

CHAPTER 11

Objective and Subjective Deprivation

Deprivation takes many forms in every society. People can be said to be deprived if they lack the types of diets, clothing, housing, environmental, educational, working and social conditions, activities and facilities which are customary, or at least widely encouraged or approved, in the societies to which they belong. They fall below standards of living which either can be shown to be widespread in fact or are socially accepted or institutionalised. As we have argued, these two standards are unlikely to be one and the same thing. Perceptions of deprivation lag behind material progress or are distorted by class and other vested interests.

A third standard of deprivation can in principle be distinguished, which tends to be implicit in any attempt to define the first standard. People may not fall below a standard of living which can be shown to be widespread, but they may fall below a standard which could be widespread, given a reorganisation of the institutions and redistribution of the means available in that society. This standard tends to be adopted more readily as an assumption in discussion about societies of the third world than about industrial societies.

The previous chapter sketched in outline some of the components of styles of living in British society and the extent to which they are diffused, particularly among different social classes. This chapter will first demonstrate what forms of objective deprivation exist in British society and how many people experience them. Because forms of deprivation are so numerous I will, for convenience, reserve for discussion in subsequent chapters forms of deprivation at work, in housing and environment, and concentrate attention here on material and social forms of deprivation. The chapter will go on to show whether, in what form, and how many, people feel deprived, and then show whether such feelings are consistent with different objective measures of

deprivation and in particular whether they are consistent with low incomes and resources.

Objective Deprivation

Different indices of deprivation were included in the survey. Those affecting work, housing and environment will be principally discussed in Chapters 12, 13 and 14, though some key items will be anticipated in the ensuing discussion. Table 11/1 sets out a long list of items which can either be shown in practice and/or according to conventional opinion to constitute deprivation. These do not of course provide a comprehensive list of forms of material and social deprivation, and information about them might sometimes have been collected differently, or in more detail. All or nearly all might be treated less as necessarily constituting deprivation when taken with other items. Six per cent of the sample had missed at least one day with a cooked meal in the previous fortnight; five per cent said they had been short of fuel and 2 per cent had inadequate footwear for both fine and wet weather. As many as 40 per cent had not had an afternoon or evening out in the previous fortnight, including five per cent who also said this was because of lack of money. Ten per cent of housewives said that there was no one outside the household upon whom they could rely for help in an emergency, such as illness; 10 per cent that they bought second-hand clothing sometimes or often and 33 per cent that they had not bought a new winter coat for at least three years. Thirty six per cent of children had not had a friend to tea or to play in the previous four weeks and 56 per cent had not had a party on their last birthday. Eight per cent of households lacked a television, and 41 per cent a refrigerator; as many as 21 per cent had fewer than six of a selected list of ten common durables or fitments in the home.

TABLE 11/1

Per cent of men and women, and people of different age and social class, who were materially and socially deprived in different senses

Indicators of material and social deprivation	All males and females	males	females	Age						Social Class (8-fold)			
				0-4	5-14	15-29	30-49	50-64	65+	Prof. & Managerial	Other non manual	Skilled manual	Partly skilled & unskilled manual
1. Short of fuel to keep warm at some or all stages during last 12 months	5.2	4	6	8	8	4	4	4	6	0	3	5	11
2. Fewer than 6 items in a selected list of 10 durables in household (inc. TV and refrigerator)	21.0	20	21	26	17	21	15	18	41	2	19	32	39
3. No television in household	8.1	8	9	7	6	8	6	6	16	6	9	11	11
4. No refrigerator	41.3	40	42	44	37	42	35	39	58	14	37	54	61
5. Does not have fresh meat most days of the week	19.2	18	21	19	18	14	15	20	36	7	15	18	30
6. At least one day without cooked meal in last fortnight	6.3	5	8	4	2	5	5	11	13	4	6	6	8
7. Less than three pints of milk per person per week										7	10	14	18
8. Household does not usually have a Sunday joint	20.1	19	21	22	18	18	17	18	33	15	16	19	26
9. Does not have cooked breakfast most days of week	66.7	62	72	73	64	67	69	68	66	59	70	72	78
10. Inadequate footwear for both wet and fine weather	2.1	1	3	6	3	2	1	1	2	0	1	3	4
11. Second-hand clothing bought sometimes (excl. infants) or often by housewife	10.4	11	10	15	16	10	10	7	6	5	8	10	17

