

UNIVERSITY OF YORK
Social Policy Research Unit

CORE POVERTY

Jonathan Bradshaw and Naomi Finch

Paper for a seminar at
Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion
LSE, London

7 March 2001

Social Policy Research Unit+University of York+Heslington+York+YO10 5DD+UK
phone ++441904433480; fax ++441904433477; email:jrb1@york.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

30 years ago, as a graduate student in the (new) Department of Social Administration and Social Work at the University of York, I (jb) wrote a section of an MPhil thesis on the *Needs of the over 80s in York* entitled *A Taxonomy of Social Need*. Kathleen Jones (supervisor) sent it to Richard Barker who published it in *New Society* (Bradshaw 1972) and Gordon McLaughlin also published a version in a Nuffield collection (Bradshaw 1972). As a result it got into the text books and as an external examiner I am still forced to read it fed back in undergraduate scripts. I never subsequently developed those ideas (but see Bradshaw 1994), partly because of the flaws that I recognised in the thinking and partly because the taxonomy was developed in the context of community care policies which have not since been a particular interest.

The heart of the argument in *The Taxonomy* was that there was a thing called *Real Need*. Real need was some combination of four types of need - normative need, felt need, demand and comparative need - each of which were different types of need and could be measured in different ways. These four elements of need overlapped and perhaps somewhere in the overlap real need could be found. It was suggested that policy makers allocating scarce resources should perhaps focus on real need - rather than (just) normative need or felt need or demand or comparative need.

Poverty is a real need and one that policy makers are now seeking to tackle. Poverty (if it means anything) is a categorical need - one that must be met for human beings to function. Poverty is also associated with all the major problems in Britain. Indeed there are strong reasons for suggesting (in the language of Beveridge's Giants) that we need to deal with want if we are to be successful in tackling ignorance, squalor, disease and possibly idleness.

But how do we define real need or core poverty?

In poverty research we have used a variety of measures, all of which have established traditions, well rehearsed rationales and a solid empirical basis. Appendix 1 to *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain* (Gordon et al 2000) reviewed them under the following headings

- Budget standards
- Income thresholds
- Consensual/social indicators
- Subjective measures
- Social exclusion

In this paper we will draw on these traditions (except budget standards) to explore the notion of Core Poverty. Part of the motivation for this is that those of us who do research on poverty and social security, until recently anyway, have found it difficult (impossible during the Tory years) to convince the policy community of the urgency of the problem of poverty. The finding that 35 per cent of children are living in families with equivalent income less than 50 per cent of the contemporary average after housing costs and including the self employed in 1998/99 - somehow has lacked moral force, persuasive power, credibility or even understanding! Though we have been critical of the detail (Bradshaw 2001) I applaud the efforts now being made by DSS to establish a set of indicators (in the *Opportunity for All* reports (2000)). This paper is a contribution to that activity. It is an exploration of a concept of real poverty based on ideas first outlined in *Taxonomy of Need*. It has been made possible by the Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusions in Britain (Gordon et al 2000). A brief summary of the PSE survey is given in the first three charts (in the PowerPoint version). A Rowntree report has been published (Gordon et al 2000). The data is now available at the Essex ESRC Survey Archive. The research team have written a host of working papers (available on the project web site (www.bristol.ac.uk/poverty/pse) and it is hoped that they will be collected together in an edited book (by Levitas and Pantazis and published by Policy Press).

REAL NEED

Real need exists when people are in some combination (to be decided) of

Normative need

Represented here by a lack of socially perceived necessities. This is based on the social indicator methodology pioneered by Townsend (1979) and developed especially by Mack and Lansley (1993) and Gordon and Pantazis (1998). For the PSE survey we developed a new and more elaborate index

than previously (including a separate index for children). We established the proportion of the general population who considered an item was a necessity in a survey that preceded the PSE survey. Only items that 50 per cent or more of the general population considered were necessities were included in the index. For the PSE survey Dave Gordon did some work on the validity of the index (and excluded some items, which did not contribute significantly). He also identified a threshold of lacking two or more items *and* having a low income as the PSE poverty threshold. In this paper we are covering low income in other ways so we merely count the proportion of households lacking 4 or more adult necessities. In the PSE survey 17.2 per cent lacked four or more necessities.

