

The Cycle of Deprivation: Myths and Misconceptions

Dr John Welshman
Senior Lecturer in Public Health
The Institute for Health Research
Lancaster University
Bowland Tower East
Lancaster LA1 4YT

Tel (01524) 592717
Email j.welshman@lancaster.ac.uk

length 4,502 text
462 notes
4,964 total

Introduction

The year 2006 marks the thirtieth anniversary of the publication of Michael Rutter and Nicola Madge's *Cycles of Disadvantage* (1976).¹ As such, it provides an opportunity to take stock of debates over cycles of disadvantage in the 1970s, and to see what has or has not been learnt since then in light of contemporary interest in inter-generational continuities in economic status, child poverty, anti-social behaviour, and policy interventions such as Sure Start. This article locates *Cycles of Disadvantage* within the broader context of the cycle of deprivation hypothesis, and the Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme. It illustrates how a historian sets about writing their history, and suggests some areas in which historical methods and perspectives can dispel myths and misconceptions, adding significantly to existing knowledge. Earlier interest in the cycle speech and Research Programme has derived from one of the following perspectives: the career of Keith Joseph himself; an interest in the history of underclass stereotypes; research on approaches to poverty, including individualist or behavioural explanations; and arguments around the alleged neglect of agency in postwar social policy.² Nevertheless for the most part, it has focused on published sources, most obviously the two best-known products of the Research Programme: *Cycles of Disadvantage* (1976) and *Despite the Welfare State* (1982).³

The main sources available to the historian are archival materials in the National Archives at Kew; the private papers of Keith Joseph himself and other significant actors; oral interviews with former civil servants and social scientists; published reports including the comparatively well-known Heinemann series; a range of other published documents including by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC); and contemporary newspapers, periodicals, and academic journals. A historical perspective throws up new and interesting questions. First, what were the

influences on Keith Joseph himself, in terms of both his own personal history, and the wider policy context, that help to explain the timing and content of the cycle speech. Second, how was the Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme set up, and why did it take the direction it did? Third, what was the attitude of the Department of Health and Social Security (DHSS) to the Research Programme, and how did this change as it developed? Fourth, what was the response of social scientists to the cycle hypothesis, and why did many social policy pundits take a deterministic position, that highlighted the relative importance on structural factors, and either ignored or downplayed the significance of behavioural, cultural, or personal characteristics? Fifth, what are the links between the 1970s research, current interest in inter-generational continuities in poverty, parenting, and policy initiatives such as Sure Start?

In a paper given at a seminar on ‘Dimensions of Parenthood’, at All Souls College, Oxford, in April 1973, Professor Michael Rutter structured his discussion around seven myths or misconceptions about child development. In a similar fashion, this article seeks to dispel five prevalent myths or misconceptions about the cycle speech and Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme. The relationship between myth and history is an interesting one, that cannot be explored in the space available here. But the five myths or misconceptions are: first, that we know the origins of the cycle of deprivation hypothesis; second, that we know what happened in the course of the Research Programme; third, that the DHSS supported the research; fourth, that social scientists were interested in the cycle hypothesis; and fifth, that there has been significant progress since 1976.

The origins of the cycle of deprivation hypothesis

The first myth or misconception is that we know the origins of the cycle of deprivation hypothesis. Clearly Sir Keith Joseph (1918-1994) was very closely identified with it, through his famous speech to the Pre-School Playgroups Association, in June 1972, as Secretary of State for Social Services. In explaining its timing and content, Joseph's own background, his genuine concern with poverty, and the concept of the problem family all played a part. His biographers, Andrew Denham and Mark Garnett, provide numerous examples of his charity work and genuine concern with poverty and the homeless, which included the founding of the Mulberry Trust housing association and support for the Child Poverty Action Group. As a young boy at school in London, for example, Joseph had sneaked food out of his house to feed a beggar in Sloane Square.⁴ An only child from a close Jewish family, he was successively a pupil at Harrow School; student at Magdalen College, Oxford; a baronet and alderman of the City of London; a prize fellow of All Souls College, Oxford; and a director of the family Bovis firm. In interviews, Joseph admitted his sense of guilt over his privileged upbringing and affluent family background. When it came to the family, a further factor was his happy home life with his first wife and four children, and his traditional views over the respective role of the parents.

