

University of Essex

Department of Sociology,
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex

Tel: Colchester (0206) 5141

Telegraphic address: University Colchester

Telex: 98440 (UNILIB COLCHSTR)

Dear Geoff,

The report is now beginning to fall into place and I have completed 9 of the chapters, though three of these have a number of holes due to the hold-up on tables. One of the more important is that on supplementary benefits. The national survey material is strong and there is a substantial amount of non-take-up.

Can you help me sort out the rather confusing material on four areas? We will need to adopt certain assumptions in adjusting ~~response~~ the findings according to response at the first and second stages, and for the moment we need to proceed by constructing a matrix and filling it with absolute numbers. I attach the two basic tables which I think we need.

Once filled we need to go through an earlier paper prepared by Dennis on eligibility, in which most of the relevant households were re-visited. I have a number of queries on that. First, the base numbers ^{for each area} seem to be too small. Either we adjust the base because of incomplete response at successive stages or, better, we adjust contacts so as to include presumed number responding in different categories.

Second, I am unsure ~~whether~~ which of the special follow-up interviews discussed by Dennis apply to the second stage ~~and~~ ^{whether they} ~~were~~ ^(their) eligibility will be on tape) and which to the first stage. This is important for the following reason. The results from the national survey

As from 2 Mansfield Place
London NW3
6 Nov 1970

University of Essex

Department of Sociology
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex
Tel: Colchester (0206) 5141
Telegraphic address: University Colchester
Telex: 98440 (UNILIB COLCHSTR)

Dear Brian,

I very much enjoyed your piece in the NS today. But one statement puzzles me. "As those at work were more heavily taxed and paid higher national insurance contributions, people on social security became relatively richer." (over last 15 yrs). Are you referring to any sources of which I am unaware? So far as I can see the Nicholson stuff for 1957-9 and in Economic Trends for ~~Feb 1970~~ 1961-8 (Feb 1970) don't allow that inference. There has been the trend from direct to indirect taxation; the much faster increase in rents of people on SB than housing costs generally; the ^{relative} growth of fringe benefits (not included in "earnings"). There is also the problem of interpreting tax relief increases on children & mortgages.

Finally, nat. ins benefits are at the moment 25% up on March 65 (48% May 1963) but wages are approx 43-45% up (or