

---

## Appendix Seven

---

### Note on the Adjustment of Sample Findings

---

The results of all sample surveys can be adjusted to take account of any departures from the true representativeness that can be traced because of sampling and response. The poverty survey poses particular problems of adjustment because interviewing was distributed over twelve months. During this period, incomes rose and rates of supplementary benefit were increased. But since the sample in each area consisted of four randomly drawn sub-samples of households which were interviewed in each quarter of the year, the results for each quarter can be compared and any cumulative results corrected for seasonal and other factors.

According to the social or government standard of poverty, 7.1 per cent of the sample households and 6.1 per cent of the sample population were living below the standard, and another 23.8 and 21.8 per cent respectively up to 40 per cent higher. These figures were adjusted to take account of the following factors:

1. *Northern Ireland.* A relatively larger sample of households was drawn in Northern Ireland so that some statements could be made about poverty in this region. Adjustments were made to all key national findings for this oversampling. As a consequence, the number in the sample living below the standard, according to their income in the previous twelve months, was reduced from 6.1 to 5.8 per cent, but those in the sample living on the margins of the standard remained at 21.8 per cent.
2. *Complete information on income.* Although information was collected for 2,050 households in the sample, information about the previous week's income was complete for only 1,808 of these, for income during the last twelve months for only 1,768. The proportion of families with different numbers of children was almost exactly the same among households giving incomplete as giving complete information, but rather more single-person households and rather fewer households containing three or four adults gave complete information. Adjustment for this factor tended to slightly reduce the numbers of households in poverty and on the margins of poverty, but leave the numbers of *people* in poverty or on its margins almost exactly the same.
3. *The supplementary benefit standard.* The net disposable income for the previous week and the previous year of households was compared with the supplementary benefit scales in force up to 7 October 1968 (plus actual housing costs). Yet a substantial part of the sample were interviewed after this date, and part of *the previous year's* income of these households was received after this date. It would have been difficult to devise and apply an appropriately weighted standard to each household. Moreover, very little difference would be made to the results. This is partly because actual housing costs are added to the supplementary benefit scales, which themselves were increased by less than 6 per cent on 7

## 990 POVERTY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

October 1968. In practice, households which had an income over 106 per cent of the standard before 7 October 1968 would have been over 100 per cent according to the pre-7 October standard. Adjustments were made to the results for the sample interviewed after October. Table A7.1 shows their income in the week prior to interview.

**Table A7.1.** Household income as percentage of SB scales plus housing cost.

	<i>Under 100</i>		<i>100-39</i>	
	<i>Households</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Households</i>	<i>Population</i>
Unadjusted	6.7	5.9	23.9	20.8
Adjusted	7.6	6.7	23.6	20.7