

Different in Scotland? Public Attitudes to Poverty A Discussion paper

Introduction

Without winning over larger parts of the public to support the fight against poverty in the UK we will never be able to put in place all the policies needed to make the kind of change required. This has been an argument voiced in recent years by increasing numbers of politicians and voluntary organisations who are concerned about poverty in the UK. Some have been inspired by the mass support for the Make Poverty History campaign in 2005, which led to very public displays of support for tackling global poverty.

Building public support for policies to tackle poverty in the UK has been seen as a significant challenge, with a sizeable part of the public sceptical about the existence of poverty in the UK and ability of Government to reduce it. Organisations such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation have been investigating what public attitudes are to poverty and how those concerned with reducing poverty could engage more effectively with the public. This discussion paper has been produced to help provoke thinking around these issues in the Scottish context. Are we in Scotland more predisposed to policies that reduce poverty, do we have a different understanding of the causes and consequences of poverty than our counterparts in other parts of the UK? Answering questions such as these, and the others posed throughout this paper, will help us develop better and more effective approaches to engaging the public in the fight against poverty. This paper looks at some of the facts about poverty in Scotland, the UK and the European Union. It then goes on to look at some of the evidence around public attitudes to poverty before considering whether there is a particular Scottish 'attitude' to poverty.

Poverty in Europe and in the UK

The word poverty echoes in the mind of the public with pictures of third world countries, starving children and natural catastrophes. However, poverty is a consistent and worrying problem also in the richest countries. In Europe 68 million of people live at risk of poverty. In 2007, the lives of too many European citizens are shaped by deprivation¹.

People living in poverty are denied material goods and participation in social activities, which the majority takes for granted. Low income influences one's life chances and outcomes. Poor health, lower educational attainment, routine and underpaid jobs, unemployment and bad housing are common injustices, which individuals on low income have to deal with on a daily basis. Experiencing poverty does not only affect one's material life, but has a significant impact on people's psychological wellbeing. Poverty is a label: the poor is stigmatised, discriminated and bullied. Thus, in today's democratic and progressive Europe, because of unfavourable socio-economic conditions, 68 million citizens are denied equal opportunities and outcomes.

Despite many debates with regard to the most effective way of measuring poverty, the most common measure refers to a household income which is below the 60% of the median national household income. Poverty is measured according to a specific social context, which takes into account variables of time and space as well as disparities in income distribution. To offer a concrete example of poverty line, in 2005/06 in the UK the 60% threshold was "£108 per week for a single adult with no dependent children, £186 per week for a couple with no

dependent children, £223 per week for a single adult with two dependent children and £301 per week for a couple with two dependent children. [...] They represent what the household has available to spend on everything else it needs, from food and heating to travel and entertainment"²

The European Union has declared its commitment to tackling poverty and social exclusion and has agreed on common objectives and targets to alleviate poverty and support those more vulnerable. However, member states benefit from a great flexibility in decision making and in implementing anti-poverty strategies in the most effective way, according to the specificity of every country.

Among European governments there is broad consensus that a dynamic and sustained economy and flexible labour markets are the keys to tackle social exclusion. However, evidence demonstrates that a booyant economy does not necessarily lift all people out of poverty. Despite a booming economy, low paid and poor employment standards (long hours, constant pressure, unhealthy environment) and low benefits levels are common experience for many people in the UK and across the European Union. Economic growth does not bring wealth to a nation, unless underpinned by governments' commitment to social justice and equal share of resources.

Redistribution through taxes and benefits is believed to be an effective way of bringing about social justice. In the UK increases in the minimum wage and tax credits have helped lift thousands of children out of poverty. However, the gap in income between rich and poor, which grew dramatically in the 1980s, persists

and has become wider according to the most recent data³.

The UK Government has committed to tackle social exclusion and to halve child poverty by 2010. In the last 10 years a significant minority of people living in poverty has benefited from changes in taxation, benefits and employment strategies. Children and pensioners have benefited most of the government anti-poverty strategies, whereas the lives of many adults are still at risk of falling below the poverty line. Amongst the most vulnerable, women, lone parents, sick and disabled and ethnic minorities, groups already suffering from gender, race, faith or physical discrimination, are those most likely to fall into poverty. Government's duty is to implement a system of human rights which protects the citizens and provides them with equal opportunities and equal outcomes.

