

## Part 1

‘Poverty’ can be difficult to precisely describe and there is much disagreement amongst academics regarding its definition (Lister, 2004). Nonetheless, much research has been done on poverty over the last century (Booth, 1897; Abel-Smith and Townsend, 1965; Niemietz, 2011). Lister (2004) draws attention to the difference in the way poverty is formally defined for academic and policy purposes, and informally discussed in a social context. Her view is that it is ‘in essence... about the meanings of poverty- both to those who experience it and to different groups in society’ (Lister, 2004, p.4.). Furthermore, there is a variety of academic literature which has explored what the reality of poverty can be like for people (Lister, 2004). Data collected from the Office for National Statistics (2019) showed that poverty is about more than just money, but living conditions too. Being able to measure poverty can help policy-makers to target support for individuals, families and groups that fall within the defined structures of what constitutes poverty (Lister, 2004). However, based on the data that was collected, research showed that the support did not always meet the individuals’ most in need (Lister, 2004)

The first time there had been a focus on what constituted poverty was during the 1800s when Booth’s (1897) survey of London was undertaken. Following his research, he developed a component called the ‘line of poverty’ which identifies the connection between income and being able to afford the resources needed for individuals and families to survive (Booth, 1897). When talking to the Royal Statistical Society in 1887, Booth states:

“By the word poor I mean to describe those who have a fairly regular though bare income, such as 18 shillings to 2 shillings per week for a moderate family, and by ‘very poor’ those who fall below this standard, whether from chronic irregularity of work, sickness or a large number of young children.”

(1887, cited in Glennerster *et al.*, 2004, p.19)

Gillie’s (1996) definition of poverty was intended to help society to develop a better understanding of the complexities of life experienced through poverty. Booth’s (1897) research

highlighted how legislation and policy makers often viewed poverty in a different way to society. Booth (1897) also demonstrates how the idea of being poor was defined by the School Board Employees and based on a survey of the homes they had visited. However, Gillie (1996) noted that the main issue at this time was the amount of people occupying individual houses, which were often too small for the number they housed. Additionally, the research revealed that servants were not included in the definition of poverty as they lived in the homes of their rich employers (Gillie, 1996). Gillie (1996) also found that Booth's (1897) research examined the income and living conditions of each household, as well as exploring the housing conditions, but did not investigate issues around employment, the number of children in each household, or matters regarding children's health and education.

Booth (1887) suggested that it would be hard for families and individuals to gain resources to live well in society, due to the low income they were living on not being enough to cover their everyday needs. Booth (1887, pp. 147-148) also noted that it had been suggested the lower-class was in poverty due to 'drink and thriftlessness'. However, he believed that this was only a minority and that this was not the sole reason the lower-class were living in poverty (Booth, 1887). Around the same time as Booth (1897), Rowntree (1901) carried out his own study, 'Visual Identification' in 1899, by focusing on families from his home town of York (Veit-Wilson, 1986, p. 92). Rowntree (1901, p. 114) collected data from families, to identify whether they were 'living in obvious want and squalor'. Veit-Wilson (1986) explains that although Rowntree's (1901) research did not focus on money, both Booth (1887) and Rowntree (1901) found that this did contribute to poverty. Through research, Rowntree (1901) became one of the first academics to clarify his theory of poverty. He defined the difference between 'Primary and Secondary poverty' as families that could not afford 'necessities' on their income, and those who could. Rowntree (1901) suggested that 'Primary poverty' is when families struggle to purchase food and basic goods for survival, due to insufficient income, and 'Secondary poverty' as families whose income is enough to cover their basic survival needs, so long as it is not spent on other things, useful or otherwise (Rowntree, 1901). Since then this 'Subsistence Standard' has been applied by social scientists and the Government (Abel-Smith & Townsend, 1965). Rowntree's second survey in 1936, helped to broaden the understanding of the term 'necessities' by including things such as a radio, newspaper and gifts for children (Rowntree, 1941). However, the underlying concept of poverty, described as insufficient material resources to meet one's needs, remained. Since then, Booth (1887) and Rowntree's (1901)

concept of poverty appears to have been widely accepted. Abel-Smith and Townsend's (1965) research used National Assistance Rates to indicate the poverty line and included a discussion on whether including income data, of money coming in and out, would give a clearer measurement of the standard of living for families. Yet, according to Abel-Smith and Townsend (1965), poverty was still seen as not having enough material resources. Moreover, Hills (2004) and Alcock (2006) commented on the different approaches to definitions and measurements of poverty as a lack of resources. Niemiez (2011) further reviewed the Government's approach to poverty measurement, and the relevant income measure, but did not question the link between poverty and a lack of resources.

