general – Recalls were only made where SB entitlement could be established or postulated beforehand, or where further information could possibly lead us to establish SB eligibility. In particular this means that the wage-stopped (if they were spotted) were excluded (but I'm not sure at this distance how exactly we could have done this, so a number may have been visited "by mistake") I seem to recall we looked at last wage on interview for confirmation of wage-stop.) This means that I get the wage-stopped only by accident and they're not all in my figure of 5 below

University of Essex

Department of Sociology,
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex

Tel: Colchester (020 6) 5141
Telegraphic address: University Colchester
Telex: 98440 (UNILIB COLCHSTR)

Sep 1 1971

Dear Dennis,

Some points specified below were probably covered in the statistical request put to Geoff Norris. But I'd be grateful for your further help.

D.M's paper on the Poor who Fail to get SB.

Yes: these would be picked up from the screens. Criteria for visits were financial only, for people on screens & follow-ups

p.3. middle. Did we pay further visits to old people not included in minority group of elderly who scored 9 or more on disability index?

Yes: as far as I recall and can verify from my notes, there were a number of instances where income unit incomplete but other unit complete) unformation where the screen failed to pick up savings, or income, or the exact tenancy / household relationship, and these were checked by recall.

p.3 foot (last complete sentence) What did we do with households in which the information on income was incomplete (e.g. one we cover the old person not receiving SB in an otherwise high income household?

p. 4 top Can we distinguish (a) ineligible if wage-stop operated; (b) ineligible by SBC's criteria but eligible by our criteria, apparently because certain income not disregarded & when it should have been disregarded; (c) information at first interview faulty or incomplete and in fact not eligible because income above scales; (d) non-contact (e) refusals?

(a) 5 wage stopped, 1 walkaway (refused by SB), 2 not registered for work (a student, + a subnormal son), (b) 1 (not your phrase, but SB had refused, yet to us he appeared eligible) Nor in. in 24 (p4) 2 with income not disregarded in (c) 12 were actually getting SB, but in various ways this was misreported, 2 had too high an income (usually straight non-reporting (d) 10 including some demi-tiers (e) refusals 5 (usually savings or more, ten small part-time earnings) not have disqualified them in 3 cases. Total (e) 15

Nearly all seem to be old people (probably a high loss of SB eligible households) population.

p. 4 line 10 3.8% of households or of

p. 5 Table 2 Can we distinguish households in which there are two income units? Elsewhere it seems you can break up the total of 19 into 11 pensioners living with rels + 8 living alone.

these 11 pensioners were households (p7). In fact as far as we make out there were only 3 alone. Of others in Table 2 we want this splitting by income too. Of 9 "non off sick with unk, I think 8 were in single units. Of remaining 8 cases, all were in 2 or more units

p.6. 5 lines up from bottom Can you confirm that long-term addition was invariably included in income allowed? There must have been some pensioners eligible for only part of this addition. I can't remember, unfortunately. I would say we tried to take age into account

p.6 footnote "in several other instances" Number? Are the wage-stopped specified here + the "other instances" included in (g) in Table 1?

re-checked & found wage-stopped, but backing earlier, yes they were included

p.7 footnote This is a ground for believing that our estimate of eligibles may be too low. On the other hand, it may be best to assume that "incompletes" are distributed, like "non-respondents", in the same way as "complete respondents."

No, not all. 'Some' ? 1/3 → 1/2. I don't think there was an adequate way of checking. I felt there was likely to be very great confusion here over the terminology (S.B. + 'supplement' to benefit = earnings-related supp.).

p.9. Para beginning "The situation.." Do you mean that all these were eligible only for the first fortnight of sickness?

p.? Table! Have already put request to distinguish different elements in (b) and (g). Were people who had applied for SB but been turned down in our belief wrongly included as "eligible" or "not upheld"? Why 9 no-contacts or refusals in Glasgow?

Only 1 as far as I recall, included in eligibles

p.? You do not give any illustrations either of wage-stopped or eligible unemployed.

Yours

Peter.

Done by someone else, on stricter market research lines. In fact I was wrongly entered & 2 were demolished. Others, interestingly tended to be old people alone! So probably a fairly high strike?

I enclose my notes for Belfast, sorry they're a bit grotty. I wasn't really collecting detail except for my own interest.

Man at 5 Willing Street was wage-stopped I think.

I recall now the very great intervening difficulty with these families, in actually identifying what they got - they'd been getting different things for so long, they weren't too sure of the names of the allowances. Also, there's the problem of long-term recipients; I don't know how they go on about their 'last wage' if they were initially wage-stopped.

Returned by Richard Barron

~~Photo~~ V. could I have copy some time?

(1)

179 Matilda Street – Man is now receiving sup. ben. on £8/19/-. Makes wonder if previous £9 u/e was SB. I told her so appeared to be entitled to more & she said she would try. But his last wage was very low so seems to be wage stopped.

---

5 Utility Street Man applied for SB & was awarded only £10/18 in spite of his last year's tax return of gross earnings £860. Look at the brew rate is up & he continues on sick pay. Will wait until the rate is up & then apply again. He too convinced it was lower than England. Has worked in England (born Dewsbury). Nervous about starting work (rubber factory, job with house, but worried about "the fumes") Once worked with Rowland and Wolff & went to Barrow but wage £2, no overtime, hostel £4, had to come back for illness in family. Wife said "Don't get him any more money or he'll never go back to work." Applied for SB when wife went to hospital recently. Home helps had to come & health visitor said should be getting SB. As soon as wife went into hospital sick pay stopped because "somebody wrote in and said He wasn't sick at all I was minding children." (i.e. his own).

Very poor house. Large son & baby sleep on couch. ~~Tried~~ Litter. Lively delinquescent sub-culture in "~~Tife~~ like if there's been a break-in round here I'd know who'd done it but the police wouldn't." Small-time gangsters & rent racketeers, prostitution & child seduction. But along with it fewer community feeling Orange lodges - go once a month. Flagpoles, painted kerbs. Pawley! ~~Tr.~~

Wife "It sounds like superstition but your own money goes further. The brew money, you no sooner get it than it's gone. Your own seems to last longer. You can lay it out better. At least that's what I think." "I'm frightened to appeal. I'm frightened of anything like that in case they knock off the brew money - give us even less" Didn't like applying. People up road apply for everything.

In spite of poor house it's a sort of tie in a way a rented house would be because they hope to get some money for it when it's demolished £50 at least, if not £100.

The London School of Economics and Political Science
(University of London)

Houghton Street, Aldwych
London, W.C.2
Telephone: 01-405 7686

15th October, 1971.

Dear Peter,

Have spent several hours puzzling over the contradictions in my income as % of S.B. and Colin's SB assessment. I have finally found out where the error is, but have no idea what caused it – the basic problem is that the tables you had were wrong – I enclose an approximate re-run of the tables (~~[illegible]~~ I ~~[illegible]~~ didn't do quite the right groups (carelessly), but thought you might like to see it immediately + also if any other tables in this series were wrong, I can re-run them all together). If you have the batch of tables in which these were run in a group still, do treat them with suspicion + check against the revised version.

The new version certainly is more reasonable, and checks against runs I have separately done to check SB. There are now 15 people ~~cases~~ classed as "below" but above 160% last year – of these, 7 people were less than 100% last week. ~~[illegible]~~ The remaining few I think Colin must have overlooked parts of their income in his calculation – my income calculations look ok. The only households with both last week + last year above 160% are: 1051172, 2103514, 2132324, 8491041.

I wish I knew why the old tables were wrong. Very sorry indeed about this.

Hazel.