Poverty in Scotland

*"Child poverty is down from one in three to one in four and pensioner poverty is down from one in three to one in six. Poverty amongst all Scots down from one in four to one in five. None of these changes happened by accident. It is not a set of random political acts. Choices have been made. We have a vision of a better fairer Scotland"*⁴

Despite improvements overtime, many people still live in poverty in Scotland. According to figures of 2007, still 1 million people in Scotland (20% of the population) live in households below the average (60% of the median income, measured after housing costs).

- Within Scotland there are major geographic and socio-demographic differences.
- Child poverty has decreased from 28% in 1994/95 to 21% in 2005/06. Since 2001 it has fallen from 27% to 21%. The government target of reducing child poverty by a quarter has been met in Scotland.
- One in three children in Scotland lives in households where the benefits are the main source of income.
- Pensioner poverty has also diminished from 26% to 20%. The trend shows a great improvement since the years 2000/01.
- Working age adult poverty has decreased from 17% to 15% in 2005/06. However, the trend shows little improvement overtime: in 1998/99 the percentage of working age adult was the same as in 2005/06 (15%), with peaks of 18% in the years 2000/01 and 2002/03.
- Despite a decrease in workless households in the last decade (from 23% in the mid 1990s to 19% in the last years), poverty rate has remained stable. The risk of poverty for in-work status is much higher than a decade ago. Work has proven not to be the best route out of poverty⁵.
- 48% of income deprived in Scotland lives in large urban areas. However, poverty is prevalent also in rural areas, although our perception of rural life does not often reflect this. Transport, access to basic services and finding stable work

are all major difficulties in rural Scotland⁶.

- Suicide rates have dramatically increased in the last 15 years in Scotland, whereas in England and Wales the trend confirms a decrease. Studies have highlighted the link between socio-economic deprivation and higher rates of suicide. Some local authorities (West Dunbartonshire, Highland, Eilean Siar, Dundee City and Argyll & Bute) and Glasgow City presented the highest rate of suicide⁷.
- Scotland's record on health inequalities is not good: Scotland has the highest premature deaths' rate in GB, around 30% higher than England and Wales; Scotland has the highest rate of obesity, after the US. Since 1995, obesity in the adult population has increased by 46% and Scottish households spend more on alcohol, tobacco and narcotics than the rest of the UK⁸.

So, despite the image of Scotland as a "vibrant nation", abundant with resources and potential, and sustained by a strong tradition of social democratic values and egalitarianism, poverty and social exclusion remain entrenched in a significant proportion of the population.

Since 2000/01 children and pensioners have benefited from a decrease in poverty, possibly to be attributed to government anti-poverty strategies. However, "most of the fall in child poverty has been due to the reduced poverty risks for both working and workless families rather than from the shift into work"⁹. Tax credits for employed and out-

of-work benefits seem to have been the key for a successful anti-poverty children strategy.

The lack of policies focused on improving living standards of working age adults can possibly account for the reason of little progress. Unemployment (due to lack of skills and training), low benefit rates and low wages can help explain the high percentage of poverty among this group. Lone parents and single childless adults are the most affected by poverty. The existence of significant levels of low pay raises questions as to whether compulsory in-work practices are the best way out of poverty.

Many trade unions, faith groups and voluntary and community organisations are at present campaigning for a "living" wage, set in excess of the current National Minimum Wage. In Scotland around half a million workers are paid less than £6.50 per hour, the majority of whom are women and part-time workers.

Public attitudes to poverty in Europe and in the UK

As part of its commitment to fight social exclusion, the European Commission published this year a survey "Poverty and Social Exclusion", examining how poverty and homelessness are perceived in the European context¹⁰. Understanding public attitudes to poverty is a necessary step, it is argued, for the development of potential policies aiming at tackling poverty and for building support for them. Do people perceive poverty as an escalating problem? Is it perceived as a condition affecting only some "bad seeds" or as a symptom of larger structural injustices in the society? How poverty is

understood, addressed and re-constructed and how “the poor” is categorized influence future anti-poverty strategies.

