	2.102	0.147	0.833	0.651	1.066	0.003
	Not working	-0.294	6.223	0.013	0.745	0.592	0.939	0.007
	Retired	-0.008	0.003	0.953	0.992	0.764	1.288	0.000

(continued)

Table B.7.10 Continued

Variable		*B*	Wald	*p*	OR[a]	95% CI for OR[b]		η^2
						Lower	Upper	
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage	-0.368	12.183	0.000	0.692	0.563	0.851	0.010
	Rented from council	-0.101	0.741	0.389	0.904	0.718	1.138	0.001
	Rented privately	0.180	1.568	0.210	1.197	0.903	1.586	0.002
Marital status	Not married	0.204	6.405	0.011	1.226	1.047	1.435	0.003

NOTE. N =4171; [a]: odds ratio, [b]: 95% confidence interval for odds ratio; The test of overall regression model was statistically significant; $\chi^2(17, N = 4171) = 1071.77$, $p < .001$, R^2(Nagelkerke) = .307.

Table B.7.11 Contact with people over 70 and people under 30; a mixed factorial analysis of variance (within subject effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Contact	Over 70-Under 30	.863	1.000	.863	5.416	.020	.001
Contact * Age group		79.547	4.000	19.887	124.737	.000	.111
Error		635.649	3987.000	.159			

NOTE. Greenhouse-Geisser reported. The mixed ANCOVA showed a significant difference between contact with people over 70 and under 30; $F(1, 3987) = 5.42$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$. The significant interaction between the type of contact and age groups showed that the different age groups differed in their extent of contact with people over 70 and under 30; $F(4, 3987) = 124.74$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .111$.

Table B.7.12 Contact with people over 70 and people under 30; a mixed factorial analysis of variance (between subject effects)

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Intercept		236.074	1	236.074	1116.901	0.000	0.219
Independent variable							
Age group		5.999	4	1.500	7.095	0.000	0.007
Covariates							
Survey year	2006	74.750	1	74.750	353.653	0.000	0.081
	2008	9.859	1	9.859	46.643	0.000	0.012
Sex	Female	0.100	1	0.100	0.471	0.493	0.000
Social class	A	0.336	1	0.336	1.592	0.207	0.000
	B	0.031	1	0.031	0.148	0.700	0.000
	C2	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	0.989	0.000
	D	0.426	1	0.426	2.016	0.156	0.001
	E	0.104	1	0.104	0.492	0.483	0.000
Ethnicity	Not white	2.021	1	2.021	9.562	0.002	0.002

(continued)

Table B.7.12 Continued

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	F	*p*	Partial η^2
Working status	Working PT	0.186	1	0.186	0.882	0.348	0.000
	Not working	0.001	1	0.001	0.002	0.961	0.000
	Retired	0.246	1	0.246	1.166	0.280	0.000
Tenure	Brought on a mortgage	3.678	1	3.678	17.403	0.000	0.004
	Rented from council	0.635	1	0.635	3.003	0.083	0.001
	Rented privately	0.000	1	0.000	0.002	0.968	0.000
Marital status	Not married	0.058	1	0.058	0.275	0.600	0.000
Error		842.712	3987	0.211			

Table B.7.13 Contact with people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors

	Contact 70	Contact 30
Mean	**0.49**	**0.58**
SE	***0.01***	***0.01***

Table B.7.14 Contact with people over 70 and under 30; means and standard errors by age group

Age Group	16-24		25-49		50-64	
	Contact 70	**Contact 30**	**Contact 70**	**Contact 30**	**Contact 70**	**Contact 30**
Mean	0.25[a]	0.93[b]	0.34[a]	0.72[b]	0.50	0.47
SE	*0.023*	*0.023*	*0.014*	*0.014*	*0.015*	*0.015*

(continued)

Table B.7.14 Continued

Age Group	65-79		80+	
	Contact 70	Contact 30	Contact 70	Contact 30
Mean	0.64[a]	0.41[b]	0.74[a]	0.38[b]
SE	0.024	0.024	0.036	0.036

B.8 Tables on regional differences (Chapter 11)

Table B.8.1 Estimated percentages according to Government office region

	Government Office Regions										
Construct	**London**	**West Midlands**	**Scotland**	**North West**	**East Midlands**	**Yorkshire & Humberside**	**South East**	**East of England**	**North East**	**Wales**	**South West**
Age Categorisation & Identification											
Age self-categorisation	35	30	30.8	31.2	31.3	21.2	26.1	28.1	31.2	24.7	29.8[a 0.46]
Old age start	34.6	32.2	30.5	35	40.8	42.1	38.1	48.1	37	41.6	44.8[a 0.67]
Age identification	62.4	52.5	53	49.3	59.6	45.9	48.9	47.1	49.4	47.3	52.3[a 0.95]

