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Abstract

Study objective – To elicit lay concepts of health and to see whether these are related to various sociodemographic factors, as has been suggested by previous smaller studies.

Design and setting – A total of 196 people aged 18 and over were selected, as a representative sample of the general population, from the electoral registers of Walsall and Dudley in the West Midlands. Respondents were interviewed in their own homes in the autumn of 1989.

Measurements – Open ended and structured questions were used to elicit concepts of health. The three main stages consisted of an unprompted section in which respondents were asked to describe the features of good or poor health in themselves or others; a prompted section in which they were asked to rate 37 health statements using a series of categories from “very important” to “not at all important”; and a section in which they were asked to indicate which of six groups of statements, each representing a particular concept of health, best represented their own notions of health.

Results – Health was seen as multidimensional. Irrespective of whether respondents addressed health in self or health in others, or good or poor health, the biomedical dimension remained an important one. The manner by which concepts of health are elicited may provide some explanation as to why so many and varied concepts are alleged to be held by different subgroups of the population (notably different social classes).

Conclusions – The differences found in this study between models of health employed by different subgroups of the general population have not been as great as has previously been suggested in the published reports. This is encouraging for those using existing health status measurements.

(† Epidemiol Community Health 1994;48:248–253)

Twenty years ago Freidson wrote that lay definitions of health and illness are important for our understanding of whether, or not lay people will believe themselves to be ill, and this in turn has consequences for a related issue – whether lay people, after coming to believe they might be ill, then consult a physician.1 This has an obvious relevance for use of health services and health policy: it is often claimed that those who most need the health and social services, are least likely to use them. When one suspects that many of the services and treatments provided by the health and social services are ill matched to the needs and priorities of the recipients, it is tempting to focus on specific socioeconomic subgroups – those thought of as least likely to respond, in what is seen as an appropriate manner, to health promotion campaigns and appropriate use of health services – to come up with a picture of the concepts held by these subgroups, and point out how and where they differ from those held by the health care providers.

Most of the studies into lay concepts of health found in the published reports have a particular context or hypothesis – for example, “How much do a particular group or groups of people living in a particular area or having a specific characteristic agree or disagree with key concepts?” or “What is the effect of deprivation in a particular background?” or “What are the differences between the classes?” These studies have often been small scale and it has therefore been difficult to extrapolate from findings concerning these subgroups to the population in general.

Furthermore, claims by the authors of such early and small scale studies which employed these subgroups have been called into question by the findings of more recent studies employing more representative samples (for example, the concept of health as the absence of illness which was once thought to be unique to working class women has now been found equally among all social classes).

Blaxter, in fact, in her recent large scale study, found the complete opposite of her findings in an earlier study:2 the “not-ill” description of health was more frequently used by the better educated and those with higher incomes.3

It is clear that where samples are not representative of the general population, an accurate picture of the lay concepts of health and illness held by that population will not emerge. This has important implications for the construction of health status indices as choices have to be made regarding the inclusion of health related items.

A number of themes, however, frequently emerge in the published reports, and it has been suggested by Blaxter4 that there is widespread agreement among health researchers that health in the abstract is perceived by the lay person as the absence of illness, as functional capacity, and as fitness. She reports that individuals define health in different terms depending on whether they are defining it in relation to themselves or to another person. Health for oneself is described differently in
that although the categories listed above re-
appear, health for oneself is predominantly
thought of in psychological terms. The better
known and well validated health status
measurements such as the Nottingham Health
Profile and the Sickness Impact Profile have
incorporated such dimensions.

As yet no methodological paradigm exists
within this field of study: methodologies used
to date have therefore been many and varied,
ranging from the use of one open ended ques-
tion (for example, D'Houtard and Field) to
the use of in depth interviews (for example,
Blaxter and Paterson) and closed ended ques-
tionnaire type material (D'Houtard and Field
and Wright).

Pill and Stott favour an open ended ap-
proach to eliciting health beliefs: “data
obtained by this method can be regarded as
a measure of salience, i.e. a measure of
the relative importance the individual attaches
to an attribute or belief”. They cite Lemon
who suggests that the degree to which attitudes
or beliefs are readily elicited in open ended
interviews may be treated as a measure of
salience. D'Houtard and Field, on the other
hand, encourage the use of the closed ap-
proach. They conducted one study using an
open ended approach and a study using closed
questions and found differences between the
concepts held by different occupational groups
in the two studies. They attempt to explain the
differences by noting that in “the open ques-
tion, health is only defined according to the
immediate or spontaneous evocations of the
respondent, whereas, when facing an already
formulated series of definitions, the choices are
elicited preferably towards this or that theme
as a function of more or less conscious atti-
tudes and according to reactions resulting
from the location of each theme in the se-
quence and the theme’s own connotations with
reference to other themes”.