Felt need

Felt need is represented here by those who say that they feel poor. In the PSE survey we used three sets of questions to measure subjective poverty, including an attempt to operationalise the *Absolute* and *Overall* notions of poverty adopted by the UN World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen in 1995 (UN 1995). But this paper uses the results obtained from the following questions.

How many pounds a week, after tax, do you think are necessary to keep a household such as the one you live in, out of poverty? How far above or below that level would you say your household is?

A lot above that level of income

A little above

About the same

A little below

A lot below that level of income

Don't know

19.6 per cent were a little or a lot below that level of income.

Demand (expressed need)

Demand is represented (rather unsatisfactorily) by those receiving Income Support/income tested JSA. We do not know if others had expressed a need unsuccessfully. Also ideally we should have included those receiving any of the means-tested benefits (Family Credit, Housing Benefit/Council Tax benefit,

Disabled Working Allowance) but data on receipt of those is not available in the GHS. Of course receipt of the means tested benefits are not the only social security benefits that demonstrate an expressed need - even contributory benefits and non contributory non means-tested benefits require an individual to make a claim. However those expressing a need for means tested benefits are perhaps expressing a more urgent need and one that requires them to go through more hoops. Also we know that there is a serious problem of non take up of Income Support (some people eligible {in need of it} do not claim it). 8.3 per cent were receiving IS/JSA.

Comparative Need

Represented here by those who have a relatively low income - those households with net equivalent household income less than 60 per cent of the median before housing costs. The study employed a variety of equivalence scales, including one created especially, based on budget standards research. But for this paper we have used the modified OECD scale. 18.8 per cent of households were poor using this measure.

We should acknowledge that the empirical representation of each of these concepts is flawed - partly by the fact that they inevitably involve a judgement about the threshold that should be applied.

CORE POVERTY¹

Table 1 shows the proportion lacking each of the core poverty components. With the exception of the proportion on Income Support, the proportion poor by each measure is fairly similar.

¹ This analysis is based on survey data which actually excludes many of the core poor - those living on the streets, in hostels, receptions centres, hospitals, prisons and especially asylum seekers living on Jack Straw's vouchers.

Table 1. Poverty rate by each measure of poverty

Poverty Measure	% poor
Normative Poverty (lacking 4+ socially perceived necessities)	17.2
Felt Poverty (subjective measure)	19.6
Expressed Poverty/Demand (receiving Income Support)	8.3
Comparative Poverty (equivalent income before housing costs less than 60% median)	18.8

However it can be seen in Table 2 that while 34 per cent are poor on at least one measure, only 2.4 per cent are poor on all four measures simultaneously. If Demand (the Income Support dimension) is excluded 33 per cent would be poor on at least one of the measures and 5.7 per cent would be poor on all three measures. These results indicate a quite extraordinary lack of overlap between measures which have and are used to represent poverty. Indeed our colleague Professor Roy Carr Hill has pointed out to us that if the measures were completely uncorrelated one would expect to obtain a distribution which is very close to the one obtained. The actual and predicted proportions are given in the table.

The logistic regression in Appendix 3 shows that the odds of those poor on one dimension being poor on each of the other dimensions is statistically significantly higher in all dimensions. However there are differences between the measures. In the case of normative poverty, comparative poverty adds rather little after felt poverty and expressed poverty. In the case of felt poverty the closest association is with normative poverty and less with expressed poverty. Expressed poverty and comparative poverty are closely associated but expressed poverty is less closely associated with felt poverty and comparative poverty less closely associated with normative poverty.

Table 2: Number of measures on which respondents are poor

	Including Income support		Excluding Income support	
	Actual	Expected	Actual	Expected
Poor on at least one	34.0	34.0	32.9	32.9
Poor on a least two	18.1	11.6	16.1	10.9
Poor on at least three	8.0	3.9	5.7	3.6
Poor on four	2.4	1.5	-	

Note: Expected under hypothesis of NO ZERO correlation between variables

What are the reasons for this?

