

Appendix Two

Representativeness of the Sample

A summary account of the representativeness of the sample will be found in Chapter 3 (pages 109-11), and further details are given here.

The age distribution of the responding sample is compared with that of the non-institutionalized population of the United Kingdom in Table A2.1. The source of information about

Table A2.1. *Distribution by age and sex of the UK population: three sources compared.*

Age	Percentage of each age group who were females					
	UK total population ^a 1969 (Registrar General)	Poverty survey 1968-9	Family Expenditure Survey 1969 ^b	UK total population 1969 (Registrar General)	Poverty survey 1968-9	Family Expenditure Survey 1969
0-4	8.6	8.9	9.7	48	46	47
5-9	8.4	8.7	9.2	49	50	50
10-14	7.3	7.7	7.9	49	49	48
15-19	7.0	7.2	6.8	49	48	49
20-29	14.1	13.4	12.8	50	51	53
30-39	12.0	12.4	12.6	49	49	50
40-49	13.0	12.4	13.3	50	51	49
50-59	11.9	11.7	11.0	52	52	52
60-69	10.4	10.3	10.2	55	55	53
70-79	5.6	5.5	5.0	63	65	58
80+	1.8	1.8	1.4	71	70	69
Total	100	100	100	51	51	51
Number	54,395,000	6,045	20,744	-	-	-

NOTES: ^aPopulation estimates published by the Registrar General adjusted to exclude institutionalized population.

^bThe detailed breakdown is from the sub-file deposited in the Survey Archive, University of Essex, and corresponds closely to the amalgamated categories in the published report.

SOURCES: Col. 1: *Annual Abstract of Statistics, 1974*, HMSO, London, p. 7; and Census 1971, *Non-Private Households*, HMSO, London, 1974.

Col. 2: Marginals count, responding sample.

Col. 3: Survey Archive, University of Essex, and Department of Employment and Productivity, *Family Expenditure Survey*, Report for 1969, HMSO, London, 1970, p. 83.

Table A2.2. Percentages of population, and of households, with specified characteristics - census compared with poverty survey.

Characteristic		1966	1971	Poverty survey 1968-9
<i>Birthplace^a (population)</i>				
UK		95.0	94.5	94.8
Republic of Ireland		1.4	1.3	1.4
West Indies, India, Pakistan and Africa		1.6	2.1	2.1
Other overseas		1.9	2.1	1.7
<i>Number of persons in household (households)</i>				
	1	15.4	18.1	17.7
	2	30.2	31.5	29.8
	3	21.2	18.9	18.9
	4	17.7	17.2	17.5
	5	8.8	8.3	9.1
	6+	6.6	6.0	7.0
<i>Tenure^b (households)</i>				
Owner-occupied		46.3	50.4	47.2
Council rented		28.2	30.7	27.7
Privately rented and others		25.5	18.9	25.1
<i>Households without amenities^a</i>				
Fixed bath		15.4	9.1	11.2
Internal WC		20.0	12.6	9.9
<i>Households sharing amenities^a</i>				
Fixed bath		4.1	3.2	5.9
Internal WC		10.8	7.2	5.7

NOTES: ^aCensus data for Britain only.

^bThe census distribution is based on tenure of *dwelling*s, not households. Since some (mostly privately rented) dwellings are shared by two or more households, the figures are not precisely comparable with the poverty survey's findings. The figure for privately rented and other forms of tenure derived from the poverty survey would be reduced, and the other two figures slightly increased, to provide a true comparison.

SOURCES: *Social Trends*, No. 5, HMSO, London, 1974, pp. 81,83,162 and 165.

the age distribution for the UK population in 1969 is the *Annual Abstract of Statistics*.¹ The numbers in each age group are given there as adding to 55,534,000. However, official estimates of population in the late 1960s were found, in the light of the results of the 1971 Census, to be too high. The revised estimate for *total* population given in the *Annual Abstract* is 55,262,000 - though, to the best of the author's knowledge, a breakdown by age has not been published. In comparing official data of age distribution with the results from the poverty survey, therefore, the number given for each age group has been slightly reduced by the same percentage to conform with this total. Secondly, on the basis of 1971 Census data for non-private households, the numbers in each age group living in hospitals, residential institutions and prisons, which were not included in the survey, have been estimated and deducted.² The

¹ *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, 1974, HMSO, London, 1974.

