

Mass-Observation: Social Research or Social Movement?¹

Historians of the recent past are turning in growing numbers to Mass-Observation as a source of information about social life between 1937 and 1948.² The volume, depth and diversity of this vast collection of material, deposited at Sussex University in 1970, provokes something like culture shock in researchers familiar with sources less rich in intimate details about people's lives, thoughts and feelings, but more tidily sorted and thoroughly catalogued, such as government social surveys, opinion polls and newspapers. Using the Mass-Observation archive presents its own set of problems,³ but at least some of them cannot be resolved without an understanding of Mass-Observation itself. This paper is an attempt to explore possible interpretations of Mass-Observation as an organization in a specific historical and sociological context.

Mass-Observation could be understood, as most contemporary accounts of the development of sociology saw it, as an organization pioneering a particular type of social research which some, e.g. Bronislaw Malinowski, saw as a vital new departure in scientific research, and others, e.g. Mark Abrams, wrote off as misguided.⁴ But it might be more appropriate to regard it as recent historians, like Tom Jeffery, have tended to see it, as a social movement with quasi-political objectives and an active and diverse following. Further to this, Mass-Observation as originally founded, came to an end in 1949. Its demise could be interpreted as the result of the research methods adopted, or of the stresses common to social movements, or as the peculiar product of trying to combine two different objectives: academically respectable research and the creation of social change.

The idea of the social research originated with two men, Tom Harrisson and Charles Madge. Tom Harrisson was a somewhat larger-than-life ornithologist-cum-anthropologist, who left his public school to go on an Arctic expedition and left Cambridge, before gaining a degree, to go on a tropical expedition. He spent the years 1931–36 in Central Borneo and the New Hebrides islands of the Western Pacific, in particular Malekula, and published his anthropological findings on the cannibals

Journal of Contemporary History (SAGE, London, Beverly Hills and New Delhi), Vol. 20 (1985), 439–452.

of the New Hebrides in a book called *Savage Civilisation* in 1937. On returning to Britain he was struck by the thought that the things he had been doing in the Pacific had not been done within these shores, and he moved to Bolton to study the Lancastrians in the same way he had studied the Malekulans. Simultaneously, Charles Madge, at the time a *Daily Mirror* reporter, published a letter in the *New Statesman* announcing the formation of a group of poets, painters and film-makers in Blackheath committed to social documentation. Harrison and Madge joined forces in a project to develop what they called a 'science of ourselves' through the organization they named Mass-Observation.

Of course, social research was not entirely new. Before the first world war Booth, Rowntree and Bowley had undertaken research into conditions in various towns, and these surveys were repeated along with others in the context of the economic depression of the 1920s and 1930s.⁵ But the objectives and methods of Mass-Observation were entirely different. Whereas the poverty surveys concentrated on carefully constructed statistical sampling of indices of social conditions such as housing, health, employment, and income, and paid relatively little attention to what people thought and felt, Mass-Observation's mission was to liberate 'facts' about what people did and said in order to 'add to the social consciousness of the time'. A major part of Madge and Harrison's own motivation was that they thought that this social consciousness was being stifled or distorted by those with power in the 1930s, (particularly political, commercial, and media power), and that its release would lead to change.

A brief look at Mass-Observation's very first enterprise illustrates these themes and shows how they dictated the research methods which remained central to the organization. Mass-Observation began with a study of a single national event, the coronation of George VI on 12 May 1937, in the hope of discovering what (if anything) such an event meant in the lives of 'ordinary people', an objective springing from the belief of both Madge and Harrison that the official interpretation of such occasions, reported in the media, was at odds with what people really thought and felt. The research methods used were to document the day from subjective accounts on the one hand, and observations on the other. The first came from a group of volunteers who were prepared to write down everything they did on 12 May, a method referred to as the 'day survey'. And the observations were recorded by twelve observers who moved around on the day, noting down what they saw and heard.⁶

