

## THE NATIONAL POVERTY SURVEY

### A DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

A multi-stage stratified design was used in which, with the exception of Belfast, every household had an equal probability of selection. Our aim was to achieve completed interviews with approximately 2,000 households in the United Kingdom.

The sampling procedure can be considered in four main phases:-

- (i) The division of the United Kingdom into appropriate regions.
- (ii) The selection of a primary area unit for sampling within each region and the selection of a suitable variable by which to stratify these units within each region.
- (iii) The selection of suitable secondary area units within each primary area unit and the selection of a suitable stratification factor.
- (iv) The final stage at which a selection of addresses was taken and converted into a sample of households.

#### Regional Division

In order to reduce the number of areas from which the sample was drawn to about 50 and to allow for some stratification within each region it was necessary to reduce the number of regions from 11 to 12 to 8 or 9.

Official statistics are usually based on the 12 standard regions of the United Kingdom or the 11 planning regions. These are identical except for South Eastern England, as shown below:-

THE NATIONAL POVERTY SURVEY  
A DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

A multi-stage stratified design was used in which, with the exception of Belfast, every household had an equal probability of selection. Our aim was to achieve completed interviews with approximately 2,000 households in the United Kingdom.

The sampling procedure can be considered in four main phases:-

- (i) The division of the United Kingdom into appropriate regions.
- (ii) The selection of a primary area unit for sampling within each region and the selection of a suitable variable by which to stratify these units within each region.
- (iii) The selection of suitable secondary area units within each primary area unit and the selection of a suitable stratification factor.
- (iv) The final stage at which a selection of addresses was taken and converted into a sample of households.

Regional Division

In order to reduce the number of areas from which the sample was drawn to about 50 and to allow for some stratification within each region it was necessary to reduce the number of regions from 11 to 8 or 9.

Official statistics are usually based on the 15 standard regions of the United Kingdom or the 11 planning regions. These are identical except for South Eastern England, as shown below:-

Standard Regions

- |                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. <u>South Eastern</u>              | - Greater London, Surrey, Sussex and Kent.  |
| 2. <u>Eastern</u>                    | - Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge and the Isle of Ely, Huntingdonshire.                   |
| 3. <u>Southern</u>                   | - Oxfordshire, Buckingham, Berkshire, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, Poole in Dorset.                                   |
| 4. <u>South Western</u>              | - Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall.  |
| 5. <u>West Midland</u>               | - Herefordshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Worcestershire.  |
| 6. <u>East Midland</u>               | - part Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire (parts of Holland & Kesteven) Rutland, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire. |
| 7. <u>North Western</u>              | - Lancashire, Cheshire, part of Derbyshire.   |
| 8. <u>Yorkshire &amp; Humberside</u> | - West Riding of Yorkshire, East Riding of Yorkshire, Lindsay - part of Lincolnshire.                                     |
| 9. <u>Northern</u>                   | - Cumberland, Westmorland, Northumberland, Durham and North Riding of Yorkshire.  |
| 10. <u>Wales</u>                     |   |
| 11. <u>Scotland</u>                  |   |
| 12. <u>Northern Ireland</u>          |   |

The Planning Regions

Regions 4 to 12 are the same as above. The South East of England is divided differently as follows:-

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <u>South East</u> | - Greater London, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Essex, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, together with all the counties included in the Southern region above. |
| <u>Anglia</u>     | - Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge and Isle of Ely, Huntingdonshire.   |

The Family Expenditure Survey uses the Planning Regions but treated Greater London as a separate stratum. (i)

---

(i) See Monthly Digest of Statistics Supplement, Appendix I  
Central Statistics Office H.M.S.O. 1908.

<u>Standard Regions</u>	
1. <u>South Eastern</u>	- Greater London, Surrey, Sussex and Kent.
2. <u>Eastern</u>	- Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge and the Isle of Ely, Huntingdonshire.
3. <u>Southern</u>	- Oxfordshire, Buckingham, Berkshire, Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, Poole in Dorset.
4. <u>South Western</u>	- Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, Cornwall.
5. <u>West Midland</u>	- Herefordshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire and Worcestershire.
6. <u>East Midland</u>	- part Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire (parts of Holland & Kesteven) Rutland, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire.
7. <u>North Western</u>	- Lancashire, Cheshire, part of Derbyshire.
8. <u>Yorkshire &amp; Humberside</u>	- West Riding of Yorkshire, East Riding of Yorkshire, Lindsey - part of Lincolnshire.
9. <u>Northern</u>	- Cumberland, Westmorland, Northumberland, Durham and North Riding of Yorkshire.
10. <u>Wales</u>	
11. <u>Scotland</u>	
12. <u>Northern Ireland</u>	
<u>The Planning Regions</u>	

Regions 4 to 12 are the same as above. The South East of England is

divided differently as follows:-

<u>South East</u>	- Greater London, Surrey, Sussex, Kent, Essex, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, together with all the counties included in the Southern region above.
<u>Anglia</u>	- Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge and Isle of Ely, Huntingdonshire.

The Family Expenditure Survey used the Planning Regions but treated Greater

London as a separate stratum. (1)

We also decided to treat Greater London separately, and amalgamate some of the remaining regions. There were several ways in which the regions could have been amalgamated but as the division of the sample into regions of the United Kingdom was a crude form of stratification, it was important to try to combine similar regions and keep separate those which were very different.