NOTE: [a] Smallest significant difference between regions $p<.05$.For age self-categorisation including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .002, the regression model was significant $F(26,3809) = 216.98$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .597$. For the perceived start of old age including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .13, , the regression model was significant $F(26,3200) = 44.597$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .266$. For age identification including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by.01 the regression model was significant $F(26,3809) = 7.853$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .051$. Including the age ratio increased the explained variance (R^2) by .001, the regression model was significant $F(17,3818) = 9.827$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .042$

Table B.8.1 Continued

Construct	Government Office Regions										
	London	West Midlands	Scotland	North West	East Midlands	Yorkshire & Humberside	South East	East of England	North East	Wales	South West
Experiences of Discrimination											
Experiences of age discrimination	25.2	26.2	23.6	27.4	24	17.9	29.6	27.1	23	22	24.9[a 0.44]

NOTE: [a] Smallest significant difference between regions $p<.05$. The binomial logistic regression model including GOR increased the explained variance (Nagelkerke R^2) by .002, the regression model was significant $\chi^2(27, N = 7702) = 336.23$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .063$.

Table B.8.1 Continued

Construct	Government Office Regions: London	West Midlands	Scotland	North West	East Midlands	Yorkshire & Humberside	South East	East of England	North East	Wales	South West
Age stereotypes of people over 70											
Friendly (warm)	50.6	53.1	52.4	50.4	59.1	58.1	47	45.6	60.6	58.6	53[a 0.6]
Age stereotypes of people under 30											
Friendly (warm)	23.9	26.6	28.3	29.8	36.2	29.2	23.3	24.6	24.1	36.7	28.7[a 0.65]
Capable (competence)	44.9	42.4	48.3	43.5	48.2	48.3	39.1	43.1	43	52.7	42.8[a 0.9]

NOTE. [a] Smallest significant difference between regions $p<.05$. For viewing people over 70 as warm including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .005, the regression model was significant $F(27,5629) = 5.0$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .023$. For viewing people under 30 as warm including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .001, the regression model was significant $F(26,3718) = 2.274$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .016$, East Midlands, was a marginal significant predictor ($p=.051$). For viewing people under 30 as competent including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by.001 the regression model was significant $F(26,3728) = 1.9$, $p < .004$, $R^2 = .013$.

Table B.8.1 Continued

Construct	Government Office Regions										
	London	West Midlands	Scotland	North West	East Midlands	Yorkshire & Humberside	South East	East of England	North East	Wales	South West
Age and Perceived Threat											
Threat to economy 2004-2006	30.8	24.2	21.5	19.9	21.4	18.9	21.2	17.7	15.8	25	21.2[a 0.85]
Threat to economy 2005-2008	18	22.7	17.4	19.1	23.6	12.5	20.7	12	20.9	28.9	22.8[a 0.83]
Material threat	17.7	19	23.3	14.1	14.7	16.6	21.6	22.6	17.4	21.5	19.6[a 0.56]

NOTE: [a] Smallest significant difference between regions $p<.05$. For threat to economic well-being 2004-2006 including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .01, the regression model was significant $F(26, 3010) = 3.587$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .030$ and the regression model was significant including the age ratio $F(17, 3019) = 4.024$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .022$. For threat to economic well-being 2005-2008 including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .017, the regression model was significant $F(26, 1739) = 3.73$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .051$. For material threat including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by.008 the regression model was significant $F(26, 3575) = 7.34$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .051$ and the regression model was significant including the age ratio $F(17,3584) = 9.8$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .044$.

Table B.8.1 Continued

Construct	Government Office Regions: London	West Midlands	Scotland	North West	East Midlands	Yorkshire & Humberside	South East	East of England	North East	Wales	South West
Expressions of prejudice											
Indirect prejudice	12	9.5	10.4	8.6	11.2	11.3	6.6	9.2	11.9	8.5	6.6[a 0.38]
Direct prejudice towards over 70's (positive)	78.7	76.4	76.2	75.4	74.2	74.8	73.9	73.9	76.6	72.7	76.6[a 0.61]
Direct towards people under 30's (positive)	53.7	41.8	55	47.6	49.8	56.1	48	53	53.9	46.9	52.4 [a 0.81]
Employment relations over 70's	12.1	11.4	12.5	8.6	11.6	6.6	9.5	12.4	11.8	5.4	11.1 [a 0.48]

