



Freeman, M. and Wannell, L. (2009) *The family and community lives of older people after the second world war: new evidence from York*. *Local Population Studies*, 82 . ISSN 0143-2974

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/29903/>

Deposited on: 20 May 2010

Mark Freeman and Louise Wannell

The family and community lives of older people after the second world war: new evidence from York¹

INTRODUCTION

The economic, medical and social problems associated with an ageing population have been the subject of widespread attention in the early twenty-first century. Increasing life expectancy, the impending retirement of the ‘baby boomer’ generation and the pensions crisis have all stimulated concern about the cost of supporting older people in the population. Revelations of neglect in care homes, lonely older people abandoned by their children, inability to pay fuel bills, and older people as victims of crime, have brought old age to the forefront of political debate. However, concern about the costs of supporting old age, and the health and conditions of the elderly, are not new.² One wave of concern, on which this article will concentrate, arose during and after the second world war. As a Nuffield Foundation survey committee, set up in 1942, acknowledged in 1947, ‘[i]n recent years there has been a considerable awakening of public interest in the problems of old age, an awakening that has manifested itself in a sympathetic attitude to old people and in a widespread desire to be generous to them.’³

In the two decades after the end of the war, considerable sociological attention was paid to the lives of the elderly. Early post-war research included the Nuffield Foundation survey, together with associated work at the University of Liverpool by Ellinor Black and Doris Read.⁴ The awareness of an ageing population, and a concern that modern life worsened the long-standing problem of isolation and helplessness among the old, who were abandoned by an increasingly mobile younger generation, stimulated several major studies of older people. These were followed by J. H. Sheldon’s pioneering book on *The social medicine of old age* in 1948, which concentrated on a sample in Wolverhampton. Thereafter, a flood of studies appeared including, in the 1950s, books by Peter Townsend on *The family life of old people* in Bethnal Green, and Peter Willmott and Michael Young, who studied community life in Bethnal Green and, later, in the London suburb of Woodford.⁵ In the 1960s Dorothy Cole and J. E. G. Utting studied *The economic circumstances of old people*

in seven geographical areas,⁶ and Jeremy Tunstall investigated old age in four areas; Harrow, Northampton, Oldham and South Norfolk.⁷ Although this group of researchers had different methods and preoccupations, together they challenged the view that older people were increasingly isolated, and emphasised the importance of family and kinship in the lives of the elderly. Of particular significance was the residential proximity of family members to older people: although an older person or couple might appear to live alone, the dimensions of the household very often extended beyond its bricks and mortar. In other words, non-co-resident kin provided a significant degree of support for the elderly. This support was often financial, and also practical (helping with the shopping, cooking, and so on) and emotional (preventing loneliness and isolation). These studies were located within a wider debate on the welfare state: the survival in a modern context of close kinship support networks could be viewed either as showing the power of traditional forms of association to adapt to modern circumstances, or as illustrating the failure of the welfare state to provide for the needs of the elderly, and a consequent need to rely on familial support. Their findings clearly and repeatedly showed that for many older people close links with family members, co-resident or otherwise, were essential elements of support and sociability. Further research carried out at the University of Liverpool, and by the National Council for Social Service, in the early 1950s, considered many of the same themes and came to similar conclusions.⁸

This article contends that community and friendship networks were more significant in the 1940s and 1950s than sociologists of the period acknowledged. One of those sociologists, Peter Willmott, remarked in 1987 that ‘though information about the respective roles of relatives and neighbours is also limited, even less is known about friends ... because research on them is more difficult to do’.⁹ Although difficult, it is important: Ray Pahl has argued that friends in contemporary Britain are replacing relatives as ‘families of choice’, partly as a result of the increasing geographical distance between family members, a tendency that can be identified among elderly and non-elderly populations. This echoes the concerns about the impact of geographical mobility on older people’s support networks in the 1940s, suggesting that the origins of ‘families of choice’ among older people might go back further than contemporary sociologists indicate.

Indeed, in a recent book, suggestively entitled *The family and community life of older people*, Chris Phillipson *et al* have argued that concentration on the family

limited the development of the sociology of old age and marginalised many important features of the experience of the elderly.¹⁰ In their words, this focus ‘seemed to fix older people as being in some way inseparable from the family’, as a result of which ‘[t]he sociology of old age became invariably a sociology of the family, and not much else.’¹¹ Phillipson *et al* argue that a wider range of social relationships should be studied in order to identify and analyse the social, cultural and familial contexts of ageing. These were not examined in full by an earlier generation of sociologists. For example, Townsend suggested tentatively that friends might be ‘substitutes for relatives’, commented on old-age clubs and organised outings, and recognised the importance of the ‘sense of community’ that existed among the elderly in Bethnal Green; however, he asserted that, in spite of all this, most older people were dependent on relatives for their ‘day-to-day interests’.¹² This article will challenge this assertion, using an unpublished study of older people in York carried out in the later 1940s.¹³ In particular, we find evidence for the ‘support convoy’ model, in which support relationships are seen to vary across the life cycle, which by Phillipson *et al* have described.¹⁴ We will examine social participation, consumption and poverty among a large sample of older people, in a period when Britain was still in the age of post-war austerity. We show that family and community gave many, perhaps most, older people a sense of belonging and protected them from isolation, but also that the help of relatives and friends was often necessary to protect them from the consequences of financial hardship.

THE YORK SURVEY

The York survey was commissioned in 1947 by the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust (JRVT), with which Seebohm Rowntree was closely associated.¹⁵ (Rowntree was also chairman of the Nuffield Foundation committee appointed in 1942). The survey was carried out in 1947 and 1948 by Research Services Ltd (RSL), a company established in 1946 by the social investigator and market researcher Mark Abrams, who later became research director at Age Concern.¹⁶ The research involved a number of interviewers, all female, and Abrams himself drafted the report.¹⁷ The extent of the population covered by the survey, and the range of topics on which information was gathered, make it a valuable source for the historian of old age. Despite some of the limitations of the survey, it is possible to use many of its findings, together with other

sources, to present a detailed picture of aspects of the 'family and community lives' of older people.

