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Why is dissemination important?

You need to demonstrate:

**IMPACT**

‘the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy.’

https://esrc.ukri.org/research/impact-toolkit/what-is-impact/
The aims of dissemination

- Inform
- Educate
- Engage

- New directions for research
- Better understandings
- More informed debate
- Bridge the gap between research and action
- Changes in policy or practice
- Empower people
A widening audience

**Academic community**
- Researchers
- Teachers and lecturers
- Students

**Policy makers**
- Think tanks and strategy consultants
- Administrators, public bodies, international organisations
- Politicians and political parties

**Interested parties**
- Users and user groups
- Community and pressure groups
- General public
The challenge of a diverse audience

Specialists
• Need to know
• Background knowledge
• Delving deep
• Statistically competent

Non-specialists
• Passing interest
• Little background
• Top level results
• Frightened of numbers
Statistical ignorance

Misunderstanding the median....

‘You get this constant juddering adjustment with poverty figures going up when, for instance, upper incomes rise.’

*Iain Duncan Smith, MP, Secretary of State for Work and Pensions 2010-2016*

‘Any candidate sitting GCSE maths should be able to explain that raising everybody above a set percentage of the median income is rather like asking a cat to chase its own tail. As families are raised above the target level of income, the median point itself rises. Not surprisingly, therefore no country in the free world has managed to achieve this objective.’

*Frank Field, MP, head of poverty review for Coalition Government*

[http://www.poverty.ac.uk/income_threshold_approach.php](http://www.poverty.ac.uk/income_threshold_approach.php)
Just ignorance
The expansion of platforms

- Research journals and books
- Conferences
- Traditional media – press, tv, radio
- Exhibitions, drama, posters
- Websites
- Blogs
- Social media – twitter, Facebook, etc
- Video platforms
- Targeted messaging
It’s a busy world....

The world wide web
- Around 1.7 billion websites (i.e. unique hostname)
- Around 200 million ‘active websites’

- Google searches
  - Over a trillion searches per year.
  - 63,000 searches per second on any given day.

YouTube
- Over one billion hours of videos are watched on YouTube every day.
- There have been 6.3 billion views for....
The most watched YouTube video ever...
...at this moment in time.

“Despacito” by Luis Fonsi featuring Daddy Yankee

[Video](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kJQP7kiw5Fk)
Maximise your chances...

• Use accredited/recognised/established websites
• Tag material effectively
• Make sure the first sentence/intro/summary covers the main points and grabs attention
• Be clear about your audience
• Think beyond text
• Be imaginative
My name is Isha
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The scrounger narrative: 2010 - 2014
Occurrences of pejorative labels for claimants in UK press articles, 2007-2016

Source: James Morrison, 'Scroungers: moral panics and media myths', ZED, 2019; using Lexis Library
Table 8: % of articles with one or more terms from ‘negative’ word-lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>Dependency</th>
<th>Non-reciprocity</th>
<th>Any negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All titles</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data: main set 1995-2011

Source: ‘Benefits Stigma in Britain’, Turn2Us, 2012
Figure 4: Negative vocabulary in newspaper articles on working age benefits: consistent titles, 1995–2011

Source: ‘Benefits Stigma in Britain’, Turn2Us, 2012
Figure 5: Fraud and non-reciprocity terms in newspaper articles on working age benefits 1995–2011

Source: ‘Benefits Stigma in Britain’, Turn2Us, 2012
Absurd! Family of 11 on £42,000 benefits get new 7-bedroom house

A family of 11, who pocket £42,000 a year in benefits, have got a seven-bedroom house worth £160,000.

A father of 11 has been given a house believed to have been worth £160,000.

"Taxpayers don't want scroungers in hope homes who can afford luxury parrots."

"The fact that the family got a new house is outrageous."
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‘Absurd! Family of 11 on GBP 42,000 benefits get new 7-bedroom house’

Daily Express, 10 August 2010

‘A JOBLESS family of 11 on £42,000-a-year benefits caused outrage yesterday after they were given a new seven-bedroom house worth £300,000... Stunned neighbours saw them carting their belongings – said to include prized parrots – out of their four-bedroom home to a bigger one just yards down the road.’

‘Official figures this week revealed that 100,000 households are raking in handouts worth more than the wage earned by most workers. Shocking government statistics showed that some benefits families are pocketing £23,244 – the average UK salary – every year without lifting a finger.’