NOTE: [a] Smallest significant difference between regions $p<.05$. For indirect prejudice including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .008, $F(27,5245) = 7.61$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .038$, the age ratio regression model was also significant $F(18,5254) = 9.28$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .031$. For direct prejudice towards over 70's including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .012, the regression model was significant $F(26,3100) = 10.014$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .077$. For direct prejudice towards under 30's including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by.01 the regression model was significant $F(26, 3100) = 9.037$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .070$. For employment relations including GOR increased the explained variance (R^2) by .016, the regression model was significant $F(27, 4777) = 7.36$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .04$and the regression model was significant including the age ratio $F(18, 4786) = 7.77$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .028$

Table B.8.1 Continued

Construct	Government Office Regions										
	London	West Midlands	Scotland	North West	East Midlands	Yorkshire & Humberside	South East	East of England	North East	Wales	South West
Intergenerational closeness											
One common group	7.3	9.8	11.9	7.6	13.6	10.3	9.6	15.1	4.7	9.4	6.0[a0.043]
Separate groups	28.0	25.7	14.8	22.1	16.5	25.9	22.4	19.3	20.1	16.7	17.1 [a0.043]
Individuals	45.2	50.1	56.8	49.4	51.3	45.4	52.4	40.7	54.7	58.9	62.5[a0.073]

NOTE: [a] Smallest significant difference between regions $p<.05$. For one common group including GOR increased the explained variance (Nagelkerke R^2) by .016 , χ^2 (26,N = 8933) = 87.947, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke R^2 = .05. For viewing people over 70 and under 30 as separate groups including GOR increased the explained variance (Nagelkerke R^2) by .013, χ^2 (26,N = 8933) = 162.119, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke R^2 = .063. The age ratio was also significant χ^2 (17,N = 8933) = 144.753, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke R^2 = .037. For viewing people over 70 and under 30 as individuals including GOR increased the explained variance (Nagelkerke R^2) by .012 , χ^2 (26,N = 8933) = 103.235, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke R^2 = .035.

Appendix C: Means and standard errors for all items

by gender, ethnicity, social class, working status, tenure and marital status

Table C.1 Means and standard errors *(italicised)* for all items by gender, ethnicity and social class. Significant pair-wise comparisons are marked.

	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
Construct	**Male**	**Female**	**White**	**Non-White**	**A**	**B**	**C1**	**C2**	**D**	**E**
Age categorisation and identification[1]										
Young age stop	44.04	49.23*	47.05	43.75*	46.52	46.07	47.78	46.63	46.49	46.14
	0.413	*0.399*	*0.294*	*0.900*	*1.512*	*0.708*	*0.565*	*0.597*	*0.689*	*0.800*
Old age start	61.30	65.54*	64.15	58.17*	65.97[a]	65.43[a]	63.58[b]	63.16[b]	62.98[b]	62.63[b]
	0.266	*0.245*	*0.184*	*0.585*	*0.973*	*0.456*	*0.356*	*0.374*	*0.434*	*0.490*
Age self-categorisation	4.84	4.69*	4.74	4.94*	4.63	4.77	4.71[a]	4.78	4.73	4.85[b]
	0.028	*0.025*	*0.019*	*0.064*	*0.102*	*0.049*	*0.038*	*0.040*	*0.046*	*0.050*
Age identification	3.40	3.24*	3.28	3.60*	3.15[a]	3.14[c]	3.28[ad]	3.38[bd]	3.47[bd]	3.30[d]
	0.026	*0.023*	0.017	0.057	*0.092*	*0.044*	*0.034*	*0.036*	*0.042*	*0.045*

(continued)

[1] Excluding 2005

Table C.1 Continued

Construct	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
	Male	Female	White	Non-White	A	B	C1	C2	D	E
Perceived prejudice										
Prejudice in the media[2]	0.25	0.18*	0.19	0.43*	0.25	0.22	0.21	0.24	0.22	0.18
	0.022	*0.019*	*0.015*	*0.045*	*0.089*	*0.039*	*0.030*	*0.032*	*0.035*	*0.036*
Prejudice towards people over 50[2]	2.79	2.97*	2.91	2.71*	3.22[a]	3.04[c]	2.85[bd]	2.86[bd]	2.78[bd]	2.90[b]
	0.033	*0.029*	*0.022*	*0.075*	*0.114*	*0.056*	*0.044*	*0.046*	*0.053*	*0.057*
Seriousness of discrimination[3]	2.57	2.50*	2.52	2.62*	2.44[a]	2.48[ad]	2.47[ad]	2.64[b]	2.59[c]	2.49[ad]
	0.019	*0.017*	*0.013*	*0.045*	*0.067*	*0.033*	*0.026*	*0.027*	*0.032*	*0.034*
Experiences of discrimination										
Age-related discrimination	0.26	0.25	0.26	0.22	0.28[a]	0.29[ac]	0.26 [ad]	0.25[d]	0.24[d]	0.21[b]
	0.008	*0.007*	*0.005*	*0.016*	*0.028*	*0.013*	*0.010*	*0.011*	*0.012*	*0.013*