The investigators aimed to interview every man aged 65 and over and every woman aged 60 and over in York and neighbouring Flaxton; a total of 10,360 were interviewed. This was 82.8 per cent of the 12,510 older people who were found in the population of the two districts. We cannot tell how those who were not interviewed differed from those who were not.¹⁸ The interviewees were asked to give answers to a questionnaire comprising 15 questions – referred to as the 'universal' questionnaire – referring to their living arrangements, income and other basic matters. Of these, a number were selected to answer a second, much more detailed, questionnaire, referred to as the 'case' questionnaire. A 'case' interview was carried out with older people who appeared to qualify on one or more of three grounds: if their health was seriously impeded; if their accommodation was substandard in terms of overcrowding, sanitation or having more than two flights of stairs separating important rooms; or on grounds of income, if they lived alone with an income of less than 45s. a week, in a 2-person household with less than 90s. a week, in a 3-person household with less than £7 a week, or in a 4-person household with less than £10 a week. Such *prima facie* 'problem cases' numbered 6,379, or 61.6 per cent of the 'universal' group; and of these 5,966 gave a 'case' interview, comprising 57.6 per cent of the 'universal' group. Of the 'case' sample, 2,128 or 35.7 per cent were men and 3,838 or 64.3 per cent women. The size of the two York samples contrasts with the relatively modest sample sizes in the contemporaneous studies by Townsend (203 in Bethnal Green), Tunstall (a total of 538 across his four areas) and Sheldon (583 in Wolverhampton). The 'case' questionnaire contained 172 questions. We focus on those questions that shed light on support networks, social contacts and economic circumstances, although many other aspects of the lives of older people could also be investigated. Although the 'case' sample was not random – it was specifically defined as comprising 'that section of old people who are, or are likely soon to become, social problems'¹⁹ – their circumstances as reported in the survey shed some light on the lives of the elderly in a mid-twentieth-century provincial town, and suggest some revisions of the picture obtained from Townsend and others.

PRACTICAL SUPPORT: COOKING AND SHOPPING

The role of family members in the support of many older people is clear from the York data, especially in the tables that consider help with practical tasks. For example, the interviewers asked the case sample, ‘who cooks for you?’²⁰ They found that 746 men and 873 women did not do all their own cooking: of *these*, 35.6 per cent of the men and 29.6 per cent of the women were cooked for by their spouse; 48.1 per cent of men and 55.1 per cent of women by another relative; and 7.2 per cent of men and 7.3 per cent of women by a friend. Friends were relatively insignificant compared with relatives in this respect. The last percentages represent 54 men and 64 women, most of whom must have lived alone, because, of the 102 people who lived alone and did not do all their own cooking, 79.4 per cent were helped by a friend. The dominance of help from friends among those who lived alone shows that those without family support could often rely on alternative networks.

The interviewers also asked, ‘who shops for you?’²¹ As table 1 shows, a total of 2,602 case respondents did not do all their own shopping, and of these 26.7 per cent were helped by a spouse and 53.9 per cent by another member of the household, while 19.1 per cent were helped by a ‘friend or relative outside [the] household’. The latter figure rose to 22.4 per cent in the case of women who did not do all their own shopping, and 26.1 per cent of women aged 70 and over who did not, while among those living alone (a total of 285 did not do all their own shopping), 86.0 per cent were helped by a ‘friend or relative’. Friends were probably more likely to assist with shopping than with cooking, which was a more intrusive task, involving entry into someone else’s home and use of their kitchen facilities. It should be emphasised here that, as Townsend remarked, the distinction between friends and relatives may have been somewhat confused: some relatives were also neighbours, and may have been referred to as friends.²² The JRVT survey, in addressing shopping patterns, made no attempt to separate friends and relatives, and even more vaguely, when asking about housework,²³ distinguished only between paid and unpaid ‘domestic help’. However, the answers to the interviewers’ questions do seem to suggest that older people living alone – at least those with poor health, poor housing or low incomes, who were the groups that appeared in the case sample – had ‘friends of choice’, or perhaps ‘friends of necessity’, who in some respects and in the provision of some support took the place of their family members. There was some scope for friends and neighbours to participate in the practical support of the elderly population, although, as we will see,

their role was considerably greater in the social life rather than in the provision of support.

Nevertheless, the findings of the survey lend considerable weight to the notion of the 'support convoy'. The circumstances of older people can change in significant ways, above all with widowhood. Of 5,966 case informants, 2,520 or 42.2 per cent had experienced a change in the composition of their household in the past five years. Among those living alone, the proportion was almost 50 per cent (in many cases probably because of the death of a spouse), and it was even higher among those living with other members of their family.²⁴ These changing household circumstances must have entailed changes in support mechanisms and social arrangements. We can also trace aspects of the support convoy through differences between age groups, particularly among men. For example, as table 1 shows, among men aged under 70 who did not do all their own shopping, 49.3 per cent said that their wife shopped for them, whereas among those aged 70 and over, 58.0 per cent named another member of their household. The proportion of these men who relied on a friend or relative outside the household for their shopping increased from 4.9 per cent among the under-70s to 12.9 per cent among those aged 70 and over. The corresponding figures for women were 16.9 per cent and 26.1 per cent, a considerably higher proportion than for men, although in other respects women's shopping arrangements changed less with age.²⁵ Among men, similar changes are apparent in regard to cooking arrangements: of men aged under 70 who did not do their own cooking, 51.2 per cent relied on their wife and 30.3 per cent on another relative, while the corresponding figures for those aged 70 and over were 29.5 per cent and 55.1 per cent.²⁶

VISITING AND SOCIAL CONTACT

The importance of friends and neighbours, as well as family members, is emphasised by the statistics on recent visitors. The interviewers asked about visitors 'yesterday', 'the day before yesterday' and 'last weekend'.²⁷ Of the whole case sample, 36.6 per cent of men, 46.9 per cent of women and 53.4 per cent of those who lived alone, had had one or more visitors on the day preceding the interview.²⁸ As shown in table 2(a), sons and daughters were the commonest category of visitor, comprising almost a quarter of all visitors, and more where the older person lived with his or her spouse only. However, among older people living alone, the commonest kind of visitor was a

friend of the same sex. Although in all groups relatives made up more than half of 'yesterday's' visitors, friends were important. In total, 777 older people were visited by friends of the same, and 145 by friends of the opposite, sex, on the preceding day, and this was the case for around a quarter of those who lived alone. The survey report commented that same-sex friendships were 'particularly important for women living on their own'.²⁹ On the 'day before yesterday' (table 1(b)) the proportion of older people receiving visitors was considerably lower, at 30.7 per cent of men, 38.8 per cent of women and 43.7 per cent of those who lived alone. These lower figures could largely be attributed to deficiencies of memory. Nevertheless, the relative proportions of relatives and non-relatives visiting on the 'day before yesterday' were roughly similar to 'yesterday'.