Cont'd. over

Table 11/1 Contd. /

Indicators of material and social deprivation	All males and females	males	females	Age						Social Class (8-fold)			
				0-4	5-14	15-29	30-49	50-64	65+	Prof. & managerial	Other non-manual	Skilled manual	Partly skilled and unskilled manual
12. <u>Housewife only</u> . No new winter coat in last 3 years	-	-	33	-	-	14	27	34	58	21	28	33	43
13. Spent less than £10 last Christmas	11.4	10	13	8	7	8	6	12	36	3	8	11	20
14. Not had holiday away from home in last 12 months	50.0	49	50	60	45	47	45	48	68	27	42	54	65
15. <u>All aged 15 and over</u> . Not been out for meal or snack to relatives or friends in last 4 weeks	45.1	48	42	-	-	34	46	49	55	28	38	47	58
16. <u>All aged 15 and over</u> . Not had relative or friend for a meal or snack in last four weeks	33.4	36	31	-	-	22	34	32	37	21	28	33	45
17. <u>Children 3-14</u> . Not had friend to play or tea in last 4 weeks	35.9	39	33	35	36	-	-	-	-	22	34	30	53
18. <u>Children 3-14</u> . Not had party last birthday	56.1	60	52	51	58	-	-	-	-	44	45	60	71
19. <u>Children 3-14</u> . Pocket money 10p or less	43.3	44	42	68	41	-	-	-	-	47	41	41	49
20. Not had afternoon or evening out in last fortnight (e.g. pub, sports match, cinema, theatre, dancing, bingo)	40.1	35	43	36	50	21	34	47	60	37	37	40	44
21. Not enough money to have evening out in last fortnight	5.2	5	5	4	7	3	6	5	6	1	4	4	8

Note: Numbers on which percentages based for all males and females of all ages vary between 5814 and 6078; for any age-group the minimum number is 510; and for any class group the minimum number is 630 in the case of all sex and age-groups, though it is 201 for housewives and 169 for children aged 3-14.

Different forms of deprivation were highly correlated and we developed two indices, a deprivation index and a durables index, to examine those people experiencing a number of different forms. Table 11/2 shows that 28 per cent of males and 30 per cent of females had at least five of ten selected forms of deprivation, and 7 and 9 per cent respectively had 7 or more. More children than young or middle-aged adults were deprived and more old people, particularly those aged 75 and over, than young people.

TABLE 11/2

Per cent of males and females of different age deprived
in none or one or more of ten respects

Deprivation Index	Age of Males							All Ages
	3-19	20-29	30-39	40-54	55-64	65-74	75+	
0	3	6	5	5	4	2	1	4
1-2	34	37	37	33	32	21	12	33
3-4	35	35	34	39	36	36	32	36
5-6	20	19	19	17	23	29	31	21
7+	7	3	5	6	5	12	22	7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	841	392	381	500	342	216	80	2752
	Females							
	3-19	20-29	30-39	40-54	55-64	65-74	75+	
0	4	7	4	4	2	1	0	4
1-2	34	38	34	34	28	16	11	30
3-4	38	35	40	39	34	35	22	36
5-6	19	15	16	16	29	33	35	21
7+	8	5	6	7	7	15	31	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	788	415	364	570	356	281	172	2969

Note: For list of 10 items, see p.

Source: Employment Series, No. 17.