- Some lack of overlap is inevitable given the different proportions included by each of the thresholds used - especially when the analysis includes the smaller percentage on Income Support.
- Then there are cases in transition. For example there are households who have recently retired or lost a worker who are now currently income poor but not (yet) necessities poor - they still have the assets acquired in better times. In contrast there are households who have recently entered employment for example who are not now income poor but who have not (yet) been able to gather together the necessities that they lacked while unemployed.
- Then there is “false consciousness”. In the subjective measure people may claim to be in poverty when they are not (by other dimensions) and people may not feel they are in poverty because they have limited understanding of relative living standards. As we shall see per cent of the sample said that they felt poor without being poor on any of the other dimensions and 0.6 per cent did not feel poor despite being poor on all the other dimensions and 14.6 per cent did not feel poor although they were poor on at least one of the other dimensions.
- Another kind of false consciousness - due to low aspirations can occur in relation to the necessities measure - some will say that they lack necessities but because they don't want them rather than because they cannot afford them. The democratic majority view is that they should want them. It can be seen in Appendix 1 that in general pensioners are more likely than non pensioners to say that they ‘don't have and don't want’ necessities and as we shall see, they are less likely to be defined as normatively poor.
- Then there are technical explanations to do with the measures themselves. One of these which

is likely to be important is the fact that the GHS income variable is before housing costs. At a given before housing costs equivalent income level, households with high housing costs are more likely to feel poor and lack social necessities than households with low housing costs. In our analysis of the PSE survey we found that London is a region with a comparatively low income poverty rate but a comparatively high socially perceived necessities poverty rate. This may be due to the impact of housing costs.

So there are a number of reasonable explanations for the lack of overlap in the households defined as poor by each of our measures. But how do we use these measures to isolate the core poor?

There seems to us to be two approaches. One is to take a straight cumulative approach. The other is to give priority to one measure over another. We explore each of these approaches in turn.

Cumulative approach

The cumulative approach assumes that a person who is poor on all our measures is more likely to be core poor than a person poor on only one of the measures. Also that being poor on two is more likely to be core poverty than being poor on one, and less likely than being poor on three or four. The more components that define a person as poor the more likely they are to be in core poverty - following these assumptions normative need, felt need, expressed need and comparative need can be treated as ordinal dimensions.

One argument in support of this approach is that we cannot rely on a single measure if we are in search of core poverty. To do so is to rely too much on the reliability and validity of the measure - (such as the income after housing costs issue discussed above). Triangulating (or even squaring) avoids being misled by such errors.

Another argument is that the results are not only more reliable but poverty found by more than one dimension is also more severe. For example having a poverty income is worse, if you also don't have the assets (to fall back on) and even worse if you also feel poor. Or if you lack necessities but do not

feel poor is that as a bad as lacking (the same) necessities and feeling poor?

We can explore this approach to core poverty in three ways.

First by examining the characteristics of the poor as measured using each of the single dimensions and the cumulative dimensions and comparing those characteristics with the non poor. The purpose is to discover whether the cumulative dimensions are better than the single dimensions at differentiating between the poor and non poor. This is tackled in Table 3 and using logistic regression in Appendix 2 a and b.

The first thing to note in Table 3 and in the logistic regression in Appendix 2b is that each of the poverty dimensions produces a poverty population with different characteristics. Thus for example the odds of being comparatively poor are higher for pensioners than is the case with the normative measure. In contrast a higher proportion of the expressed poor are lone parents. Families with children are more likely to be in felt poverty.

The characteristics of the non poor are found in the right hand column of the table. In general the cumulative dimensions do produce a group whose characteristics are more unlike the non poor than any of the single dimensions. The same is true for those poor on 3/4 dimensions compared with those poor on 2/3 dimensions. This is the case for all characteristics except the age of the youngest child in Table 3 where the normative poverty measure gives a higher proportion of young children.

One problem with this analysis that should be acknowledged is that the group poor on four dimensions is very small only 2.4 per cent of the total sample - 29 cases - and for the rest of the analysis we shall use the 3+ cumulative measure for comparisons.

