

Poverty, Shame and Social Exclusion

Synthesis Working Paper 3

Perceptions of Poverty in Diverse Cultural Settings:

A brief summary of findings

Robert Walker

2012

Professor Robert Walker, Oxford Institute of Social Policy, University of Oxford
Robert.walker@spi.ox.ac.uk



UKaid
from the Department for
International Development

Perceptions of Poverty in Diverse Cultural Settings:

A brief summary of findings

This is the third in a series of papers that explore the relationship between shame and poverty in seven diverse societies: China; India; Korea; Pakistan; Uganda; Norway and Britain. The stimulus for the exploration is the assertion of Nobel laureate, Amartya Sen¹, that shame lies at the 'irreducible absolutist core' of poverty combined with evidence from psychology that shame erodes individual agency, reducing the ability of individuals to act in their own best interests. The previous two papers have indicated that shame is an emotion with similar psychological and physiological manifestations in each society and that shame and poverty are often connected in traditional proverbs, literature and film. In addition, they have provided broad support for Sen's contention since shame does appear to be an important constituent in the daily experience of people living in poverty in the very different countries in which qualitative research was conducted, although there were subtle differences in the triggers of shame and in the arenas in which it occurred.

Evidence from psychology, supported by literature and film, suggests that shame is both internally felt and externally imposed by others. It follows that a fuller understanding of the association of poverty and shame requires an engagement with people who are not currently poor and, because of the importance of mass media in reflecting and shaping public discourse and people's attitudes, some investigation of the coverage of poverty by journalists. Therefore this paper reports on early findings from group discussions with people not in poverty in some of the aforementioned countries and analysis of newspapers. Unlike the previous two papers which were based on a thorough synthetic analysis of national investigations, this paper is necessarily based on a comparatively quick survey of draft research reports supplemented by a collective discussion of the findings with the research team. The results presented below must therefore be treated with caution since they are subject to revision, not least because additional analysis is to be undertaken especially of coverage of issues by print journalists.

As with the elements of the research reported earlier, the methodology adopted is based on a core template to provide a platform for comparison but which allows for variation to reflect local opportunities and constraints including national norms and expectations. Focus group discussions were conducted with people not in poverty in Britain, China, India, Norway, and Uganda and will shortly commence in Pakistan. Six groups were conducted in India with men, women and school teachers in both Gujarat and Kerala involving a total of 51 adults and activity groups with 16 children aged 11 to 15. Five groups were held in China with respectively recent college graduates, upper middle class entrepreneurs and professionals, working class industrial and service sector workers, migrant workers and retired persons previously

¹ Sen, A. (1985) *Commodities and Capabilities*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

working in state owned enterprises. In Britain, 13 women and eight men were interviewed in seven micro groups in two urban localities supplemented with two focus groups with 20 children aged between 12 and 15 and in Norway 22 adults were participated held in six micro-groups in two urban and one coastal locality supplemented by a group of six college students. Finally, eight groups were held in Uganda divided between the rural area in which depth interviews with people in poverty had previously been undertaken and an urban area nearby. Four groups were comprised of women and four were conducted with men, both were recruited with the help of local community councils. Recruitment to the groups varied being largely based on street recruitment in Britain, snowball sampling in Norway and recommendations through elders and community councils elsewhere.

Poverty and its causes

Group discussions are designed to provoke participants to talk, to express views, to listen and to reflect. Perhaps inevitably in such contexts people's expressed views change during the course of discussion and some make statements that entirely contradict remarks that they have offered earlier. This phenomenon of fluctuating views and opinions was much in evidence in most of the groups although possibly to a lesser extent in China.

Nevertheless, most people started in the discussions with a very similar conception of poverty almost irrespective of where they lived. They saw poverty in absolute terms relating to the lack of resources necessary for survival and spoke about poor housing, lack of clothing and a shortage of food. In Britain, Norway and China there was often subsequent discussion about whether poverty existed any longer in each country; poverty often being described in relation to famine and starvation that they knew of in sub-Saharan Africa. In China, there was generally recognition that poverty still existed in rural parts of the country and many urban migrants were also thought of as being poor.

There was some appreciation in China of the concept of relative poverty and it was this idea that enabled respondents in Norway and Britain to engage with the possibility of poverty still existing in their societies. In the former, it was seen as a problem largely confined to drug addicts, migrants and possibly to the Roma community. In Britain, relative poverty was believed to be much more widespread although some people felt that it was wrong to use the term poverty to cover hardship. Moreover, a minority of British respondents only acknowledged that poverty existed after they had been introduced to vignettes based on the experiences of the people in poverty who had earlier been interviewed at which point the conversation often turned to whether or not the poverty was real in the sense of being inescapable..