Although more of the elderly than of the young, and more children than young adults experience deprivation, the pattern varies according to type of deprivation. A higher percentage of children than of all other age-groups lived in households which were short of fuel, depended in some measure on second-hand clothing and had inadequate footwear (Table 11/1). A higher percentage of middle-aged than of young adults had not had an evening out or been out to relatives or friends, or received them in their homes, than young adults, but the percentage lacking material possessions or facilities in the home was about the same as of young adults and, in some instances, was lower.

For all types of deprivation except the payment of small amounts of pocket money to children there was a correlation, and usually a very marked correlation with social class (Table 11/1). Compared with people of professional and managerial class far more of those in the unskilled or partly skilled manual classes lacked durables in the household, were short of fuel, did not eat fresh meat frequently, drank very small quantities of milk and had not been on a summer holiday.

Subjective Deprivation

To what extent did people feel deprived? A variety of questions were asked in the survey. How well off do you feel these days on your income, compared with the rest of your family, other people round here of your age and the average in the country? On the whole is your situation getting better or worse? Do you think you were as well off, say, ten years ago? Do you find it specially difficult to manage on your income? Do you think you could genuinely say you are poor now? The exact form of the questions will be found in the questionnaire reproduced at the end of this book. Other questions were directed at satisfaction with work and pay and are discussed in Chapter 12.

A summary of response is given in Table 11/3. In no case does the proportion of the entire sample expressing a sense of deprivation fall below about 15 per cent - representing over eight millions in the population. More chief wage earners and housewives tended to feel worse off by comparison with other members of their families living outside the household than by comparison with the national average for people of their age or others in their immediate localities. As many as 30 per cent of chief wage earners or heads of households said they found it specially difficult to manage on their incomes and as many as 41 per cent over the age of 35 said they were not as well off compared with 10 years previously. Eight per cent, representing $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions, said they felt poor all the time, and another 18 per cent sometimes. On the other hand, more people felt better off than felt worse off than ever, the numbers being 34 and 18 per cent respectively. This evidence does at least raise the question whether expressions of deprivation are more widespread among individual families than is assumed collectively in discussion publicly of social problems. It suggests that they are.

INSERT TABLE 11/3

The data on subjective attitudes present a rather different picture according to social structure from those on material and social conditions. Let us first consider variations according to age. Although more of the elderly than of the young felt poor or worse off than their families, their neighbours or the national average, the difference is in some instances not as marked as one might expect. The number feeling poor increased only gradually from 23 per cent of the under 30s to 36 per cent of the over 65s. However there was a marked increase with age in the proportion of the population saying that their own situation was worse than it had ever been and a very marked decrease in the proportion saying that it was better than ever. Among all age-groups more people felt worse off in relation to the rest of their families than in relation to their neighbours or the national average.

TABLE 11/3

Percentage feeling deprived in different senses

Types of subjective deprivation	All men and women	men	women	Age				Social class (8-fold)			
				under 30	30-49	50-64	65+	Prof. & managerial	Other non-manual	Skilled manual	Partly skilled and unskilled manual
<u>Chief wage-earners and housewives only</u>											
Compared with rest of family feels:											
better off	22.7	26	20	32	26	20	10	38	28	20	15
about the same	46.9	47	46	42	51	46	44	39	45	51	48
worse off	27.4	24	30	25	20	31	41	19	24	27	33
N =	3422										
Compared with others around locality, feels:											
better off	20.3	22	19	26	22	18	14	35	24	17	14
about the same	58.1	58	58	55	59	58	59	49	54	64	61
worse off	14.7	13	16	12	12	18	19	8	13	14	20
N =	328										
Compared with average in country, feels:											
better off	19.9	22	18	20	25	18	10	51	25	12	10
about the same	52.1	51	53	60	52	54	44	32	52	61	51
worse off	20.5	20	21	13	16	21	35	10	15	20	30
N =	3423										

Sources: Subjective Deprivation Series 1-21. Attitudes to Poverty No. 12, and frequency counts subjective tape.
 Note: Those giving "don't know" as answers are excluded from the table, and totals therefore of percentages do not quite add to 100.