These two methods became the twin pillars of Mass-Observation's research methodology. By 1940 the organization had a team of full-time observers working in Bolton to watch people, to record overheard comments, to engage in conversations which were recorded as indirect interviews and more rarely to interview directly. In all this, observers were not supposed to involve their own reactions. Mass-Observation also had a panel of volunteers, to whom it sent monthly 'directives' consisting of a list of questions to which subjective answers were expected. What was wanted from them were detailed, candid, personal reactions: as Harrison put it, 'material which could not be obtained by interviewing or by any contact made between the investigator and strangers'. They were regarded as informants, in the anthropological sense.⁷ The number of voluntary panellists has been exaggerated, not least by the organization itself, which repeatedly claimed to have a panel of 2,000. Nick Stanley, who has subjected the figures to rigorous analysis, throws some light on the claim. During the period 1937 to 1945, a total of 2,847 individuals replied to at least one directive, but less than half this number, 1,095, replied to more than one.⁸ In addition, 200 of these volunteers kept diaries, originally just on the twelfth of the month, following the coronation initiative, but during the war diarists were asked to send in full monthly diaries. As in the case of replies to the directives, commitment varied and few diarists submitted instalments every month, but during the six years of war, Mass-Observation had a total of 500 diarists on its books.⁹

Who was prepared to undertake this sort of self-observation on a purely voluntary basis and why? Samuel Hynes in his book *The Auden Generation* describes them as young members of the provincial lower-middle-class, 'the lonely bored livers of unexciting lives'. Closer analysis by Tom Jeffery confirms that a sizeable minority was indeed lower-middle-class but Jeffery argues that the idea that their lives were empty is a misrepresentation.¹⁰ Many had won scholarships from elementary to secondary school, but few had gone to university. Typical occupations of men and women were clerk and schoolteacher. Many male panellists in 1939 were shopkeepers, journalists, scientists or students, though a rising number joined the forces during the war. Throughout, a substantial minority of men, though not women, were manual workers in manufacturing industry. The vast majority of women classified themselves as housewives, though of course they may have been in paid employment prior to marriage.¹¹ Many experienced unemployment

between the wars. Most read widely and were keen to go beyond their limited schooling.

This educative urge was an important part of their motivation in joining Mass-Observation. Few belonged to any political party, yet many were 'left of centre'. The desire for self-education was coupled to a desire for a better understanding of current events. This is reflected in the fact that many Mass-Observation members were also members of the Left Book Club. This was a publishing enterprise started by Gollancz in 1936 as an outlet for broadly left-wing publications which most booksellers were at the time refusing to take. The co-membership of the Left Book Club and Mass-Observation is indicative of the socio-political motivation of many of Mass-Observation's participants. The Left Book Club's objective was to inform people of the rise of fascism and its horrific consequences, to introduce them to the socialist experiments in Russia and China, and to draw attention to the social conditions at home, notably mass unemployment and poverty, which the government, currently appeasing the dictators, was apparently content to ignore.¹² Jeffery writes that the majority of Mass-Observation's panellists 'volunteered to work for Mass-Observation because they wanted to be of some use in the fight against fascism and against official neglect of ordinary people'.¹³ They could clearly identify with the key ideas of Mass-Observation's introductory pamphlet of February 1937, which stressed the need to investigate popular fears of the coming war, and the way that the press manipulated ordinary people. The invitation to send in their most intimate thoughts and feelings and what they knew of those of others around them must have given them a sense of being listened to which was itself a counter to their powerlessness. This may have been particularly important for women, who in spite of having won the vote, were still largely deprived of a 'voice' in traditional party politics and trade union organization between the wars. In addition, gossip as well as news, home life as well as work, sex as well as politics, were considered important, an acknowledgement that 'the personal is political'. As many women as men kept Mass-Observation diaries, and possibly rather more women kept full diaries on a sustained basis.

This is not to say that *all* Mass-Observation's members were lower-middle-class autodidacts. There were middle-class members, particularly among the full-time observers, some of whom were university friends or acquaintances of Madge and Harrison. As Jeffery says, members of this group, who included Humphrey Jennings, Humphrey Spender, John Sommerfield, Celia Fremlin and Woodrow Wyatt, stand out by their wider-ranging experience, in terms of friendship networks,

university education, foreign travel, etc. In addition there were working-class members, mostly from the artisan stratum, for whom the key difference from the lower-middle-class was that their hours of work were longer, so they had less time to devote to Mass-Observation. Whichever group one looked at, however, the numbers of women with small children were very small, presumably because the time constraints of child care are even greater than those of manual work. Women Mass-Observers tended to be either single or older married women with grown-up children.

Mass-Observation's leaders referred to their recruits as 'men and women of goodwill', by which was meant both goodwill towards Mass-Observation, which they were supplying with data free of charge, and goodwill towards society in general – for surely a science of ourselves must benefit us all?