Nevertheless while there is no doubt Joseph was genuinely concerned about poverty, Denham and Garnett also note that while he was sympathetic to the genteel poor, especially older people and those with disabilities, he regarded the low-paid and the unemployed – the able-bodied poor – as problems. His speeches are peppered with arguments about the deserving and undeserving poor; cases of malingering and benefit fraud; and unemployables. In particular, Joseph's interest in low-income families was of a particular kind, and closely bound up with the concept of the problem family. This essentially behavioural explanation of poverty and deprivation,

that emphasised household squalor and inadequate parenting, exercised an important influence over public health doctors, social workers, and voluntary organisations in the 1940-70 period. In 1966, for example, Joseph had included among categories of need, problem families whose poverty was not caused primarily by lack of income, but by difficulties in managing money and in using welfare services. However while Joseph was influenced by the problem family literature, he was at the same time unaware of the important critiques that had been mounted against it. As Denham and Garnett have noted, Joseph was a man of academic enthusiasms, but showed little sign of the scepticism normally associated with the term ‘intellectual’. In these ways, along with the better-known Edgbaston speech (October 1974), Joseph’s cycle hypothesis illustrates marked continuities between late-nineteenth and late-twentieth century thought on poverty, placing it squarely within the longer-term history of recurring underclass stereotypes over the past 120 years.

While Joseph’s personal history and view of poverty are clearly important, the broader policy context is also relevant. The timing of the cycle speech can be related to the rediscovery of poverty in both Britain and the USA, and situated within a combination of reformist social engineering (evident in debates about educational disadvantage) and a more conservative ‘social pathology’ interpretation, that emphasised cultural deprivation. Contemporary documents reveal more explicit connections with the American Head Start programme. The work of Urie Bronfenbrenner, for example, then Professor of Psychology at Cornell University, was cited by Joseph in the cycle speech, and the American academic was involved in some of the early cycle seminars. Bronfenbrenner had played an important part in the setting up and subsequent evaluation of the Head Start projects. Moreover in the autumn of 1972, a British team, that included Tessa Blackstone, Geoffrey Otton, and

Joan Cooper, paid a visit to the USA, sponsored by the Ford Foundation, to look at American programmes for pre-school education, including Head Start. In the event, their report was tentative about the possible role of pre-school education and care in breaking an alleged cycle of deprivation.⁵ Nevertheless these connections provide much evidence on processes of policy transfer that are themselves intriguing in light of the current Sure Start initiative. Overall, the speech can be seen to have had complex origins in terms of Joseph's personality and the broader policy context; in the past and the present; in both Britain and the USA.

The Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme: how much do we know?

The second myth or misconception is that we know what happened in the course of the Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme. The existing secondary accounts, by Richard Berthoud and Alan Deacon, have been based on the three published progress reports by the Joint Working Party, and on the studies from the Research Programme itself, notably the books *Cycles of Disadvantage* (1976) and *Despite the Welfare State* (1982). Arguably attempting to find out ‘what really happened’ is an enterprise doomed to failure in a postmodernist age. Nevertheless it is clear that a full understanding of the direction taken by the Research Programme, and in particular the shift from the behavioural focus of the cycle hypothesis to the structural emphasis of many of the researchers, is only possible through analysis of the available archival sources, supplemented by oral interviews. These shed new light on tensions within the DHSS-SSRC Joint Working Party, between the social scientists, and with the DHSS civil servants. They also reveal the broader political context for the Research Programme, following the election of the Labour government in March 1974.

The archival sources make it possible to trace the setting up of the Research Programme, showing for instance, that discussions between DHSS and SSRC were underway in the Spring of 1972, well before the cycle speech, and illustrating, through early Working Papers, differences about how deprivation might be defined.⁶ One question that the archival sources open up is that of the significance of the broader political context, in dictating the shift from the original behavioural emphasis of the cycle to the more structural focus of the Research Programme. The minutes of the meetings of the Joint Working Party and other materials illustrate important changes of personnel, such as the impact of the appointment to the Joint Working Party of Dennis Marsden, from the Department of Sociology at Essex; Muriel Brown from the London School of Economics; and Adrian Webb, of the Department of

Social Sciences at Loughborough. Moreover minutes and referees' reports indicate anxieties about the Research Programme that are to an extent glossed over in *Despite the Welfare State* (1982). An internal report by the Organising Group, for instance, admitted that they had found it very hard to keep a clear view of the funding over the life of the Research Programme as a whole. The initial strategy of issuing an invitation to researchers had led to an imbalance where most of the proposed work emphasised familial processes and child development. While efforts had been made to correct that, it was still difficult to find good researchers interested in socio-economic or social policy perspectives.