Table Cont'd over

[illegible][illegible]

Second, variations in attitude according to class corresponded in some but by no means all respects with the picture presented by different objective measures. The number of people in unskilled and partly skilled manual classes who said they felt poor sometimes or often was 41 per cent, compared with only 7 per cent of those in professional and managerial classes. When asked to relate their situation to that of the rest of the family, neighbours, the national average and their own previous living standards the differences tended to be less marked. A substantial proportion of people in professional and managerial classes said they were worse off, for example, than the rest of their families. A fifth felt they were worse off than previously in their lives. Nearly a fifth found it difficult to manage on their incomes.

There was, of course, a high correlation between different expressions of deprivation, but neither was it complete nor did those expressing extreme types of deprivation always also admit less extreme types of deprivation as well. Thus, 39 per cent of those saying they found it difficult to manage on their incomes also said they never felt poor, and although 91 per cent of those who said they felt poor all the time also said it was difficult to manage on their incomes 9 per cent said they did not.

We sought to examine people saying they felt deprived in several different respects. Table 11/4 shows that more women than men among chief wage-earners or heads of households felt deprived in one or more respects, feeling worse off than their families, neighbours, the national average or than previously in their lives, or finding it difficult to manage on their incomes.

TABLE 11/4

Per cent of men and women feeling deprived in none or
one or more of five respects

Number of types of subjective deprivation acknowledged	Men	Women
None	47	31
1	24	22
2	14	16
3	9	17
4	4	10
5	2	5
Total	100	100
No.	1556	472

THIS TABLE WILL BE REPLACED. TOTALS, ESPECIALLY FOR WOMEN, TOO LOW, BECAUSE HOUSEWIVES WERE QUESTIONED AS WELL AS CHIEF WAGE-EARNERS OR HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS.

Note: The five items were feeling that income was worse compared with (i) relatives; (ii) people of their age in the locality; (iii) the national average/and (iv) previously in their lives, and (v) finding it difficult to manage on their incomes.

The numbers of chief wage-earners or heads of households feeling deprived in one or more respects were widely distributed by type of household. More people aged 60 and over who lived alone and more heads of households with four or more children, and fewer heads of households with two or three children, than other types of households felt deprived in at least three respects.

The Interrelationship Between Objective and Subjective Deprivation

There was a strong relationship between objective and subjective deprivation. This can be shown first without direct reference to income and other resources. For example, the larger the number of types of deprivation from which people suffered the more numerous were the number of types of subjective deprivation acknowledged, as Table 11/5 shows. The progression is marked,

and consistent. Among those scoring 0 or 1 on the deprivation index nearly 58 per cent of chief wage earners or heads of households replied in the negative to each of five questions about whether they were worse off than their relatives, their neighbours, the national average or the previous circumstances, and felt poor sometimes or always. Among those scoring 8 or more on the deprivation index over half answered positively to at least three of the five questions.

TABLE 11/5

Per cent of chief wage earners or housewives with different degrees of objective deprivation who felt deprived in none or one or more of five respects

How many of five types of subjective deprivation are acknowledged	Deprivation index (maximum score 10)				
	0 - 1	2 - 3	4 - 5	6 - 7	8 or more
None	58	52	36	26	18
1-2	32	36	44	36	31
3-5	10	12	19	38	51
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Number	305	717	628	305	72

Unclassifiable: 7.

Source: Attitudes to Poverty Series No. 61.

The same trend applies to other grouped data about deprivation, for example, the lack of different durables or fitments in the household (Table A/20, Appendix 8) and to most of the individual items listed in Table 11/1.

Subjective Deprivation and Income

The broad correspondence between objective and subjective deprivation can be explained only by demonstrating the link between objective deprivation and income or other resources and going on to explore ways in which the latter help to shape attitudes. This link can be shown first in relation to

individual items. Thus two-thirds of chief wage-earners or heads of households who said they always felt poor, and a half of those who sometimes felt poor, compared with a fifth of those never feeling poor, had net disposable incomes which were below or on the margins of the social standard of poverty (Table 11/6). Indeed, nearly 90 per cent of those always feeling poor and 80 per cent of those feeling poor sometimes, had household incomes below the mean of their type (Table A/21, Appendix 8). Again, over half those saying they had difficulty managing on their incomes, compared with a fifth of those not feeling any difficulty, lived at this same low standard (Table A/22, Appendix 8).