The way in which Mass-Observation defined its social research objectives determined the methods it adopted, and these involved the participation of a loose organization of an unlimited number of members whose voluntary commitment depended upon a sense of shared objectives. Even though Mass-Observation was definitely never a mass movement, it certainly bears resemblance to a social movement, for all that it was small. To put it in perspective, the most generous aggregation can credit Mass-Observation with no more than 2,847 individuals on its panel of volunteers, compared with a high point of 57,000 Left Book Club members.¹⁴ (Many would query whether the Left Book Club itself should be seen as a 'movement'.) However, Mass-Observation's influence extended beyond its panellists, since an essential concomitant of collecting information was its dissemination for the purpose of augmenting 'the social consciousness of the time'.

The organization produced over twenty books between 1937 and 1950, most of which were written rapidly, with the overt intention of returning information to the 'masses'. Their style was not dissimilar from that of documentary film: they tended to present a series of 'clips', each consisting of a word picture, some faithfully recorded dialogue, and a short commentary written in a direct, journalistic style on various aspects of the topic in hand, be it Bolton pubs, the phoney war, wartime production, post-war prospects, or religious belief.¹⁵ Further research would be necessary to discover the circulation, let alone the impact, of these books. However, the fact that Mass-Observation's main publishers were Gollancz (of Left Book Club fame), Penguin Special (trying to do something similar to the Left Book Club) and John Murray (another 'progressive' publisher) indicates that circulation was likely to be within

the same social milieu as that from which Mass-Observation's active participants were drawn.

In addition to publishing books, Harrison and other full-timers, notably H. D. Willcock, produced numerous newspaper and journal articles, and made frequent broadcasts. It should be noted that their intention was to communicate the findings of Mass-Observation to a much wider audience than an academic one. Mass-Observation's relationship with academia was rather like that with the press. It had friends in both camps (e.g. Bronislaw Malinowski, Professor of Anthropology at the University of London, and Tom Driberg of the *Daily Express*). But in general it saw both the press and academia as rivals, and as detractors of Mass-Observation's projects. This led to long-term mutual antagonism, for all that Tom Harrison was eventually appointed to a personal chair at Sussex University on the occasion of depositing the Mass-Observation archive there.

We shall now consider three problems encountered by Mass-Observation between 1937 and 1948: how to continue its existence in wartime, its relationship with government, and its relationship with business, and shall argue that because of the particularly close integration between the social research and the movement upon which it depended, these problems eventually destroyed the organization as originally conceived.

The war presented Mass-Observation with problems of attrition, as its members were gradually called up, and their freedom to observe and report was hampered by censorship. The war put an end to Harrison's Bolton project (though some of the data collected was published as *The Pub and the People* in 1943), and Harrison himself was called up in 1942. Within two years he was airlifted into Borneo, to remain in the Far East for twenty-five years, apart from brief home visits. But in some ways Mass-Observation did not suffer as much as other allied groupings, like the Left Book Club, from the advent of war. The Left Book Club's membership fell steadily from 1939, whereas record numbers wrote replies to Mass-Observation directives in 1939 and after a fall from this peak in 1940, numbers climbed again. 1942 and 1943 were Mass-Observation's best years in terms of the frequency of responses from its panellists.¹⁶ Mass-Observation may have benefited from its concentration on Britain, which freed it from association with a commitment to Russia as a model of anti-fascism, an association which caused deep rifts in many left-wing organizations, including the Left Book Club, on the occasion of the Nazi-Soviet Anti-Aggression Pact of August 1939,

which looked rather like socialist appeasement of fascism and sowed seeds of doubt and disillusion. The war had been anticipated by Mass-Observation and it brought a new challenge: it was now more urgent than ever to defeat fascism, and Mass-Observation directed its energies in wartime towards producing efficiency in government and industry. Mass-Observation's interpretation of 'efficiency' was securing the maximum effort from the people through willing co-operation. Of course, leaders in government and industry would, by its analysis, fail to do so if they ignored what people really thought, felt and wanted. It maintained a critique of these leaders for living at a distance from those they were supposed to lead, and redoubled its energies to collect information which would connect them with social reality.