For our purposes, variations in incomes between regions were important and looking at average net income before tax per capita<sup>(2)</sup> the richest region in South Eastern, followed by the Eastern, Southern and West Midland regions. Next comes South West, East Midland, North West, Yorkshire and Humberside regions with Wales, Scotland, Northern region and Northern Ireland the poorest. There are of course, big variations within some regions. In particular the Eastern regions where the area included in the planning region Anglia is a low income area, Essex is a high income area and Hertford is very high. It was therefore decided to use the planning regions, thus including Essex and Hertford with the South East and combining Anglia with the East Midlands. The United Kingdom was divided into 9 regions as shown in Table 1:-

We also decided to treat Greater London separately, and amalgamate some of the remaining regions. There were several ways in which the regions could have been amalgamated but at the division of the sample into regions of the United Kingdom was a crude form of stratification, it was important to try to combine similar regions and keep separate those which were very different.

For our purposes, variations in incomes between regions were important and looking at average net income before tax per capita<sup>(2)</sup> the richest region in South Eastern, followed by the Eastern, Southern and West Midlands regions. Next comes South West, East Midlands, North West, Yorkshire and Humberside regions with Wales, Scotland, Northern region and Northern Ireland the poorest. There are of course, big variations within some regions. In particular the Eastern regions where the area included in the planning region Anglia is a low income area, Essex is a high income area and Hertford is very high. It was therefore decided to use the planning regions, thus including Essex and Hertford with the South East and combining Anglia with the East Midlands. The United Kingdom was divided into 9 regions as shown in Table 1:-

TABLE I

<u>REGION</u>	<u>Population</u> N	<u>(Jun.1966)</u> %	<u>ELECTORATE</u> 1966 N	<u>(Mar.)</u> %	<u>No. of</u> <u>Consti-</u> <u>tuencies</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Admini-</u> <u>stration</u> <u>areas</u>
South East	9,158,290 =	16.9%	5,890,851 =	16.4%	86	273
West Midlands	5,021,380 =	9.2%	3,232,757 =	9.0%	54	120
North West	6,731,940 =	12.4%	4,432,479 =	12.4%	79	177
Northern & Yorkshire & Humberside	8,048,800 =	14.8%	5,338,912 =	14.9%	95	263
Scotland	5,190,800 =	9.5%	3,344,859 =	9.3%	71	372
Wales & South West	6,320,230 =	11.7%	4,150,882 =	11.6%	78	353
East Anglia & East Midlands	4,880,960 =	9.0%	3,128,407 =	8.7%	52	191
Greater London	7,913,600 =	14.6%	5,423,849 =	15.1%	103	33
Northern Ireland	1,469,000 =	2.7%	902,301 =	2.5%	12	67
<u>TOTAL</u>	54,321,500 =	100%	35,845,297 =	100%	630	1849

TABLE I

REGION	Population M	(1961, 1966) %	ELECTORATE 1966 M	(Mar.) %	No. of Consti- tuencies	No. of Admini- stration areas
South East	2,128,280 =	16.3%	2,880,821 =	19.4%	88	323
West Midlands	2,021,380 =	9.2%	2,232,721 =	9.0%	24	120
North West	2,731,240 =	12.4%	4,432,478 =	12.4%	28	122
Northern & Yorkshire & Humberside	8,048,800 =	14.9%	2,338,212 =	14.9%	22	268
Scotland	2,180,800 =	9.2%	3,344,828 =	9.2%	21	325
Wales & South West	2,320,230 =	11.7%	4,120,082 =	11.6%	28	323
East Anglia & East Midlands	4,880,880 =	9.0%	3,138,407 =	8.7%	22	161
Greater London	7,313,800 =	14.6%	2,423,848 =	12.1%	103	33
Northern Ireland	1,468,000 =	2.7%	302,301 =	2.2%	12	67
<u>TOTAL</u>	24,321,200 =	100%	32,842,257 =	100%	230	1843



Nine regions allowed us, at the next stage, to divide the primary area units in each region into a maximum of three strata:- rural, high income urban and low income urban; select two primary units from each stratum thus enabling us to calculate standard errors with some degree of accuracy and at the same time for practical and economic reasons to restrict the sample to about fifty areas.

#### The Selection of Primary Area Units within Regions

There are two units of area commonly used for sampling purposes:-

local authority administrative areas and constituencies.

In England and Wales the administrative areas are the Greater London boroughs, County boroughs, municipal boroughs, urban districts and rural districts. In Scotland administrative areas are cities, boroughs and district councils. In Great Britain there are 1,782 administrative areas which vary greatly in size. The Family Expenditure Survey used the administrative area of Great Britain as the primary sampling units and stratifies all of them except those in the Greater London Council area into four strata:-

- (i) Administrative areas in provincial conurbations.
- (ii) All urban areas not in provincial conurbations.
- (iii) Semi-rural areas.
- (iv) Rural areas<sup>(3)</sup>

---

(3) For a detailed description of the sample design of the Family Expenditure Survey see:-  
 Kemsley W.F.F. Family Expenditure Survey - Handbook on the Sample, Fieldwork and Coding Procedures. Government Social Survey -  
 H.M.S.O. 1969 p. 8-20.

Nine regions allowed us, at the next stage, to divide the primary areas into each region into a maximum of three strata:- rural, high income urban and low income urban; select two primary units from each stratum thus enabling us to calculate standard errors with some degree of accuracy and at the same time for practical and economic reasons to restrict the sample to about fifty areas.