Visits paid by relatives, especially sons and daughters, were a more significant component of the social lives of older people at weekends (table 1(c)). Sons and daughters were more likely to be of working age, and therefore less able to visit on weekdays.³⁰ When asked about visitors 'last weekend', 33.3 per cent of all older people in the case sample mentioned sons or daughters, and only 11.1 per cent friends of the same, and 2.5 per cent friends of the opposite, sex. Weekend visits from friends were most important for those living alone: 18.1 per cent of these people mentioned friends of the same, and 2.1 per cent friends of the opposite, sex, although among this group visits from sons and daughters were more numerically significant at the weekend. More than half of the whole case sample had received visitors the previous weekend. In total, covering all three questions, 62.5 per cent of men had received at least one visitor 'yesterday', the day before, or at the weekend, as had 73.0 per cent of women and 74.4 per cent of those living alone. Among the whole case sample, 69.2 per cent had been visited, and 22.9 per cent had answered 'yes' to all three questions.³¹ A separate question revealed that more a tenth of the case sample were visited monthly or more often by their doctor, representing another, if perhaps less welcome, form of personal contact.³²

The investigators were at pains to point out that, although 70.9 per cent of the case sample had 'regular' visits from relatives, a number did not, even where they had relatives (including sons and daughters), many of whom lived in York. (The definition of 'regular' is not entirely clear.) Of the 1,734 (29.1 per cent of the case sample) who were *not* visited regularly by any relatives, 740 said that a son or daughter was their next-of-kin, and 669 others named brothers, sisters and other relatives, including in-

laws. Although lack of regular visits did not mean a complete break from other family members these figures suggest that a not insignificant proportion of older people had lost contact with children and siblings.³³ It is likely that many of these who had lost contact with children or other next-of-kin relied more heavily on friends and neighbours for practical support and social contacts. Moreover, a proportion of older people in all communities have no living children, and necessarily rely on alternative 'social and emotional resources'.³⁴

Older people were almost as likely to pay visits as to receive them, although exact comparisons are not possible, because the interviewers only asked whether they had paid any visits within the previous week. It should be emphasised that many of those who received visits also paid them, probably often to each other. A fairly small proportion could not pay visits, because they were confined to their homes: this was true of 529 members of the sample, or 8.9 per cent. Among the members of the case sample who were *not* confined to their homes, 43.7 per cent of men, 53.9 per cent of women and 66.6 per cent of those living alone had visited someone in the previous week (even 21.2 per cent of the 99 people living in an institution had done so). As table 3(a) shows, 2,727 older people had paid visits, amounting to 50.2 per cent of the 5,437 unconfined members of the sample.³⁵ The proportions were 43.7 per cent of men, 53.9 per cent of women, and 66.6 per cent of the 992 older people who lived alone and were not confined indoors. Again, it should be emphasised that, because of mobility difficulties, those in the case sample were less likely to be in a position to visit others than were those in the elderly population as a whole. Here, as table 3(b) shows, friends of the same sex were the largest single category of person visited, being mentioned by 37.9 per cent of all those who had paid visits, including 45.1 per cent of the 661 unconfined older people living alone who had paid visits. Moreover, 182 people had visited friends of the opposite sex. It is not possible to cross-tabulate the proportions paying and receiving visits, but the impression from these figures for the case sample is of an elderly population that, on the whole, enjoyed a reasonable level of social participation.³⁶ Friends had an important place in the lives of older people. As one anthropologist has concluded, 'friends play a part in the acceptance of physical ageing, in the management of transitions such as retirement and widowhood, and in coping with such age-related losses as youthful appearance, health and fitness, of home, kin and other friends'.³⁷

CLUBS, SOCIAL PARTICIPATION AND CONTENTMENT

Visits were only one way of ensuring social contact; social clubs were another. In his study of Bethnal Green in the 1950s, Townsend downplayed the significance of clubs in the life of the elderly. However, given that almost one in four of his sample attended clubs of one sort or another,³⁸ they may have played a role of considerable importance in the lives of many members of the elderly population. The Nuffield survey emphasised this, especially in relation to men:

old men enjoy belonging to clubs, where they can spend much of their time. Old women are not, apparently, as interested in clubs, perhaps because they are usually more fully occupied in their own houses. An old man who has been accustomed to go daily to work finds that he is a positive nuisance to his wife and to himself when he has nothing to do except to potter around the house all day ... a well run club for old men often changes a life of dull and dreary loneliness to one of happy contentment.³⁹

Among the York case sample, 797 were members of clubs, representing 13.4 per cent of the total. Unlike in Bethnal Green, club membership was heavily concentrated among men, of whom 28.2 per cent were members, compared with just 5.2 per cent of women. These figures support the comments of the Nuffield committee, and reflect the strength of the working men's clubs in the north of England:⁴⁰ 56.2 per cent of club members were members of these organisations, compared with just 6.5 per cent who were members of old age pensioners' clubs,⁴¹ 8.9 per cent who were in church and chapel clubs, and 2.4 per cent in the British Legion and similar organisations.⁴² Among both men and women, there were not significant variations in club membership by age. Although among men there was a slight falling away from club membership after the age of 70, more than a quarter of all men aged 70 and over were club members. Among male club members, 37.7 per cent had visited their club on the day preceding the interview, and the figure was slightly higher among those aged 70 and over. Among all club members of both sexes – and including all club memberships where an individual was a member of more than one – 34.9 per cent went to their club more than once a week, and 35.4 per cent once a week. Among men the figures were 47.9 per cent and 30.0 per cent respectively.