In India and Uganda there was little debate over whether poverty existed; it self-evidently did in the rural areas in Kerala and Gujarat and in both rural and urban

districts in Uganda where respondents lived. In India, the poor were identified in terms of deficiencies in the basic essentials of food, clothing and shelter, government housing schemes, caste, tribe and attendance of children at school. In Uganda, the totemic distinguishing features also related to basic essentials in terms of food: 'less salt'; housing: 'grass thatched houses', 'houses you can see into', 'no mattress or proper bedding'; and clothing: 'torn old clothes' and 'children running round naked'. Respondents in Uganda also quite often associated people living in poverty with negative behavioural traits including, theft, drunkenness and dirtiness.

The use of behaviour as a discriminating feature of poverty tended to reflect thoughts on the reasons why poverty existed. The reasons given, certainly in Uganda, India and Britain, though to a lesser extent in China and possibly in Norway, were individualistic. In Uganda, three clear sets of factors were evident and these were echoed elsewhere but with sometimes different illustrative characteristics: behavioural - laziness, alcohol abuse and polygamy; lack of skills and general competency; and family background linked to the same behavioural traits and educational deficiencies resulting in the 'inheritance of poverty'. In India, respondents quite often additionally referred to tribal groups where the causes of poverty were believed to be cultural ('they will stay naked for ever') and to the failure of people to grasp the opportunities offered by industrialisation and economic growth. British respondents couched much of their explanation in terms of people not working and on the reasons for this: 'a poverty of aspirations', poor life choices and, importantly, a lack of work ethic and an acceptance of dependency on the state or on other people. Respondents in Norway similarly spoke much about bad decisions and poor choices that led people to fall into poverty and also cultural factors that closely coincided with the Ugandan discussion on inheritance.

The different groups of Chinese respondents tended to have varying explanations for poverty. Most groups placed considerable emphasis on economic restructuring and the decline of state owned enterprises but migrants largely dismissed this idea saying that anyone could get jobs in the city. They argued instead that the real problem of poverty was in rural areas where people worked hard for subsistence incomes without access even to old age pensions. To these structural reasons, some respondents added health issues and disability that prevented people from working and also an absence of 'connections' necessary to access jobs and other resources within the Chinese context. Structural factors were also discussed in Norway although less often than individualistic ones: a labour market that offered few openings for those without skills, discrimination against ethnic minorities and a problematic welfare system. In Britain discussion tended to flip between individualistic and structural reasons, the global recession, unemployment, the rising cost of living, growing economy and an inept education system, but almost always returned to individual deficiencies as the principal cause of poverty. Structural reasons were little mentioned in either India or Uganda with the exception of teachers in India who identified the failure by government satisfactorily to address the problem.

The fact that, with the exception of respondents in China, respondents typically held people responsible for their own poverty sets the context for extensive blaming and shaming which was what people living in poverty described in interviews conducted with them.

Language and labelling

The language used by respondents referring to people in poverty was robust and often derogatory in the discussions held in India, Britain and Uganda but much more muted in China and, for the most part, in Norway.

Many of the adult respondents in India clearly held people in poverty in considerable contempt. They used abusive terms to describe people in poverty and talked extensively about their drunkenness, their irresponsible spending on mobile phones and television sets, their refusal to work or their immediate spending of everything earned on alcohol that meant that they worked one day and lazed around on several recovering from the effects of alcohol. Being poor was often equated with being dishonest and examples of poor people not paying back loans were frequently cited as evidence of this. Similar language was heard among children who admitted that children from low income homes were publicly taunted and ostracised, their views dismissed and that they were encouraged to play separately for fear of assault. There are laws in India that prevent discriminatory language being used against people on the basis of caste and it was clear that people felt constrained by this. Equally, they admitted to using abusive language in private or when, as teachers, they were talking in the staff room.