Table 3: Characteristics of the poor defined by different dimensions

	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Comparatively poor	Poor on at least 1	Poor on at least 2	Poor on at least 3	Poor on all 4	Not Poor (poor on 0)
Gender	41	42	34	39	45	36	31	21	51
Male	59	58	66	61	55	65	70	79	49
Female									
Age	8	8	14	9	8	9	8	7	6
Under 25	68	62	59	45	56	59	68	82	65
25-59	24	31	27	46	36	32	23	11	29
60+									
Ethnicity	88	94	95	93	94	93	94	86	99
White	12	7	6	7	6	8	6	14	1
Non-white									
Marital Status									
Single	16	17	32	19	16	17	22	33	13
Married	44	43	19	41	46	39	31	17	65
Cohabiting	13	11	5	5	8	10	8	3	11
Sep/Divorced	18	18	31	16	15	21	30	40	6
Widowed	9	11	14	19	14	13	10	7	5
Family type	21	22	27	31	25	25	22	21	14
Single	21	24	16	27	25	25	19	10	36
Couple no children	26	25	6	16	24	22	18	7	25
Couple with children	13	12	24	13	10	17	28	55	2
Lone parent	19	17	27	13	16	11	13	7	24
Other									
Number of adults in household									
1	33	34	51	45	35	42	51	76	16
2	54	59	38	48	56	53	45	21	65
3+	13	7	11	8	9	5	4	3	19
Number of children in household									
0	51	57	58	64	61	55	47	38	67
1	19	23	20	14	18	22	26	24	12
2	14	11	11	12	13	13	14	17	16
3+	16	9	11	10	8	10	14	21	6
Youngest child									
0-4	52	47	35	39	43	48	44	50	38
5-11	35	30	44	37	36	34	35	39	30
12+	14	23	20	24	21	18	21	11	32
Tenure									
Not social	56	58	37	54	58	48	38	25	95
Social	44	43	64	46	42	52	62	75	5
Employment status									
Work full time	28	26	8	14	25	18	10	7	52
Work part time	13	12	6	9	12	12	9	7	19
Retired	19	25	20	38	30	26	16	7	19

	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Comparatively poor	Poor on at least 1	Poor on at least 2	Poor on at least 3	Poor on all 4	Not Poor (poor on 0)
Student	3	3	4	3	4	2	2	3	2
Does not work	36	33	62	36	30	42	64	76	9
Household Employment Status									
No workers	33	35	62	33	28	38	64	86	6
Workers	51	44	18	29	45	38	22	7	78
Retired	17	21	20	38	27	24	14	7	17
Age Left School									
0-16	82	81	87	80	78	83	89	93	67
16+	17	17	12	17	20	16	10	7	33
Still in education	1	2	1	4	3	2	1	0	1

Second, in Table 4 we compare the attitudes of the poor and non poor to poverty related matters. Again on most dimensions the cumulative dimensions produce proportions which are most different from those of the non poor. The poor on 3/4 dimensions are more likely to have *lived in poverty often or most of their life*, to think that *poverty is increasing* in the past and in the future, to believe that injustice is the main cause of poverty and to be dissatisfied with the place they live in. It does not appear that these attitudes are merely a reflection of the contribution of the felt poverty dimensions - the felt poverty dimension produces a lower proportion on all these attitudes than the cumulative poverty dimensions.

Table 4: Attitudes of the poor by various dimensions of poverty

	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Comparative poverty	Poor on at least 1	Poor on at least 2	Poor on at least 3	Poor on all 4	Not poor
<i>Looking over your life, how often have there been times in your life when you think you have lived in poverty by the standards of that time?</i>									
Often/Most of the time	24	23	22	13	17	24	24	25	5
<i>Over the last ten years, do you think poverty has been</i>									
Increasing	53	55	50	53	54	62	60	69	43
<i>Over the next ten years, do you think poverty will</i>									
Increase	47	48	47	43	47	53	52	55	39
<i>Why in your opinion are there people who live in poverty</i>									
Because there is much injustice in society	35	36	33	34	33	35	40	38	34
<i>How satisfied are you with this area as a place to live?</i>									
Dissatisfied	21	17	23	16	15	20	25	31	7

Third we consider how social exclusion is associated with each of the dimensions of poverty. Social exclusion was operationalised in three ways - as exclusion from the labour market; as exclusion from services; and as exclusion from social relations. For the purposes of this analysis we have reduced the complexity of the PSE indicators of social exclusion to eight dimensions. It can be seen in Table 5 that the cumulatively poor are much more likely than the other poor and the non poor to be labour market excluded, unable to participate in three or more activities, disengaged and confined. However they are no more likely than the normatively poor to be service excluded and they are less likely than the non poor to have no contact with family or friends daily or to lack support in four areas.