These figures suggest that the clubs played a considerable role in the lives of the proportion of the elderly population who were club members, particularly men. We cannot tell whether non-members also visited clubs: if so, they may have played an even larger role than was documented in the York survey. Whereas women were more likely to have had visitors and paid visits, men were more likely to obtain social contact through clubs, although it should be emphasised here that a tenth of men had been visited by a friend on the previous day alone (see table 2(a)).⁴³

The investigators also asked informants about the duration of their last visit to their club. Table 4 shows the frequency of visits and the duration of the last visit. From this, it is possible to estimate the average length of time that club members spent at their club, and the amount of time spent per week. This is complicated by the fact that 80 individuals were members of more than one club. However, a calculation based on table 4 shows that, on a low estimate, the average club visit lasted around an hour and fifty minutes, and that the average club member spent over four hours a week at their club. This means that, across the whole case sample,⁴⁴ including club members and non-club members, *men* spent an average of an hour and quarter at a club each week, a figure that would, presumably, be higher among the non-case sample.⁴⁵ The investigators asked what members did at the clubs, and what their favourite activity was: 93.5 per cent of members talked to their friends, and more than half took refreshments and played cards, while 55.5 per cent named talking to friends as their favourite club activity. These figures suggest that clubs were, particularly for many elderly men in York, an important way in which social contacts were maintained. Townsend himself noted that there was a considerable demand for clubs, finding that 30 per cent of non-members did not join because they were in employment, infirm or had caring responsibilities: *not* because they simply did not want to.⁴⁶ The view of Seebohm Rowntree and his collaborator G. R. Lavers was that most clubs were ‘desirable institutions, performing a thoroughly useful function’, and this was particularly clear in the case of the large minority of elderly men in the case sample who were members.⁴⁷ Pubs also provided an opportunity for socialising, although the investigators did not ask specifically about them.⁴⁸ Rowntree and Lavers were far from thinking that pubs were ‘desirable institutions’, but they did admit that they ‘are not infrequently social institutions of considerable importance to the communal life of the neighbourhood’.⁴⁹ Given the characteristics of the non-case

sample, it is distinctly possible that clubs and pubs played a larger role in the life of the male population than was indicated by the case sample data.

Churchgoing also fostered social participation. More than a fifth of the case sample attended a religious service monthly or oftener, with 15.7 per cent attending once a week or more. As with other social activities, churchgoing was more likely and more frequent among those who were mobile – of the 3,848 people who were ‘able to go out and move about at will’, 18.6 per cent attended once a week or more – and it was also more common among women than men. The York figures were higher than those for Bethnal Green, where Townsend found that only 13 per cent attended church or chapel monthly or oftener, predominantly women.⁵⁰ In addition to attendance at services, 9.6 per cent of the York case sample had attended ‘church or chapel functions’ in the previous six months: these were mostly women, and the most common functions were ‘socials, dances, parties’, mothers’ meetings, whist drives and jumble sales.

Cinemas also played a role in the lives of the elderly population: 16.7 per cent of the case sample had visited the cinema in the fortnight prior to being interviewed, a figure that was slightly higher among women. The popularity of the cinema is underlined by the fact that, apparently, even among those who were confined to bed, 15, or 12.0 per cent, claimed to have been during the preceding fortnight.⁵¹ The attendance ‘at the pictures’ of those confined to bed may be explained by institutional film shows, which were attended by 3.8 per cent of those who had visited the cinema in the past fortnight. Most, however, travelled to the cinema, and many went to the cinema with their spouses or children, and 10.1 per cent with their friends. However, the extent to which cinemas fulfilled a *social* function is less clear, because among those who had been to the cinema in the preceding fortnight, almost a third went alone.

Overall, the impression given by the survey was of a mostly contented elderly population. For each case informant, an opinion was obtained from the interviewer as to his or her level of contentment. It should be emphasised that this was only the opinion of the interviewer, and not the outcome of a direct question. In total, 20.5 per cent of the case sample was considered ‘very contented’ and 74.7 per cent ‘contented’, with only 4.0 per cent ‘discontented’.⁵² There were not significant variations between men and women, by age, or by domestic arrangements: among all categories of domestic arrangements, only a small proportion of older people,

between two and five per cent, were considered 'discontented' by the interviewer. However, among the small numbers confined to bed (125) and confined indoors and restricted in movement (347), the proportions 'discontented' were predictably somewhat higher, at 15.2 per cent and 8.9 per cent respectively.⁵³ The low levels of 'discontentment', among most groups, were reflected in social participation and meaningful activities. Thus, when five different activities were considered – the extent to which people went to church, visited the cinema, practised a handicraft, had a hobby, and spent a day away from home – it was found that, while a predictably small 0.9 per cent of the case sample did all five of these things, 23.7 per cent did at least three, and only 8.2 per cent did none of them. Partly owing to the nature of the five activities chosen, men were less likely to do more than two of these things, but the proportions of men and women doing none (9.0 per cent and 7.7 per cent respectively) were not very different. It is not possible to tell what proportion of these elderly people who did none of these things were in the 'discontented' group, but it may well have been high. Again, it must be remembered that the case sample contained those who were in circumstances that made it more difficult to participate in these activities.

POVERTY AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

Although older people in York were mostly able to participate in social activities, the extent of their participation could be severely restricted by their financial circumstances. This was emphasised a decade later in Cole and Utting's study, which concluded that the 'meagre incomes' of the elderly restricted their independence and social participation, and advocated higher old-age pensions for those aged 70 and over, as well as better private pensions.⁵⁴ The York data gives an insight into the straitened financial circumstances of many of the elderly population, particularly when examined in conjunction with Rowntree and Lavers's study of poverty in York, which was carried out in 1950 and emphasised the importance of old age as a cause of poverty in the era of the welfare state.

Rowntree and Lavers, using a sample survey of the households in York, calculated a poverty line, which varied according to the size of household, and whether members of that household were in employment. They found that 1,746 persons, corresponding to 2.8 per cent of the 'working-class' population,⁵⁵ or 1.7 per cent of the total population, were below the poverty line. There were 846 'families' in

poverty, 4.7 per cent of the 'working-class' total, or somewhere below 3 per cent of the total number of families in York. Of the families in poverty, the main cause of poverty was old age in 576, or 68.1 per cent, of cases. Many of the older people in poverty were in receipt of old-age pensions: the pension for a single person was 26s. and for a couple 40s., while in both cases the poverty line, after rent and rates, stood considerably higher than this.⁵⁶ Therefore, a single elderly person, or an elderly couple, living with nobody else and with no source of income other than the old-age pension, would be in poverty. Indeed, many on supplementary pensions were also in poverty, as Rowntree and Lavers emphasised: 'Among the large percentage of cases where poverty is due to old age, a good many of the families concerned are in receipt of supplementary pensions, thus demonstrating that even with our stringent definition of poverty, supplementary pensions are no longer a guarantee against poverty.'⁵⁷