Many of Mass-Observation's members moved on account of the war into new contexts, such as the forces, war industry and voluntary organizations like the Home Guard and the Women's Voluntary Service, which brought them into contact with new social groups, especially of working-class people. Even though censorship as well as the rigours of service life affected what service-men and women could send in to Mass-Observation, some continued to correspond with the organization, which was able to amass a collection which affords considerable insights into wartime forces' life. Equally, the direction of people, especially women, into types of industrial work that were new to them, gave fresh scope for participant observation. Mass-Observers were quick to pick up the kinds of matters which would interest their organization. For example, a woman welding trainer sent in all the letters her trainees had written to her during 1942, and one of the diarists gave long verbatim reports of the proceedings of a Women's Parliament held in January 1942.¹⁷ Mass-Observation published its wartime findings rapidly. For example, *War Begins at Home*, a study of such things as government propaganda, class divisions within evacuation and fears of air attack, came out early in 1940, and *People in Production*, researched between October 1941 and March 1942, was written and published before the end of that year. It examined aspects of production such as divisions in the work-place, poor organization of processes and people, and neglect of the interrelation of home and work, especially as far as women were concerned. Mass-Observation's message, expressed in such publications, was that it was no good relying on national unity and patriotic resolution: these things could only be achieved by genuinely bringing the objectives of the war and the methods of waging it into line with the aspirations and preferences of 'the masses'. In this Mass-Observation was not alone, though the milieu of which it was a part was rather different from the

pre-war one. A. C. H. Smith in *Paper Voices* has depicted a wartime movement embracing George Orwell, J. B. Priestley, the Commonwealth Party and the *Daily Mirror*, to which could be added the Army Bureau of Current Affairs and army education more generally, as waging a 'war to win the war'.¹⁸ Mass-Observation belonged in this context.

However, the very success with which Mass-Observation brought information about ordinary people to the attention of the nation's leaders during the war, caused tensions within Mass-Observation's leadership and changed its relationship with its followers.

The occasion for an irredeemable split between the two founding fathers, Madge and Harrisson, was the employment of Mass-Observation by the Ministry of Information in the spring of 1940. The 'Home Intelligence' section of the MOI was run by an old friend of Harrisson's, Mary Adams, and she commissioned Mass-Observation to send in regular 'morale reports'. With Arnold Plant she also set up an official investigative body, the Wartime Social Survey, which eventually became a rival to Mass-Observation. Madge did not approve of Mass-Observation's link with officialdom, and after six months of quarrelling left the organization. The split is sometimes seen in terms of personality. Jeffery writes of Tom Harrisson: 'You either got on with him or you gave up. Madge gave up.'¹⁹ Under J. M. Keynes' patronage, Madge did a socio-economic survey of wartime patterns of saving and spending in Bolton, and later became Professor of Sociology at Birmingham University. But Madge's objections were important. Mass-Observation's intention had been to stand as an independent critic of government, rather than as an organ of propaganda in itself. How could it work against manipulation of the masses if it was co-opted by the Ministry officially engaged in manipulation?

Harrisson clung to the idea that by refusing to sign the Official Secrets Act he maintained the independence of Mass-Observation. But it is clear that he increasingly saw his work for the state as a means to the end of changing the government's orientation – one of the objectives, after all, of Mass-Observation as a social movement.

The impact of the Morale Reports which recorded reactions to the news, is itself indicative of the unwillingness of many members of government to accept evidence of what people were thinking when it came from sources other than those they were used to, i.e. the press, the police, and social worthies like JPs, clergymen and doctors. The Labour members of the wartime coalition, e.g. Bevin and Morrison, were among the worst in this respect, and a parliamentary row blew up in early summer 1940, in which Mass-Observation personnel were slated

as 'Cooper's Snoopers', after the Minister of Information Duff Cooper. There was further tension over Mass-Observation's reports on the effects of the blitz of autumn 1940–41. Mass-Observation started by producing reports for the Admiralty on morale in bombed ports, but was soon covering all the major blitzed towns. In November 1940, it criticized inadequate government emergency provisions for the distressed inhabitants of Coventry, and misleading press statements to the effect that Coventry people were crying out for merciless reprisals on German cities. In contrast, it suggested, Coventry people were in a state of shock; they lacked both welfare and information and further bombing would have produced panic. These reports, hotly contested as 'unreliable' in government, did lead to better provisions for Coventry, in a sense vindicating Harrison. But they also had more sinister consequences at the hands of the Admiralty and Service chiefs, who concluded from them that the saturation bombing of German civilian populations would be the shortest way to victory. In a sense this vindicates Madge's doubts.²⁰