The fact that the manner of eliciting con-
cepts of health may yield different results also
makes comparisons of findings from different
studies rather difficult. In addition, re-
searchers do not commonly report on the
actual process or means of analysis by which
categories of beliefs/health concepts have
“emerged” from raw data. It is therefore hard
to estimate how much of a researcher’s own
interpretation or subjectivity has gone into the
analytic process.

Even more importantly, some researchers
do not list the questions/types of questions that
have been used to elicit the raw data in the first
place. In addition, it is often unclear whether
concepts of health have been elicited in con-
junction with concepts of illness, or whether
the two have been sought in isolation. Simi-
larly, there has been a general failure to report
whether health/illness definitions have been
sought in relation to self, other, or in the
abstract (with the exception of researchers like
Blaxter, D'Houtard, and Field and Calnan).

Many of the existing health status measure-
ments, such as the Sickness Impact Profile, the
Nottingham Health Profile, and the Rosser
Index, have been developed using convenience
samples, often of health personnel. It is there-
fore the aim of the present study to elicit the
salient features of health as perceived by or-
dinary people for eventual use in a health status
index, and to see whether this study supports
the findings of the existing reports on lay
concepts of health.

**Methods**

**STUDY POPULATION**

The survey was administered by interview and
was conducted in the West Midlands. The
sample consisted of 196 members of the
general public (51.0% men and 49.0% women)
aged 18 and over randomly selected from the
electoral registers of the Walsall and
Dudley areas.

**DATA COLLECTED**

During the first stage of the interview
unprompted notions of good and poor health
were elicited through the use of open ended
questions.

During the second stage the respondents
were presented with a structured question-
naire in order to elicit the relative importance
to them of 37 different stated characteristics of
good or bad health.

Various background information data about
the respondent were also collected – basic
sociodemographic information such as age, sex,
and marital status; class related informa-
tion such as qualifications gained, income, and
social class as defined by the Registrar
General; and health related information.

**CONCEPTS OF HEALTH**

The concepts of health in the first part of this
study were derived from answers to five ques-
tions: (1) How would you describe someone
who is in good health? (good health in others);
(2) How would you describe someone who is in
poor health? (poor health in others); (3) [When
appropriate.] In what ways are things different
now from when you were in poor health? (good
health in self); (4) [When appropriate.] Al-
though you are in good health now, what
things would make you think you were not in
good health? (poor health in self); (5) [When
appropriate.] In what ways are things different
now from when you were in good health? (poor
health in self).

The respondents were free to mention whatever they chose, and their re-
sponses were coded verbatim. The inter-
viewers were given strict guidelines concern-
ing prompting, only prompts such as
“anything else” were allowed. The questions
concerning health in self were asked at the
beginning of the open ended interview, after
the first part of a sociodemographic schedule
had been completed. This part of the socio-
demographic schedule contained a brief health
history and was considered a warm up for the
more abstract questions and it contained no
hints concerning the notions of health or ill-
ness that might be employed.
PROCEDURE
Each respondent was interviewed at home, and
to ensure that the interviewers were accurately
transcribing the responses to the open ended
questions, the first part of the interview
(unprompted notions of health) was tape
recorded for quality control purposes. A ran
dom sample of the tapes was then transcribed
and checked against the material written ver
batim by the interviewers.

CODING OF RESPONSES
Initially, tentative categories were derived and
checked independently by at least one other
researcher. The same categories were used for
the other good health concepts (for example
good health in self). A similar coding scheme
was used for the poor health concepts, using
reverse statements with minor alterations and
additions. Coding the material did not prove
an easy task. Since the within-coder consist-
ency and between-coder consistency proved
relatively poor for some of the categories, all
the questionnaires were reprocessed in a dif
ferent way. A computer package was used
which enabled all verbatim statements that had
been coded under particular categories to be
grouped together. These were then worked
over by the entire research team, until consen
sus was reached. The verbatim statements are
still available on a database, and can be
recoded as necessary.

The final 30 “basic” categories were con
densed into seven concepts similar to the ones
Blaxter used, as shown in table 1.

Since the numbers in some of the seven
categories were still very small for the purp
ose of analysis, four broader categories of
functional dimension, biomedical dimension,
fitness dimension, and psychosocial dimension
as outlined by Blaxter were also used (table 2),
even though this weakened the analysis
somewhat, because in the process of aggrega
tion variation is lost, thus making effective
comparisons more difficult. Table 2 summaris
es how these dimensions were derived.