(continued)

[2] Excluding 2005 and 2008

Table C.1 Continued

Construct	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
	Male	**Female**	**White**	**Non-White**	**A**	**B**	**C1**	**C2**	**D**	**E**
Stereotype content										
Stereotype content- over 70										
Friendly (warmth)	3.66	3.55*	3.61	3.53	3.58[c]	3.48[a]	3.56[c]	3.63[b]	3.71[bd]	3.64[c]
	0.025	*0.023*	*0.017*	*0.057*	*0.089*	*0.042*	*0.033*	*0.035*	*0.041*	*0.045*
Capable (competence)	2.94	2.95	2.94	2.94	2.71[a]	2.80[a]	2.91[bc]	2.98[b]	3.08[bd]	2.99[b]
	0.025	*0.023*	*0.017*	*0.058*	*0.091*	*0.043*	*0.034*	*0.036*	*0.042*	*0.046*
Admiration	3.05	3.06	3.05	3.05	2.90[a]	2.85[ac]	3.01[d]	3.10[bc]	3.14[bc]	3.19[bc]
	0.026	*0.024*	*0.018*	*0.060*	*0.094*	*0.045*	*0.035*	*0.037*	*0.044*	*0.048*
Pity	2.69	2.77*	2.73	2.79	2.98[a]	2.75[b]	2.76[bc]	2.73[b]	2.63[bd]	2.73[b]
	0.029	*0.026*	*0.020*	*0.065*	*0.102*	*0.049*	*0.038*	*0.041*	*0.047*	*0.052*
Envy	2.02	1.93*	1.95	2.21*	1.96	1.90[a]	1.94	1.99	2.04[b]	2.00
	0.025	*0.023*	*0.017*	*0.058*	*0.090*	*0.043*	*0.034*	*0.036*	*0.042*	*0.046*
Moral	3.95	4.00	4.01	3.68*	4.08	3.98	4.00	3.94	3.96	3.99
	0.023	*0.021*	*0.016*	*0.053*	*0.083*	*0.040*	*0.031*	*0.033*	*0.039*	*0.042*

(continued)

Table C.1 Continued

	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
Construct	**Male**	**Female**	**White**	**Non-White**	**A**	**B**	**C1**	**C2**	**D**	**E**
Stereotype content- under 30[3]										
Friendly (warmth)	3.02	3.06	3.03	3.21*	3.01	3.02	2.99[a]	3.10[b]	3.12[b]	3.00
	0.024	*0.022*	*0.016*	*0.055*	*0.085*	*0.041*	*0.032*	*0.034*	*0.040*	*0.043*
Capable (competence)	3.41	3.47	3.44	3.50	3.37	3.42	3.38[a]	3.47[b]	3.52[b]	3.46
	0.024	*0.022*	*0.017*	*0.056*	*0.087*	*0.042*	*0.032*	*0.035*	*0.041*	*0.044*
Admiration	2.65	2.69	2.65	2.95*	2.80[b]	2.64	2.61[a]	2.74[b]	2.69	2.67
	0.024	*0.022*	*0.017*	*0.055*	*0.086*	*0.041*	*0.032*	*0.034*	*0.040*	*0.044*
Pity	2.00	1.94	1.95	2.15*	1.97	1.86[a]	1.97	1.94	2.01[b]	2.05[b]
	0.026	*0.024*	*0.018*	*0.060*	*0.094*	*0.045*	*0.035*	*0.038*	*0.044*	*0.048*
Envy	2.60	2.52*	2.55	2.55	2.69	2.57	2.58	2.57	2.52	2.48
	0.029	*0.026*	*0.020*	*0.066*	*0.103*	*0.049*	*0.038*	*0.041*	*0.048*	*0.052*
Moral	2.61	2.56	2.57	2.76*	2.51[c]	2.50[a]	2.51[a]	2.66[b]	2.71[bd]	2.58
	0.025	*0.023*	*0.017*	*0.058*	*0.090*	*0.043*	*0.033*	*0.036*	*0.042*	*0.046*

(continued)