TABLE 11/6

Per cent of chief wage-earners or heads of households saying they felt poor always, sometimes and never whose household incomes were below and above the social standard of poverty

Net disposable household income as per cent of supplementary benefit scales plus housing cost	Always poor	Sometimes	Never
Under 100	19 (19)	11 (9)	6 (4)
100 - 139	46 (40)	42 (39)	16 (15)
140+	35 (40)	46 (52)	78 (81)
Total	100 (100)	100(100)	100 (100)
Number	153 (417)	328(967)	1343(3725)

Note: Percentages in brackets apply to all persons in such households.

Source: Attitudes to poverty series No. 4.
LSE. Ch.7 Series No. 7/46.

The majority of people, then, reflected in their attitudes to their living standards the resources which in fact they had at their command. This can be illustrated in considering answers to the question how well off they felt in relation to the average in the country. Table 11/7 shows that nearly half those with less than 50 per cent of the mean net-income worth last year of households of their type felt worse off and only 7 per cent better off. These figures were almost reversed among people with net income worth above the national mean.

TABLE 11/7

Per cent of chief wage-earners and housewives with low and high net income worth who said they were better off or worse off than or the same as the average in the country

Compared with the average in the country	Net income worth last year as per cent of the mean of household type					Total
	Under 50	50-89	90-109	110-199	200+	
Better off	7	11	18	40	48	20
The same	42	59	63	43	30	53
Worse off	47	23	13	11	11	21
Don't know	4	7	6	6	11	7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number	342	1126	425	546	142	3423

Source: Net income worth series No. 41.

Personal Denials of Poverty

The whole direction of our analysis so far has been to call attention to the strong relationship not just between objective deprivation and resources but subjective deprivation as well. The myth of the contented poor is not borne out by the data. Some saying they were deprived, however, had relatively high incomes. When attention is concentrated only on a single expression of deprivation this point can be illustrated quite dramatically. Thus, ~~54~~ ⁵⁵ per cent of chief wage-earners or heads of households with incomes below the social poverty standard, and 50 per cent of those with incomes on the margins of that standard, said they never felt poor. Moreover, 3 per cent with incomes more than twice the standard nonetheless said they always felt poor, and another 9 per cent felt poor sometimes. Or again, 56 per cent of those below the standard said they did not have difficulty in managing on their incomes and 17 per cent of those with incomes of more than twice the standard nonetheless said they did have difficulty in managing. The point can also be made in relation to Table 11/7. A small proportion of those with net income worth

Of those living below the social standard 21% fell into this category. The most striking fact is the way this percentage varies with age (see Table 11/8).

Table 11/8

% Percentage of those below social standard of poverty who never feel poor, according to age.

	<u>age.</u>			
	<u>under 30</u>	<u>30-49</u>	<u>50-64</u>	<u>65 plus.</u>
Per cent	7%	14	24	33
Numbers	8	8	18	47

Russell

of less than half the mean of their household type felt worse off than, and over two-fifths the same as, the national average.

These inconsistencies must not be exaggerated. In some measure they can be shown to be functions of the definition of income and of the income unit, the stability or regularity of income, and restricted study of a single question on subjective attitudes instead of a cluster of related questions, as well as the well-known problems of obtaining reliable information about on-going attitudes and income in surveys at a single point in time. This is not to deny the fact that some people feel they can manage and others feel they cannot on the same low incomes, or that some feel poor on incomes which are relatively high. But before resorting to theoretical supposition about groups in the population who seem to live at one standard and yet reflect another in their attitudes, close attention needs to be directed to the conventions and problems of measurement. And more evidence of a preliminary nature giving grounds for the existence of special social factors or pressures in such cases needs to be presented.