#### The Selection of Primary Area Units within Regions

There are two units of area commonly used for sampling purposes:-

#### Local authority administrative areas and constituencies.

In England and Wales the administrative areas are the Greater London boroughs, County boroughs, municipal boroughs, urban districts and rural districts. In Scotland administrative areas are cities, boroughs and district councils. In Great Britain there are 1,732 administrative areas which vary greatly in size. The Family Expenditure Survey used the administrative areas of Great Britain as the primary sampling units and stratified all of them except those in the Greater London Council area into four strata:-

- (i) Administrative areas in provincial constituencies.
- (ii) All urban areas not in provincial constituencies.
- (iii) Semi-rural areas.
- (iv) Rural areas.

(5) For a detailed description of the sample design of the Family

Expenditure Survey see:-  
Kemal W.F. Family Expenditure Survey - Handbook on the Sample,  
 Fieldwork and Coding Procedures. Government Social Survey -  
 H.M.S.O. 1969 p. 8-20.

There are 630 constituencies in the United Kingdom and they vary in size far less than administrative areas, the majority of constituencies comprising an electorate of between 50,000 and 70,000.

Our choice depended on the availability of data firstly by which to stratify and secondly by which to compare the representativeness of the selected sample. It is also important to choose units which are roughly similar in size.

In terms of readily available comparative data, at first sight it seemed that local authority administrative areas were the better choice. For each county borough, each administrative county and for urban areas with populations above 50,000, there was a great deal of published data in the Census (1961) and elsewhere. However, for rural districts less information was published and such data was restricted to population size, density and structure, number of households, dwellings, amenities, overcrowding and tenure. Some unpublished data for 1961 was available but based on a ten per cent sample only.

The only data actually based on constituency area was size of electorate and voting behaviour. However, very few constituencies cross county boundaries (there are three partly in Greater London and partly in Hertford, Kent or Surrey). All except one county borough were included in a single constituency and altogether 53 of the 81 county boroughs in England and Wales have boundaries

There are 630 constituencies in the United Kingdom and they vary in size far less than administrative areas, the majority of constituencies comprising an electorate of between 50,000 and 70,000.

Our choice depended on the availability of data firstly by which to stratify and secondly by which to compare the representativeness of the selected sample. It is also important to choose units which are roughly similar in size.

In terms of readily available comparative data, at first sight it seemed that local authority administrative areas were the better choice. For each county borough, each administrative county and for urban areas with populations above 50,000, there was a great deal of published data in the Census (1961) and elsewhere. However, for rural districts less information was published and such data was restricted to population size, density and structure, number of households, dwellings, amenities, overcrowding and tenure. Some unpublished data for 1961 was available but based on a ten per cent sample only.

The only data actually based on constituency area was size of electorate and voting behaviour. However, very few constituencies cross county boundaries (there are three partly in Greater London and partly in Hertford, Kent or Surrey). All except one county borough were included in a single constituency and altogether 53 of the 61 county borough in England and Wales have boundaries

coinciding exactly with constituency boundaries. Moreover the names of the boroughs, urban districts and rural districts contained in each constituency were known: thus the data available for use on a constituency basis had the same limitation as that for local authority administrative areas: namely availability of data for individual rural districts. There was no difference between using administrative areas or constituencies in availability of data for comparing the representativeness of the sample.

The choice therefore depended on the availability of a stratification factor which would enable us to classify urban area units into high income, middle income and low income areas. The greater variation in size of administrative areas as compared with constituencies could have been overcome to some extent by amalgamating some of the smaller areas although this would have been a complicated exercise.

#### Urban Areas

National Surveys in the past have often used the 'J-index' as a stratification factor for urban areas. The J-index is the percentage of the parliamentary electorate qualified to serve as jurors. Until 1967 the Family Expenditure Survey used the J-index based on the parliamentary electorate who in 1955 were qualified to serve as jurors. In 1963 rateable values were reassessed in England and Wales which reduced the power of J-index to discriminate between high and low income areas because the new assessment had increased the number eligible for jury service.

coinciding exactly with constituency boundaries. Moreover the names of the boroughs, urban districts and rural districts contained in each constituency were known: thus the data available for use on a constituency basis had the same limitation as that for local authority administrative areas: namely availability of data for individual rural districts. There was no difference between using administrative areas or constituencies in availability of data for comparing the representativeness of the sample.

The choice therefore depended on the availability of a stratification factor which would enable us to classify urban area units into high income, middle income and low income areas. The greater variation in size of administrative areas as compared with constituencies could have been overcome to some extent by amalgamating some of the smaller areas although this would have been a complicated exercise.

#### Urban Areas

National surveys in the past have often used the 'U-index' as a stratification factor for urban areas. The U-index in the percentage of the parliamentary electorate qualified to serve as jurors. Until 1957 the Family Expenditure Survey used the U-index based on the parliamentary electorate who in 1952 were qualified to serve as jurors. In 1953 rateable values were reassessed in England and Wales which reduced the power of U-index to discriminate between high and low income areas because the new assessment had increased the number eligible for jury service.

It was likely that we might have found a high proportion of the very poor in areas where the J-index was low but as we wanted to select a national sample representative of all income groups this did not make it a suitable stratification factor for our purposes at this stage. (4)

It was important to find, if possible, a single stratification factor. A composite factor could have been calculated using factors which indicate variations in the socio-economic status of an area, for example percentage of overcrowded households, percentage of manual workers, percentage of the population under fifteen years of age and population density. As we wanted to limit the number of primary unit areas to 40 or 50 and at the same time make regional comparisons it would not have been possible to stratify by several factors unless they were made into a composite index. Instead we looked for one factor which correlated highly with factors associated with low socio-economic status. Voting behaviour defined as the percentage of the electorate voting left was such a factor. (5) (See Table 2 and 3).