The wartime relationship with government was seen by Harrison as consistent with Mass-Observation's objectives. The same was true of Mass-Observation's relationship with business concerns at this time. Mass-Observation undertook at least one work-place study on behalf of its management. The works manager at one of the factories of an industrial enterprise, Ekco Ltd., which was producing radar equipment, was concerned about what he saw as slackness among his workers, principally women. Mass-Observation sent a full-time observer incognito to discover, through participant observation, the causes of the problem. This study, written up as *War Factory* and published in 1943, remains a superb picture of the responses of a group of women, mainly unaccustomed to industrial work, to the processes and work-place relationships of an engineering factory, and the prejudices with which they were confronted by men and management. With the usual combination of autocracy and a genuine democratic urge for all to learn from such findings, Harrison got Gollancz to publish the book and disseminated it amongst the Ekco work-force, rather to the surprise of the management.²¹ But in spite of Tom Harrison's *post hoc* openness, the spirit behind the research was manipulative. The company was the paymaster, the research into its work-force was conducted in secrecy on its behalf, and the conclusions were intended to suggest how it could extract higher productivity from its women workers.

The question of how the 'science of ourselves' was to be used, depended to a large extent on who was paying for it. The Advertising Service Guild, an association of eight advertising agents, funded an

increasing number of Mass-Observation studies during and after the war. It should not be imagined that this meant that Mass-Observation immediately became narrowly focused on market research, since the Advertising Service Guild's wartime aim was to 'assist the war effort' by promoting 'independent surveys into fundamental problems of war activity and organization'. Under this heading came Mass-Observation's clothes rationing, propaganda, savings and homes post-war plans and a large-scale investigation into war production generally.²² After the war, however, Mass-Observation did increasingly conduct narrowly focused surveys for commercial companies with products to sell, such as its surveys on washing habits, on the domestic use of paint and on the public taste for cosmetics, custard powder, baked beans and frozen fish.²³

In these projects Mass-Observation used the sources described earlier – on the one hand, the observations of full-time, largely incognito observers, and on the other hand, the replies to its 'directives' and the diaries of its panel of volunteers. Many of the projects, even *People in Production*, which was almost evangelical in its advocacy of 'human factor management' as the solution to wartime inefficiency, could be seen as consistent with the original aim of Mass-Observation, which was to bring to the attention of national leaders the social reality experienced by ordinary people, for the purpose of changing the balance of power within society. Yet it is also possible to see in this material a redefinition of this objective, along the lines that Mass-Observation's information would simply offer guidance on how to wield power more effectively, by telling leaders how to lead, managers how to manage and salesmen how to sell.

Possibly the original objective of the movement was so vague that it was inevitable that its leaders would eventually produce some sort of sharper working definition. After all, the original objective amounted to no more than the notion that 'information is power'. There was no analysis of power relations – between men and women, managers and workers, press and readers, government and people. In fact Tom Harrison, a committed empiricist, shied away from theory which could have led to such analysis.²⁴ But since he was determined to use Mass-Observation's information to produce change, he ended up devoted to changing the style with which power was wielded, rather than the *structure* of relationships which maintained that power.

It could be argued that the distinction we are making is too fine, and that too much is being read into the changes which occurred in the course of Mass-Observation's history. The organization inevitably had to attract funds, and the objectives of the social research and the movement on

which it depended necessarily had to evolve. After all, Mass-Observation's information did lead to some improvements in the way people were both governed and managed during the war, and marketing in itself is not immoral! But we shall conclude by arguing that these changes were of fundamental importance to Mass-Observation, both as social research, and as a social movement.

After the war, the social research methods undertaken by Mass-Observation were pushed increasingly in the direction of statistical sampling. This was popular with market research because it rendered simplistic results rapidly. It was also favoured in the academic community, by economists, political scientists and especially sociologists, because it was seen as more scientific than Mass-Observation's anthropological technique of using informants. There was what amounted to an onslaught against Mass-Observation's methods after the publication of *People in Production* in 1942. Before the war, rude but memorable comments had been made such as: 'Facts simply multiply like maggots in a cheese and leave no shape' and references to Mass-Observers as 'busybodies of the left . . . scientifically they are about as valuable as the chimpanzees' tea party at the zoo'. During and after the war numerous academic criticisms appeared in serious academic journals, culminating in Mark Abrams' hostile critique in *Social Surveys and Social Action*, published in 1951.²⁵ The attack concentrated both on the absence of a clear framework within which data was collected, and the use of indirect interviews and informants. The structured questionnaire and the representative statistical sample were the favoured methods.