Likewise, the focus groups in Uganda often generated a tirade of abuse. Men suffering from poverty were not only thought to be lazy, drunkards, unwilling to work, they were described as being 'arrogant, unprepared to listen to good advice', 'breeding every other year like vermin', being either impotent or promiscuous and each way despised while the women 'do nothing but roam about the village, gossip mongering' and together 'the poor man spends all the money drinking, the wife wakes up at 10am and doesn't even bother to go and dig for food'. One Ugandan respondent offered the motto that 'you associate with a poor person at your own risk'. In Britain, respondents tended to distance themselves from people in poverty terming the latter 'them'. Very often the distinction between being poor and being on benefit was lost reflecting the fact that respondents seldom considered that it was possible to be poor while working. Hence, respondents spoke of 'scroungers', 'benefit bums' and 'welfare dependants' as being synonymous with people in poverty although they mostly distanced themselves from these labels saying that they were terms used by the media. They nevertheless used terms such as: 'a social burden' - attached to benefits recipients, particularly those with children; 'sink estates', places 'where the desire to do better is crushed out of you as an individual', people 'working the system' or being 'happy being on benefits' as part of a 'culture of dependency'.

In Norway, this kind of language was used sparingly, being largely reserved for Roma people. Respondents did distinguish 'us' from 'they' when referring to people in poverty and used terms such as 'awful' and 'terrible' to describe their circumstances, typically with a mix of sympathy and despair. However, Roma people were quite often characterised as 'sitting around', smoking or begging and being bound to 'their cultural traditions. In China, the language was much less derogatory with opprobrium being reserved for professional beggars, former prisoners receiving social assistance and able bodied persons 'too lazy to work'. However, it is perhaps revealing that the Chinese respondents felt that children from poor families might get bullied at school since children do not hide their prejudices. The adults opined that such children might defend themselves from such attacks by working hard and performing well in class and two teachers reported that, in their experience, children from poor backgrounds would try very hard to conceal their financial circumstances unless they were so desperate that they needed to seek financial assistance from the schools. This discussion among Chinese adults raises the issue of where children from more affluent homes acquired their prejudices and one might assume that this would be from their parents. It could be, therefore, that these comments about the views of children offer a glimpse of the true views held by the Chinese adults but concealed in the social setting of a focus group.

Deserving and undeserving

Within the broad categorisations of people living in poverty as being 'the other', respondents in all the societies were at pains to distinguish between those who, in Britain, were termed deserving from those who were not. This was apparent even in China with the three aforementioned groups failing to attract much sympathy. There were other groups of low income people who might have been placed in the undeserving group but these differed in the various focus groups reflecting their own particular circumstances. The retirees held little affection for adult children who were dependent on their parents; and migrants had little sympathy for those receiving social assistance which regulations generally prevented them from accessing in Beijing.

In Norway, it was possible to detect a hierarchy of 'the undeserving' or at least a set more or less deserving groups that was defined according to varying criteria. One set of criteria concerned the acceptance or otherwise of responsibility: persons who worried about their circumstances or who appeared to feel ashamed were held in higher esteem than those who did not, such as persons who behaved shamelessly, who had given up trying or who simply did not care. Similarly those who explicitly refused to shoulder blame or responsibility for their circumstances, blaming others or an absence of jobs, were not looked upon favourably and nor were the 'fake' poor. Often, for example, Roma people were offered as examples who were considered to be far less deserving than the 'real' poor which, in marked contrast to the views expressed in other countries' included heroin addicts. Finally, Norwegian

respondents distinguished between those whom they thought had ‘chosen’ poverty from those for whom it seemed unavoidable.

The discourse between deserving and undeserving was particularly marked in the British groups and closely linked with belief in the importance of the work ethic contrasting with beliefs about the prevalence of the abuse of benefits and general irresponsibility. There was a strong theme that the benefits system was too generous and provided an attractive lifestyle for those who were ‘workshy’ and those who chose to have too many children too young. Echoing current discourse at a political level and reflected in the media, there were repeated references to people who wanted ‘rights without responsibilities’. Several respondents argued that the large numbers receiving benefits at enormous cost to the tax payer was demonstrable evidence that this situation already existed in Britain. Equally, when vignettes taken from the earlier fieldwork with people living in poverty were shared with the groups, such strong views often softened only to re-emerge as people challenged the reasons why people had found themselves in such precarious circumstances. Had they not borrowed too much? Could they not really cut down on their expenditure? Why had they so many children? A subtext underlying much of the discussion between deserving and undeserving was that society was meeting the cost of supporting people in poverty and that meant people paying higher taxes at a time when financial stringency was lowering the incomes of everybody except the very rich who could afford accountants or could transfer their assets beyond the reach of the taxman.