Old age was the most significant cause of poverty, and the elderly people in poverty constituted a significant proportion of the elderly population, probably more than 10 per cent. Of *all* those interviewed for the JRVT survey (not just the case sample), the old-age pension was the only source of income for 33.7 per cent of informants. Although some of the recipients of old-age pensions would have been lifted out of poverty by the earnings of other members of the household, the pension was the only source of income for 20.1 per cent of those living alone, and for 35.3 per cent of those living with their spouse only. These two groups alone numbered 1,316 people, or 12.7 per cent of the elderly population interviewed for the purposes of the survey.⁵⁸ This suggests that Rowntree and Lavers underestimated the extent of poverty in their survey, as recent scholars have also concluded using other evidence.⁵⁹ Moreover, given that only 971 individuals in the JRVT survey had any income from employment, even our figure of 12.7 per cent is likely to underestimate significantly the level of poverty among older people in York in 1947-8. Among case interviewees, the pension was the sole source of income for 43.2 per cent, and for 28.1 per cent of those living alone, and 49.1 per cent of those living with their spouse only.⁶⁰ This means that at least 18.2 per cent of those in the case sample were living below Rowntree and Lavers's poverty line, and probably rather more. Under Rowntree's chairmanship, the Nuffield Foundation study of 1947 had optimistically considered the old-age pension to be sufficient for 'bare subsistence', even where people lived alone or with their spouse only.⁶¹ This was obviously not the case, even given the strictness of the Rowntree and Lavers poverty line.

Of course, the JRVT survey questions about income did not necessarily capture other sources of material support that might not have been defined as 'income': for example, meals cooked by relatives. However, it is clear that the extent of participation in consumerism and social life was restricted, for many elderly people, by their limited income as much as by any difficulties with mobility. The lack of resources among the case sample is repeatedly emphasised in the tabulated results of the survey. Table 5 summarises the percentages of the case sample who cited lack of money as the reason for not engaging in particular activities. It shows that 33.0 per cent of the case sample claimed that they could not afford a holiday (this figure increased to 57.0 per cent among those living alone), 13.5 per cent told the interviewer that they could not afford to visit the cinema (a matinee ticket at the Clifton Realto cinema cost 2s.3d., or 1s.9d. for concessions, in 1947),⁶² 34.8 per cent said that they lacked the means to eat in a restaurant, 30.9 per cent cited cost as reason for not buying the local weekly newspaper (the *Yorkshire Gazette* cost 1½d.), and 5.3 per cent could not, or so they claimed, afford enough bedding to keep themselves warm. Another question revealed that, of 4,434 *householders* in the case sample, 1,634 needed repairs to their home:⁶³ this emphasises the extent of 'amenity deprivation' that existed among older people, and according to other sources persisted into the 1960s.⁶⁴ Because of these levels of deprivation, many members of the elderly population were particularly reliant on the various support networks that existed for them, and on inexpensive or free forms of entertainment, particularly visiting, and being visited by, friends and relatives. Holidays, in particular, were beyond the reach of many, and remained so into the 1950s and 1960s.⁶⁵ As the Nuffield study acknowledged, 'few old people can afford holidays away from their own homes', the cinema was often too expensive, and attendance as spectators at sporting events was 'limited by the comparatively high cost of admission'.⁶⁶ Even those whose circumstances placed them comfortably above the Rowntree and Lavers poverty line were denied – or at least, considered themselves unable to afford – minor luxuries such as the cinema and weekly newspapers.⁶⁷

CONCLUSION

The overall impression given by York survey, is of a relatively contented elderly population, but without the means to pursue some of the activities that they might

have wished to. Nevertheless, activities of little or no cost – such as visiting friends and relatives, talking to friends at a social club, and going to church – were pursued by many older people, even in the case sample, in which mobility and participation were more restricted than among older people as a whole. Seebohm Rowntree’s dispiriting claim that ‘by far the worst evil of old age was loneliness’ was not borne out by the survey, at least as far as the majority was concerned.⁶⁸ Most older people had something to do with their time, and few seemed to be ‘discontented’, even among the case sample, whose members may have had more reason to be unhappy than the non-case sample. Around a tenth of older people were in precarious financial circumstances and poor health, and their social participation was severely restricted, albeit in some cases partly through personal choice. The remainder of the elderly population seems to have relied on a range of support networks, and these varied with age and circumstances. There is some evidence for a ‘convoy’ model of practical support, and considerable evidence that the role of friends and the wider community loomed large in the day-to-day social interactions of older people in York after the second world war. However, lifestyles were still very much circumscribed by poverty: if retirement from work was not the ‘tragic event’ that Townsend painted, these older people were far from enjoying a modern version of the ‘third age’.⁶⁹ The levels of poverty uncovered by the JRVT survey emphasise the importance of the support networks that were available, and of both the family and community lives of older people.

¹ We are grateful to the British Academy for funding to support this research under its Small Grants scheme, award number SG-42744.

² On the longer history of old age, see Pat Thane, *Old age in English history: past experiences, present issues* (Oxford, 2000).

³ *Old people: report of a survey committee on the problems of ageing and the care of old people under the chairmanship of B. Seebohm Rowntree* (London, 1947), 95.

⁴ *Old people*; Ellinor I. Black and Doris B. Read, *Old people’s welfare on Merseyside* (Liverpool, 1947).

⁵ J. H. Sheldon, *The social medicine of old age: report of an enquiry in Wolverhampton* (London, 1948); Peter Townsend, *The family life of old people: an inquiry in east London* (Harmondsworth, 1963 [1st ed. London, 1957]); Peter Willmott and Michael Young, *Family and kinship in East London* (London, 1957);

Peter Willmott and Michael Young, *Family and class in a London suburb* (London, 1960).

⁶ Salisbury, Leicester, Hexham Rural District, Seaton Valley, Glasgow, Wimbledon and East Ham. See Dorothy Cole and J. E. G. Utting, *The economic circumstances of old people* (Welwyn, 1962), 8.

⁷ Jeremy Tunstall, *Old and alone: a sociological study of old people* (London, 1966).

