

From the Chairman

As from The Mill
Buckland St Mary
Somerset

University of Essex

Department of Sociology
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex
Tel: Colchester (OCO 6) 5141

July 31 1969

Dear Hilary,

In revising your Methodological Appendix on the poverty survey I'd be grateful if you'd take into account the revised method of sampling of the FES (described on p.124 of the Report for 1967, and also in Statistical News, May, 1968). What we might have is a side-heading "Differences between Essex/LSE Survey and F.E.S. in Sampling Method" followed by a couple of paras listing the differences and explaining advantages/disadvantages. It would be helpful to circulate a draft to Stuart & Durbin in Aug or Sept for their comments before we all get immersed in the autumn term.

Could I also invite from you ~~the~~ a typed version of the article published in New Society, with any amendments you care to make? The final amendments are being made to the Colchester conference papers and will ~~be~~ have to be sent to the press before the end of August. It would be good to include material from the team.

I'm enjoying writing peacefully in this rural retreat

Ever

Peter

Thurs.

Dear Hilary,

I'm delighted to have your papers. I had in fact put the first in the typing pipeline & am told it will be ready by Friday or Monday. I'll send you a couple of copies.

I had waited to comment until I had a typed version. I shall of course get in touch pretty soon

Yours

Peter

averaged 6.4 mg m⁻³

[illegible][illegible]

7-10-49

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and addresses, including "Mr. J. H. Smith, 123 Main St., New York, N. Y." and "Mr. J. H. Smith, 123 Main St., New York, N. Y."

100

As from 2 Mansfield Place
London NW3

March 7th (!) - waiting since January!

University of Essex

Department of Sociology,
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex

Tel: Colchester (0206) 5141

Telegraphic address: University Colchester

Telex: 98440 (UNILIB COLCHSTR)

Dear Hilary,

I've been locking the framework of the interim report into shape and have just spent a couple of days going through your Appendix on Methods. It will look quite substantial when duplicated but I'd be grateful if you could clear up some queries before I get it typed. I may have asked you some of these before.

1. Much of Hazel's tabulating programme covers 2050 households. Your tables generally cover only the 1886 completed interviews. This does not matter for some purposes but I think it should be pointed out. However, in comparing regional response rates perhaps it is more useful to count all 2050. I have re-calculated in order to compare with Census & FES. There is a slightly closer correspondence with population distribution for some regions (e.g. Scotland, N. Ireland) though wider for others (e.g. SE.) (Can you clear up form of table (and add notes ^{on} definitions?) Will this change affect other tables e.g. Nos. 4 & 5?)
2. The excess of W. Midlands (& of N. Ireland) and deficiency of North & Yorks is perturbing. Should we identify the rural parts separately in the table(s)?
3. I do not follow the "translation" from address to household sample in either the text or the table. I attach your ms. for two tables. The numbers do not quite add up horizontally, and the difference is not explained by the footnote. More importantly, how are the totals of effective addressees related to totals of response of households? Either your column of effective addressees covers addressees for each household (but this is denied in the text) or the excess of households over addressees is not accounted for in the lower of the two tables attached. Perhaps the right course would be to have two columns: "Total number of effective addressees" and "Total households at effective addressees"

4. Should we reweight tables to halve Belfast numbers?
I cannot recall our reasoning.

5. The material on the 4 areas is good but you don't give tables showing addresses chosen, response rates for screening survey & for follow-up ^{in each area}. It is important to include these.

6. Our elaborate sampling method produced ~~only~~ "approximately one address in a hundred" which otherwise would not have been included. Is this a systematic count? May the proportion have been higher in some areas? Have you a list of the serial numbers of households not on register? This would be a fascinating study. ~~What~~ There is also the point that if the 1 per cent were mostly poor this would still amount to an important correction of, say, 5 per cent poverty. One per cent is half-a-million etc.

7. Does Table 7 cover all admin counties & county boroughs in the U.K.?

8. Couple of footnote refs required (on p. 3 to the criterion of "average net income before tax per capita"; and on p. 12 full reference to a paper by Durbin).

¶

Sorry to pitch these at you but I'm sure you'll agree that it is important to get things right before we forget. You had said there was "more to come." I have raised the questions above of (a) more information on numbers of interviews in 4 areas and perhaps you also mean (b) reliability of sample & representativeness since you attached a couple of tables on regional response without textual comment. I have done some work on (b) and unless you have any material I suggest I complete a short separate appendix on this and let you see it. But is there anything else you have in mind? You have not discussed field supervision & interviewing. I realise a lot might be written. I shall include a paragraph in the introduction but do you want to go into more detail?

By the end of ^{March} ~~present~~ week I hope to be assembling all the meat in the middle of the report.

Many good wishes

Yours Peter.

Now found
Marie's summary.
Shall I include this?

University of Essex

Department of Sociology,
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex

Tel: Colchester (0206) 5141

Telegraphic address: University Colchester

Telex: 98440 (UNILIB COLCHSTR)

13 May 1971

Dear Hilary,

I have now had time to go carefully through your letter. Thank you for the amendments. I understand about the W. Midlands & Northern rural areas. There remain two points on which I badly need your advice.

1. In dealing with over-representation of N. Ireland should I (a) reduce numbers appropriately in your tables on method of sampling, ^(e.g. table 5 p. 14) adding in text & footnotes that in fact these are only the national representation, & that we interviewed a larger sample in order to say something about N. Ireland as a whole? (b) adjust tables marginally for the report? In this instance it will be rare even for a decimal point to be affected and rather than complicate the computing programme by ^{introducing} a weighting process or subtraction process, it seems best merely to modify the more crucial tables (e.g. % in parity) in the report, and say so.

2. I'm still puzzled about the fact that there is no distinction in your numbers for different regions between addressees and households. You now ~~say~~ ^{refer} in your letter, & a footnote, ~~that~~ to "deletions to balance additional households at an address" which you say is described on p. 7. But it ~~is~~ is not. Or rather, you seem to imply this without specifically saying so. May I assume that "For every address at which two households were found ~~for~~ for interview, an address at the end of the sample list was deleted. For every address at which there were three households, two addresses at the end of the sample list were deleted, and so on." There

is one further technical point. If you delete on grounds of finding multiple households, why not add when you find an empty address? Perhaps we should comment on this in the text.

I was a bit disappointed about the difficulty of tracing the addresses not on the electoral register. How did you get the information about 20-25? Might it be underestimated? I will, incidentally, be able to tell you soon whether there is any correlation between poverty and recent move on the part of the household, since we have a fine ~~break~~ breakdown of how long it was since household last moved.

One point about "rich, middle, poor, rural". It may be useful to have this as a summary variable. Have you got ~~some~~ a list of the serial numbers according to such a classification?

Can you give me a quick ring at home about these points (794-3072)? I'd be most grateful. Because of the difficulty of keeping copies at present, I'd be grateful too if you could return to me a photocopy of this letter & the previous one.

I hope all is going well at Bristol. Let me know if you want any data to analyse this summer!

Yrs ever

Peter