Attention therefore has to be paid to the fact that any measure of resources, even of the rather broad kind employed in this survey, may not cover all the types of resources available to some families in their specific situations, and that resources are differently distributed within some households, particularly between income units. [But we are still left with a genuine problem, even if limited in scope, of people with extremely low resources who deny feelings of deprivation. How can this be explained? We will consider those with incomes below the social standard of poverty who ~~denied they always~~ or ~~sometimes felt poor.~~ *said they never felt poor.*

[PLEASE NOTE: THE REMAINING PARAGRAPHS IN THIS SECTION NEED TO BE CHECKED WITH A FORTHCOMING PRINT-OUT OF INDIVIDUAL CASES]

*In working with income
units*

We found that they had three distinguishing features. First, stability of personal circumstances. By comparison with those living at the same low standard they had experienced fewer personal changes. Fewer had lived at the same address for ten years or more. Fewer were of the same social class as their fathers. Fewer said they were as well off as ten years earlier. To these might be added a point about stability in health. When allowing for age, fewer had any degree of incapacity. *not feasible.*

Second, more frequent social contacts. More had frequent contacts with relatives, gave hospitality to relatives and friends, went on a summer holiday and had evenings out. To a large extent this also explains the disproportionately large number of men who were not yet retired among them. So, paradoxically, although they seem to have had more opportunity to become aware through social interaction of their own low standards of living, such interaction seemed to have dispelled some of their own sense of deprivation.

Third, other feelings of deprivation. They were not lacking in any sense of deprivation. By comparison with people with higher incomes more of them said it was difficult to manage on their incomes, or felt worse off by comparison with relatives or neighbours. And by comparison with others living at the same low standard of living, who admitted to feeling poor always or sometimes, just as many, or nearly as many, confessed to other types of subjective deprivation.

Subjective Perceptions of Poverty in Society

Was subjective deprivation translated into perception of the extent and causes of poverty? One might suppose that more of those who felt poor would have recognised the existence of poverty in society, and that many more of them would have adopted sympathetic attitudes towards the problem. On the whole, our evidence contravenes such supposition. Table 11/8 shows there

were similar proportions among those feeling and not feeling poor who failed to recognise the existence of poverty today. The specific question was, "There's been a lot of talk about poverty. Do you think there's such a thing as real poverty these days?". When we came to examine those who were objectively poor, by the criterion of net disposable income we found that slightly fewer recognised the existence of poverty, compared with those who were not poor.

TABLE 11/8

Per cent of chief wage-earners or heads of households feeling poor
always, sometimes and never who believed there was
real poverty today

Real poverty today	Always poor	Sometimes poor	Never poor
No	38	36	35
Yes	61	59	63
DK	1	4	3
Total	100	100	100
Number	157	351	1459

Source: Attitudes to Poverty Series.

Broadly similar findings applied to their attitudes towards the poor. We had asked chief wage earners or heads of households to describe poverty and we also asked what they thought could be done about the problem. We attempted to code the different answers they gave in terms of attitude. We identified the following:

- (i) Punishing attitudes to poverty, for example, blaming it on large families, irresponsible unemployed and people "who live on the Welfare State (30 per cent);
- (ii) Punishing attitudes involving immigrants only (4 per cent);

(iii) Expansive or sympathetic attitudes towards all the poor or to different sections (31 per cent);

(iv) Expansive or sympathetic attitudes towards retirement pensioners only (23 per cent);

(v) Pessimistic or fatalistic attitudes towards eliminating poverty:

"there will always be those who won't work", "people who can't fend for themselves", "the poor will always be with us", "there are always going to be people who are hopeless at managing. Nothing can be done", (8 per cent).

(vi) Optimistic attitudes: the government was doing something about it, the problem was diminishing and prosperity becoming widespread (13 per cent);

(vii) Other attitudes: teaching people to manage their incomes better, educating people to work harder, helping poorer countries, stop helping poorer countries (1 per cent).