According to “Poverty and Social Exclusion”, in Europe poverty is seen by the general public as a progressively widespread problem, with an increasing proportion of the population acknowledging the existence of it. However, this appears to be less of the case in the UK. As highlighted above, poverty in Britain is far from being a limited phenomenon, but according to the Eurobarometer survey these facts are not understood by the British public. In fact, there is a huge gap between the public perception of poverty and the actual presence of it. In 2007, 40% of the population still believes there is no poverty in the UK.

There is a direct link between acknowledging the presence of poverty and having contact with it. Those who have never experienced poverty or have never had any contact with people in poverty are more likely to reject the idea that there is poverty in the UK. Nevertheless, virtually everyone has at least indirect contact with poverty (through the media, homeless people, etc.). It seems that for 40% of the UK citizens poverty is an invisible presence.

Not only does the UK public underestimate the seriousness and extent of poverty, but views regarding its causes vary consistently from the common perception in Europe. According to the European survey, in the UK a larger portion of the population tends to blame the poor for her/his irresponsible behaviour and lack of moral drive. On the contrary, the most popular opinion among

European citizens is that poverty is caused by structural inequalities in society. However, findings of research commissioned by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation depict a different scenario: the majority of the population sees poverty as an “inevitable part of the progress” (32%) and as a consequence of “laziness and lack of willpower” (28%)¹¹. Both surveys recognize a high degree of individual blame, but offer different scores with regard to societal causes of poverty. On the one hand, these figures validate that “blaming the poor” is a prevalent attitude to poverty and, on the other hand, that the UK public is largely misinformed about its reasons.

Furthermore, 41% of the UK population (28% in Europe) holds the view that poverty is an inherited condition. Those considering laziness and lack of willpower as the causes of poverty are more likely to believe that poverty is an inherited condition¹². Among those, the opinion is that negative behavioural patterns are transmitted from one generation to the other. People living in poverty are therefore categorized into a static and homogenous scheme, which neglects the complexity of the phenomenon and downplays dynamics of poverty. Such attitudes strengthen the stigmatization of the poor: they are seen as outcasts because they do not fit into the dominant culture and because they do not contribute to the well being of the society. Looking at the figures related to the perceived reasons of poverty, lack of education, alcoholism and other addictions appeared as the most popular in the UK, whereas in Europe unemployment, low wages and low social security benefits are believed to be the main causes of poverty.

Cultural difference: myth or reality?

Tackling poverty and inequalities is at the heart of the Scottish government policy. Despite constraints due to the reserved powers, the Scottish government disposes of a wide range of powers to improve the lives of the many people still living in deprivation and to prevent others from falling into poverty.

As figures have revealed, poverty remains an alarming phenomenon in Scotland and society seems to be overwhelmed by increasing inequalities. How do the “Scots” perceive this phenomenon? Is the majority concerned about the lives on low income of their neighbours? Or has the modern individualistic lifestyle overtaken the supposedly once collectivist and egalitarian character of this nation? Due to lack of figures with regard to public attitudes to poverty in Scotland, the debate is sometimes impressionistic, relying on stereotypes and lacking critical analysis of the Scottish society and of dominant and institutional discourses.

Scotland has been often depicted as a progressive nation, driven by social-democratic values. The institutional particularities in Scotland, the legal and educational system for example, have, for some, sustained the idea of the separateness of the Scottish character. There has been speculation regarding the complexity of the relationship between electoral behaviour, social attitudes and about the alleged “liberal” politics of Scotland, whether this constitutes a distinctive aspect of Scottish society or is a matter of historical circumstances and of misinterpretation of voting patterns.

Critics have questioned the extent to which the institutional separateness of Scotland may suggest something about societal mores and values. It is a matter of fact that Scotland has developed historically, culturally and institutionally in its own particular way. In the past, Scotland has developed a unique legal and education system and since 1970s has promoted distinctive social policies. Some commentators have highlighted this as a confirmation of the distinctive character of the Scottish people. However, the relationship between society and institutional development is not straightforward: similar societies can articulate their cultural inheritance in extremely different institutional forms. Despite Scotland's separate development, it has been argued that political and social attitudes do not differ structurally from those of the rest of the Union¹³. In *The Same But Different: Why Scotland?* McCrone claims that it is the “frame of reference”, i.e. how social and economic structures are translated in political practices, and not political and social attitudes, that makes Scotland different from England¹⁴.