[3] Excluding 2005

Table C.1 Continued

Construct	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
	Male	**Female**	**White**	**Non-White**	**A**	**B**	**C1**	**C2**	**D**	**E**
Perceived threat										
Threat to the economy 2004 and 2006	3.10	3.17*	3.15	2.93*	3.00[a]	3.15	3.11	3.13	3.12	3.20[b]
	0.024	*0.022*	*0.016*	*0.057*	*0.083*	*0.041*	*0.032*	*0.033*	*0.040*	*0.042*
Threat to the economy 2005 and 2008	2.32	2.38	2.37	2.21*	2.32	2.29[b]	2.29[b]	2.43[a]	2.39	2.36
	0.026	*0.024*	*0.018*	*0.053*	*0.103*	*0.047*	*0.035*	*0.039*	*0.042*	*0.045*
Material threat[4]	3.09	3.07	3.07	3.15	3.14	3.00[a]	3.07	3.09	3.08	3.12[b]
	0.021	*0.019*	*0.014*	*0.042*	*0.077*	*0.037*	*0.028*	*0.031*	*0.034*	*0.035*
Symbolic threat	3.26	3.28	3.27	3.29	3.22	3.23[a]	3.24	3.30[b]	3.28	3.29
	0.016	*0.015*	*0.011*	*0.035*	*0.060*	*0.029*	*0.022*	*0.024*	*0.026*	*0.028*
Expressions of prejudice										
Indirect prejudice[5]	3.41	3.42	3.42	3.37	3.62[a]	3.54[a]	3.45[bc]	3.34[bde]	3.41[bf]	3.33[bd]
	0.017	*0.015*	*0.011*	*0.037*	*0.059*	*0.029*	*0.023*	*0.024*	*0.027*	*0.029*

(continued)

[4] Excluding 2005-2008

[5] Excluding 2008

Table C.1 Continued

Construct	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
	Male	**Female**	**White**	**Non-White**	**A**	**B**	**C1**	**C2**	**D**	**E**
Internal control of prejudice[6]	8.04	8.49	8.37	7.24*	7.99	8.82[a]	8.25	8.27	7.75[b]	7.91
	0.172	*0.175*	*0.124*	*0.394*	*0.743*	*0.263*	*0.221*	*0.249*	*0.294*	*0.546*
External control of prejudice[7]	7.65	8.34*	8.09	7.08*	8.49	8.72[a]	7.72[b]	8.06	7.52[b]	7.51
	0.185	*0.189*	*0.134*	*0.425*	*0.802*	*0.284*	*0.238*	*0.268*	*0.317*	*0.589*
Direct prejudice[8] people over 70	4.01	4.15*	4.09	4.06	4.12	4.09	4.09	4.12	4.06	4.08
	0.016	*0.014*	*0.011*	*0.033*	*0.061*	*0.028*	*0.021*	*0.022*	*0.025*	*0.027*
Direct prejudice people under 30	3.56	3.68*	3.62	3.62	3.74	3.67[a]	3.64	3.62	3.65[a]	3.54[b]
	0.022	*0.020*	*0.015*	*0.051*	*0.084*	*0.038*	*0.030*	*0.032*	*0.036*	*0.039*

[6] Only 2008

[7] Only 2008

[8] Excluding 2004

Table C.1 Continued

Construct	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
	Male	Female	White	Non-White	A	B	C1	C2	D	E
Employment relations with over 70's	2.33	2.30	2.30	2.38	2.28	2.30	2.32	2.29	2.32	2.33
	0.020	*0.019*	*0.014*	*0.044*	*0.076*	*0.036*	*0.027*	*0.029*	*0.033*	*0.039*
Employment relations with under 30's	2.55	2.56	2.54	2.64	2.62	2.57	2.52	2.54	2.56	2.58
	0.023	*0.021*	*0.016*	*0.050*	*0.086*	*0.040*	*0.031*	*0.033*	*0.037*	*0.043*
Intergenerational closeness										
Similarity 2004	2.76	2.73	2.73	2.85*	2.42[a]	2.70[bc]	2.77[b]	2.78[b]	2.82[bd]	2.74[b]
	0.024	0.021	0.016	0.049	0.076	0.038	0.028	0.032	0.044	0.048
One common group[9]	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.09	0.07[a]	0.08[a]	0.10[a]	0.13[b]	0.13[b]
	0.007	*0.006*	*0.005*	*0.015*	*0.024*	*0.011*	*0.008*	*0.010*	*0.012*	*0.013*
Separate groups[10]	0.24	0.18*	0.20	0.24	0.22	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.24	0.19
	0.009	*0.008*	*0.006*	*0.020*	*0.032*	*0.015*	*0.011*	*0.013*	*0.016*	*0.018*
Separate individuals[11]	0.46	0.52*	0.50	0.38*	0.49	0.53[a]	0.49	0.48[b]	0.45[b]	0.50

[9] Excluding 2004

[10] Excluding 2004

[11] Excluding 2004

	0.011	*0.010*	*0.008*	*0.025*	*0.040*	*0.018*	*0.014*	*0.016*	*0.020*	*0.022*

(continued)