Results
UNPROMPTED NOTIONS OF HEALTH
Health in others: good health
As can be seen from table 3, for good health in
others, the two concepts most favoured were
health as physical fitness and psychosocial well
being. Good health was also seen as being able
to function properly and not having any ill
esses. Health is having a good constitution
and as living a healthy life was mentioned less
frequently.

When health as fitness is combined with
energy/vitality to make up the fitness dimen
sion, positive fitness becomes the most im
portant dimension (table 4). The biomedical
dimensions take on the least importance.

Health in the abstract is therefore less likely
to be seen as not being ill but more to do with
fitness and general well being.

Health in others: poor health
To obtain the preferred concepts for health in
others, Blaxter concentrated on good health
(“think of someone who is very healthy, who
are you thinking of and why do you call them
healthy”). Since we expected there to be a
difference between describing good health in
someone else and poor health in someone else,
we added a “poor health in others” question.

As can be seen from table 3, for poor health
in others, the emphasis was much more on the
functional and biomedical aspects. Approximately 34% of the general population described

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Concepts of health fitted into four dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Functional dimension  | Health as function
| Biomedical dimension  | Health as not ill absence of disease
| Fitness dimension     | Health as physical fitness
| Psychosocial dimension| Health as psychosocial well being
|                       | Not fitted into any of above dimensions
|                       | Health as a reserve
|                       | Health as behaviour |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Coding categories fitted into seven concepts of health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good health</td>
<td>Poor health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as not ill</td>
<td>General “feel ill” items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General “feel ill” items</td>
<td>General “not feel ill” items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good appetite/eating</td>
<td>Poor appetite/eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other symptoms</td>
<td>Other symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not needing medication/see doctor</td>
<td>Needing medication/see doctor in hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No named diseases or conditions</td>
<td>Named diseases or conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No respiratory problems</td>
<td>Dying/respiratory problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General “not ill” items</td>
<td>General “not well” items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as a reserve</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong/robust/resistance to illness</td>
<td>No resistance to illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as behaviour</td>
<td>General items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General items</td>
<td>Health as physical fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet</td>
<td>Keeping fit/maintain fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td>Being fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>No weight problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as energy/vitality</td>
<td>No energy/lethargic/tired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/active/lively</td>
<td>Unable to undertake usual activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as function</td>
<td>Physical mobility problems, including housebound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to undertake usual activities</td>
<td>Sensory/speech impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sensory or speech impairment</td>
<td>Cognitive impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cognitive impairment</td>
<td>Always asking for help/needling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not dependent on others</td>
<td>help/dependence on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as psychosocial well-being</td>
<td>Strained/worried/unable to cope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stress or worry/relaxed, able to cope</td>
<td>Feelings, ie, feel depressed/irritable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings, ie, feel better/content/positive/confident/cheerful/joyful/happy/enjoyment/outgoing</td>
<td>withdrawn/not enjoy life/lack of motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment of usual activities</td>
<td>No enjoyment of usual activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to help others</td>
<td>Lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fitting into any of above concepts</td>
<td>Unlucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky</td>
<td>Financial problems/standard of living/income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems with finance/standard of living/income</td>
<td>Look ill/pale/drawn/haggard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look well/good colour</td>
<td>Sleep problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other categories</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant responses</td>
<td>Not relevant responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, for good health in others, the concept most favoured by the general population was
health as physical fitness and psychosocial well being.
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Table 3 Number of people mentioning each concept of health (and as % of all respondents to that question): general population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts of health</th>
<th>Good health in others (n = 196)</th>
<th>Poor health in others (n = 196)</th>
<th>Good health in self (having been in poor health) (n = 30)</th>
<th>Poor health in self (in good health now) (n = 143)</th>
<th>Poor health in self (in poor health now) (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health as not ill absence of disease</td>
<td>50 (26)</td>
<td>83 (43)</td>
<td>22 (73)</td>
<td>105 (73)</td>
<td>13 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as reserve good constitution</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>29 (15)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>13 (9)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as behaviour</td>
<td>25 (13)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as physical fitness</td>
<td>79 (40)</td>
<td>32 (16)</td>
<td>3 (10)</td>
<td>19 (13)</td>
<td>3 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as energy-vitality</td>
<td>61 (32)</td>
<td>44 (22)</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>29 (21)</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as function</td>
<td>75 (38)</td>
<td>84 (43)</td>
<td>10 (33)</td>
<td>43 (30)</td>
<td>11 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health as psychosocial well being</td>
<td>78 (40)</td>
<td>68 (35)</td>
<td>10 (33)</td>
<td>27 (19)</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: People may mention more than one concept.