It is clear that the Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme departed dramatically from Joseph's original thesis. A cycle of deprivation that was essentially a behavioural interpretation of poverty, that stressed the importance of inter-generational continuities, became instead a cycles of disadvantage concept that was concerned more with structural factors and emphasised the discontinuities in the experiences of families. There were a variety of factors at work here, to do with the approach of the SSRC; differences between members relating to their disciplinary backgrounds; the influence of the *Cycles of Disadvantage* literature review itself; and the broader political context after March 1974. Richard Berthoud has argued, for example, that at the time of the cycle speech, the SSRC operated very much in 'responsive' mode. It publicised its presence to the research community, and waited for suitable projects to appear. He alleges that the SSRC had little experience of commissioning a large-scale research project of this kind, and in 1972 it had never been asked an important question by an outsider. Nevertheless the move towards socio-economic factors was less a takeover of the Programme than an attempt to balance the original bias towards psychology.

Civil servants and researchers

The third myth or misconception is that the DHSS supported the research. It was a Joint DHSS-SSRC Working Party, with the DHSS providing the funding. There were seven DHSS representatives on the Joint Working Party, including two each from the Local Authorities Social Services Division, the Social Work Services Division, and the Research Management Division.⁷ Key members included Joan Cooper and Geoffrey Otton. Like Otton, Cooper had been involved with the Children's Department at the Home Office, and has been specifically linked with a 'child care' view of delinquency. Other prominent DHSS members were Alice Sheridan, Deputy Director of the Social Work Services Division (serving on the Joint Working Party 1972-82) and Margaret Edwards, then a Principal in the Local Authorities Social Services Division. What is interesting is those parts of DHSS that were involved with Transmitted Deprivation: Social Services and Social Work, rather than Social Security.

However while the published reports show the composition of the Joint Working Party, the internal department files reveal the stance of the DHSS much more explicitly. Differences between the SSRC and the DHSS were apparent from the outset, particularly over the relevance of the Research Programme to policy. The DHSS was more inclined than the SSRC to see the Research Programme as both a major research exercise, and an experiment in post-Rothschild co-operation. Nevertheless while individual DHSS members suggested that the SSRC should act as contractors, some shared Joseph's later antagonism to social science. As the research got underway, there is no doubt that day-to-day relationships between the DHSS and SSRC were difficult. The DHSS was concerned, for example, that the role of the

Organising Group, and the procedures of the Chairman, meant that some research had been funded which had not been subject to close scrutiny. There was also disquiet about the published progress reports. Yet DHSS civil servants were also scornful of attempts to give the Research Programme greater intellectual coherence. Moreover in a period when there was increasing pressure on resources, there were doubts about the relevance of the cycle to policy. The result was that by the Spring of 1977 the DHSS was playing a smaller part in the Working Party, not withdrawing entirely, but reducing its representation ‘by stealth’.⁸ These concerns came to a head over arrangements for the final report on the Programme on the whole. Many academics approached to help Muriel Brown and Nicola Madge with the final report had declined, and referees had been critical of several of the studies. Most strident was Alice Sheridan who argued the SSRC had been sold a pup, and ‘we are likely to be open to criticism for having spent so much to get so little’.⁹

As Richard Berthoud has noted, the DHSS did see ‘the problem’ as one of individuals and the personal social services, whereas the SSRC saw it as one suitable for broader social scientific analysis. But archival evidence reveals more deep-seated DHSS scepticism about the Research Programme as a whole, partly because it was more familiar with social surveys than with qualitative methodology or ethnographic fieldwork. Civil servants felt that Joseph’s emphasis on the cycle of deprivation thesis was largely a personal crusade, and Ministerial support evaporated following the election of the 1974 Labour Government. Moreover as already noted, it was not clear that the most appropriate parts of DHSS were involved, since the Social Security Division remained outside the Research Programme. Perhaps most importantly, the DHSS members were essentially concerned throughout with the policy implications of the research, and saw the conclusions of *Despite the Welfare State* as being

impractically broad and unrealistic. What were the long-term implications for the DHSS involvement in research projects? As Chief Scientist, Sir Douglas Black was involved in discussions regarding DHSS misgivings about the value of the Research Programme. It seems highly probable, therefore, that the experience of the DHSS affected its involvement in the Black Report on inequalities in health.