‘Matthew Sinclair of the Taxpayers’ Alliance said: ‘It is shocking to see so many extreme cases like this of families abusing the welfare system.....Taxpayers don’t expect their money to be spent keeping scroungers in huge homes and allowing them to make extravagant purchases like luxury parrots.'
Letters

No financial aid for us yet our taxes help family of 11

AFTER I entered some personal financial details into an online benefits calculator, it finished by displaying the statement: ‘The calculator has determined that you are not entitled to any means-tested benefits or tax credits under your current circumstances.’

Although my wife and I are in our 70s, our income is too high. I receive a pension for my 28 years in the Royal Navy and a small income from a contributory pension that I built up for work I undertook until retirement age: both are taxed.

To assist us in our declining years, we also paid off our mortgage. What a mistake to make.

We, like many other families existing just above the breadline, cannot even get financial help to paint our front door when the likes of the Bishops receive a new house partly paid for by my taxes (“Absurd! Family of 11 on £42,000 benefits get new 7-bedroom house”, August 10).

Oh well, just another day of gloom and doom until the new government gets to grips with this benefits disaster.

Terry Nash,
Gosport, Hants
Families on £100,000 a year in benefits

By Christopher Hope
Whitstable Editor

TENS of thousands of families are eligible for benefits and tax credits that are worth more than the average Briton's salary, the Government admitted yesterday.

Some can claim almost £100,000 a year in housing benefit alone, according to a report by the Department for Work and Pensions.

It is a huge amount of money, said Duncan Smith, the Work and Pensions Secretary, said the generosity of the benefits system meant that claimants regarded those who worked as "bloody maroons". He said: "This is a tragedy. We must be sure that people improve their lives and help people improve their lives - not just put them on long-term benefits."

The State of the Nation report estimated that 670,000 households were eligible for benefits and tax credits worth more than £15,000 a year. Of these, 60,000 households were allowed to claim benefits worth more than £50,000 a year (over £120,000 a year)

To reach this level of income, two adults in a family would have to claim incapacity benefit, council tax benefit and housing benefit. They would also have to have three or more children and claim child benefit and tax credits.

The report also disclosed that the amount of public money spent on housing benefit, intended to help cover the cost of renting accommodation, rose to £4.2 billion in 2009-10. The maximum housing benefit limit, the report said, was now more than £20,000 a year, according to the report.

The report also revealed that the amount of public money spent on housing benefit, intended to help cover the cost of renting accommodation, rose to £4.2 billion in 2009-10. The maximum housing benefit limit, the report said, was now more than £20,000 a year, according to the report.

The report also revealed that the amount of public money spent on housing benefit, intended to help cover the cost of renting accommodation, rose to £4.2 billion in 2009-10. The maximum housing benefit limit, the report said, was now more than £20,000 a year, according to the report.

The report also revealed that the amount of public money spent on housing benefit, intended to help cover the cost of renting accommodation, rose to £4.2 billion in 2009-10. The maximum housing benefit limit, the report said, was now more than £20,000 a year, according to the report.
‘Families on £100,000 a year in benefits’

Daily Telegraph, 28 May 2010

‘Iain Duncan Smith, the Welfare and Pensions Secretary, said the generosity of the benefits system meant that claimants regarded those who worked as “bloody morons”.’
IDS: How benefits can do more harm than good, Iain Duncan Smith said last night.

In an attack on Labour's child poverty targets, the Work and Pensions Secretary said youngsters’ lives were not necessarily improved by bigger handouts.

He criticised Gordon Brown’s measure of poverty – 66 per cent of median earnings – which was included in law in an attempt to abolish child poverty by 2020.

Mr. Duncan Smith said this “poverty plus a pound” approach led to hollow claims of success by lifting income over an arbitrary line. Focusing on tax credits and other measures did little to address fundamental problems, he said.

“Do we measure the things that really improve well-being?” he asked. “It’s better health, lower crime and lower fear of crime, work, a strong sense of community.

“Tackling these will cost money, of course it does. But I do believe increased income and increased wellbeing do not always follow the same track.”

Take a family headed by a drug addict or someone with a gambling addiction – increase the parent’s income and the chances are they will spend the money on furthering their habit, not on their children. According to the relative income poverty figures they might not leave a low income, whereas any reasonable measure of longer term life chances they would be stuck firmly below.