Table C.1 Continued

	Gender		Ethnicity		Social Class					
Construct	**Male**	**Female**	**White**	**Non-White**	**A**	**B**	**C1**	**C2**	**D**	**E**
Groups in same community[12]	0.21	0.20	0.20	0.27*	0.20	0.19	0.23[a]	0.22	0.18[b]	0.18[b]
	0.009	*0.008*	*0.006*	*0.020*	*0.032*	*0.015*	*0.011*	*0.013*	*0.016*	*0.018*
Contact 70	0.50	0.53*	0.52	0.45*	0.56	0.53	0.51	0.52	0.50	0.52
	0.009	*0.008*	*0.006*	*0.019*	*0.031*	*0.015*	*0.012*	*0.012*	*0.014*	*0.015*
Contact 30	0.63	0.59*	0.61	0.58	0.64	0.59	0.62	0.62	0.59	0.61
	0.010	*0.009*	*0.007*	*0.023*	*0.037*	*0.018*	*0.014*	*0.014*	*0.017*	*0.018*

NOTE. Significant differences are $^{*}p < .05$; Means with different superscript letters differ significantly differ from each other $p < .05$ a's differ from b's, c's differ from d's and e's differ from f's, means with the same letter do not differ from each other.

[12] Excluding 2004

Table C.2 Means and standard errors *(italicised)* for all items by working status, tenure and marital status. Significant pair-wise comparisons are marked.

	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
Construct	**Full Time**	**Part Time**	**Not Working**	**Retired**	**Mortgage**	**Owned outright**	**Rented from LA**	**Rented Private**	**Married**	**Not-married**
Age categorisation and identification[13]										
Young age stop	47.71[b]	47.29[b]	47.02	44.79[a]	47.28	45.80	46.81	47.11	47.21	46.06
	0.524	*0.836*	*0.684*	*0.791*	*0.509*	*0.587*	*0.670*	*0.777*	*0.379*	*0.443*
Old age start	64.36[d]	64.69[ad]	63.37[b]	62.21[c]	63.73	64.05	63.00	63.03	64.21	62.74*
	0.337	*0.516*	*0.430*	*0.494*	*0.321*	*0.366*	*0.420*	*0.495*	*0.238*	*0.280*
Age self-categorisation	4.77	4.69	4.70	4.82	4.78	4.71	4.81	4.76	4.76	4.76
	0.037	*0.055*	*0.046*	*0.049*	*0.035*	*0.037*	*0.044*	*0.052*	*0.025*	*0.029*
Age identification	3.21[a]	3.22[a]	3.23[a]	3.53[b]	3.31	3.29	3.34	3.31	3.27	3.37*
	0.033	*0.049*	*0.041*	*0.045*	0.031	0.034	0.040	0.047	0.023	0.026

(continued)

[13] Excluding 2005

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired	Mortgage	Owned outright	Rented from LA	Rented Private	Married	Not-married
Perceived prejudice										
Perceived frequency of prejudice[14]	1.92[a]	1.91[a]	1.87[a]	1.77[b]	1.90	1.89	1.83	1.82	1.86	1.87
	0.028	*0.043*	*0.034*	*0.042*	*0.027*	*0.031*	*0.033*	*0.042*	*0.020*	*0.023*
Prejudice in the media[9]	0.21	0.18	0.20	0.24	0.20	0.16[a]	0.26[b]	0.26	0.20	0.22
	0.027	*0.042*	*0.033*	*0.041*	*0.026*	*0.031*	*0.032*	*0.042*	*0.019*	*0.022*
Prejudice towards people over 50[15]	2.84	2.98[a]	2.80[b]	2.97[a]	2.93[b]	2.87	2.79[a]	2.98[b]	2.90	2.88
	0.042	*0.064*	*0.054*	*0.057*	*0.040*	*0.043*	*0.051*	*0.061*	*0.029*	*0.034*
Seriousness of discrimination[10]	2.46[a]	2.49[a]	2.43[a]	2.71[b]	2.50	2.52	2.57	2.56	2.55	2.51
	0.025	*0.037*	*0.032*	*0.034*	*0.024*	*0.026*	*0.030*	*0.036*	*0.017*	*0.020*
Experiences of discrimination										
Age-related discrimination	0.22[a]	0.22[a]	0.25[a]	0.31[b]	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.25	0.23	0.29
	0.010	*0.015*	*0.012*	*0.014*	*0.009*	*0.010*	*0.011*	*0.014*	*0.007*	*0.008*