Social scientists and the cycle of deprivation

The fourth myth or misconception is that social scientists were interested in the cycle hypothesis. Richard Berthoud has argued that the cycle hypothesis was fundamental to an understanding of the relationship between individuals and institutions in the social structure, and a test of the ability of social scientists to contribute to a real debate. However he has argued that the projects were either concerned with economic questions (the Atkinson project on inter-generational continuities in low incomes) or psychiatric questions (the Rutter and Quinton project on child care difficulties) but not with the relationship between them. Alan Deacon has claimed similarly that, by the 1970s, the alleged rejection of individualist or behavioural accounts of poverty by theorists such as Richard Titmuss had hardened into an approach that precluded any discussion of such factors. It was this ‘quasi-Titmuss paradigm or school’ that, in its hostility to explaining poverty by reference to the behaviour of the poor, created an intellectual void that was filled by neo-Conservative writers in the 1980s. Like Berthoud, Deacon argues that many social scientists did not respond to the challenge of the Research Programme, regarding Joseph’s research agenda as at best a red herring and at worst a distraction from the much more important issue of the generation and persistence of inequalities.

There is certainly evidence that many if not most social scientists favoured a structural explanation. The best-known examples are Peter Townsend and Bill Jordan. However adopting a collective biography approach to other social scientists who were hostile to the cycle hypothesis, or at best marginal to the Research Programme, reveals more about why they adopted the stance that they did. If we look at the work of Harriett Wilson, Adrian Sinfield, and Bob Holman, for example, there are marked similarities in the approach that they took, along with direct personal links. First, many had taken the Diploma in Social Administration at the London School of Economics in the early 1960s, along with placements with Family Service Units. They had been greatly attracted to, and deeply influenced by, the Fabian outlook of their teachers – Richard Titmuss, Peter Townsend, and Brian Abel-Smith – and for many this led to a life-long commitment. Second, many were reacting against the emphasis in social work on casework, and attempting to counter the problem family stereotypes that were current in the 1950s and early 1960s. Third, through their research, whether on the socialisation of children, long-term unemployment, or different theories of the causes of poverty, they were concerned with the question of the relationship between behaviour and wider structural constraints. Fourth, Holman and Sinfield in particular had direct experience of the American ‘War on Poverty’, the impact on it of Oscar Lewis’s culture of poverty theory, and the American literature on blaming the victim.¹⁰ Overall, their point of view was not that they regarded people in poverty as victims, whether passive or not, but that structural or simply external factors were the primary ones that explained their poverty, not their behaviour.

This was not the whole story of course, and the work of others, such as Herbert Gans in the USA and A. H. Halsey in the UK, had shown a willingness to

engage with both structural and cultural explanations. Ethnographic and anthropological fieldwork in the USA had come to view culture as an adaptive response to environmental factors; and the experience of the Educational Priority Areas had thrown these debates into relief. What appears to have happened is that this more subtle analysis became marginalised by the structural emphasis of much of the social policy community, especially after a famous Peter Townsend 1974 paper. There was a difference, of course, between hostility to ideology on the one hand, and the attractions of research funding on the other, and the *Cycles of Disadvantage* literature review did help to draw social scientists in. However by then the die had largely been cast, and attitudes hardened in the late 1970s, with the publication of the early Community Development Project reports, evidence of growing inequality, and rising unemployment.¹¹ While many authors argue that the cycle of deprivation hypothesis was tested in the Research Programme and found wanting, it would be more correct to say that it was ignored or subverted by many researchers, particularly those from social policy backgrounds. It was left to others to grapple with what they termed personal and economic factors, and it is only more recently that the debate about agency and structure has become a major theme in social policy.

1976-2006: How much progress?

The fifth and final myth or misconception is that there has been significant progress since the publication of *Cycles of Disadvantage*. In terms of the cycle of deprivation hypothesis, research by psychiatrists and psychologists has revealed a much clearer sense of continuities and discontinuities, indicating that parental failure is only one component in psychosocial problems. Research has demonstrated that there is substantial intergenerational continuity; that the continuities are more marked for the

more severe problems than for the minor ones; but also that there are marked discontinuities; that resilience helps to explain individual differences; and that the continuities are greater looking backwards than looking forwards. Moreover much more is known now about mediating processes, both within the family (such as poor parenting), and outside the family (such as overall living conditions), and these point to a synergistic interaction between them. Thus this research points to an interplay between risk and protective processes, and between proximal and distal risk mechanisms, and is much more cautious about assigning causes to what are recognised as multifactorial disorders.¹²