The distinction between deserving and undeserving took a rather different form in both India and Uganda and at first glimpse was less marked than that seen in Britain and Norway and even that in China. It perhaps appeared less marked due to the vehement contempt in which the non-poor held people living in poverty. In essence, all people suffering poverty were considered pretty much the same. A second factor was the lower salience of state support for low income people. In both countries state schooling served as a potent symbol to distinguish children from poor families but equally it was widely considered that the education provided by state schools was noticeably inferior to that provided by private schools. Compared with belief in Britain that benefits were too high, in ~India and Uganda it was recognised that benefits receiving through the education system were limited. Furthermore, in Uganda many of the anti-poverty programmes, especially those directed at agricultural improvement did not directly benefit the poorest families but were taken up by people who had land and therefore were in a position to gain from state subsidies and investment; some non-poor respondents in the focus groups may have been benefitting from this form of government support.

In the case of India, state support in the form of an employment guarantee and, in Gujarat, subsidies in the aftermath of the 2001 earthquake, was disliked by many of the non-poor respondents. The widely held view was that the payments encouraged laziness and the willingness of people to take the work on offer. Respondents

considered themselves directly affected by this since they were dependent on domestic workers and on daily labourers to work their land. A view commonly expressed was that it had made labour more difficult to acquire, since people now had an alternative, and had eroded the hierarchy of respect since they now had to persuade low status people to work for them.

A further development evident in both Uganda and India was the increase in employment and entrepreneurial opportunities created by economic growth and, in the case of Uganda, the discovery and exploitation of oil. In this context, respondents pointed out that many people in poverty were not taking up these new opportunities and therefore were likely to remain poor. Not too much attention was paid to the possibility that people living in poverty had neither the financial or human capital at their disposal to exploit the new opportunities that were becoming available.

Both the process of economic development and the existence of anti-poverty programmes fed the negative attitudes held by the respondents who were not themselves poor but the attitudes were generalised and did not seem to create the cleavage between deserving and undeserving poor apparent in the other countries.

Social exclusion

Respondents in the earlier interviews with people in poverty emphasised how important it was to keep up appearances, to fulfil their obligations to family and community and to ensure, insofar as they could, that they appeared to be 'normal' and that their children did not stand out as being 'different'. From the perspective of respondents in the group discussions, with the possible exception of those in China, this behaviour by people in poverty tended to reinforce their belief that they were profligate, wasting money on show, and prioritising short-term needs rather than saving and investing for their futures.

In Uganda, community is strong with public meetings and events such as funerals providing occasions in which all members of the community are expected to participate and often to contribute in cash or in kind. In the depth interviews with persons in poverty, respondents reported that they were often not invited to such events because they were poor and sometimes they excluded themselves because they could not afford to go. When they did go, they reported that they were often shunned and, in public meetings their views were not listened to on account, they believed of their poverty. These perceptions were confirmed in the group discussions with their more affluent peers who argued quite openly that they sought to avoid conversations with people in poverty. They variously suggested that people in poverty: 'felt uncomfortable mingling with rich' being 'used to their station in life'; that alternatively they did not know their level and were prone to remind you 'that it was the same God who blessed you with riches as deprived them'; that they rejected

advice and were as likely as not to ‘insult you in response’; and that ‘when they are with the rich, their smiles are a mockery, their laughter sarcastic, dirty and damaging’

In India, people in poverty spoke about the importance of ritual and reciprocity and the efforts that they went to in order to avoid the shame of failing to fulfil obligations. Such efforts were broadly dismissed in the focus groups as being wasteful and seeking to live above a person’s station and causing them to go into debt. Likewise, people were criticised for buying lights for the festival of Diwali. So, whereas rich and poor in Uganda gave similar accounts of their interaction, if not the underlying rationale, in India, comparatively rich and poor apparently had an entirely different understanding of the importance of fulfilling social obligations. However, it is not necessarily the case that the rich would apply such generalisations to their own lives; certainly the non-poor Indian respondents complained equally loudly that people in poverty could not be relied on to pay off their debts.

In Britain, the formal demands of the community were less than in either Uganda or India but the dynamic of consumption where yesterday’s luxury becomes today’s necessity imposed considerable demands on a low income family not want to stand out as different and deprived. Certainly, respondents in the focus groups criticised individuals in poverty for conspicuous consumption and cited televisions, mobile phones and branded trainers as demonstrable evidence that poverty was the result of profligacy. This position was even taken by some respondents in Norway although they tended to refer explicitly to the social pressures created by a consumption orientated society, exacerbated by growing inequalities.