---

(4) At that time the qualification for a juror (indicated by a J against the elector's name) was to be a householder resident in premises of a rateable value of £30 or more in London and Middlesex and of £20 or more elsewhere.

Since 1967 the Family Expenditure Survey has not used the J-index. See Kemsley W.F.F. op cit p.9.

---

(5) Voting Left was defined as all those not voting for Conservative., Independant or Liberal Candidates. The Correlations used in Table 2 and 3 were calculated by Bledwyn Davies and Peter Stone.

It was likely that we might have found a high proportion of the very poor in areas where the J-index was low but as we wanted to select a national sample representative of all income groups this did not make it a suitable stratification factor for our purposes at this stage. (4)

It was important to find, if possible, a single stratification factor. A composite factor could have been calculated using factors which indicate variations in the social-economic status of an area, for example percentage of overcrowded households, percentage of manual workers, percentage of the population under fifteen years of age and population density. As we wanted to limit the number of primary unit areas to 40 or 50 and at the same time make regional comparisons it would not have been possible to stratify by several factors unless they were made into a composite index. Instead we looked for one factor which correlated highly with factors associated with low social-economic status. Voting behaviour defined as the percentage of the electorate voting left was such a factor. (5) (See Table 2 and 3.)

(4) At that time the qualification for a juror (indicated by a J against the elector's name) was to be a household resident in premises of a rateable value of £30 or more in London and Middlesex and of £20 or more elsewhere.

Since 1967 the Family Expenditure Survey has not used the J-index. See Kamalay W.F. op cit p.2.

(5) Voting left was defined as all those not voting for Conservatives, Independent or Liberal Candidates. The Correlations used in Table 2 and 3 were calculated by Nicholas Davies and Peter Stone.



TABLE 2Correlations with percentage voting left at 1964 General election for County Boroughs

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>
Workers in industry/occupied males	+0.6
Semi and unskilled workers/non manual workers	+0.8
Percentage of population under 14 years	+0.5
Percentage of population over 25 years who left school at 15 or under	+0.7
Percentage of households without exclusive use of bath	+0.6
Percentage of households living less than 1½ persons/room	-0.6
Admin, managerial and professional workers/economically active males	-0.8
Percentage population over 25 years who finished education after 17 years	-0.7
Retail turnover/capita	-0.4

TABLE 3

Correlations with percentage voting left at 1964 General Elections  
for County Boroughs and Counties together

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>	
	<u>Voting Left</u>	<u>Popl. Density</u>
Percentage of Population over 25 years who finished Education at 15 years or earlier	+0.9	+0.5
Percentage of workers in heavy industry/occupied males	+0.5	+0.1
Males sick/economically active males	+0.5	+0.4
Percentage of overcrowded households	+0.5	+0.5
Administrative, managerial and professional workers/economically active males	-0.6	-0.3
Non-manual males/economically active males	-0.6	-0.4

T A B L E 2

Correlations with percentage voting left at 1964 General Election for County Boroughs

Factor	Correlation Coefficient
Workers in industry/occupied males	+0.6
Semi and unskilled workers/non manual workers	+0.8
Percentage of population under 14 years	+0.5
Percentage of population over 25 years who left school at 12 or under	+0.7
Percentage of households without exclusive use of bath	+0.6
Percentage of households living less than 14 persons/room	-0.6
Admin, managerial and professional workers/economically active males	-0.3
Percentage population over 25 years who finished education after 17 years	-0.7
Retail turnover/capita	-0.4

T A B L E 3

Correlations with percentage voting left at 1964 General Election for County Boroughs and Counties together

Factor	Voting Left	Popl. Density
Non-manual males/economically active males	-0.6	-0.4
economically active males	-0.6	-0.3
Administrative, managerial and professional workers	+0.5	+0.2
Percentage of overcrowded households	+0.5	+0.4
Males sick/economically active males	+0.5	+0.1
Percentage of workers in heavy industry/occupied males	+0.5	+0.2
Education at 15 years or earlier	+0.5	+0.2
Percentage of population over 25 years who finished	+0.5	+0.2

The association between socio economic factors and voting behaviour was not as high when counties were taken together with county boroughs, partly because there is greater variation within these areas. However, the association was stronger than with population density, a factor we had considered using (see Table 3).

Percentage of the electorate voting left at the 1964 General Election was therefore chosen as a suitable single stratification factor for urban areas. Clearly this decision weighted the choice of primary area units in favour of constituencies for the voting behaviour of local authority administrative areas other than county boroughs or counties cannot be calculated.

#### Rural Areas

Voting behaviour was not considered a suitable stratification factor for rural areas. In the first place voting behaviour is different in very rural areas and we had no strong evidence that it correlated highly with socio economic factors. Secondly, only about 20 per cent of the population live in rural areas so further stratification was considered unnecessary. Using constituencies as the primary area units, a rural constituency was defined to be a constituency in which more than 50 per cent of the population lives in rural districts and in which there was no urban district or borough larger than 30,000 population. The latter criterion was added as a check against those rural districts which have been substantially

The association between social economic factors and voting behaviour

was not as high when counties were taken together with county boroughs, partly because there is greater variation within these areas. However, the association was stronger than with population density, a factor we had considered using (see Table 3).