Similarly from the perspective of social policy, there have been major theoretical steps forwards and methodological breakthroughs. The concept of social exclusion has been a major theoretical advance, deriving from European work on disadvantage, and recognising the value of a dynamic and relational approach to poverty.¹³ Critiques have been relatively slow to appear, but have focused on the privileging of paid work, the difficulties in operationalising the concept, and the wide-ranging indicators that have been chosen.¹⁴ Nevertheless the results of data from life course perspectives, changes in income dynamics from one year to the next, and from inter-generational studies of the transmission of economic status have all had a major impact on understanding. Cohort studies such as the National Child Development Study, for example, have demonstrated strong continuities and pervasive influences between childhood antecedents and adult outcomes.¹⁵ Moreover this is an area of public policy where the links between academic research and policy initiatives seem particularly clear. What seems to have had the greatest impact on policy at the birth of Sure Start was the research on childhood disadvantage and intergenerational

transmissions of economic status, which was quickly adopted in Treasury documents and the annual poverty reports.¹⁶

In terms of knowing what works, in terms of policy initiatives, academics are helping to assess the impact of Sure Start, although interim evaluations have been critical.¹⁷ The main problem has been that, as in the Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme of the 1970s, researchers still tend, for the most part, to study solely psychological factors, or solely economic ones. Dichotomies are more attractive to politicians and civil servants seeking solutions, and in terms of policy the picture is more mixed. On the credit side, there are clearly major advances, in terms of the approach that the current Government has taken to child poverty. Through an eclectic mix of earlier policies, New Labour has clearly arrived at an understanding of poverty that is both structural and behavioural. Major resources have been poured into changes to the tax and benefit system, to initiatives such as Sure Start, and to the creation of Children's Centres.¹⁸ Nevertheless alongside these undoubtedly achievements, there have been more fundamental underlying continuities. The *Breaking the Cycle Report* (2004) by the Social Exclusion Unit, for example, refers to an 'intergenerational cycle of deprivation', along with the 'transmission' and 'inheritance' of disadvantage.¹⁹ Moreover alongside the focus on social exclusion has been the parallel rhetoric of anti-social behaviour, with its explicit problem family vocabulary. The Social Exclusion Unit has been shut, and its work transferred to a smaller taskforce in the Cabinet Office; social exclusion work is to be trained on the 'high harm, high risk and high lifetime cost families', with the aim of intervening in such families as soon as they appear at risk of exclusion, breakdown, or criminal behaviour.²⁰ Perhaps above all, what seems to have created the space in which these

debates can occur, is the relatively early stage of knowledge about pathways and mechanisms, and the broader relationship between agency, structure, and behaviour.

Conclusion

Michael Rutter and Nicola Madge's *Cycles of Disadvantage* is an important book, which has made an extremely valuable contribution to an important debate, which still bears re-reading, and has stood the test of time. The thirtieth anniversary of its publication offers an opportunity to take stock of the debate over the cycle of deprivation, to look backwards and to look forwards, and to think about what has really been achieved, in both the academic world and the policy arena, since 1976. This article has sought to illustrate historical methods, to dispel some myths and misconceptions about both the cycle speech and subsequent Transmitted Deprivation Research Programme, and to outline some areas in which a historical perspective can add significantly to existing knowledge. Sources that include archival materials, private papers, oral interviews, published reports and a range of other published documents provide new evidence on important areas of research. Key questions include those to do with the origins of the cycle speech; the setting up and direction of the Research Programme; the attitude of the DHSS towards it; the response of social scientists to the cycle hypothesis; and arguably the most important question, of the links between the concerns of 1976 and those of 2006.

There has clearly been important progress in understanding since 1976, from both psychiatry and social policy perspectives, which means that Joseph's cycle of deprivation is recognised to be a gross over-simplification. While his original thesis – that psychosocial problems persisted between the generations, and that the root cause was some kind of failure in parenting – led to the establishment of an important

Research Programme, Joseph himself was forced to concede that there were both continuities and discontinuities, and parenting was only one component in the process. Researchers have continued to deepen and refine our understanding of inter-generational continuities, and the role of mediating processes. Nevertheless their understandable reluctance to offer answers around causal processes, or more specifically to do with pathways and mechanisms, has created a space in which alternative policy prescriptions can flourish. This means that alongside the focus on social exclusion, child poverty, and inter-generational continuities in economic status, there is a parallel and increasing emphasis on anti-social behaviour, parenting, and problem families. Arguably what comes over most strongly from a review of the past 30 years is the persistence of dichotomies – between continuity and discontinuity; between intra-familial and extra familial factors; between social scientists and psychologists; between research and policy; and between individuals and institutions. Overall, the result of the neglect of this important part of recent intellectual history is that several wheels are being regularly reinvented.