⁸ *Social contacts in old age: report of a survey undertaken by the Liverpool Personal Service Society in conjunction with the Department of Social Science at the University of Liverpool* (Liverpool, 1953); *Over seventy: report of an investigation into the social and economic circumstances of one hundred people over seventy years of age* (London, 1954).

⁹ Peter Willmott, *Friendship networks and social support* (London, 1987), 1.

¹⁰ Chris Phillipson, Miriam Bernard, Judith Phillips and Jim Ogg, *The family and community lives of older people: social networks and social support in three urban areas* (London, 2001).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 4-5.

¹² Townsend, *Family life*, 145, 148

¹³ Research Services Limited, 'A survey of aged people in York': Borthwick Institute of Archives (BIA), York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation papers, BSR93/XI/6 (hereafter, JRVT report). These papers were held in the Joseph Rowntree Foundation library, the Homestead, York, before being transferred to the Borthwick Institute.

¹⁴ Phillipson *et al*, *Family and community lives*, 27-30.

¹⁵ See [Lewis E. Waddilove,] *One man's vision: the story of the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust* (London: 1954. The JRVT is now the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

¹⁶ On Abrams, see Michael Warren, 'Abrams, Mark Alexander (1906-1994)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/54696>, accessed 11 Jan 2008].

¹⁷ Peter Rowntree, 'Report on the progress of schemes for the welfare of the aged in York', 20 May 1947, BIA Rowntree Papers, NFS/8.

¹⁸ In the County Borough of York in 1951 there were 4,472 men aged 65 and over, and 9,327 women aged 60 and over; the figures for Flaxton Rural District were 863 and 1,712 respectively. This gave a total for the whole area covered by the inquiry of 16,375. See General Register Office, *Census 1951, England and Wales, county*

report: *Yorkshire, West Riding* (London, 1954), table 21; *Yorkshire, East and North Ridings* (London, 1954), table 22.

¹⁹ JRVT report, 4.

²⁰ JRVT report, tables 95-9.

²¹ JRVT report, tables 87-90.

²² Townsend, *Family life*, 139-40.

²³ JRVT report, tables 100-5.

²⁴ JRVT report, table 209.

²⁵ JRVT report, table 89.

²⁶ JRVT report, table 97.

²⁷ As noted above, the interviews were undertaken over a long period. Some of the interviews were carried out on a Monday or Tuesday. It appears from table 52 in the report that, by 'yesterday' the interviewers meant the last weekday, and by the 'day before yesterday', they meant the last weekday but one. However, this is not entirely certain.

²⁸ JRVT report, table 48. According to table 54 of the report, 494 had received two visitors, and 140 three or more, amounting in total to 24.6 per cent of those who had received visitors 'yesterday'. A further 113 did not state the number.

²⁹ JRVT report, 39.

³⁰ Older men themselves were more likely to be in employment than older women, and therefore less able to pay or receive visits. However, the nature of the case sample was such that participation in employment was relatively low: only 134 in the sample had not retired from work, and only 233 reported having any part-time employment.

See JRVT report, tables 201-3.

³¹ JRVT report, table 52.

³² JRVT report, table 171.

³³ JRVT report, table 62.

³⁴ G. Clare Wenger, *The supportive network: coping with old age* (London, 1984), 71, 76. In this survey, the proportion with no living children was 31 per cent.

³⁵ JRVT report, table 67. Information was 'unobtainable' in 57 cases, while 2,653 had not paid any visits in the previous week.

³⁶ Of the case sample, 42.3 per cent had received at least one personal letter in the preceding fortnight, and 32.8 per cent had sent one (JRVT report, tables 70-1). It is not possible to tell who these correspondents were.

³⁷ Dorothy Jerrome, *Good company: an anthropological study of old people in groups* (Edinburgh, 1992), xii.

³⁸ Townsend, *Family life*, 143-4.

³⁹ *Old people*, 80.

⁴⁰ See Chris Coekin, *Knock three times: working men, social clubs and other stories* (Stockport, 2006). The *York Herald* carried a series of articles entitled 'Around the Clubs' from January to May 1952.

⁴¹ Seebohm Rowntree's son Peter established old people's clubs in York in 1946: B. S. Rowntree to W. W. Hackett, 17 July 1946, BIA RP NFS/7.

⁴² Other types of club included political clubs and a large and vague category comprising 'Other clubs', to which 21.8 per cent of club members belonged.

⁴³ 6.4 per cent had been visited by friends of the same sex, and 3.9 per cent by friends of the opposite sex. It is not possible to tell how much overlap there was between these two groups, but the majority of men who had been visited on the previous day had had only one visitor (JRVT report, table 54).

⁴⁴ Here we also assume that men and women had the same average length of visit, and number of weekly visits.

⁴⁵ If the calculations above excluded the 111 men in the case sample who were confined to the house, and therefore not able to go to a club, the proportions being club members, and the average length of time per person spent at a club, would be even higher.

⁴⁶ Townsend, *Family life*, 144.

⁴⁷ B. Seebohm Rowntree and G. R. Lavers, *English life and leisure: a social study*, (London, 1951), 167.

⁴⁸ JRVT report, table 78, summarising the case sample diaries. Here, 145 individuals reported that they had been at a club in the evening (compared with 85 in the afternoon and 41 in the morning), but only 31 reported that they had spent part of the evening at a pub. Using a similar multiplier leads one to the conclusion that only around 100 people in the case sample went to pubs, or less than 2 per cent of the total, which seems implausibly low. It seems likely that pub visits were under-reported in

the survey, perhaps due to reluctance on the part of the interviewees to admit to drinking.

⁴⁹ Rowntree and Lavers, *English life and leisure*, 174.

⁵⁰ Townsend, *Family life*, 142-3.

⁵¹ JRVT report, tables 15, 15A.

⁵² In 47 cases, 0.8 per cent of the sample, the information was 'unobtainable'.

⁵³ JRVT report, tables 85-6.

⁵⁴ Cole and Utting, *Economic circumstances*, 103; see also Townsend, *Family life*, 166-8.

⁵⁵ The 'working-class' population was defined as those households where the chief wage-earner (and spouse, where appropriate) earned less than £550 a year: B. Seebohm Rowntree and G. R. Lavers, *Poverty and the welfare state: a third social survey of York, dealing only with economic questions* (London, 1951), 1.