Percentage of the electorate voting left at the 1964 General Election was therefore chosen as a suitable single stratification factor for urban areas. Clearly this decision weighted the choice of primary area units in favour of constituencies for the voting behaviour of local authority administrative areas other than county boroughs or counties cannot be calculated.

#### Rural Areas

Voting behaviour was not considered a suitable stratification factor for rural areas. In the first place voting behaviour is different in very rural areas and we had no strong evidence that it correlated highly with social economic factors. Secondly, only about 20 per cent of the population live in rural areas so further stratification was considered unnecessary. Using constituencies as the primary area units, a rural constituency was defined to be a constituency in which more than 50 per cent of the population lives in rural districts and in which there was no urban district or borough larger than 30,000 population. The latter criterion was added as a check against those rural districts which have been substantially

urbanised since their designation 'rural' (6).

#### The Sampling Procedure for the Primary Area Units

The constituencies in Great Britain were divided first into rural and urban. In Northern Ireland we treated Belfast as one stratum and the remaining eight constituencies as another. As there were so few rural constituencies in the West Midlands (8), and the North West (3), it was decided to amalgamate them with the nineteen rural constituencies of Northern Yorkshire and Humberside region to form a separate stratum from which two constituencies could be chosen. (as it happened both selected constituencies were from the West Midlands region). In the regions where there were large numbers of urban constituencies:- the South East, Greater London, the North West, Northern Yorkshire and Humberside; the constituencies were ranked in descending order of percentage voting Left and divided into three strata denoting low income, middle income and high income areas. In East Anglia and East Midlands there were insufficient urban constituencies to justify two urban strata. The distribution of strata within each region is shown in Table 4, and Table 4 and 5 show the distribution between states of the households finally interviewed compared with the national distribution.

Within each stratum constituencies were ranked in pairs in descending

---

(6)

The Family Expenditure Survey since 1967 have based their definition of 'rural area' on population density and size of population of urban areas within the rural district. See Kemsley W.F.F. op. cit p.8.

(d) The Family Expenditure Survey since 1967 have based their definition of 'rural areas' on population density and size of population of urban areas within the rural district. See Kemsley W.F.F. op. cit. p.8.

Within each stratum constituencies were ranked in pairs in descending

national distribution.

between states of the households finally interviewed compared with the region is shown in Table 4, and Table 4 and 5 show the distribution

to justify two urban strata. The distribution of strata within each

East Anglia and East Midlands there were insufficient urban constituencies

strata denoting low income, middle income and high income areas. In

in descending order of percentage voting left and divided into three

Northern Yorkshire and Humberside; the constituencies were ranked

constituencies:- the South East, Greater London, the North West,

region). In the regions where there were large numbers of urban

it happened both selected constituencies were from the West Midlands

separate stratum from which two constituencies could be chosen. (as

constituencies of Northern Yorkshire and Humberside region to form a

(3), it was decided to amalgamate them with the nineteen rural

few rural constituencies in the West Midlands (8), and the North West

and the remaining eight constituencies as another. As there were so

and urban. In Northern Ireland we created Belfast as one stratum

The constituencies in Great Britain were divided first into rural

The Sampling Procedure for the Primary Area Units

urbanised since their designation 'rural' (d).

order of size of electorate. Using random numbers two constituencies were selected with replacement in each stratum with probability proportioned to size except in the event of selecting the same unit, when the opposite member of the pair was included in the sample<sup>(7)</sup>.

In Northern Ireland two constituencies were sampled in Belfast and one from the remaining rural constituencies.

---

(7)

The theoretical basis of the sample design is described in a paper by Durbin. See Durbin J. Estimation of Sampling Errors in Multi-Stage Surveys.

order of size of electorate. Using random numbers two constituencies were selected with replacement in each stratum with probability proportional to size except in the event of selecting the same unit, when the opposite member of the pair was included in the sample (7)

In Northern Ireland two constituencies were sampled in Belfast and one from the remaining rural constituencies.

---

(7) The theoretical basis of the sample design is described in a paper by Durbin. See Durbin J. Estimation of Sampling Errors in Multi-stage Surveys.



TABLE 4

<u>Region</u>	<u>No. of Consti- tuencies</u>	<u>Stratum</u>	<u>Electorate (March 1966)</u>		<u>Poverty Sample Completed Interviews</u>	
			N	%	N	%
South East	16	Rural	1,088,343	= 3.0%	56	3.0
	24	Poor	1,630,112	= 4.5%	82	4.3
	24	Middle	1,661,027	= 4.6%	79	4.2
	22	Rich	1,511,369	= 4.2%	75	4.0
	86		5,890,951	= *16.4%	292	15.5
West Midlands (urban)	24	Poor	1,410,573	= 3.9%	78	4.1
	22	Rich	1,353,516	= 3.8%	77	4.1
	46		2,764,089	= 7.7	155	8.2
North West (urban)	26	Poor	1,384,743	= 3.8%	73	3.9
	24	Middle	1,311,628	= 3.7%	70	3.7
	26	Rich	1,568,473	= 4.4%	83	4.4
	76		4,264,844	= *11.9	226	12.0
Northern, Yorkshire & Humberside (urban)	26	Poor	1,382,301	= 3.9%	85	4.5
	24	Middle	1,563,228	= 4.4%	78	4.1
	26	Rich	1,332,415	= 3.7%	62	3.3
	76		4,277,944	= *11.9	225	11.9
Scotland	29	Rural	1,331,248	= 3.7%	82	4.3
	22	Poor	1,046,980	= 2.9%	50	2.7
	20	Rich	966,631	= 2.7%	50	2.7
	71		3,344,859	= 9.3	182	9.7
Wales, South West	32	Rural	1,636,625	= 4.6%	68	3.6
	24	Poor	1,244,122	= 3.5%	62	3.3
	22	Rich	1,270,135	= 3.5%	84	4.4
	78		4,150,882	= 11.6	214	11.3
East Anglia & East Midlands	20	Rural	1,243,790	= 3.5%	67	3.6
	32	Poor) Rich)	1,884,617	= 5.2%	95	5.0
	52		3,128,407	= 8.7	162	8.6
Greater London	34	Poor	1,643,438	= 4.6%	88	4.7
	34	Middle	1,923,120	= 5.4%	92	4.9
	35	Rich	1,857,291	= 5.2%	91	4.8
	103		5,423,849	= *15.1	271	14.4