² The age-group data for these institutions have been adjusted, first, to conform with the total numbers

results are given in Table A2.1, though it must be added that these refinements have not made much difference to the percentage distribution. For purposes of comparison, the age distribution of the responding FES sample for 1969 is also shown in the table, and it will be seen that the poverty survey sample reflects more closely than does the FES sample the proportions of the population at the youngest and oldest ages.

Fifty-one per cent of the sample were females, exactly reflecting the proportion in the population as a whole. The percentage of each age group who were females was also closely representative, as shown in the right-hand columns of Table A2.1.

From the censuses of 1966 and 1971, it is possible to select other data for purposes of comparison with the survey data. Some examples are given in Table A2.2. Because the survey occupied a period a little more than midway between the two censuses, inferences can be made from these two 'benchmarks' for the survey year - though the fact that the 1966 Census was itself based on a 10 per cent sample needs to be remembered. The survey data for birthplace and number of persons in the household compare fairly well with census data. There seems to have been some over-representation of privately rented tenures, and a slight under-representation of council-rented tenures, but this was due partly to the distribution being based on dwellings in the case of the census and households in the case of the survey. There seems to have been some under-representation of households lacking sole use of an internal WC, but about the expected representation of households lacking sole use of a fixed bath.

There are other checks on the survey data. In 1971, the General Household Survey, a representative sample survey covering England, Wales and Scotland, was launched. In that year, nearly 12,000 households provided information. Table A2.3 compares the distribution by household type with the corresponding distribution from the poverty survey. There was a close correspondence between the two sets of results. A further example is provided by estimates from the General Household Survey of the incidence of limiting long-standing illness and of

Table A2.3. *Percentage of households by type, comparing the General Household Survey with the poverty survey.*

<i>Household type</i>	<i>General Household Survey (1971)</i>	<i>Poverty survey (1968-9)</i>
Single person under 60	5	6
Single person 60 or over	12	12
2 adults, both under 60	14	14
2 adults, one or both 60 or over	17	17
Small families (1 or 2 adults with 1 or 2 children)	22	20
Large families	12	13
Large adult-households (3 or more adults with 1 child at most)	18	19
Total	100	100
Number	11,858	2,044

SOURCE: Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, Social Survey Division, *The General Household Survey*, Introductory Report, HMSO, London, 1973, p. 95.

found to be in such institutions at the 1971 Census, and secondly, to include an estimate for Northern Ireland.

the poverty survey of disablement conditions restricting activity (which are compared in Figure 20.1, page 704).

A source of comparable data other than the General Household Survey is the Family Expenditure Survey. Elsewhere in this report some examples have been given. Thus, mean gross and mean gross disposable income for different types of household are compared with the distribution derived from the Family Expenditure Survey in Table A.3 (Appendix Eight, page 993), and the percentages of total net disposable income received by quantile groups are compared in Table A.1 (Appendix Eight, page 991). The two surveys corresponded closely in the percentages of aggregate household income drawn from different sources.

Finally, the survey findings can in many different respects be compared with administrative counts and estimates. Some examples are given in Table A2.4.

Table A2.4.^a

	<i>Survey estimates</i>	<i>Government estimates</i>
Receiving unemployment benefit	390,000	325,000
sickness benefit	920,000	994,000
industrial injury and war disablement pension	325,000	615,000
retirement pension	7,215,000	7,122,000
widows' benefits	485,000	577,000
family allowances	4,400,000	4,257,000
supplementary benefit	2,440,000	2,736,000

NOTE: ^aFor source and methods, see Chapter 24, page 827.

Again on the basis of the survey, there were estimated to be 535,000 one-parent families, with 1,010,000 children, in the United Kingdom in 1968-9, compared with DHSS estimates for Britain in 1971 of 620,000 and 1,080,000 respectively (see page 755). There were 4.8 per cent of households in receipt of rate rebates. This compares with a figure of 5.1 per cent given by the Department of the Environment for 1967-8 for England and Wales only.¹ There were 17.4 per cent of school-children in the sample receiving free school meals, compared with government figures of 16.8 per cent for England and Wales and 17.2 per cent for Scotland (see page 865). An estimated 320,000 council tenants were receiving rent rebates, compared with an IMTA estimate of just under 300,000 for England and Wales (see page 876).

¹ Department of the Environment, *Handbook of Statistics*, HMSO, London, 1970, p. 5.