“Or take a family where no one has ever worked. Increase their benefit income – while taking no other proactive action – and you push the family further into dependency, only increasing the chance that their child will follow that same path as an adult.

So while income is important we should be clear that the source of that income can have very different effects. Income through benefits maintains people on a low income, whereas any income gained through work can transform lives.”

Senior sources said ministers were considering amending the law so that children’s life chances were measured in a broader way.

On Tuesday, the Institute for Fiscal Studies think tank has suggested that lower income groups are bearing the brunt of the Government’s cuts. But David Cameron insisted yesterday that the rich were carrying a much larger share of the burden than the poor, pointing out that most benefits would be uprated in line with inflation.

If you look at the overall numbers, the top 10 per cent pay ten times as much as the bottom 10 per cent,” the Prime Minister told ITV’s This Morning.

Labour work and pensions spokesman Liam Byrne said: “David Cameron had just buried compassionate conservatism for good. He promised us he was a different kind of Tory. Now we know he’s just like the worst of the Tories past.

“This Government has just decided to take twice as much from families and children as from our country’s bankers.”
IDS: How benefits can do more harm

Daily Mail, 2 December, 2011

‘Take a family headed by a drug addict or someone with a gambling addiction - increase the parent’s income and the chances are they will spend the money on furthering their habit, not on their children.’

Iain Duncan Smith, Work and Pensions Secretary
2016: Reader comments on six stories...

‘Overwhelming the tone and emphasis ..to the six discursive events was one of disdain towards the unemployed and/or claimants generally.

Numerous remarks were tinged with outright prejudice bordering on hatred or incitement’

Source: James Morrison, 'Scroungers: moral panics and media myths', p186, ZED, 2019
"scrounging wasters"
"lowlife scrounging bums"
"pondlife" "parasites"
"mindless mouth-breathers"
"dirty little scummers"

Source: James Morrison, 'Scroungers: moral panics and media myths', p186, ZED, 2019
Tweets

“It’s ur own frigging fault get a job!”
“these dickheads” would “fail, spunk the money up the wall and go back on the dole”
“Are these fucking disgusting people real?”

Source: James Morrison, 'Scroungers: moral panics and media myths', p186, ZED, 2019
Individual versus issue based stories

“ Issued based stories spurred counter-discursive voices to assert themselves at times lining up to criticise structural social inequalities and defend claimants”

“the way media narratives are framed has a strong priming effect on public responses”

Source: James Morrison, 'Scroungers: moral panics and media myths', p186, ZED, 2019
The way in which poverty contributes to articles and broadcasts in UK news

“many of these ‘incidental’ references use poverty to lend emphasis or to sensationalise.”

A bias against understanding

“It becomes difficult to construct an understanding of poverty as a structural outcome of inequalities, and therefore to develop the basis for a collective response to it”


“With a lack of discussion on the wider socioeconomic causes and contributing factors, poverty within the UK appears as an ‘orphan phenomenon’ with an unknown genesis”


“Missing from most mainstream news coverage of poverty is capitalism critique and the role of the present economic system in generating poverty.”

‘Poverty in the news’, Joanna Redden; Information, Communication & Society, 2011
BBC Trust verdict:

“failure of accuracy”
“breach of impartiality”

There are millions of people living in poverty within the UK

https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/research/news/articles/share-animation-raise-awareness-uk-lives-lived-poverty
https://youtube/yDVBB4VLce0
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PSE UK impact objectives

• Further academic research
• Increase public understanding
• Contribute to UK poverty debate and policy
• Contribute to UK, EU and international measures
• Support community and pressure groups
PSE dissemination strategy

• Reach a wide audience
• Use a wide variety of channels
• Strong coverage of findings in press & radio
• Television programme
• Aim for both a local and international audience
• Build an audience over time
• Launch and maintain a twitter account

• **Launch and maintain a website**
BREADLINE BRITAIN

FOUR PROGRAMMES ABOUT BEING POOR IN THE 1980s

On ITV at noon on
Sundays from 21st August 1983

The programmes can be recorded by a national VCR.
“...we did see it as a valid ‘educational’ job, particularly in an election year, to place the question of living standards firmly on the agenda of public debate”