CONT.

Region	Inventory Category- No. of	Category	(Metric) Total Hectares	Area	Volume	Weight
Central Region	103		2,433,840	=	412.1	511
	32	rice	1,822,381	=	2.32	81
	34	rice	1,823,130	=	2.42	83
	34	rice	1,823,432	=	2.42	83
Northwest East and West	25		3,138,401	=	4.8	185
	33	rice	1,884,911	=	2.32	82
	30	rice	1,253,490	=	3.22	81
Northwest East and West	18		4,120,885	=	11.2	314
	33	rice	1,310,132	=	3.22	84
	34	rice	1,344,135	=	3.22	83
	35	rice	1,466,618	=	4.22	83
Southwest	17		3,344,822	=	10.3	183
	30	rice	1,000,031	=	3.12	20
	33	rice	1,040,380	=	3.22	20
	30	rice	1,294,411	=	3.12	83
Northwest East and West	18		4,120,885	=	11.2	314
	32	rice	1,335,412	=	3.12	83
	34	rice	1,223,338	=	4.42	18
	38	rice	1,562,130	=	3.22	82
Northwest East and West	30		4,564,844	=	11.2	332
	30	rice	1,223,412	=	4.42	83
	34	rice	1,311,428	=	3.12	10
	38	rice	1,029,443	=	3.22	13
Northwest East and West	10		2,124,022	=	1.1	122
	33	rice	1,222,412	=	3.82	11
	34	rice	1,010,212	=	3.22	10
Southwest	80		2,880,021	=	10.22	303
	33	rice	1,211,302	=	4.22	12
	34	rice	1,001,021	=	4.22	10
	34	rice	1,000,112	=	4.22	83
Southwest	18	rice	1,023,380	=	3.02	24

TABLE 4



TABLE 4 (cont.)

Region	No. of Consti- tuencies	Stratum	Electorate (March 1986)	Poverty Sample Completed Interviews
West Midlands & North West Northern Yorkshire & Humberside	30	Rural	1,892,207 = 4.7%	72 3.8
Northern Ireland	4	Belmont	222,480 = 0.7%	46 2.4
	8	Rural	649,821 = 1.6%	41 2.2
			902,301 = 2.2%	4.6
TOTAL U.K.	630		32,842,297 = 100.3	1886 100

\*Due to rounding figures do not add up exactly to the total.

**TABLE 5****Percentage of households interviewed in each stratum (First Stage)**

<u>Stratum</u>	<u>Electorate of U.K.</u>	<u>Households in Poverty Survey</u>
Rural	21.4	20.5
Low percent voting left (Rich)	27.5	27.7
Middle percent voting Left (Rich)	23.2	21.9
High percent voting left (Poor)	27.1	27.5
(Belfast)	(0.7)	(2.4)
<b>TOTAL U.K.</b>	<b>99.9</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**TABLE 6****Distribution of Primary Area Units**

<u>Percentage of Electorate Voting Left (1966)</u>	<u>Urban constituencies in Sample (excluding N. Ireland)</u>		<u>Urban constituencies in Great Britain</u>
	N	%	%
80 and over	1	2.6	4.7
70 - 80	3	7.9	12.0
60 - 70	9	23.6	19.6
50 - 60	10	26.3	29.6
40 - 50	9	23.6	21.4
30 - 40	5	13.1	10.6
under 30	1	2.6	1.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

TABLE 2

Percentage of households interviewed in each stratum (First Stage)

x

Stratum	Percentage of Households of W.I.	Households in Loverly Survey
Rural	21.4	20.2
Low percent voting left (Rich)	27.2	27.7
Middle percent voting left (Rich)	23.2	21.2
High percent voting left (Poor)	27.1	27.2
(Ireland)	(0.7)	(2.4)
TOTAL U.K.	99.9	100.0

TABLE 6

Distribution of Primary Area Units

Percentage of Electors Voting Left (1966)	Urban constituencies in Ireland (excluding N. Ireland)	Urban constituencies in Great Britain
	%	%
30 and over	1	4.7
70 - 80	3	12.9
60 - 70	9	19.6
50 - 60	10	29.6
40 - 50	9	21.4
30 - 40	2	10.6
under 30	1	1.8
TOTAL	38	100