While persons experiencing poverty seek social engagement and social acceptance, they often cannot afford the former and are not afforded the latter. Indeed, their attempts at engagement are often rejected and used as evidence to justify the differentials: ‘the poor’ are poor because ‘they’ try to be like ‘us’. It might be pushing the evidence too far to suggest that the affluent wish to maintain differentials in consumption and participation in order to reinforce their own position and to retain the overt evidence of economic success. However, the explicit statement by respondents in India and Uganda that poor people seem increasing to be forgetting their rightful position is at least consistent with this interpretation.

Understanding the responses

While there were strong similarities between respondents in countries as disparate as Britain, India and Uganda, there were some differences within and between countries that warrant explanation. One possible factor is the degree of distance, financial and social, between poor and non poor and, linked to this, the nature and sources of information that the more affluent had about people living in poverty.

In Britain and Norway respondents volunteered to participate in group discussions without the involvement of neighbourhood councils or gatekeepers. This means that these respondents, at least, are likely to have been more interested in social matters

and more sympathetic to the circumstances of families in poverty than affluent persons in general. A not insignificant number of people in the focus groups across all countries reported that they had been born into poor families and a number drew on knowledge of acquaintances, or members of their own families, who had recently been made redundant or for some other reason had come to experience hardship. Those who had had direct experience of poverty typically claimed that, as a result of this experience, they well understood the difficulties faced by poor families; but they were also prone to offer the example of their own success as evidence that anyone could escape poverty if they did well in school, worked hard, and made the right decisions. The implication, sometimes left unsaid but often stated, was that people in poverty had failed in each of these respects and were continuing to do so.

As previously noted, the various groups of respondents in China clearly reacted differently to poverty, reflecting their own life experiences that provided distinct reference points. Migrant workers consider the urban poor to be comparatively affluent compared to those in rural China who lived in mud dwellings without facilities, and who needed to work the land continuously in order to meet school and health costs and to fulfil social obligations in their village communities. Former employees of state owned enterprises saw unemployment as the major cause of poverty whereas a number of recent graduates and persons currently employed in working class jobs considered themselves to be poor relative to other people in Beijing.

Respondents in Uganda and India explained that they gained their knowledge of what it was like to be poor from direct engagement with people in poverty on a day by day basis. They lived among them, they saw them at community gatherings, they witnessed 'the squalor that they chose to live in' and they employed them in their homes and in their businesses. Respondents in Uganda also noted that people in poverty always volunteered their help in times of crisis or celebration. However, non poor respondents in both countries also said that knew from direct experience that 'the poor' were untrustworthy, thieves and drunkards, cynical and negative in their approach to life, easily prone to anger and frequently abusive and dismissive of people with talent and success such as themselves. Their relationship with people in poverty, they explained, was one of mutual dependence. Such people needed work and income and by supplying employment respondents enjoyed a better way of life and took pleasure from the fact that they were able to help tackle poverty. But they said that it was a fraught relationship bedevilled by the arrogance, unreliability and laziness of people in poverty.

In Norway, and perhaps especially in Britain, respondents said that they gained much of their knowledge about poor people living in their country from the media. Some professionals in both countries gained insight into the problems of people in poverty through their dealings with clients. As with the teachers in India cited above, they tended to offer more structural accounts of poverty although these were frequently interspersed with 'unbelievable' instances of personal inadequacy and

dreadful situations. In Norway, there was mention of parties on the populist, political right trying to stir up hatred especially of migrants from which respondents said that they wanted to distance themselves. They noted, too, that while the media did not 'bash the poor', they did praise the achievements of the rich and endorse their lifestyles through the flattery of extensive coverage. They also observed increasing scepticism in the media towards people living on state disability benefits and a negative attitude towards the Roma community.

Most respondents in Britain claimed that virtually all that they found in the British media was scepticism and negativity towards people in poverty and living off benefits. Many respondents sought to distance themselves from such positions, dismissing the stories of scroungers and benefits abuse found in what was often referred to as the 'gutter press'; 'that kind of thing', they argued, was what sold newspapers in Britain. However, their conversation was replete with references to stories that they had read in newspapers and heard on radio that were frequently used as evidence that people were poor because made the wrong choices, lived on 'sink estates', had children too early in life and found life on benefits much easier than working. Radio and, to an extent, television, especially news programmes, were, in contrast to newspapers, believed to be a source of factual knowledge; they believed what they heard if not always what they read.