⁵⁶ The poverty line for a single man was 36s.1d. or 37s.11d. depending on whether he was in employment. The figures for a single woman were 31s.1d. or 33s.2d., and for a married couple 56s.2d. or 57s.2d. See Rowntree and Lavers, *Poverty and the welfare state*, 28-9. Some of the figures presented here were not given in Rowntree and Lavers's study, and have been calculated. They did not give the numbers of individuals affected by each cause of poverty, and it is not possible to calculate this from the data given in the survey.

⁵⁷ Rowntree and Lavers, *Poverty and the welfare state*, 35.

⁵⁸ Calculated from JRVT report, table 23. The table shows that the old-age pension was the only source of income for 28.1 per cent of the 1,086 'problem' cases living alone, 48.5 per cent of the 1,760 'problem' cases living with a spouse only, none of the 438 'non-problem' cases living alone, and 14.3 per cent of the 1,103 'non-problem' cases living with a spouse only. Adding these percentages together gives a figure for those living on old-age pensions only of 1,316, to the nearest whole number.

⁵⁹ Timothy J. Hatton and Roy E. Bailey, 'Seebohm Rowntree and the post-war poverty puzzle', *Economic History Review*, **53**, (2000).

⁶⁰ Calculated from JRVT report, table 23C.

⁶¹ *Old people*, 23-4. The Nuffield report noted that most older people were *not* in this situation, and that where they lived with relatives, the pension was enough to provide for subsistence and modest personal expenditure.

⁶² *Yorkshire Evening Press*, 6 January 1947.

⁶³ JRVT report, table 289.

⁶⁴ Ian Gazeley, *Poverty in Britain 1900-1965* (Basingstoke, 2003), 176.

⁶⁵ Townsend, *Family life*, 168; Cole and Utting, *Economic circumstances*, 103.

⁶⁶ *Old people*, 83, 79, 77.

⁶⁷ The situation of some older people improved when the rates of old-age pensions were increased in 1951, to 30s. a week for a single person and 50s. for a couple. Rowntree and Lavers showed that, had these rates been in force when they carried out their survey, the number of families in poverty would have been reduced from 846 to 351. Assuming the entire reduction to be among families in poverty due to old age, the impact would have been to cut this number from 576 families to just 81: calculated from Rowntree and Lavers, *Poverty and the welfare state*, 35-6.

⁶⁸ *Yorkshire Evening Press*, 14 March 1947.

⁶⁹ Townsend, *Family life*, 157; Chris Gilleard, Paul Higgs, Martin Hyde, Richard Wiggins and David Blane, 'Class, cohort and consumption: the British experience of the third age', *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, **60B**, (2005), S305.

Table 1: Responses to the question ‘who shops for you?’, case sample

			All men	All women	Men aged 69 & under	Men aged 70 & over	Women aged 69 & under	Women aged 70 & over	All those living alone
Informants not doing all own shopping (base for percentages)	2,602		726	1,876	205	521	744	1,132	285
	No	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Person shopping for informant									
Spouse	694	26.7	31.7	24.7	49.3	24.8	32.5	19.6	
Other member of household (except domestic servant)	1,402	53.9	52.5	54.4	38.5	58.0	53.9	54.8	
Friend or relative outside household	498	19.1	10.6	22.4	4.9	12.9	16.9	26.1	86.0
Housekeeper, domestic servant, landlady	58	2.2	5.8	0.9	8.3	4.8	0.1	1.3	5.3
Other person	18	0.7	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.3	1.1	2.8
Delivered by shop	72	2.8	1.5	3.3	0.5	1.9	3.4	3.2	7.7
Information unobtainable	21	0.8	1.4	0.6	1.0	1.5	0.3	0.8	0.3

Source: JRVT report, table 89.

Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, because some informants gave more than one answer. The question was asked only to ‘first’ case interviewees, i.e. the first case interviewee in each household, some of which contained two or more case interviewees.

Table 2: Visitors recently received, case sample

(a) Visitors received 'yesterday'	Domestic organisation									
			All men	All women	Alone	With spouse only	Without spouse as part of family	With spouse as part of family	Other ways	In Institution
All informants (base for percentages)	5,966		2,127	3,839	1,039	1,620	1,727	1,228	164	188
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Any visitor(s)	2,580	43.2	36.6	46.9	53.4	48.1	36.3	43.4	36.6	14.4
Brothers, sisters	204	3.4	2.8	3.8	4.5	3.3	3.2	3.3	1.8	2.1
Sons, daughters	1,411	23.7	22.5	24.3	22.1	28.7	17.6	30.5	14.6	6.9
Other relatives	439	7.4	6.3	7.9	8.5	8.6	6.8	6.4	6.1	3.7
Friends - same sex	777	13.0	6.4	16.7	24.4	11.0	12.2	8.6	16.5	1.1
Friends - opposite sex	145	2.4	3.9	1.6	2.1	3.5	1.6	3.0	0.6	1.1
Official visitor	28	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.2	--	1.1
Other visitors	3	0.1	*	0.1	0.1	--	--	0.2	--	--
No visitors	3,386	56.8	63.4	53.1	46.6	51.9	63.7	56.6	63.4	85.6

* = less than 0.05%

Source: JRVT report, table 48.

Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, as some older people had more than one visitor. Visits by doctors are not included in this table.

(b) Visitors received 'the day before yesterday'	Domestic organisation									
			All men	All women	Alone	With spouse only	Without spouse as part of family	With spouse as part of family	Other ways	In Institution
All informants (base for percentages)	5,966		2,127	3,839	1,039	1,620	1,727	1,228	164	188
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Any visitor(s)	2,141	35.9	30.7	38.8	43.7	40.4	29.5	37.1	28.7	11.7
Brothers, sisters	188	3.2	2.4	3.5	4.2	3.0	3.2	2.9	2.4	1.1
Sons, daughters	1,166	19.5	18.7	20.0	18.2	24.8	13.7	25.1	12.8	5.9
Other relatives	380	6.4	5.9	6.6	6.9	8.0	6.0	5.0	4.9	2.6
Friends - same sex	572	9.6	4.6	12.4	17.2	7.6	9.4	7.2	9.1	2.1
Friends - opposite sex	112	1.9	3.0	1.3	2.1	2.9	1.1	1.8	1.2	--
Official visitor	17	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	--	--
Other visitors	2	*	--	0.1	0.1	0.1	--	--	--	--
No visitors	3,825	64.1	69.3	61.2	56.3	59.6	70.5	62.9	71.3	88.3

* = less than 0.05%

Source: JRVT report, table 48.