Under pressure from these criticisms, and in order to retain credibility with clients, Mass-Observation introduced more statistics into its publications, even though its published statistics were in many cases useless, because the size and composition of the respondent group from which percentages were calculated were not given. Of course this led to further academic attacks. H. D. Willcock eventually gave up and went to the Government Social Survey, originally founded as the Wartime Social Survey by Harrison's friend Mary Adams, to do statistical surveys. However recent research, including the author's and that of Di Parkin, has found a strong consistency between Mass-Observation's findings and those of sample-based questionnaire research, such as that done by the Wartime Social Survey. The main divergence is that Mass-Observation's data was so much deeper that it was able to give a fuller picture. For example, Mass-Observation discovered not just that a sizeable minority

of women were unwilling to undertake war work, a fact which the Wartime Social Survey reported too, but also that under certain conditions women were prepared to enter war work and that these conditions were, specifically, collective provisions for domestic work, reduction of hours, offers of better pay and more interesting industrial work. Similarly, Mass-Observation's findings on attitudes to Churchill supported those of The British Institute of Public Opinion to the effect that he was popular, but enabled Mass-Observation to add that in spite of his personal popularity Labour would win the next General Election.²⁶ However, Mass-Observation did not have the courage of its convictions after the war, and endeavoured, damagingly, to appear respectably quantitative.

As far as Mass-Observation as a social movement is concerned, more research needs to be done on the fortunes of the organization after 1945. As far as we know, there is not yet a statistical analysis of recruitment to and composition of the panel in the years 1945–49, of the calibre of Stanley's work on the earlier period, which indicates a decline in the numbers of panellists replying to directives in 1944 and 1945. A superficial perusal of directive replies and diary instalments suggests a continuing shrinkage thereafter. As to causes, one possible explanation is that the decline was the result of the betrayal of trust in selling the intimate confessions of voluntary informants to cosmetics manufacturers. A further hypothesis is that there may have been a feeling among those running the organization themselves as well as outside, that the old objective had been realized by the Labour victory in the General Election of 1945. Now the aspirations of ordinary people would be fulfilled, so no further effort was necessary. Obviously a more thoroughgoing analysis of power would have pointed towards the need for continued effort to impress upon the Labour government what 'people of good will' were keen to see achieved through post-war reconstruction. As it was, Tate and Lyle, the British Medical Association, and other particular interest groups had the field to themselves after the war, claiming, for example, that no one wanted nationalization, or a wholly public as opposed to a partly private health service.²⁷

Gradually, during the years after the war, the organization moved further towards market research and away from a 'science of ourselves' aimed at the creation of social change. In 1949 it was superseded by Mass-Observation Ltd., run by two ex-observers, Leonard England and Mollie Tarrant. This was a market research organization, using principally the 'representative sample' and the questionnaire, rather than the subjective report of the voluntary informant. Tom Harrison exchanged his rights in the organization for control of all the material

collected by Mass-Observation prior to 1949. He commented on this material that over 90 per cent of it was never used in the compilation of reports and publications. It now sits in boxes in the Sussex University Library, an amazingly rich source whose depths historians are barely beginning to plumb.

Notes

1. This paper is intended as a discussion piece, and does not pretend to be based on in-depth research on Mass-Observation, for which the reader should see Tom Jeffery, 'Mass-Observation – A Short History' (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Occasional Paper, Birmingham 1978); N. S. Stanley, "'The Extra Dimension': a study and assessment of the methods employed by Mass-Observation in its first period 1937–40", (CNAA PhD 1981); Angus Calder, *The Mass-Observers* (Cape, forthcoming).

2. As a member of this group, I have used the Mass-Observation Archive as a source of information on education in the Armed Forces and, more extensively, the wartime employment of women; see P. Summerfield, 'Education and Politics in the British Armed Forces in the Second World War', *International Review of Social History*, XXVI (1981), Part 2; idem, 'Women Workers in the Second World War' (University of Sussex DPhil 1982); idem, 'Women, Work and Welfare: a study of child care and shopping in Britain in the Second World War', *Journal of Social History*, 17, 2 (Winter 1983); idem, *Women Workers in the Second World War, Production and Patriarchy in Conflict* (London 1984).

3. Some of these were discussed by myself and others at a session entitled 'Using the Mass-Observation Archive' at the British Association for the Advancement of Science Conference held at Sussex University, August 1983.