Some respondents in the British discussion groups, especially those who encountered people in poverty in a professional capacity through work, or who knew people in their family who were receiving benefits, tried hard to reconcile positive experiences with the negative accounts in the media, sometimes citing what they knew to be positive as possible exceptions to the negative rule. Those who themselves had claimed benefits as a result, for example, of unemployment, teenage pregnancy or relationship breakdown were also prone to cite their experience as being exceptional; they did not choose 'to have kids when young in order to obtain council housing', they did not 'sleep around' or claim benefits in preference to working; they had faced real problems in their lives and managed to come through them.

Conclusion

To date, focus groups have been conducted in five of the seven study countries. In each case, they have involved discussions with persons who share the characteristic of not being considered poor within their own communities. The analysis of these discussions generally supports the contention, heard frequently in the interviews with people living in poverty, that people in poverty are despised and humiliated by the affluent.

It seemed possible many times in the analysis to group together respondents from Uganda, India and Britain in terms of their views and to contrast them with persons from China and Norway. Respondents from the first three countries often used

robust negative language, dismissing people in poverty as being lazy, inadequate and untrustworthy. Accounts of the causes of poverty were predominantly individualistic and often prioritised bad behaviour and weak character. These views were present in the groups in China and Norway but were muted and juxtaposed against structural accounts of the causes of poverty and the possibility of individual misfortunate. Moreover, the above division by country became less apparent as respondents struggled with the concepts of deserving and undeserving poor. These emerged spontaneously in Norway, China and Britain, typically in relation to the provision of welfare payments to individuals, but were less evident in India and Uganda. There was, though, in India and Uganda, a corresponding debate that distinguished between those people in poverty who took up the opportunities offered by economic growth and those who did not.

Respondents differed markedly in the degree of direct contact that they had, and had had, with people living in poverty. Some considered themselves to have been poor, or even to be poor today; this experience they felt gave them understanding of the problems confronted by people having difficulty in making ends meet. Others, especially those living in rural communities, were in day to day contact with people experiencing poverty, while some people in Norway and Britain gained most of their information through the media. Respondents' perceptions were, of course, mediated by the reality that they were not poor but others were. Some respondents recognised, occasionally only when challenged, that their views were self justifying. Such a process of self justification might help to explain the prevalence of individualistic rather than structural explanations of poverty. It might also help to account for the plethora of negative responses to people living in poverty that was evident in discussions in all countries. This negativity was somewhat tempered in Norway and China either because the balance of views was truly different, or because social norms were such that political correctness inhibited the use of derogatory language against a vulnerable section of the community.

Such negativity towards people in poverty certainly suggests that people might well be widely shamed as a direct consequence of their poverty. The existence of poverty, and that of a person living in poverty, requires an explanation and that forthcoming from non-poor respondents in the focus groups was, with certain exceptions, generally an individualistic one. As such, it held people in poverty to be responsible for their own circumstances and often laid the blame, not on misfortunate, but on personal incompetence and flaws in character. Such a view brings with it benefits to the person who is not poor. It confirms them in their view that they are a better person, more successful as a consequence of talent and hard work. It relieves them of responsibility for the poverty that they witness around them or that they see on television. It assuages any personal guilt that they might derive through direct or indirect exploitation of people living in poverty.

This account of the views of non poor people largely accords with that given by the people interviewed who were living in poverty. It confirms their view that they were

looked down on by others. It also throws light on how the attempts by people in poverty to make do and to appear normal attract opprobrium and serve to reinforce views held by the non-poor that people in poverty are bad financial managers or trying to live above their station. The evidence provided to date, therefore, is that people living in poverty generally feel ashamed and generally are shamed by those who are not. It also suggests that building support among the affluent to tackle poverty by means that are not themselves shaming is a challenge of a considerable order.

Robert Walker¹

February 2012

1 This draft draws on collaborative research undertaken by the following colleagues but the interpretation presented herein is that of the author and not necessarily that of the research team as a whole: Grace Bantebya; Elaine Chase; Sohail Choudhry; Erika Gubrium; Ivar Lødemel; JO Yong-Mie (Nicola); Leemamol Mathew; Amon Mwiine; Sony Pellissery; Monimala Sengupta and YAN Ming. The research is funded jointly by the UK Economic and Social Research Council and the UK Department for International Development (UKAid).