Jane Hewland, Head of Features, LWT
Breadline Britain survey brief

“The survey’s first, and most important, aim is to try to discover whether there is a public consensus on what is an unacceptable standard of living for Britain in 1983 and, if there is a consensus, who, if anyone, falls below that standard”

“This minimum may cover not only the basic essentials for survival (such as food) but also access, or otherwise, to participating in society and being able to play a social role”
The consensual method defines poverty as:

“an enforced lack of socially perceived necessities”
‘Breadline Britain’ ITV, 1983
The Government reaction

‘people who are living in need are fully and properly provided for’

Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister

*House of Commons, 22 December, 1983*
THIS TIME
VOTE FOR
TONY BLAIR
YOUR LABOUR CANDIDATE
‘Breadline Britain in the 1990s’ ITV, 1991

And in 2013....
The programme gained considerable support on social media.
Re-framing the debate: PSE press coverage

The Daily Mirror, front page, 19 June 2014
Poverty doubled in 30 years, study shows

Steve Morris

The Guardian

The number of British households living below minimum standards has more than doubled in the past 30 years, despite the rise in the country’s average income, new research shows.

The finding, which is based on data from the UK’s Office for National Statistics, is significant because it suggests that the incomes of the poorest households have not kept up with inflation, even as the country’s overall income has grown.

The study found that 10.8 million people are now living in households that are living below the minimum standard, up from 4.9 million in 1980.

This is the first time that the number of households living below the minimum standard has exceeded 10 million, according to the research.

The findings come as the government is set to announce its plans for tackling child poverty, which has risen sharply since 1998.

The government’s own statistics show that the number of children living in poverty has increased by 20% since 1998, and is now at its highest level since records began.

The Guardian has been campaigning for a decade to highlight the plight of children living in poverty, and last year published a series of stories on the issue.

The story is part of a wider package of Guardian coverage, which includes an investigation into the impact of austerity on children and young people, and a series of stories on the rise in child poverty.

Launched in 2010, the Guardian’s poverty project has won numerous awards and has been a key driver of the newspaper’s campaign against the government’s austerity policies.

The story will be published in full in the Guardian on Thursday.
SOCIETY
Number in poverty has soared since Thatcher

By Chloe Gomes
star report

The proportion of impoverished households has soared since 1979, with the number living below the official poverty line increasing from 10.6 million in 1979 to 16 million in 2010, according to official figures published this week.

Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg said the findings were "absolutely shocking", and called for urgent action to tackle the problem.

"The Government's po-

tudy has concluded that there are now 16 million people living in poverty in the UK. This is more than 10 million families."

The report highlights the "huge" scale of poverty in the UK, with the number of people living in poverty increasing by 1.3 million since 1996. It also reveals that 1.5 million children are living in poverty, with the number of children in poverty increasing by 0.5 million since 1996.

The report suggests that the Government's policies have contributed to the rise in poverty, with the introduction of the minimum wage and the abolition of the minimum wage in 2012.

A Department for Work and Pensions spokesman said: "We are committed to reducing poverty, and we are taking action to make sure that people who need help the most get it."

The report also highlights the importance of providing support to groups such as single parents, disabled people, and elderly people, who are particularly vulnerable to poverty.

The report concludes that the Government must do more to tackle poverty, and that it must work with local authorities to ensure that everyone has access to the support they need.
Ministers’ fury over claim that poverty has doubled

The proportion of families living below the poverty line is rising, according to figures released today by the government’s Social Exclusion Unit.

The figures, which were compiled by the Social Exclusion Unit, show that the number of families living in poverty has increased by 10% in the past year, from 600,000 to 660,000.

The Social Exclusion Unit said that the increase was due to a rise in the number of single-parent families and a fall in the number of families in employment.

The unit also said that the rise in poverty was not due to a fall in the number of people in work, but rather to a fall in the average earnings of those in work.