Notes

¹ Michael Rutter and Nicola Madge, *Cycles of Disadvantage: A Review of Research*, London, Heinemann, 1976.

² See, for example, Richard Berthoud, ‘Transmitted Deprivation: The Kite that Failed’, *Policy Studies*, 3, 3 (1983), 151-69; Alan Deacon, “Levelling the Playing Field, Activating the Players”: New Labour and the “Cycle of Disadvantage”, *Policy and Politics*, 31, 2 (2003), 123-37.

³ Muriel Brown and Nicola Madge, *Despite the Welfare State: A Report on the SSRC/DHSS Programme of Research into Transmitted Deprivation*, London, Heinemann, 1982.

⁴ Andrew Denham and Mark Garnett, *Keith Joseph*, Chesham, Acumen, 2001, pp. 22, 55, 104, 232.

⁵ Tessa Blackstone, *Education and Day Care for Young Children in Need: The American Experience*, London, Centre for Studies in Social Policy, 1973.

⁶ National Archives, Kew, London (hereafter NA), NA MH 152/81. For more on the archival sources see John Welshman, ‘Ideology, Social Science, and Public Policy: The Debate Over Transmitted Deprivation’ *Twentieth Century British History*, 16, 3 (2005), 306-41.

⁷ SSRC/DHSS, *Transmitted Deprivation: First Report of the DHSS/SSRC Joint Working Party on Transmitted Deprivation*, London, SSRC, 1974.

⁸ NA MH 152/87: P. Benner to G. Hulme, 18 February 1977.

⁹ NA/MH 152/76: A. M. Sheridan to D. Benham, 2 July 1980.

¹⁰ See, for example, Adrian Sinfield, *Which Way for Social Work?*, London, Fabian Society, 1969; Harriett Wilson, ‘Parenting in Poverty’, *British Journal of Social*

Work, 4, 3 (1974), 241-54; Robert Holman, *Poverty: Explanations of Social Deprivation*, London, Martin Robertson, 1978.

¹¹ Roger Fuller and Olive Stevenson, *Policies, Programmes and Disadvantage: A Review of Literature*, London, Heinemann, 1983, pp. 1-4.

¹² Michael Rutter, ‘Keith Joseph’s Claim on Transmitted Deprivation and What Followed from It’, paper given at the ‘Cycles of Disadvantage’ conference, St Catherine’s College, Oxford, 21 July 2006.

¹³ John Hills, Julian Le Grand and David Piachaud (eds), *Understanding Social Exclusion*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.

¹⁴ Ruth Levitas, ‘The Concept and Measurement of Social Exclusion’, in Christina Pantazis, David Gordon, and Ruth Levitas (eds), *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain: The Millennium Survey*, Bristol, Policy Press, 2006, pp. 123-60.

¹⁵ John Hobcraft, ‘Social Exclusion and the Generations’, in Hills, Le Grand, and Piachaud, *Understanding Social Exclusion*, pp. 62-83.

¹⁶ Stephen Machin, ‘Childhood Disadvantage and Intergenerational Transmissions of Economic Status’, in Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion-HM Treasury, *Persistent Poverty and Lifetime Inequality: The Evidence*, London, CASE-HM Treasury, 1999, pp. 17-21.

¹⁷ ‘Doubts Over Value of £3bn Sure Start’, *Guardian*, 13 September 2005, p. 1.

¹⁸ See, for example, John Hills and Kitty Stewart (eds), *A More Equal Society? New Labour, Poverty, Inequality and Exclusion*, Bristol, Policy Press, 2005.

¹⁹ Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, *Breaking the Cycle: Taking Stock of Progress and Priorities for the Future: A Report by the Social Exclusion Unit*, London, ODPM, 2004, pp. 10, 28, 73, 93, 138.

²⁰ ‘New Taskforce to Focus on Alleviation of Social Exclusion’, *Guardian*, 13 June 2006, p. 14.