This must be recognised to be only a rough method of categorising opinion. Some items in the list tend to merge conceptually with others and there were of course statements betraying different kinds of attitudes and sometimes inconsistent attitudes. About 11 per cent of statements contained at least two of the above list and were counted twice.

There was not much variation between these expressions of attitude towards poverty and personal admissions or denial of poverty. There was a tendency for people who considered themselves to be poor to be more expansive towards poverty and the poor in general, as well as to retirement pensioners in particular, but it was not marked. There was an equivalent tendency for people who considered themselves to be poor to be less punishing towards those in poverty, and also to be less optimistic about the possibility of eliminating

the problem. When we turned to compare these attitudes with the objective criterion of net disposable incomes there was again surprisingly little variation. Fewer of those with incomes below than above the state poverty line thought that poverty existed (54 per cent compared with 62 per cent) and among those who did believe that it existed slightly more (about a third) took punishing attitudes towards the poor, and slightly less (about a quarter) took an expansive attitude towards the poor in general, though more of them continued to take an expansive attitude towards retirement pensioners. However, these figures have to be treated with caution, not only because of the difficulties of categorising the descriptive answers that were given to the questions but also the fact that a third of respondents denied there was any poverty and therefore did not express any attitudes towards the phenomenon.

A further set of data, however, is not subject to quite so many uncertainties. Chief wage-earners or heads of households were asked to say whose fault it was if there were any people in poverty: the Government, education, industry in not providing the right jobs, the people themselves who were in poverty, anything else, or a combination of these. The results are given in Table 11/9. The distribution of attitudes among those who felt poor all the time was rather different from those never feeling poor, but still not markedly different. Twenty-eight per cent, compared with 43 per cent, blamed people who were themselves poor, and 21 per cent, compared with 10 per cent, blamed the Government. Among all sections of the population there was a tendency to adopt individualistic rather than institutional explanations of poverty.

TABLE 11/9

Per cent of chief wage-earners or heads of households feeling poor
always, sometimes and never who blamed different factors for poverty

Fault for poverty	Always poor	sometimes poor	never poor
People themselves #	30	38	44
Government #	22	14	9
Education #	4	5	6
Employers #	3	3	2
Combinations of above	33	36	32
Other	7	5	6
Nothing	1	—	1
Total	100	100	100
Number	146	340	1412

These findings must be interpreted with caution. The survey method is not the best to elucidate attitudes which are subtle and which tend to vary with situational context. Indeed, at the design stage of the survey this assumption was consciously adopted and though efforts were made to introduce meaningful attitude questions at appropriate points in the interviews priority was given throughout to objective measures of resources and behaviour. Little previous work has been done to elucidate the problem and the data afford some basis for further work.

How might the pattern of findings which have been described be interpreted? We have found a marked objective basis, in terms both of measures of material or social deprivation and relative scale of incomes or other resources, for expressions of subjective deprivation. But these perceptions of personal circumstances appear to be large sealed off from more general or abstract perceptions of society. Some of the poor have come to conclude that poverty does not exist. Many of those who recognise that it exists have come to conclude that it is individually caused, through mixture of ill-luck, indolence and mismanagement and is not a collective condition determined principally by

institutionalised forces, particularly Government and industry. In this they share the perceptions of the better-off. Divided they blame individual behaviour and motivation and, unwittingly, [^]lend support to the existing institutional order. Perhaps the two straws of hope in our analysis are that there are significant proportions among them who are prepared to look to the Government for the blame for poverty and who are prepared to adopt expansive attitudes to their fellows.

Objective Deprivation and Lack of Income

The direction of this analysis leads unavoidably back to the substantial and all-important relationship that can be established between measures of objective deprivation and low income. It can be seen both for individual and grouped items. Thus, 42 per cent of housewives who said they often bought second-hand clothing were in households with incomes below the social standard of poverty, compared with 26 per cent of those never buying such clothing. Forty-four per cent of those not having a new winter coat in the last three years were in the same situation, compared with 21 per cent.