Table 4 Number of people mentioning each dimension (and as % of all respondents to that question): general population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of health</th>
<th>Good health in others (n = 196)</th>
<th>Poor health in others (n = 196)</th>
<th>Good health in self (having been in poor health) (n = 30)</th>
<th>Poor health in self (in good health now) (n = 143)</th>
<th>Poor health in self (in poor health now) (n = 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional dimension</td>
<td>75 (38)</td>
<td>84 (43)</td>
<td>10 (33)</td>
<td>43 (30)</td>
<td>11 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical dimension</td>
<td>50 (26)</td>
<td>83 (43)</td>
<td>22 (73)</td>
<td>105 (73)</td>
<td>13 (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness dimension</td>
<td>122 (62)</td>
<td>60 (34)</td>
<td>8 (27)</td>
<td>49 (34)</td>
<td>7 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosocial dimension</td>
<td>78 (40)</td>
<td>68 (35)</td>
<td>10 (33)</td>
<td>27 (19)</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

somebody in poor health as somebody who looks ill, drawn, or haggard (figures not shown). More people mentioned poor health as having a poor constitution, than was the case for good health. When the seven concepts are combined to make up the four broader dimensions, there was less differentiation between the dimensions than was the case for good health in others (table 4).

There was little difference found in the average, modal, and median number of responses between the good health and poor health items. This seems to suggest that respondents are equally able to define good and poor health in others. In contrast, Herzlich and Graham suggest that as individuals will only ever have partial experience of illness, defining illness may present difficulties for them. Pill and Stott, however, note that respondents found it easier to talk about illness than health: they were more comfortable talking about illness, because of their actual experience of it.

One of the drawbacks of presenting two similar questions in close proximity to each other (how would you describe someone in good/poor health?) is that respondents may simply reverse the statements. The mean, mode, and median for these items may suggest that this is the case in this study. It is clear, however, that although some reversal may take place, there are still differences between the concepts employed (tables 3 and 4).

Health in self: good health

For health in self, the most important dimension was the biomedical one. Some respondents defined themselves to be in good health now but had had episodes of poor health in the past (n = 30). They were asked in what way things were different now from when they had been in poor health. A question posed in this way, perhaps, invites respondents to recite their previous ills and pains. Blaxter asked the question: “At times people are healthier than at other times. What is it like when you are healthy?”. It was felt that this would have been a more appropriate question to elicit concepts for good health in self.

Health in self: poor health

The poor health in self item was split into two questions: those who were in good health presently were asked to think about what would make them think they were not in good health, and those who considered themselves to be in poor health were asked to think how things are different from when they were in good health.

For those who considered themselves to be in good health now (the majority of all respondents), for all groups, the biomedical dimension yielded by far the most concepts, that is having complaints or illnesses would make them think they were not in good health. The numbers for those in poor health were very small, but the biomedical dimension also predominates.

BACKGROUND VARIABLES

The background variables were examined to see whether there is a strong association between models of health employed and various sociodemographic characteristics, as the published reports suggest. Only good health in others will be reported here.

Age, sex, and marital status

The published reports suggest that age and sex influence the models of health employed. Blaxter, for instance, found that fitness is a concept associated with the young and with men. This was also the case in the present study on the seven categories, but on the four broader dimensions of health (when health as energy-vitality is combined with health as fitness), these differences largely disappear. Health as positive fitness is the most favoured dimension among both sexes and the younger and middle aged groups alike. The older age group (over 60) saw good health in others more often in terms of psychosocial functioning, whereas this was the least favoured concept.
among the younger age group. Apart from this age group, the biomedical dimension did not feature very highly for good health in the abstract. Marital status closely resembled the three age groups in the concepts of health favoured, presumably because the young are most likely to be single, the older age group most likely to be widowed, etc. The numbers in some of the categories were too small from which to draw any useful conclusions.

Class related variables: social class based on current job, social class based on job of head of household, education and incomes

As mentioned above, published reports suggest a strong correlation between social class and concepts of health held. A class stereotype has emerged where the working classes are seen to hold a socialised, functional conception of health with their main concern being ability to get through the day properly, ability to fulfil their social roles, and having a good morale. The middle classes, on the other hand, are alleged to hold more esoteric notions of health: health as positive fitness, health as hedonism, health as personal unfolding, health as a striving for self realisation, and well being.