[14] Only 2005

[15] Excluding 2005 and 2008

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired	Mortgage	Owned outright	Rented from LA	Rented Private	Married	Not-married
Stereotype content										
Stereotype content- over 70										
Friendly (warmth)	3.56[a]	3.47[a]	3.56[a]	3.76[b]	3.59	3.61	3.60	3.60	3.58	3.63
	0.032	*0.048*	*0.040*	*0.044*	*0.030*	*0.033*	*0.039*	*0.046*	*0.022*	*0.026*
Capable (competence)	2.93	2.92	2.93	2.99	2.93	2.94	3.00	2.90	2.95	2.93
	0.033	*0.049*	*0.041*	*0.045*	*0.031*	*0.034*	*0.040*	*0.047*	*0.023*	*0.027*
Admiration	3.12[a]	3.03	3.01	3.00[b]	3.07	2.99[a]	3.10[b]	3.10	3.06	3.04
	0.034	*0.050*	*0.043*	*0.047*	*0.032*	*0.035*	*0.042*	*0.049*	*0.023*	*0.028*
Pity	2.79[b]	2.71[b]	2.79[b]	2.62[a]	2.76[a]	2.67[b]	2.72[a]	2.83[a]	2.73	2.74
	0.037	*0.055*	*0.046*	*0.051*	*0.035*	*0.038*	*0.045*	*0.053*	*0.025*	*0.030*
Envy	1.98	1.90	2.02	1.96	1.94[a]	1.90[a]	2.07[b]	2.08[b]	1.97	1.98
	0.032	*0.048*	*0.041*	*0.045*	*0.031*	*0.034*	*0.040*	*0.047*	*0.022*	*0.026*
Moral	4.02	3.96	3.95	3.96	3.99	4.02[a]	3.91[b]	3.96	3.99	3.97
	0.030	*0.045*	*0.038*	*0.042*	*0.029*	*0.031*	*0.037*	*0.043*	*0.021*	*0.024*

(continued)

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired	Mortgage	Owned outright	Rented from LA	Rented Private	Married	Not-married
Stereotype content- under 30[16]										
Friendly (warmth)	3.01	2.99	3.08	3.07	3.03	3.04	3.03	3.09	3.01	3.08
	0.031	*0.046*	*0.039*	*0.043*	*0.029*	*0.032*	*0.038*	*0.044*	*0.021*	*0.025*
Capable (competence)	3.42[b]	3.30[a]	3.44[b]	3.53[b]	3.45	3.43	3.44	3.46	3.43	3.46
	0.031	*0.047*	*0.040*	*0.044*	*0.030*	*0.033*	*0.039*	*0.045*	*0.022*	*0.026*
Admiration	2.65	2.62	2.68	2.73	2.61[a]	2.67	2.75[b]	2.75[b]	2.64	2.72*
	0.031	*0.046*	*0.039*	*0.043*	*0.030*	*0.033*	*0.038*	*0.045*	*0.022*	*0.025*
Pity	2.00	1.91	1.97	1.95	1.90[a]	1.94[a]	2.05[b]	2.08[b]	1.99	1.93
	0.034	*0.051*	*0.043*	*0.047*	*0.032*	*0.036*	*0.042*	*0.049*	*0.023*	*0.028*
Envy	2.58	2.48[a]	2.64[b]	2.49	2.58	2.48[a]	2.56	2.64[b]	2.54	2.58
	0.037	*0.055*	*0.047*	*0.052*	*0.035*	*0.039*	*0.046*	*0.053*	*0.026*	*0.030*
Moral	2.57	2.53[a]	2.66[b]	2.58	2.54[a]	2.58	2.66[b]	2.61	2.58	2.60
	0.032	*0.048*	*0.041*	*0.045*	*0.031*	*0.034*	*0.040*	*0.047*	*0.022*	*0.026*

(continued)

[16] Excluding 2005

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status					Tenure					Marital status		
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired		Mortgage	Owned outright		Rented from LA	Rented Private		Married	Not-married	
Perceived threat														
Threat to the economy 2004 and 2006	3.16	3.19	3.13	3.09		3.14	3.12		3.17	3.10		3.18	3.08*	
	0.031	*0.046*	*0.041*	*0.041*		*0.029*	*0.031*		*0.037*	*0.045*		*0.021*	*0.025*	
Threat to the economy 2005 and 2008	2.37	2.38	2.35	2.33		2.34	2.32		2.38	2.41		2.37	2.34	
	0.033	*0.050*	*0.039*	*0.050*		*0.032*	*0.037*		*0.039*	*0.048*		*0.023*	*0.027*	
Material threat[17]		3.04[a]	3.06	3.07	3.15[b]		3.06[a]	3.06		3.11	3.15[b]		3.09	3.06
	0.026	*0.041*	*0.033*	*0.039*		*0.026*	*0.029*		*0.031*	*0.039*		*0.018*	*0.022*	
Symbolic threat	3.25	3.27	3.28	3.27		3.28	3.23[a]		3.31[b]	3.28		3.27	3.26	
	0.021	*0.032*	*0.026*	*0.029*		*0.020*	*0.022*		*0.025*	*0.030*		*0.015*	*0.017*	

(continued)