The unit said that the increase in poverty was not due to a fall in the number of people in work, but rather to a fall in the average earnings of those in work.
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The unit said that the increase in poverty was not due to a fall in the number of people in work, but rather to a fall in the average earnings of those in work.
This lonely nation

We have no one to turn to and don’t get on with neighbours

1 in 5 can’t cope financially

We’re Europe’s unhealthiest

Less satisfied with social lives

People in the UK are more likely to say they are sick or disabled than almost every other EU country, says the OECD report. Despite spending more on healthcare than the EU average, people in the UK are more likely to report poor health and the percentage of people who say they are “very satisfied” with their own health has fallen by 9.2% since 2005. The report also found that the UK is one of the few countries where the prevalence of smoking, a major risk factor for poor health, has increased. Only in Denmark and France have more people started to smoke. In many other countries, notably in northern Europe, smoking rates have fallen. Only 15.3% of people aged 16 and over smoke tobacco, compared with 24.6% in 2005. The report also found that the UK has the highest levels of mental health problems among young people, with 22.7% of 16-24 year olds reporting poor mental health, compared with 16.3% in the EU average.
PSE website: impact objectives

- Publish PSE UK, 2012 research methods, results and findings – quantitative and qualitative
- Increase public understanding
- Contribute to poverty debate
- Provide teaching materials
- Support community and other groups
Who were we targeting

• academic researchers
• policy makers
• educators
• students
• pressure groups/community activists
• journalists/press
• international audience
The PSE holding page, 2010

www.poverty.ac.uk

What is poverty

What is poverty? How poor is too poor? What does a person need to participate in society in Britain in the twenty-first century? What is the minimum standard of living to which everyone should be entitled? Who falls below?

This website is being developed to report the findings of a major new ESRC research project into poverty and social exclusion in the UK. This important research project will build on earlier findings of what it is like to be growing up in poverty in the UK today and how this interacts with social exclusion through a large-scale survey to be conducted in 2011. It is a major collaboration between the University of Bristol, University of Cambridge, The Open University, Queens University Belfast, University of Glasgow, and the University of Trier working with the National Centre for Social Research and the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency.

This website will be making accessible new data from the 2011 survey data and data from the earlier surveys. We will enable you to interrogate this data and track changes over time.

Are you interested in following this research and getting in? In the next few months, we'll be putting up a survey which you can take in.

We launch June 2010. See you then.
Launched January, 2011
Key words used for website

- Poverty
- Poverty research
- Poverty survey
- Poverty in UK
- Social exclusion
- Deprivation
- Material deprivation
- Social deprivation
- Poor in UK
- Minimum standard of living
- Necessities
- PSE
- ESRC poverty research
- Breadline Britain
- benefits
- pensions
- low pay
- poor
Stage two, 2012

Aims to:

• Provide details of the PSE research
• Provide background understanding
• Give people and communities a voice
• Include personal stories
• Be topical and relevant
• Provide analysis of current government policies
• Make website searchable
Definitions of poverty

Definitions of poverty really matter. They set the standards by which we determine whether the incomes and living conditions of the poorest in society are acceptable or not and are essential for determining questions of fairness. From these definitions follow all actions to help the poorest.

In the UK these definitions are being hotly debated as the Coalition government seeks to change the criteria currently used to monitor and measure child poverty (see the PSE: UK team’s response to these proposals in Tackling Child Poverty and Improving Life Chances and Social Mobility and Child Poverty Review). This section sets out different ways to define and measure poverty and outlines recent key developments. The PSE: UK research project uses the “consensual method”, which defines poverty as those whose lack of resources forces them to live below a publicly agreed minimum standard.

In the film below you can hear how key speakers at the Second Peter Townsend Memorial Conference defined poverty.
In this section you will find full details of the current Poverty and Social Exclusion in the United Kingdom research project (PSE UK), including background working papers as well as final reports, key summaries and an opportunity to investigate some of the key survey data. It also provides summary details of the predecessor research projects in Britain in 1999, 1990 and 1983 and in Northern Ireland in 2002/3.

These research projects all use relative deprivation to examine poverty and, in particular, the consensual method. The key concept underlying the consensual approach is to identify what items are necessities on the basis of the public’s perceptions of minimum needs and then to examine who is forced to go without these necessities. This research series therefore provides a unique insight into those who fall below the minimum standards set by society and how this has changed over time.

The first report from the PSE UK team ‘The impoverishment of the UK’, was published in March 2013. It paints a shocking picture of the extent of deprivation and inadequate living standards in the UK today.

Many countries across the world, and in particular the European Union, have taken up and developed the idea of publicly-perceived necessities. Brief details of this research can be found under international.
A single parent

Jennie is 39 and unemployed. She lives with her three sons, all of whom have disabilities, in Redbridge, outer London. The family has lived in temporary accommodation for the last 12 years.

