Figure 1. The impact of social position on GHQ, controlling for age and sex
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Figure 2.1 The impact of social position on GHQ, controlling for job status, age and sex

a) Income

\[\text{Deviance (-2 x log likelihood) } = 240658.8\]

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{income_graph}
\caption{Income septile differences in GHQ score}
\end{figure}

b) Cambridge

\[\text{Deviance } = 240682.9\]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{cambridge_graph}
\caption{Cambridge septile differences in GHQ score}
\end{figure}

b) NS-SEC

\[\text{Deviance } = 240689.8\]
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{nssec_graph}
\caption{NS-SEC class differences in GHQ score}
\end{figure}
Figure 2.2 The impact of social position on GHQ, controlling for ghq-lag, age and sex
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Figure 3. The impact of social position on GHQ, controlling for ghq-lag, age and sex for the “ever economically inactive”

1. Income

Deviance (-2 x log likelihood) = 240484.4

2. Cambridge

Deviance = 240497.6
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