4. Essay by Bronislaw Malinowski in Mass-Observation, *First Year's Work 1937–38* (London 1938); Mark Abrams, *Social Surveys and Social Action* (London 1951).

5. See *inter alia* Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People of London* (London 1892–1900); B. S. Rowntree, *Poverty: A study of town life* (London 1901); A. L. Bowley, *Has Poverty Diminished?* (London 1905); Sir H. L. Smith, *The New Survey of London Life and Labour* (London 1930–35); B. S. Rowntree, *Poverty and Progress* (London 1941); John Hilton, *Rich Man, Poor Man* (London 1944); Pilgrim Trust, *Men without Work* (Cambridge 1938).

6. Charles Madge and Humphrey Jennings (eds), *May 12th* (London 1937).

7. Mass-Observation, *War Begins at Home* (London 1940), 16–22.

8. Stanley, *op. cit.*, 155–156.

9. D. Sheridan, *The Mass-Observation Records 1937–1949, A Guide for Researchers* (Mass-Observation Archive, University of Sussex 1982), 15–16; idem, 'Mass Observing the British', *History Today*, 34 (July 1984), 45.

10. S. Hynes, *The Auden Generation* (London 1976), 282; Jeffery (1978), 29.

11. Stanley, *op. cit.*, Table 7 opposite p. 167.

12. Stuart Samuels, 'The Left Book Club', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 1, 2 (April 1966); John Lewis, *The Left Book Club: An Historical Record* (London 1970).

13. Jeffery, *op. cit.*, 29.
14. Samuels, *op. cit.*, 71.
15. These topics were dealt with in the following Mass-Observation publications: *The Pub and the People* (London 1943); *War Begins at Home* (London 1940); *People in Production* (London 1942); *The Journey Home* (London 1944); *Puzzled People* (London 1947).
16. Stanley, *op. cit.*, 155 and Table 2, p. 158.
17. Mass-Observation Archive, TC32, 'Women in Wartime', Box 3, File F; Diary No. 5390.
18. A. C. H. Smith with E. Immirzi and T. Blackwell, *Paper Voices, The Popular Press and Social Change 1935-1965* (London 1975).
19. Jeffery, *op. cit.*, 40.
20. Tom Harrisson, *Living through the Blitz* (London 1976), chapter x.
21. M. Lipman, *The War, a Memoir* (unpublished ms. 1975). Lipman was works manager at Ekco, Malmesbury, and describes how the War Factory project was set up and carried out. Mass-Observation, *War Factory* (London 1943).
22. Mass-Observation, *People in Production* (London 1942), iii, foreword by Advertising Service Guild. See also The Advertising Service Guild's Bulletins, entitled 'Change', in which Mass-Observation reported on the other topics mentioned here.
23. Mass-Observation Archive, File Report 2315, Survey of Laundry Usage, January 1946; File Report 2546, The Application of Face Cream, 1947; File Report 2547, Custard Powder, 1947; File Report 3143, Washing Habits, 1949; Mass-Observation, *People and Paint* (ICI Publications, 1949); Mass-Observation Bulletin No. 43, 'Shopping at Department Stores', Jan./Feb. 1952; File Report 3646, Baked Beans, 1957; File Report 3652, Frozen Fish, 1957; File Report 3888, Instant Coffee, 1959.
24. See, for example, Mass-Observation, *War Begins at Home* (London 1940), 2-3, and Tom Harrisson, *Britain Revisited* (London 1961), 19.
25. Harrisson quotes examples in *Britain Revisited*, 16-17. See also Margaret Bunn, 'Mass-Observation: A comment on People in Production', *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies*, vol. xiii, 1944; Abrams, *op. cit.*
26. P. Summerfield, *Women Workers in the Second World War*, (London 1984), 40-41; Di Parkin, 'Using Mass-Observation', paper presented to BAAS conference, August 1983.
27. P. Addison, *The Road to 1945, British Politics and the Second World War* (London 1975), 273; R. Miliband, *Parliamentary Socialism* (London 1972), 301-302 especially footnote 3, p. 301, on Tate and Lyle's anti-nationalization propaganda.

Penny Summerfield

is a Lecturer in the Social History of Education at the University of Lancaster. She is the author of *Women Workers in the Second World War* (London 1984) and of articles on various aspects of the social history of the war. She is currently directing a new project on girls' education, 1902-1950.