Table 5: Poor by various dimensions and social exclusion

	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Relatively poor	Poor on at least 1	Poor on at least 2	Poor on at least 3	Poor on 4	Not Poor (poor on 0)
Labour market excluded	30	32	58	30	26	36	61	79	4
Service excluded									
<i>Lacking two or more services</i>	46	37	32	33	35	40	46	45	18
Exclusion from social relations									
<i>Unable to participate in three or more activities</i>	81	56	52	40	47	67	78	90	7
<i>No contact with family or friends daily</i>	13	12	10	9	11	8	9	10	12
<i>Lack of support in four areas</i>	19	20	16	23	23	18	16	14	24
<i>Disengaged from all activities</i>	22	17	23	18	16	19	19	24	7
Confined	45	60	52	44	52	63	72	86	17

We conclude from these results that the cumulative method has something going for it. Those who are defined as poor on 3 or 4 dimensions are different from those defined as poor on only one of the dimensions and they are also more unlike those who are not poor.

Merit arguments

But let us turn to consider the arguments based on merit - that one poverty dimension has more merit than another. There are good reasons to think that this might be true for technical reasons - for example: household income is subject to unreliable recall, out of date, fluctuates, equivalence scales are highly contestable, the 60 per cent of median threshold is totally arbitrary etc

But one measure of poverty might have more merit for more substantive reasons - for example: can a person be defined as poor if s/he does not feel poor - feeling poor may be a necessary condition if not

a sufficient condition. So anyone who is core poor may have to be poor on the subjective dimension.

For another example lacking four socially perceived necessities is a direct indicator of poverty whereas having a low income is an indirect measure. Or referring back to the volatility arguments current income poverty is not a strong enough indicator of actual deprivation.

Again there appears to be a good deal to be said for some of these arguments. But how are policy makers to decide which permutation is core poverty. Table 5 presents all possible permutations in a matrix with the proportions against each permutation. It can be seen that there are some very small permutations:

- only 0.8 per cent are poor on all the dimensions except comparative (income poor)
- only 0.9 per cent are poor on all dimensions except normative (lacking necessities)
- only 0.5 per cent lack necessities and are on Income Support but do not feel poor or have a low income
- only 0.3 per cent are on IS and feel poor but do not lack necessities or have a low income and
- only 0.6 per cent are poor on all dimensions except felt poverty.

Table 6: Poverty rates by permutations of measures

Group number	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Comparative poverty	Poverty rate
1	yes	yes	yes	yes	2.4
2	yes	yes	yes	no	0.8
3	yes	yes	no	no	4.5
4	yes	no	no	no	3.6
5	no	yes	yes	yes	0.9
6	no	no	yes	yes	1.2
7	no	no	no	yes	6.5
8	no	yes	no	yes	2.5
9	yes	no	yes	no	0.5
10	no	yes	yes	no	0.3
11	no	no	yes	no	1.1
12	yes	no	no	yes	1.1
13	yes	yes	no	yes	3.2
14	yes	no	yes	yes	0.6
15	no	yes	no	no	4.7
16	no	no	no	no	66

Which of these permutations are most likely to be in core poverty? We explored the following three permutations

- Given the problems with income discussed above we take a group that includes those who are

not poor on income but are poor on the normative and felt dimensions. This includes some who are and who are not on Income Support. Groups 1, 2, 3, 13 = 10.9 per cent.

- Given the problem of false consciousness we take a group who are normatively poor and income poor but not necessarily felt poor or on Income Support. Groups 1, 12, 13, 14 = 7.3 per cent.
- Following the logic of felt poverty being a necessary but not sufficient condition we include all permutation cases feeling poor, if they are also poor on one other measure. Groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 13 = 14.6 per cent.

How do these groups compare? In Tables 7, 8 and 9 we have compared these groups with the not poor and the group which is poor on three or more dimensions (out of four rather than four on the grounds that the number poor on four dimensions is too small). It can be seen in Table 7 that the characteristics of the poor defined by our three selected merit groups is in general not as different from the non poor as the cumulatively poor. Appendix 2c presents the results of a logistic regression of the odds of being poor by socio economic group.

On social attitudes in Table 8 the picture is more mixed. On the social exclusion dimensions in Table 9 the cumulative poor group is more likely to be labour market excluded and disengaged from civic activities.