[17] Excluding 2006 and 2008

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired	Mortgage	Owned outright	Rented from LA	Rented Private	Married	Not-married
Expressions of prejudice										
Indirect prejudice[18]	3.42	3.42	3.45	3.38	3.43	3.38	3.43	3.45	3.42	3.41
	0.021	*0.033*	*0.027*	*0.030*	*0.020*	*0.023*	*0.025*	*0.031*	*0.015*	*0.017*
Internal control of prejudice[19]	8.41[b]	8.16	7.44[a]	8.94[b]	8.41	8.25	7.74	8.43	8.28	8.24
	0.213	*0.321*	*0.274*	*0.372*	*0.209*	*0.252*	*0.321*	*0.313*	*0.159*	*0.191*
External control of prejudice[20]	7.86[b]	8.48[b]	7.09[a]	8.8 [b]	8.15	7.72	8.19	7.94	7.95	8.05
	0.230	*0.347*	*0.296*	*0.401*	*0.225*	*0.272*	*0.347*	*0.337*	*0.172*	*0.206*
Direct prejudice[21] people over 70	4.07	4.06	4.09	4.12	4.08	4.07	4.10	4.14	4.11	4.06*
	0.020	*0.030*	*0.024*	*0.029*	*0.019*	*0.021*	*0.023*	*0.029*	*0.014*	*0.016*

[18] Excluding 2005

[19] Only 2008

[20] Only 2008

[21] Excluding 2004

(continued)

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired	Mortgage	Owned outright	Rented from LA	Rented Private	Married	Not-married
Direct prejudice people under 30	3.63	3.58	3.59	3.66	3.60	3.66	3.59	3.65	3.64	3.61
	0.029	*0.043*	*0.035*	*0.040*	*0.028*	*0.030*	*0.034*	*0.041*	*0.020*	*0.022*
Employment relations with over 70's	2.30	2.29	2.32	2.34	2.33[a]	2.39[a]	2.25[b]	2.19[b]	2.31	2.31
	0.024	*0.038*	*0.036*	*0.041*	*0.024*	*0.029*	*0.032*	*0.038*	*0.018*	*0.021*
Employment relations with under 30's	2.57	2.51	2.59	2.52	2.57	2.56	2.54	2.50	2.59	2.50*
	0.027	*0.042*	*0.040*	*0.046*	*0.027*	*0.033*	*0.036*	*0.043*	*0.020*	*0.024*
Intergenerational closeness										
Similarity 2004	2.72	2.74	2.81	2.74	2.76	2.72	2.77	2.73	2.74	2.75
	0.028	0.044	0.038	0.046	0.027	0.032	0.040	0.044	0.020	0.026
One common group[22]	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.09
	0.008	*0.013*	*0.011*	*0.013*	*0.008*	*0.009*	*0.011*	*0.013*	*0.006*	*0.007*

[22] Excluding 2004

(continued)

Table C.2 Continued

Construct	Working status				Tenure				Marital status	
	Full Time	Part Time	Not Working	Retired	Mortgage	Owned outright	Rented from LA	Rented Private	Married	Not-married
Separate groups[23]	0.19[b]	0.18[b]	0.22	0.24[a]	0.21[b]	0.18[a]	0.25[b]	0.21	0.21	0.20
	0.011	*0.018*	*0.015*	*0.018*	*0.011*	*0.013*	*0.015*	*0.017*	*0.008*	*0.009*
Separate individuals[24]	0.52[a]	0.51	0.46[b]	0.48	0.49	0.51	0.46	0.51	0.49	0.50
	0.014	*0.022*	*0.018*	*0.022*	*0.013*	*0.016*	*0.018*	*0.021*	*0.010*	*0.012*
Groups in same community[25]	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.19	0.22	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.21
	0.011	*0.018*	*0.015*	*0.018*	*0.011*	*0.013*	*0.015*	*0.017*	*0.008*	*0.009*
Contact 70	0.49[a]	0.50	0.53[b]	0.53	0.49[a]	0.56[b]	0.51[a]	0.50[a]	0.52	0.51
	0.011	*0.017*	*0.014*	*0.015*	*0.011*	*0.012*	*0.013*	*0.016*	*0.008*	*0.009*
Contact 30	0.64[a]	0.60	0.58[b]	0.60	0.57[a]	0.63[b]	0.61[b]	0.65[b]	0.60	0.62
	0.013	*0.020*	*0.017*	*0.018*	*0.013*	*0.014*	*0.016*	*0.019*	*0.009*	*0.011*

[23] Excluding 2004

[24] Excluding 2004

[25] Excluding 2004

NOTE. Significant differences are $^{*}p < .05$; Means with different superscript letter pairs significantly differ from each other $p < .05$. a's differ from b's, c's differ from d's and e's differ from f's, means with the same letter do not differ from each other.