Evidence for this class stereotype has not been supported by Blaxter's large scale random study, nor by the findings of the present study. The non-manual workers are more likely to uphold a biomedical model of health (p < 0.05) than the manual workers and mention positive fitness only marginally more often than those in manual occupations.

Education and income as a proxy for social class did not show much more social differentiation than the social class variable: those with qualifications were more likely to mention health as fitness than those without qualifications (p < 0.01) and this is in accordance with published reports. There were no other differences.

The total number of concepts mentioned did not vary by social class. Differences between the class related variables must therefore reflect genuine differences in concepts held, rather than an ability of the non-manual classes and the better educated to be more articulate and generate more concepts; nor did the manual workers and those with less education simply “repeat” concepts more often than their non-manual counterparts.

Illness experiences

Overall, there was some evidence that various illness experiences affect the way lay people conceptualise health, but the findings are very tentative. Blaxter found that the “not-ill” concept of health was more frequently associated with the respondent’s own state of health: “at all ages, but particularly among the elderly, those who themselves were in poor health or suffering from chronic conditions were less likely to define health in terms of illness”. The who claimed to suffer from a longstanding illness, disability, or infirmity were less likely to mention the biomedical dimension, but saw good health more in terms of functioning (p = 0.05). Those who did not have a chronic illness were more likely to uphold health in terms of fitness (p = 0.01).

Respondents were asked to rate their current health status on a 0 to 100 visual analogue scale. Most respondents from the general population (70%) rate their health status between 75 and 100, which is approximately equivalent to the number of people who did not suffer from a longstanding illness. There were no differences on the broader four dimensions between those who rated their health below 75 and those above 75. There were no differences between those suffering limiting effects of their illness, however the numbers in this subgroup were very small.

Those who had experienced a recent death or admission to a hospital of anyone close did not use different concepts to those who had not had these experiences, which is perhaps a little surprising.

The prompted responses

Respondents were presented with 37 health related items and were asked to state the importance of each in deciding what good health is, through the use of a five-point Likert Scale, ranging from “very important” to “not at all important”. The items composing the scale were based upon results from earlier studies and also from existing health status measures. They cover a wide range of health related variables including symptoms, psychosocial functioning, disabilities, feelings, and physical fitness.

Principal factor analysis (with varimax rotation) was used to reduce a matrix of correlations between the 37 item response scores to a smaller number of representative dimensions or factors. This proved unsuccessful; there was little distinction within the data. To see which of the socioeconomic variables are the main determinants of choice of conceptualisations of health, $\chi^2$ statistics were used to estimate significant differences in cell distributions. This proved equally unsuccessful, the two concepts of health that seem to be associated with all class related variables are that those without qualifications, lower incomes, and in manual occupations don’t like going to the doctor and like having a good memory! There were no other significant associations between demographic variables and the prompted notions of health.

Discussion

From the unprompted notions of health, it seems that although people employ many different concepts for poor and good health in self and others, the biomedical dimension is an important one, the notable exception being good health in others.

Positive health, it seems, is about being fit, energetic, and feeling on top of the world; poor health in self and others means not being able to get through the day properly, not being able to carry out one’s usual tasks, and feeling...
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poorly. To some extent these differences may be due to the fact that the question, “how would you describe someone in good health” is a more abstract one. As has been discussed above, lay people may find it easier to conjure up images of those in poor health or what poor health in themselves means: poor health is more readily associated with incapacities or illnesses, good health has less dramatic connotations.

The effects of sociodemographic and related variables on the concepts of health advanced showed unsurprising results, given the indications from the published reports. Social class as defined by the Registrar General and based on the occupation of the respondent or of the head of household is either not an adequate discriminatory variable or there is in fact little social differentiation to be found, as might previously have been suggested.

It may be argued that closed ended questions such as the ones used in the present study, invite respondents to state that each statement is important. This certainly seemed to have been the case in the present study. However, a recent study in Australia that posed questions in a similar way, albeit using different items, was able to reduce the 33 items used to four dimensions and discriminate between the respondents perceptions on a number of items and dimensions. The original 33 items used in that study were selected from a list of ailments and diseases which a previous survey had shown were prevalent in the general population, and health topics which were considered to be important by large numbers of respondents. As mentioned above, the 37 items covered in the present study were based upon results from earlier studies and also from existing health status measures. Given the indications from the unprompted notions of health, which showed up fewer differences between the variables examined than might have been expected, it may be concluded that all 37 items are important to most people. It is very encouraging that the health status measures they have been derived from do not disadvantage certain age, socioeconomic, or illness groups.
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