THE SELECTED CONSTITUENCIES

		<u>Percent voting Left</u>
Greater London	Woolwich East	71.6
	Islington North	65.9
	Lewisham North	53.0
	Hornchurch	52.3
	Wandsworth Streatham	45.4
	Hendon North	49.2
South East	Thurrock	69.4
	Dartford	56.6
	S.W. Hertfordshire	47.0
	Aylesbury	45.5
	Guildford	39.5
	Bournemouth W.	38.8
	New Forest	Rural
	Lewes	Rural
East Anglia & East Midlands	Ipswich	56.4
	Leicester S.E.	40.1
	Melton	Rural
	Grantham	Rural
Wales & South West	Neath	83.9
	Bristol South	67.1
	Gloucester	42.8
	Bristol West	29.5
	Yeovil (Somerset) Rural	

THE SELECTED CONSTITUENCIES

Percent voting  
Left

Greater London	Woolwich East	71.6
	Islington North	67.3
	Lewisham North	53.0
	Hornchurch	52.3
	Wandsworth Streatham	45.4
	Hendon North	49.2
South East	Thurrock	69.4
	Garford	56.5
	S.W. Hertfordshire	47.0
	Aylesbury	45.2
	Cuddiford	39.2
	Bournemouth W.	38.8
	New Forest Rural	
	Lewes Rural	
East Anglia & East Midlands	Ipswich	56.4
	Leicester S.E.	40.1
	Milton Rural	
	Grantham Rural	
Wales & South West	Neath	83.9
	Bristol South	67.1
	Gloucester	43.8
	Bristol West	29.2
	Yeovil (Somerset) Rural	



THE SELECTED CONSTITUENCIES (cont.)

		<u>Percent voting Left</u>
	North Devon      Rural	
West Midlands	(R)Coventry East	67.8
	(R)Birmingham Northfield	59.6
	Brierley Hill	48.8
	Oldbury & Halesowen	53.2
North West	Newton	62.8
	Salford East	67.2
	Manchester Wythenshawe	59.7
	Bolton East	59.2
	Southport	37.2
	North Fylde	36.7
Northern & Yorkshire & Humber side	Pontefract	78.3
	Bradford East	69.4
	South Shields	64.7
	Newcastle on Tyne East	59.8
	Leeds N.W.	44.4
	Haltemprice	33.7

THE SELECTED CONSTITUENCIES (cont.)

Percentage Voting  
Left

	North Devon	
	Rural	
67.3	(Dovecroft East	West Midlands
59.6	(Birmingham	
48.8	Northfield	
	Stratford Hill	
23.2	Oldbury &	
	Malesovan	
62.8	Newton	North West
67.2	Salford East	
59.7	Manchester Wythenshawe	
59.2	Holton East	
37.2	Southport	
36.7	North Fylde	
		Northern & Yorkshire & Humber
78.3	Pontefract	side
69.4	Bradford East	
64.7	South Shields	
59.8	Newcastle on Tyne	
	East	
44.4	Leeds N.W.	
33.7	Whitebridge	

THE SELECTED CONSTITUENCIES (cont.)Percent voting  
LeftWest Midlands, North West,  
Northern & Yorkshire &  
HumbersideSouth Worcester-  
shire

Rural

Oswestry

Rural

ScotlandGlasgow Shettle-  
ston

77.5

Coatbridge &  
Airdrie

64.1

(R)Aberdeen South

52.0

(R)Edinburgh West

44.7

Galloway

Rural

Kinross &  
W. Perth-  
shire

Rural

N. IrelandFermanagh &  
South Tyrone

Rural

Belfast East

Belfast North

---

R = Repeated selection, Edinburgh West and Birmingham Northfield were selected twice so the second members of the pairs to which they belonged were selected i.e. Aberdeen South and Coventry East.

R = Repeated selection, Edinburgh West and Birmingham Northfield were selected twice so the second members of the pairs to which they belonged were selected i.e. Aberdeen South and Coventry East.

# N. Ireland

Belfast North  
Belfast East  
South Tyrone  
Fermanagh &

Rural

Rural

Shire  
W. Perth-  
Kintore &

Galloway

Rural

(6) Edinburgh West

(8) Aberdeen South

Aberdeenshire &  
Aberdeenshire

77.2

64.1

22.0

44.7

Edinburgh  
Glasgow

Orkney

Rural

Rural

South West  
Shire

Humberside  
Northern & Yorkshire  
West Midlands, North West

## THE SELECTED CONSTITUENCIES (cont.)

Percent voting  
Left

Regional Response Rate and Distribution  
of the Poverty Survey Sample compared with F.E.S.

<u>Region</u>	<u>Response Rate</u>		<u>Poverty Survey</u>		<u>F.E.S. (1.9.6.8.)</u>
	<u>Poverty Survey</u>	<u>F.E.S. (1967) (i)</u>	<u>No. of co-operating households</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>	<u>% of sample (ii)</u>
Northern, Yorkshire & Humberside	76.0	71.2	225	11.9	16.1.
North West	78.0	69.5	226	11.9	11.6
East Midlands & East Anglia	76.7	72.5	162	8.6	9.0
Greater London	72.0	61.2	271	14.4	9.2
West Midlands	78.1	71.7	227	12.0	13.0
South East	72.6	73.2	292	15.5	16.9
South West & Wales	74.9	73.6	214	11.3	12.3
Scotland	79.0	73.4	182	9.6	9.7
N. Ireland	83.7	-----	87	4.6	2.2
<b>TOTAL FOR U.K.</b>	<b>75.6</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>1886</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

(i) Source:- Kemsley W.F.F. Family Expenditure Survey, Handbook on the Sample Fieldwork and Coding Procedures. H.M.S.O. 1969 p.29. Table 7.3.