Townsend (1979) had previously proposed that the concept of 'resources' should replace the term 'income' when defining families and individuals as being in poverty. He suggested that people are in poverty

...when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary... in the societies to which they belong.

(Townsend, 1979)

Yet mostly what he lists under the heading of 'resources' are material resources, including income, assets, and home production (family, personal leisure, self-employment) (Townsend, 1979). Townsend (1979) also suggests 'the value of public social services' (health and education), suggesting a multidimensional approach, but he does not discuss this further in his 1979 book. In his later work, Townsend (1987) distinguishes clearly between concepts of poverty and ('as important') wider deprivation, including social deprivation (isolation, discrimination, lack of opportunities for education or employment). He argues that poverty (a lack of resources) is just one of the factors leading to deprivation: '[Deprivation] turns on the level of conditions or activities experienced, [poverty] on the incomes and other resources directly available' (Townsend, 1987, pp. 125-146).

**Reference List:**

- Abel-Smith, B., & Townsend, P. (1965) 'The Poor and the Poorest'. London: G Bell and Sons Ltd.
- Alcock, P. (2006) *Understanding Poverty*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Booth, C. (1897) *Life and Labour of the People in London, Ix: Comparisons, Survey and Conclusions*. Macmillan and Company. London.
- Gillie, A. (1996) 'The Origin of the Poverty Line', *The Economic History Review*, 49(4), pp. 715–730.
- Glennerster, H. (2004) 'The Context for Rowntree's Contribution'. In H. Glennerster, J. Hills, D. Piachaud, & J. Webb (Eds.), (2004) *One Hundred Years of Poverty and Policy*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Hills, J. (2004) *Inequality and the State*; Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Lister, R. (2004) *Poverty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Niemietz, K. (2011) 'A New Understanding of Poverty'; London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2019) *Data Relating to Poverty*. Available at: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/> (Accessed: 3 December 2019).
- Rowntree, B. S. (1901) *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*. London: Macmillan.
- Rowntree, B.S. (1941) *Poverty and Progress: A Second Social Survey of York*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Townsend, P. (1987) *Deprivation*, *Journal of Social Policy*, 15(2), pp. 125–146.
- Veit-Wilson, J. (1986) 'Paradigms of Poverty: A Rehabilitation of B S Rowntree', *Journal of Social Policy*, 15(1), pp. 69–99.

## Part 2

Inter-generational housing inequalities: 'Baby Boomers' versus the 'Millennials'

The aim of the paper was examining inter-generational of societal opinion and their awareness. Hoolachan and McKee (2019) were examining between baby boomers (born between 1945 -1965, Willetts, 2010) and millennials (born between 1982 -2000, Howe and Strauss, 2000). Baby boomers in the United Kingdom (UK) had more benefits as they were born in the post war, they had higher increase of employment, the welfare state ,raise in education also in 1950's and 1960's council houses were built, people could afford to buy them as

employment was about (Kynaston, 2007).

Millennials have had the opposite, there has been change's within lobal and neoliberal structures affecting the welfare system, employment and housing opportunities.

Hoolachan and McKee (2019) findings suggested that the millennials did not have any resentment towards the baby boomers, in fact both the millennials and baby bloomers put the blame on governmental policies on privatisation of the housing system and the causal employment.

## References List

Hoolachan, J. & McKee, K. (2019) 'Inter-generational housing inequalities: *'Baby Boomers' versus the 'Millennials'*', vol 56(1) 210-225.

Howe, N & Strauss, W. (2000) *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage books.

Kynaston, D. (2007) *Austerity Britain 1945-51*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Willetts, D. (2010) *The Pinch: How the Baby Boomers Took Their Children's Future – And Why They Should Give It Back*. London: Atlantic Books.