Table 7: Characteristics of the poor defined by different dimensions

% of poor who are	Normative and felt poor	Normative and income poor	Felt poor +1	Poor on 3 (out of 4) measures	Not poor
female	67	65	65	70	49
non white	8	10	7	6	1
lone parent	19	26	17	28	2
children present	53	52	47	53	33
retired	14	18	21	14	17
workless	39	56	37	64	6

Table 8 : Attitudes of the poor by various dimensions of poverty

	Normative and felt poor	Normative and income poor	Felt poor +1	Poor on at least 3 out of 4	Not poor
<i>Looking over your life, how often have there been times in your life when you think you have lived in poverty by the standards of that time?</i>					
Often/Most of the time	30	24	26	24	5
<i>Over the last ten years, do you think poverty has been</i>					
Increasing	66	62	63	60	43
<i>Over the next ten years, do you think poverty will</i>					
Increase	59	53	56	52	39
<i>Why in your opinion are there people who live in poverty</i>					
Because there is much injustice in society	38	40	37	40	34
<i>How satisfied are you with this area as a place to live?</i>					
Dissatisfied	21	24	20	25	7

Table 9: Poor by various dimensions and social exclusion

	Normative and Felt poverty	Normative and Income poverty	Felt poverty +1	Poor on 3 (out of 4) measures	Not Poor (poor on 0)
Labour market excluded	37	53	35	61	4
Service excluded					
<i>Lacking two or more services</i>	47	48	43	46	18
Exclusion from social relations					
<i>Unable to participate in three or more activities</i>	83	81	69	78	7
<i>No contact with family or friends daily</i>	10	9	8	9	12
<i>Lack of support in four areas</i>	15	18	16	16	24
<i>Disengaged from all activities</i>	21	21	18	19	7
Confined	78	73	66	72	17

CONCLUSION

In this paper we have explored the overlap between four dimensions of poverty. We have found that there is, on the face of it, extraordinarily little overlap in the group of people defined as poor by four of the dimensions that are generally used to measure poverty. There are reasons for this lack of overlap, connected to the reliability and validity of the different measures. However the people who are defined as living in poverty by different measures of poverty are different. This inevitably means that the policy response to poverty will be different depending on which measure is employed.

In the face of this evidence, policy makers may well ask the research community to identify who are the core poor. We have approached an answer to this question by analysing overlap in two ways. First by exploring the cumulation of dimensions of poverty. We have found that the more dimensions that people are poor on, the more unlike the non poor and the poor on only one dimension they are - in their characteristics, in their social attitudes and in their social exclusion. Second by treating particular dimensions as meriting more attention than others. We explored three permutations of this type and concluded that while they were more unlike the non poor than those poor on a single dimension they were not as unlike the non poor as the cumulatively poor were. These results indicate that the cumulatively poor might be a better way of identifying the core poor than giving priority to one dimension over another.

This conclusion is not particularly original in itself - the work evaluating the Irish poverty strategy has involved combining measures of poverty (Layte, Nolan and Whelan 2000) and Statistics Netherlands analysis of the European Community Household Panel Survey has compared EU poverty on more than one dimension at a time (Dirven et al 2000).

There are implications from this for the national research effort on poverty. The main data set used to estimate poverty rates, the Family Resources Survey, only covers the comparative and demand measures explored here, though there is some data on access to assets. It is recommended that the FRS should be adapted to include the normative and subjective measures that were included in the PSE Survey. It is possible to establish normative poverty using a much shorter set of items than that included

in the PSE survey and the subjective questions are also very short. It is also suggested that other key national data sets such as the British Household Panel Survey should include these dimensions of poverty. For reasons that remain obscure the BHPS dropped the subjective poverty question after 1996 and this was probably a mistake. In general, future studies of poverty and of the extent to which poverty is being relieved should present results using a combination of measures.