Because of sustained support for ‘left’ political parties, it is widely believed that Scottish society is more egalitarian and collectivist. However, critics have shown that much of this belief rests only on evidence given by the electoral preference of the Scottish: since 1950s, left-of-the centre parties have largely won the support of the electorate. But can such results simply be read-off as necessarily implying that Scots are inherently more liberal than people living in England, Wales or Ireland? Many commentators have questioned such conclusions.

McCrone has questioned the myth of a left-wing Scotland, focusing on the nation's looser attachment to the Conservative Party. If compared to the achievements of the right in England, Scottish support for the Conservative party has, in fact, been very limited over the last 50 years. The first signs of electoral divergence north and south of the border can be traced back to 1955. Since then, the gap in electoral behaviour has widened reaching a peak in 1992. McCrone argues that during the 1980s, there has been a major electoral shift to the left as a counter-reaction to the centralizing attempts of the Thatcher government. The middle classes, fearing the loss of privileged ruling positions in key areas, turned to the left, joining a vast proportion of working-class Labour supporters¹⁵. However, in *W(i)ther the Union? Anglo-Scottish Relations in 21st Century*, McCrone argues that it is not the strength of the Labour, but it is the presence of political options and the small support for the Tories that account for a shift to left in the last 15 years¹⁶. The rise of the Scottish National Party and of the Liberal Democrats and the visibility, if not strength, of smaller parties, like the Greens and the Scottish Socialists, have shaped the current political horizon.

Thus, if there is evidence that the Scottish political spectrum is positioned more left, with four parties left-of-the-centre and one right-of-the-centre, the relationship between electoral patterns and society ideology seems to be more complex. It might, instead, be suggested that Scotland has been able to articulate its own cultural legacy by organising itself politically in an original way, in this case by providing alternatives to the two major parties¹⁷. Keating points out that, because party competition in Scotland

leans to the left, public opinion has tended to associate this composition with a more egalitarian and collectivist attitude of the Scottish¹⁸. The same opinion is expressed by Curtice, who criticizes the assumption of a social-democratic Scotland, claiming that this label has been attached to the "Scots" during Thatcher's rule, at a time when the same values were branded as "British" in England¹⁹. Such views challenge the stereotypical image of the "Scots", readjusting the extent to which Scottish voting models indicate progressive and egalitarian attitudes on the part of the society. The diversity north of the border has to be found in the modes in which the Scottish "way of life" adapts to institutional forms, not in a structural diversity in social and political attitudes.

Some commentators have referred to the British and Scottish Social Attitudes surveys²⁰ to find a confirmation of the egalitarian drive of Scottish society. It has been suggested that Scotland is more inclined than England to favour redistribution. However, according to the most recent figures, it seems that the view on redistribution has changed dramatically overtime. Although an increasing proportion of the population acknowledges the existence of social injustice, the number of people supporting redistribution of income has halved (from 61% in 1999 to 30,5% in 2005)²¹. The gap between the perception of unfairness in the society and the resolve to empower the government to redistribute income is remarkable in Scotland. These findings contradict the common belief that Scotland is more egalitarian and collectivist than the rest of the UK. The latest findings appear to challenge the image of a society steeped in collectivist, redistributive attitudes,

replacing it with one increasingly moving towards more individualistic and consumerist notions commonly associated with other parts of the UK.

Scottish social policy pre- and post-devolution

We have attempted to explore some stereotypical images of Scottish society and to frame and define the meaning of “different”. It has been assessed that the institutional separateness of Scotland does not necessary imply that political and social attitudes are different from those in the rest of the Union. However, the recent developments in Scottish political and institutional structure open up new opportunities for the realization of policies tailored for Scotland. The Scottish Executive (now Government) itself has advocated “Scottish solutions for Scottish problems”, aiming at tackling the specificity and priorities of the Scottish context in a “Scottish way”.

Since devolution, social policy has been central to the government’s agenda and, thanks to the acquisition of a variety of new competences, has represented the Scottish Executive’s chance to make a real difference in people’s lives. Scotland has enthusiastically welcomed devolution as the chance to prioritize Scottish. However, although it may be true that specific Scottish problems exist, it remains debatable whether there has developed a distinctive ‘Scottish’ approach to solving these problems.