[EXTEND LATER]

The relationship tends to be stronger for grouped items. Thus there was a high correlation between net income worth (and total resources) and the number of selected durables and fitments in the home (Table A/23, Appendix 8). The correlation remains marked when different social customs and activities are brought into the picture. Table 11/10 gives emphatic endorsement of the effects of lack of resources not only in restricting the number of everyday possessions in the home but on diet, hospitality in the home, summer holidays, afternoons and evenings out and other social activities. Among people whose resources were less than half the mean for their household type 68 per cent were deprived in 5 or more of ten respects, compared with only 12 per cent of those with more than twice the mean. Only 9 per cent were deprived in fewer than three respects. Under personal perceptions of deprivation, therefore,

rest a whole range of objective manifestations of deprivation, and under them rest sheer lack of money resources and wealth.

TABLE 11/10

Per cent of people with low and high net income worth who were deprived in none or one or more of ten respects

Deprivation index	Net income worth last year as per cent of the mean of household type				
	Under 50	50-89	100-109	110-199	200+
0	0	2	4	6	15
1-2	9	25	39	51	50
3-4	23	40	41	33	22
5-6	37	24	16	7	8
7+	31	9	1	2	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Number	480	1866	706	841	225

Note: For list of 10 items, see pp.

Source: Net Income Worth Series, No. 24.

Summary

This chapter sets out to trace the connections between objective and subjective forms of deprivation. It starts by identifying different kinds of deprivation and shows that a substantial proportion in the population, including relatively more children and old people, especially the latter, experience several kinds.

A substantial proportion also feel poor in different senses. For example, 8 per cent of chief wage earners and heads of households, representing $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions, said they felt poor all the time, and 41 per cent of those aged 35 and over said they were not as well off as they had been ten years previously.

Objective and subjective forms of deprivation were found to be strongly correlated. The attitudes of the great majority of the sample towards their own living standards reflected the resources which in fact they had at their command. The myth of the contented poor is not borne out by the data.

Although many people living in poverty said in answer to one question that they never felt poor, they nonetheless recognised ~~in other ways that they were worse off than people with high or middle incomes or than they had been themselves in previous life.~~ The poor who expressed least deprivation tended to be people ~~whose personal circumstances had remained stable and who had more frequent, possibly compensatory, social contacts.~~

7 The marked tendency of the poor to admit to feelings of poverty and other forms of subjective deprivation did not, on the whole, extend to their perceptions of poverty in society at large. Compared with the rest of the population slightly fewer believed there was any poverty. Among those who did believe in its existence slightly more took punishing attitudes towards the poor in general, though not towards retirement pensioners. And though more of them attributed poverty to the fault of the Government and fewer to the fault of people who were themselves poor, they tended to believe that it was individually caused through a mixture of ill-luck, indolence and mismanagement, rather than being a collective condition induced by institutional forces such as Government and industry.

The whole direction of the analysis, however, is to show the powerful relationship between objective manifestations of deprivation and sheer lack of money resources and wealth, which underlie perceptions of personal deprivation.

APPENDIX 8

TABLE A/20

Per cent of chief wage-earners and housewives living in households with different numbers of durables in a list of ten who felt deprived in none or one or more of five different respects

Number out of total of 5 expressions of deprivation	Number of selected list of 10 durables in household			
	0 - 3	4 - 5	6 - 7	8+
None	28	33	42	53
1-2	37	38	41	35
3-5	35	28	17	12
Total	100	100	100	100
Number	200	406	665	752

TO BE SUBSTITUTED, TO INCLUDE A SMALL NUMBER OF HOUSEWIVES EXCLUDED FROM THE TABULATIONS. 20 2.3

Source: Attitudes to Poverty Series No. 63.

List of durables: television, record player, radio, refrigerator, washing machine, vacuum cleaner, telephone, central heating, armchairs, easy chairs for each member of the household, and living room carpet.