Meet Jennie and family in the following three videos recorded in autumn 2011.
Third stage, 2013/14

Aims to:
• Make the website more dynamic and engaging
• Make results accessible
• Make data interactive
• Provide detailed analysis papers of PSE UK findings
• Provide links to journal articles & books based on PSE research
• Provide a platform for the PSE qualitative research and for PSE community engagement project
Falling below minimum standards

At a glance

PSE UK 2012 is the most comprehensive survey of poverty and social exclusion ever undertaken in the UK. The research finds that about a third of households in the UK today face significant difficulties, specifically:

- Around 4 million people are not properly fed by today’s standards.
- Around 2.6 million children live in homes that are damp.
- Around 2.3 million households cannot afford to heat the living areas of their homes.
- Over 30 million people suffer from financial insecurity.

The public sets the minimum living standard

The Poverty and Social Exclusion (PSE) research measures the numbers of people who fall below what the population as a whole think should be a minimum standard of living.

This is the only measure looking at both what the majority think are necessities for life in the UK today, and actual living standards (rather than just income).


This first PSE Facts and Findings looks at the numbers lacking necessities in 2012. PSE Facts and Findings
Publications and dissemination

How does poverty link to other disadvantages?

Poverty and Social Exclusion in the United Kingdom is the largest research project of its kind ever carried out in the UK and the research's findings have produced extensive details on the very high levels of deprivation in the UK today, its characteristics and causes. The findings have received widespread publicity and media coverage and have formed the basis of four books, a large number of journal papers and conference presentations. You can access details of these various articles, papers and publications through the left hand menu.

For a summary of the impact of the research on public debate and on policy practice in the UK and internationally, visit the Bristol University's impact story on 'Defining Poverty in the 21st Century' here.

Recommended
Life stories from austere times

Life Stories is based on the PSE UK qualitative research into 'Understanding experiences of low income during recession'. Sixty-two video testimonies were collected during 2012-2013, in Birmingham, Glasgow and Gloucestershire. The report of this qualitative work, Life on a low income in austere times, provides full details of the research and its findings. It finds that while the experiences of poverty had not changed greatly post the 2008 recession and at the start of the era of austerity, people on low incomes reported feeling under greater pressure, more insecure and more marginalised. Four videos based on extracts from the videos recorded can be viewed below. These videos illustrate some of the main themes found in this research.

Life on a low income in austere times: Part 1 details the real choices that the rising cost of living impose on low income households and the items and activities people are forced to go without. Participants also explain the impacts of cuts to services that they have observed within their communities and the consequences for already fragile household budgets.

Life on a low income in austere times: Part 2 documents the emotional impacts of low income. Participants discuss the embarrassment and guilt of not being able to afford things that others take for granted. The stigma of claiming benefits and services, as well as the stigmatising impact of media debates and portrayal of benefits claimants are also detailed.
Building an audience: 2010 to June 2014

ITV Tonight tx

PSE UK conference coverage
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page Views</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2585997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitions-poverty</td>
<td>244834</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>182854</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitions-poverty/absolute-and-overall-poverty</td>
<td>154403</td>
<td>5.97%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitions-poverty/social-exclusion</td>
<td>144470</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitions-poverty/deprivation-and-poverty</td>
<td>78729</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-resources-books/poverty-united-kingdom</td>
<td>67885</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitions-poverty/income-threshold-approach</td>
<td>64980</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pse-research</td>
<td>55100</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living-poverty</td>
<td>43629</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>editorial/100-questions-about-poverty</td>
<td>31794</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/living-poverty/personal-experiences/jennie-single-parent</td>
<td>26805</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/living-poverty/personal-experiences</td>
<td>24648</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report-disability-government-cuts-benefits/benefit-cuts-'hitting-disabled-people-hardest'</td>
<td>22906</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/definitions-poverty/consensual-method</td>
<td>22271</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tags/lone-parents</td>
<td>20417</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis-poverty/measurement-life-chances-government-policy/reefining-poverty</td>
<td>19744</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tags/government-policy</td>
<td>19291</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tags/government-cuts</td>
<td>18400</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods-working-papers-mental-health-poverty-poverty-measurement-social-exclusion-well-being/social</td>
<td>17275</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tags/child-poverty</td>
<td>17213</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>2585997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
India lifted 271 million people out of poverty in 10 years: UN report @UNDP @ophi_oxford

India lifted 271 million people out of poverty in 10 years: UN report theweek.in

Poverty and Social Exclusion in the UK. Largest #poverty research project ever carried out in the UK, funded by @ESRC. Tweeting latest news, opinions & research.