Mooney and Poole speculate on the possibility of creating a new distinctive welfare policy and argues about the extent to which so far Scotland’s social policy has diverged from England, exploring contrasting views with regard to

pre-devolution welfare policy²². On the one hand, it has been suggested that, since the rise of Thatcherist social policy in 1980s, Scotland has worked on the realization of a more collectivist political agenda, as a reaction to free-market and ‘Anglo-centric’ guiding principles²³. On the other hand, some critics have perceived this time as the point of convergence between English and Scottish social policies. Thatcher’s centralizing power started to shape the objectives and aims on the Scottish welfare agenda²⁴. Mooney and Poole have concluded that, despite institutional differences, Scotland has not been able to develop its own distinctive social policy: the lead of the Tories in the 1980s has weakened the prospects of building a radical Scottish welfare agenda²⁵.

Despite these overall tendencies the Scottish Executive (now Government) has promoted some legislation, which reflects an attempt to promote social justice and equality. Free personal care for the elderly, free school meals for primary schools, abolition of “up-front” university tuition fees and rejection of Trust status for hospitals, all represent first signs of dedication to deliver equal opportunities and adequate standards of living for everyone. However, the question arises whether these policies demonstrate that the Scottish Government can lead the way in innovative and anti-poverty social policies. According to Keating, the distinctive character of Scottish social policy is to be found in the delivery of public services. For instance, Scotland has rejected the managing and financing innovations introduced in England for the NHS. These approaches have been criticized by some for representing a first step towards the privatization of public

services (and an unequal, income-based access to services). Keating points out that this “managerial” restructuring in the English NHS reflects the shift of the middle classes towards the private provision of social services, such as health and education²⁶. In Scotland, instead, the support for more equally accessible and state provided social services is confirmed by the negative response to Foundation Hospitals and by the long-term commitment to a comprehensive schools system.

Mooney and Poole, despite agreeing on the distinctive character of some aspects of Scottish social policy (teachers’ pay, tuition fees and personal care for elderly), are more concerned about the impact of the new regulations in terms of real improvements of state-led services. It has in fact been argued that Scotland’s post-devolution welfare policy does not mark a “radical departure” with reference to its outcomes²⁷. It is important to evaluate whether the government has been successful in providing efficient services equally to everyone, thus tackling injustices and inequalities.

Conclusion

On the one hand, it has been speculated about the alleged liberal and egalitarian character of Scottish society. On the other, it has been discussed whether devolved Scotland is determined to develop policies aiming at the construction of a fairer society. An overall picture of Scotland shows that the country does not position itself far behind other nations in terms of wealth and wellbeing. However, some figures related to the health of the nation, suggest that Scottish society is deeply divided. Wealthy and secure neighbourhoods are situated next

to the most deprived and vulnerable communities. Here, the existence of inequalities is tangible: poor quality housing, crime, low education attainment, unemployment, low wages, teenage pregnancies, lower life expectancy, poor nutritional habits, alcohol and drug abuse and high suicide rates are issues that poor people have to deal with on a daily basis.

Nowadays being “poor” means to carry a stigma. Official measures often neglect the discriminatory and emotional side of the experience of poverty. Defining poverty as lack of income or “lack of items considered necessary by the majority” highlights only the economic deficiency of the poor. There is a huge gap between the official definition of poverty, the public perception of poverty and accounts given by those living in deprivation. Objective measures do not tell anything about personal experiences of poverty and cast a barrier between those above and those below the poverty line. Negative perceptions of ‘the poor’ are reinforced by a lack of knowledge and contact with poverty; uncritical acceptance of biased media representations and dominant discourses deploying a language of (false) morality and images of public nuisance work together to attach to the poor the label of outcast.

The discussion of the similarities and differences in ‘public attitudes’ and responses to poverty in Scotland should encourage all of those engaged in the fight against poverty to reflect critically on their approaches. Whilst a belief in the existence of a Scottish ‘general public’, waiting to be mobilized in the fight against poverty, may be seriously misplaced, we should not discount the opportunities that

the different political institutions in Scotland may provide for articulating a different discourse around poverty.