(ii) Source:- Department of Employment & Productivity Family Expenditure Survey Report for 1968. H.M.S.O. 1969 p.81 Table 19.

Regional Response Rate and Distribution  
of the Poverty Survey Sample compared with F.E.S.

Region	Response Rate		Poverty Survey	
	Poverty Survey	F.E.S. (1967) (i)	No. of co-operating households	% of sample
N. Ireland	83.7	---	---	4.6
Scotland	79.0	73.4	182	9.6
Wales	74.9	73.6	214	11.3
South West	72.8	73.2	292	12.2
South East	72.0	71.7	227	12.0
West Midlands	72.0	61.2	221	14.4
Greater London	72.7	72.2	162	8.6
East Anglia	78.0	69.2	226	11.9
North West	76.0	71.2	222	11.9
shire & Humberside				
Northern, York-				
TOTAL FOR U.K.	72.8	70.2	1886	100

(i) Source:- Kossley W.F. Family Expenditure Survey, Handbook on the Sample  
Fieldwork and Coding Procedures. H.M.S.O. 1969 p.20. Table 7.3.

(ii) Source:- Department of Employment & Productivity Family Expenditure Survey  
Report for 1968. H.M.S.O. 1969 p.21 Table 19.

Sample of addresses analysed by eligibility  
for inclusion in the sample

<u>Region</u>	<u>Total No. of addresses issued</u>	<u>Empty</u>	<u>Business only</u>	<u>Demol- ished</u>	<u>Aliens</u>	<u>Ill &amp; away</u>	<u>Ill at home</u>	<u>Away</u>	<u>Total No. of Effective Addresses</u>
Northern Yorkshire & Humberside	308	13	---	1	1	---	4	-	290
North West	317	11	1	1	---	---	4	1	298
East Midlands & East Anglia	227	9	---	---	2	1	--	3	211
Greater London	393	12	---	2	---	1	2	2	376
West Midlands	321	12	---	1	---	2	4	1	298
South East	420	11	1	1	---	---	2	1	402
South West & Wales	304	13	---	---	2	---	2	1	286
Scotland	248	10	1	---	---	---	4	3	230
N. Ireland	109	3	2	---	---	---	--	-	104
<b>TOTAL SAMPLE</b>	<b>2647</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2495*</b>

\*Excludes 5 addresses which could not be traced.

\*Excluded 2 addresses which could not be traced.

TOTAL SAMPLE		2557	93	2	6	2	4	22	12	2452*
N. Ireland	109	3	2	---	---	---	---	---	-	104
Scotland	248	10	1	---	---	---	---	4	3	230
Wales & South West	304	13	---	---	2	---	---	2	1	286
South East	420	11	1	---	1	---	---	2	1	402
Midlands & West	321	12	---	---	1	---	2	4	1	298
London & Greater	393	12	---	2	---	---	1	2	2	376
East Anglia & Midlands & East	527	9	---	---	2	1	---	---	3	211
North West	317	11	1	---	---	---	---	4	1	298
Yorkshire & Northern	308	13	---	1	1	---	---	4	-	290
Total No. of addresses issued		Empty	Business only	Demolished	Aliens	III & away	III at home	away	Total No. of Effective Addresses	

Sample of addresses analysed by eligibility  
for inclusion in the sample



Response rate analysed by Region

<u>Region</u>	<u>Total no. of effective addresses</u>	<u>Complete Interviews</u>	<u>Incom- plete Inter- views (i)</u>		<u>Refusals</u>	<u>Non- Con- tact</u>	<u>Lost</u>	<u>Response rate %</u>
			A	B				
Northern, Yorkshire & Humberside	290	225	6	15	45	5	2	76.0
North West	298	226	8	7	42	6	1	78.0
East Midlands & East Anglia	211	162	8	19	20	2	-	76.7
Greater London	376	271	9	9	75	12	-	72.0
West Midlands	298	227	7	26	32	6	-	78.1
South East	402	292	8	8	90	4	-	72.6
South West & Wales	286	214	8	14	40	9	1	74.9
Scotland	230	182	5	6	32	2	3	79.0
N. Ireland	104	87	1	2	12	1	1	83.7
TOTAL SAMPLE NO.	2495	1886	60	106	388	47	8	
%	100	75.6	2.4	4.2	15.6	1.9	.3	

(i) In-complete A means complete information for at least one income unit in the household and incomplete information for at least one other income unit.

In-complete B means no income unit in the household gave complete information on the income and assets section of the questionnaire.

(1) In-complete  
A means complete information for at least one income unit in the household and incomplete information for at least one other income unit.

B means no income unit is the household gave complete information on the income and assets section of the questionnaire.

Region	Total no. of effective addresses	Complete interview	Income-plate interview (1)		Refusals	Non-Contact	Lost	Response rate %
			A	B				
N. Ireland	104	87	1	2	12	1	1	82.7
Scotland	230	182	2	6	32	2	2	78.0
Wales & South West	286	214	8	14	40	9	1	74.9
South East	402	292	3	3	30	4	-	72.8
West Midlands	298	227	7	26	32	6	-	78.1
Greater London	376	271	9	9	72	12	-	72.0
East Anglia & East Midlands	211	152	9	12	20	2	-	76.7
North West	298	226	8	7	42	6	1	78.0
Northern, Yorkshire & Humberside	290	222	6	12	42	2	2	76.0
TOTAL SAMPLE NO.	2492	1866	60	106	398	47	2	
%	100	75.6	2.4	4.2	15.9	1.9	.8	

Response rate analysed by Region