19 Photos and videos
Latest PSE tweet

Professor @nickbailey37 explains how to Measure #poverty efficiently using adaptive #deprivation scales | Poverty and Social Exclusion poverty.ac.uk/editorial/adap...
This film was made by local people living in Ardoyne and New Lodge, to show the hardships people are facing now, before the proposed Welfare reforms.
World’s Most Accurate Pie Chart
Data visualisation

• Communicates to the non-statistician
• Conveys information quickly
• Brings out relationships in data
• Gives new insights
“As knowledge increases among mankind, and transactions multiply, it becomes more and more desirable to abbreviate and facilitate the modes of conveying information from one individual to the many.”

William Playfair, 1801

The price of wheat, weekly wages and reigning monarch 1565-1820,

Playfair, 1821
DIAGRAM OF THE CAUSES OF MORTALITY
IN THE ARMY IN THE EAST.

The areas of the blue, red, and black wedges are each measured from the centre as the common vertex.

The blue wedges measured from the centre of the circle represent severe cases, with the areas indicating the deaths from preventible & unavoidable Zymotic diseases, the red wedges measured from the centre, the deaths from wounds, & the black wedges measured from the centre, the deaths from all other causes.

The black line across the red triangle in Nov 1854 marks the boundary of the deaths from all other causes during the month.

In Oct 1854 & Apr 1855, the black areas coincide with the red; in Jan & Feb 1855, the blue coincides with the black.

The entire areas may be compared by following the blue, the red, & the black lines extending there.
From page to pixels

- Views of large quantity of data
- Views across time and place
- Views of spatial relationships
- Invites reader to become an explorer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damp-free home</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm coat</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three meals daily</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough bedrooms</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrations</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing machine</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two pairs shoes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly family meal</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two meals daily</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace worn clothes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat of fish</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual holiday</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents annually</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends round fortnightly</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go out fortnightly</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and friends visit</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family visits</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair electrics</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and veg daily</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family occasions</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home decorated</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household insurance</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview clothes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some savings</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session structure

1. The challenges of effective dissemination
2. The media environment
3. Poverty and Social Exclusion 2010-2014 case study
4. Data visualisation
5. Your research dissemination
Build dissemination in from the start

• What are your aims?
• Who do you want to reach?
• What publications do you want?
• Which media will you target?
• What are your budget limitations?

And

• Talk to interested parties early on
• Consider the impact on those involved in the research

Build ethics in from the start

http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/
Ensure valid consent

1. ‘Research subjects must be informed fully about the purpose, methods and intended possible uses of the research, what their participation in the research entails and what risks, if any, are involved.’
2. ‘Research participants must participate in a voluntary way, free from any coercion.’

Remember:
1. Participants and researchers may define ‘harm’ very differently.
2. You might understand potential harms of which the participant is unaware and you must raise any such concerns.
Ensure confidentiality

ESRC guidelines state:
‘the confidentiality of information supplied by research subjects and the anonymity of respondents must be respected’.

Data Protection Act 2018 requires:
Data is ‘used fairly, lawfully and transparently.’
Generating publicity

• Think about ‘new’ angles that might attract media attention.
• Think about the use of people’s stories. This could help gain coverage - BUT you need to be careful.
• Provide background analysis and context in your press releases. Make it a clear and accessible.
• Consider publishing a summary report (see JRF Findings ‘UK Poverty 2018’ for a clear example).
• Think about who might be interested in advance - specialist correspondents will be easier to engage with.
• Consider how your findings might be (mis)interpreted.

‘How to report on people in poverty’, Media Diversity Institute
Going online....

• Explore possible blogs to contribute to such as:
  https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/
  https://www.rethinkingpoverty.org.uk/topics/rethinking-poverty/
  https://www.socialeurope.eu/category/blogs

• Explore websites that might promote your findings:
  Your university’s/department’s site
  Your sponsoring organisation’s site
  Specialist sites such as www.poverty.ac.uk

• Think in terms of multi-media....
The Children's Society

No child should feel alone