Note: Except for those in institutions, percentages do not sum to 100, as some older people had more than one visitor. Visits by doctors are not included in this table.

(c) Visitors received 'last weekend'	Domestic organisation									
			All men	All women	Alone	With spouse only	Without spouse as part of family	With spouse as part of family	Other ways	In Institution
All informants (base for percentages)	5,966		2,127	3,839	1,039	1,620	1,727	1,228	164	188
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Any visitor(s)	3,262	54.7	50.0	57.3	60.1	59.4	47.0	58.4	45.7	37.8
Brothers, sisters	325	5.4	5.0	5.7	6.9	4.8	5.0	5.5	3.7	8.0
Sons, daughters	1,985	33.3	32.6	33.6	29.2	40.7	25.4	41.9	20.7	18.6
Other relatives	825	13.8	12.7	14.5	14.3	16.0	11.6	15.1	9.1	8.0
Friends - same sex	664	11.1	5.4	14.3	18.1	8.8	12.2	7.2	16.5	3.2
Friends - opposite sex	147	2.5	4.0	1.7	2.4	3.5	1.3	3.0	0.6	2.1
Official visitor	9	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	--	--
Other visitors	6	0.1	*	0.1	0.5	--	--	--	--	0.5
No visitors	2,704	45.3	50.0	42.7	39.9	40.6	53.0	41.6	54.3	62.2

* = less than 0.05%

Source: JRVT report, table 50.

Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, as some older people had more than one visitor. Visits by doctors are not included in this table.

Table 3: Visits paid in the past seven days, case sample

(a) Number of older people paying visits

	Whole sample	All men	All women	Domestic organisation					
				Alone	With spouse only	Without spouse as part of family	With spouse as part of family	Other ways	In Institution
Number in case sample not confined to home (base for percentages)	5,437	2,000	3,437	992	1,533	1,521	1,136	154	99
Informants paying no visits in past seven days (%)	48.8	55.5	44.9	33.0	47.5	52.3	57.1	52.0	72.7
Informants paying visits in the past seven days (%)	50.2	43.7	53.9	66.6	51.7	46.1	42.2	46.7	21.2
Information unobtainable	1.0	0.8	1.2	0.4	0.8	1.6	0.7	1.3	6.1

Source: JRVT report, table 67.

(b) Persons visited in the past seven days

	Whole sample		All men	All women	Domestic organisation					
					Alone	With spouse only	Without spouse as part of family	With spouse as part of family	Other ways	In Institution
Informants paying visits in the past seven days (number; base for percentages below)	2,727		873	1,854	661	792	701	480	72	21
	Number	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Persons visited										
Sons	420	15.4	19.9	13.3	13.0	18.7	12.1	18.5	11.1	19.0
Daughters	908	33.3	35.2	32.4	28.1	37.2	29.7	42.3	18.0	14.3
Sisters	339	12.4	9.2	14.0	15.3	10.2	14.0	9.2	15.3	19.0
Brothers	109	4.0	5.9	3.1	4.4	3.9	4.6	2.7	2.8	9.5
Other relatives	263	9.6	8.2	10.3	11.6	7.4	9.4	10.0	11.1	23.8
Friends, same sex	1,033	37.9	31.5	40.9	45.1	33.9	40.8	30.6	41.6	14.3
Friends, opposite sex	182	6.7	11.8	4.3	4.0	9.3	4.1	7.7	8.3	19.0
Officials, clergymen, etc.	24	0.9	1.5	0.6	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.4	--
Other people	13	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.9	0.1	0.4	--	--

Source: JRVT report, table 68.

Note: Percentages do not sum to 100, because some older people paid more than one visit. Visits to doctors are not included in this table.

Table 4: Frequency of visits to club, and duration of last visit to club, all club members in the case sample

			All men	All women
All club members (base for percentages)*	877		646	231
	Number	%	%	%
Frequency of visits				
More than once a day	14	1.8	2.0	1.0
Every day	92	11.5	14.8	1.5
2 or 3 times a week	200	25.1	31.1	7.1
Once a week	311	39.0	30.0	66.2
Less often than once a week	260	32.6	29.9	40.9
Duration of last visit				
Less than 1 hour	75	9.4	11.8	2.0
1 hour to 1 ¾ hours	328	41.2	37.6	52.0
2 hours to 2 ¾ hours	346	43.4	42.2	47.0
3 hours and over	55	6.9	7.7	4.6
Cannot remember	73	9.2	8.5	11.1

* The informants who belonged to two clubs were counted twice in this table, the frequency with which they attended both clubs, and the duration of their last visit to both clubs, being included. There were 797 club members, 80 of whom belonged to two clubs. None belonged to more than two. The report gave the wrong figure, 797, as the base for percentages. The number of men and women was not given in the report, and has been calculated from the percentages.

Source: JRVT report, tables 2-3.

Table 5: Percentage of case sample not doing/having selected things, and percentage citing lack of means as a reason

	(a) Number	(b) Column (a) as % of case sample (N=5,966)	(c) Number citing lack of means as a reason	(d) % of case sample citing lack of means	(e) % of those in column (a) citing lack of means
Not owning a wireless set	961	16.1	486	8.1	50.6
Not visiting cinema in preceding fortnight	4,968	83.3	806	13.5	16.2
Not taking a holiday in the past year	3,998	67.0	1,967	33.0	49.2
Not eating in a restaurant in the past month	5,332	89.4	2,074	34.8	38.9
Not reading a newspaper 'yesterday'	269	4.5	76	1.3	28.3
Not reading a Sunday newspaper 'last Sunday'	875	14.7	205	3.4	23.4
Not reading a weekly newspaper in the past week	5,039	84.5	1,844	30.9	36.6
Not using cooking facilities 'yesterday'*	2,059	34.5	522	8.7	25.4
Not having enough bedding to keep warm	594	10.0	316	5.3	53.2

* The figures given here refer to the number and proportion giving the reason that the cooker 'uses too much fuel to be used every day'.

Source: JRVT report, tables 12, 16, 41, 44, 122, 124, 126, 279, 217.