National anti-poverty projects, such as *Get Heard*²⁸, have recommended that there is a need to connect Government agencies and officials, and the public, more directly into the experience of poverty. People in poverty feel that the public should be educated and taken closer to “life below the poverty line”. As the final report of *Get Heard Scotland* points out, it is necessary to address the structural causes of poverty to unveil that it is society as a whole (not the poor) that has a responsibility towards poverty. “[Get Heard] participants were clear that attitudes towards those experiencing poverty cannot be tackled on their own: our society tolerates the abyss that has developed between the rich and the poor, it tolerates the relentless pursuit of greater wealth and the consumerism that help widen this abyss. People in the workshops were clear- we cannot begin to tackle poverty until we begin to narrow the gap between rich and poor”²⁹

¹ European Commission, 2007. *Poverty and Exclusion 2007*. Eurobarometer. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/2007/eurobarometer_povertyandexclusion_en.pdf

² <http://www.poverty.org.uk/summary/key%20facts.shtml>

³ National Statistics. Available from: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?id=1005>

⁴ First Minister: *Speech on Poverty in Scotland*. Launch of the 2007 edition of 'Poverty in Scotland' by the Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG). Glasgow Caledonian University. Friday, March 2, 2007. Available from:

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/News/News-Extras/poverty-speech>

⁵ Scottish Executive. *Scottish Households Below Average Income 2005/2006*. Available from: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/05/30085716/6>

⁶ McKendrick, J. H., 2007. Rural Poverty. J. H. McKendrick, G. Mooney et al. (eds), *Poverty in Scotland 2007*, London: CPAG.

⁷ The Scottish Government. Available from: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2007/03/01145422/5>

⁸ National Statistics. Available from: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget_print.asp?ID=1159

⁹ Palmer, G., MacInnes, T. and Kenway, P., 2006. *Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion in Scotland*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

¹⁰ European Commission, 2007.

¹¹ Park, A., Phillips, M. and Robinson, C., 2007. *Attitudes to poverty: Findings from the British Social Attitudes survey*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available from: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1999-poverty-attitudes-survey.pdf>

¹² European Commission, 2007.

¹³ See for example M. Keating, G. Mooney and D. McCrone.

¹⁴ McCrone, D., 2006. *The Same But Different: Why Scotland?* Available from: http://www.institute-of-governance.org/onlinepub/mccrone/bsa_scotland_talk_sept2005.html

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ McCrone, D., 2004. *W(i)ther the Union? Anglo-Scottish Relations in 21st Century*. Available from: <http://www.institute-of-governance.org/onlinepub/mccrone/whitherunion.html>

¹⁷ Mooney, G. and Poole, L., 2004. “A Land of Milk and Honey”? Social policy in Scotland after

Devolution'. In *Critical Social Policy 2004*; 24; 458. Available from:
<http://csp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/24/4/458>

¹⁸ Keating, M., 2005. *The Government of Scotland. Public policy Making after Devolution*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

¹⁹ Curtice, J. and Heath, A., 2000. 'Is the English Lion About to Roar? National Identity After Devolution'. In R. Jowell et al. (eds.) *British social attitudes: the 17th Report*. London: Sage, 155-174.

²⁰ British Social Attitudes and Scottish Social Attitudes surveys. Available from:
<http://nesstar.esds.ac.uk/webview/index.jsp>

²¹ Scottish Social Attitudes Survey 1999 and 2005. Available from:
<http://nesstar.esds.ac.uk/webview/index.jsp>

²² Mooney, G. and Poole, L., 2004.

²³ Ozga, J., 1999. 'Two Nations? Education and Social Inclusion and Exclusion in Scotland and England', *Education and Social Justice*, 2, pp. 44-64.

²⁴ See for example Littlewood, P., 1998. Education, pp. 141-62. In J. English (ed), *Social Services in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Mercat Press.

²⁵ Mooney, G. and Poole, L., 2004.

²⁶ Keating, M., 2005.

²⁷ Mooney, G. and Poole, L., 2004.

²⁸ For more information on the *Get Heard* project:
<http://www.ukcao.org/getheard/index.htm>

²⁹ Burnett, L., 2006. *Get Heard Scotland. Final Report*. Glasgow: The Poverty Alliance.

Discussion Paper written and researched by Sara Disanto, Policy intern at the Poverty Alliance. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of Poverty Alliance. To comment on the issues raised in this discussion paper please contact Peter Kelly peter.kelly@povertyalliance.org