REFERENCES

- Bradshaw, J.R. (1972) 'The concept of social need', *New Society*, 496, 640-643
- Bradshaw, J.R. (1972) 'The taxonomy of social need', in McLachlan, G. (ed), *Problems and Progress in Medical Care*, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Bradshaw, J.R. (1994) 'The conceptualisation and measurement of need: a social policy perspective', pp 45-57 in Popay, J. and Williams, G. (eds), *Researching the People's Health*, Routledge: London
- Bradshaw, J. Ed (2001) *Poverty: the outcomes for children*, London Family Policy Studies Centre.
- Bradshaw, J. (2001) Poverty: the outcomes for children in CASE/DSS, *Indicators of progress: a discussion of approaches to monitor the Government's strategy to tackle poverty and social exclusion; Report of a workshop held on 19 July 2000 organised by DSS and CASE*, <http://www.dss.gov.uk/publications/dss/2001/iop/iop.pdf>, London: DSS. pp. 19-30.
- Dirven, HJ et al. (2000) Income Poverty and Social Exclusion in the EU Member States: TASK 4. Paper presented at the Working Group Statistics on Income, Social Exclusion and Poverty, April 20000.
- Eurostat (2000) *European Social Statistics: Income, Poverty and Social Exclusion*, EC/Eurostat.
- Gordon, D. et al (2000) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Gordon, D. and Pantazis, C. (eds), *Breadline Britain in the 1990s*, Department of Social Policy and Planning, University of Bristol: Bristol
- Layte, R. Nolan, B. and Whelan, C. (2000) Poverty and affluence in Ireland: a comparison of income and deprivation approaches to the measurement of poverty, in Gordon, D. and Townsend, P. (eds) *Breadline Europe: The Measurement of Poverty*, Bristol: The Policy Press
- Mack, J. and Lansley, S. (1985) *Poor Britain*, George Allen and Unwin
- Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Allen Lane.
- United Nations (1995) *The Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action: World Summit for Social development 6-12 March 1995*, New York, UN Department of Publications

Appendix 1: Socially perceived necessities -don't have and don't want

	Don't have don't want	
	Non pensioners	Pensioners
Damp-free home	2.9	1.7
Beds and bedding for everyone	0.2	0.5
Heating to warm living areas of the house	0.4	0.7
Visiting friends or family in hospital	7.8	9.1
Warm, waterproof coat	2.8	1.5
Two meals per day	3.7	1.2
Medicines prescribed by doctor	6.2	3.0
Refrigerator	1.2	1.7
Fresh fruit and vegetables daily	6.6	6.4
Celebrations on special occasions	1.2	5.9
Replace broken electrical goods	6.0	6.7
Visits to friends or family	1.4	7.1
Washing machine	1.2	6.9
Money to keep home in a decent state of decoration	1.2	2.7
Meat fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day	4.0	4.2
Insurance of contents of dwelling	4.5	6.1
Attending weddings and funerals	2.9	4.4
Visits to school, eg. Sports day	28.9	43.4
Hobby or leisure activity	19.3	17.8
Two pairs of all weather shoes	3.9	3.4
Collect children from school	32.4	46.0
Carpets in living rooms and bedrooms	2.6	1.2
Telephone	0.6	0.5
Deep freezer/ fridge-freezer	1.2	1.7
Appropriate clothes for job interviews	1.9	5.1
Friends or family round for a meal	7.6	16.3
Regular savings for 'rainy days'	4.3	13.4
A television	0.7	0.7
A dictionary	5.7	7.6
Replace worn out furniture	8.3	19.3
An outfit for social occasions	2.9	5.2
Money to spend on self weekly	3.2	2.0
Presents for friends and family yearly	0.6	1.8
A holiday away from home once a year	10.2	24.3
<i>Having a daily newspaper</i>	<i>40.1</i>	<i>27.7</i>
<i>Attending place of worship</i>	<i>67.6</i>	<i>56.1</i>
<i>New, not second-hand, clothes</i>	<i>3.9</i>	<i>4.2</i>
<i>Roast joint/vegetarian equivalent once a week</i>	<i>12.0</i>	<i>9.4</i>
<i>A evening out once a fortnight</i>	<i>16.2</i>	<i>39.4</i>
<i>A dressing gown</i>	<i>14.4</i>	<i>5.6</i>
<i>Coach/train fares to visit friends and family quarterly</i>	<i>47.4</i>	<i>53.9</i>
<i>Car</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>28.7</i>
<i>Microwave oven</i>	<i>11.2</i>	<i>27.5</i>
<i>A meal in a restaurant/pub monthly</i>	<i>16.1</i>	<i>31.5</i>
<i>Tumble dryer</i>	<i>27.6</i>	<i>49.3</i>
<i>Going to the pub once a fortnight</i>	<i>33.3</i>	<i>63.4</i>
<i>Holidays abroad once a year</i>	<i>17.3</i>	<i>43.2</i>
<i>Video cassette recorder</i>	<i>3.3</i>	<i>18.5</i>
<i>CD Player</i>	<i>8.9</i>	<i>48.3</i>

<i>Home computer</i>	30.0	74.2
<i>Dishwasher</i>	49.7	75.1
<i>Mobile phone</i>	37.0	76.6
<i>Satellite television</i>	47.7	78.2
<i>Access to the internet</i>	45.0	79.2

Source: PSE Survey (Gordon et al 1999)

Appendix 2a: Logistic regressions of the odds of being poor by each of the single measures

	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Comparatively poor
Gender				
Male	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Female	1.22	1.30	1.31	1.14
Ethnicity				
White	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Not white	3.40***	2.18*	0.33	2.83**
Family type				
Single	1.00***	1.00**	1.00***	1.00***
Couple no children	0.61*	0.68	0.39**	0.50**
Couple with children	0.64	1.51	0.83***	0.18**
Lone parent				
Other	2.15	3.69*	2.96	0.94
	0.55*	0.71	1.20	0.33**
Number of children in household				
0	1.00**	1.00***	1.00***	1.00***
1	2.22*	1.98	4.97**	5.87***
2	1.60	0.62	3.97*	5.49**
3+	4.08***	0.98	13.05***	12.36***
Household Employment Status				
Workers	1.00***	1.00***	1.00***	1.00***
No workers	5.24***	6.81***	41.18***	12.42***
Retired	1.57	2.56***	8.94***	9.39***

* < 0.05 ** < 0.01; *** < 0.001

Appendix 2b: Logistic regressions of the odds of being poor by the cumulative measures

	Poor on at least 1	Poor on at least 2	Poor on at least 3	Poor on all 4	Poor on 0 (not poor)
Gender					
Male	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Female	1.03	1.63**	1.65	2.30	0.97
Ethnicity					
White	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Not white	4.04**	3.53**	0.63	1.17	0.25**
Family type					
Single	1.00***	1.00***	1.00***	1.00**	1.00***
Couple no children	0.50***	0.63	0.57	0.36	2.01***
Couple with children	0.83	0.38	0.18*	0.33	1.21
Lone parent	2.71	2.36	1.20	7.10	0.37
Other	0.60	0.28**	0.30*	0.25	1.67
Number of children in household					
0	1.00*	1.00***	1.00**	1.00	1.00*
1	2.34*	5.44**	11.69**	0.76	0.43*
2	1.24	2.13	5.49*	0.75	0.81
3+	1.74	4.36*	19.85***	3.57	0.58
Household Employment Status					
Workers	1.00***	1.00***	1.00	1.00***	1.00***
No workers	8.92***	10.22***	31.96***	42.14***	0.11***
Retired	4.19***	3.32***	4.30**	3.61	0.24***

* < 0.05 ** < 0.01; *** < 0.001

Appendix 2c: Logistic regressions of the odds of being poor on the merit measures.

	Normative and felt poverty	Normative and income poverty	Felt poverty + 1
Gender			
Male	1.00	1.00	1.00
Female	1.75**	1.26	1.65**
Ethnicity			
White	1.00	1.00	1.00
Not white	2.17	2.06	2.13
Family type			
Single	1.00**	1.00**	1.00***
Couple no children	0.67	0.45*	0.77
Couple with children	0.59	0.37	0.46
Lone parent	1.24	1.62	1.41
Other	0.28**	0.32*	0.28**
Number of children in household			
0	1.00**	1.00*	1.00***
1	4.38*	3.71	5.62**
2	1.61	2.98	1.93
3+	2.68	8.60**	3.23
Household Employment Status			
Workers	1.00***	1.00***	1.00***
No workers	5.49***	15.97***	7.18***
Retired	1.25	4.24**	2.19**

* < 0.05 ** < 0.01; *** < 0.001

Appendix 3: Odds of being poor on the other dimensions of poverty

	Normative poverty	Felt poverty	Expressed poverty	Comparatively poor
Normative poverty		1.00 11.94***	1.00 3.47***	1.00 1.76**
Felt poverty	1.00 11.94***		1.00 1.88*	1.00 3.96***
Expressed poverty	1.00 3.48***	1.00 1.78***		1.00 6.43***
Comparatively poverty	1.00 1.78**	1.00 3.97***	1.00 6.48***	

* < 0.05 ** < 0.01; *** < 0.001