



Relative Deprivation in Dhaka City: A Case Study of Dhanmondi

Lutfun Nahar Lata*

Lecturer, BRAC University, Bangladesh

Md. Abdul Wohab*

Senior Lecturer, BRAC University, Bangladesh

ABSTRACT

The study focuses on the construction of a normative deprivation index for Dhanmondi, which in the traditions of Townsend (1979), Mack and Lansley (1985, 1992), Halleröd (1994) and Gordon et al. (2000), underscores items the lack of which would constitute poverty. However, unlike these studies, the present study does not measure the head count ratio but explores the dynamics of this normative construction of deprivation in terms of demographic and socio-economic variables. The data for this study come from a sample survey of 149 respondents from Dhanmondi in 2008. The normative deprivation index for Dhanmondi in 2008 shows that 12 items out of 48 appear significant at the level of $\alpha=0.01$ in inter-item total correlation and more than 50 percent of respondents perceive their absence as constituting poverty. More than 90 percent respondents agree on the importance of 10 items: (i) three meals a day, (ii) Medicine, (iii) A fan at home; (iv) A good job, (v) Celebrating especial occasion, (vi) Meat, fish and fruits equivalent every other day, (vii) Regular monthly savings (viii) Refrigerators (ix) TV (x) Mobile.

The British society during 1960s was more concerned with cooked breakfast, children's birthday party and a week's holiday, whereas during 1980s and 1990s, it was more preoccupied with heating, toilet, bath, beds and damp free home. However, during late 1990s, there was a shift of trend towards hospital visit and two meals a day. The Swedish society had more medical priorities than others and viewed glasses, vacuum cleaner and telephone as more necessary than bed, heating, toilet and bath as perceived by the British. In terms of correlates, the Dhanmondi deprivation index is found significantly related to occupation, education and age followed by residence, income and gender. Thus the experience of poverty is specific to time and space and the item-wise difference between Bangladesh and British normative deprivation is due to the cultural differences of two societies.

Keywords : Relative deprivation; poverty; Dhaka; urban Bangladesh

1. INTRODUCTION

There are many approaches to measure poverty. Simple measures of poverty look only at relative income, but agreed international definitions of poverty described not just to how much money people have, but to whether it is enough for them to maintain a minimum

* The material presented by the author does not necessarily portray the viewpoint of the editors and the management of the Institute of Business & Technology (BIZTEK) or BRAC University, Bangladesh.

* Lutfun Nahar Lata : laata@live.com

* Md. Abdul Wohab : wohab@bracuniversity.ac.bd

acceptable way of life. Cash income is a key factor, but is not the only indicator of people's access to good and services. For example, possession of certain kinds of assets is equivalent to additional income; by adding to people's resources, it raises their living standards and their access to goods and services. Budget standards, defining the income needed to buy a basket of basic goods, have a closer relationship to the ability of people to purchase basic items. However, they do not encompass all elements that comprise a standard of living. Two ways of measuring low standards of living are by looking at consumption expenditure or using deprivation indices, based on items that people are deprived of because they cannot afford them. The latter are more accurate, since they give a broader picture than simply what is being spent on consumer goods at a moment in time, and it is this approach that this study takes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Most research on poverty focus on the measurement of poverty and the construction income poverty line. Rowntree (1901) conducted a study on poverty at York, England. Based on subsistence he constructed a poverty line for a family consisting of a man and his wife and 3 children in 1899 as their income was 17s. 8d. per week at York. His study showed that nearly 27.84% of the total population of the city was living in poverty. Rather than relying on income for measuring poverty in the United Kingdom like income proxy measures or budget standard and supplementary benefit, Townsend (1979) relied on people's subjective understanding of poverty labeled as relative deprivation index. His measurement is criticized as behavioral and not a consensual as they involve the judgment of experts or researchers in determining acceptable indicators of deprivation (Desai, 1986). These deficiencies were taken into account in the work of Mack and Lansley (1985, 1992), who used a list of indicators and asked their respondents whether or not they thought (a) each potential indicator was necessary to avoid hardship; (b) whether the respondents lacked those indicators, and (c) whether this lack was due to the lack of resources to purchase them. Thus poverty was conceptualized as "consensual" if 50 percent and more respondents agreed that the lack of an item constituted poverty. Accordingly 26 items were listed to measure poverty of which 5 items were suggested by the respondents and 21 items were provided by the researchers. The survey classified poverty into two categories, poor-who lack three or more items, and severely poor--who lack seven or more items. Drawing on this tradition, out of 54 items, Gordon et al. (2000) created a list of 35 poverty items that more than 50 per cent of the respondents considered necessary to avoid poverty. They extended Mack and Lansley's methodology by adding additional dimensions of poverty and including exclusion as well as child poverty along with adult poverty. Poor is defined by them as those who are unable to afford at least two socially defined necessities. This methodology is adopted in other poverty studies as in Denmark (Mack and Lansley, 1985), Sweden (Halleröd, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1998), Ireland (Callan, Nolan and Whelan, 1993; Nolan and Whelan, 1996a), Belgium (Van den Bosch, 1998), Holland (Muffels et al., 1990; Muffels and Vries, 1991; Muffels, Berghman and Dirven, 1992), Finland (Kangas and Ritakillio, 1998), Germany (Andreßband Lipsmeir, 1995) and Vietnam (Davies and Smith, 1998).

However no study as such is conducted in the Third World countries. In Bangladesh, poverty is basically conceptualized from the perspective of destitution and subsistence rather than of deprivation. A recent study by Ahmed (2007) conceptualized poverty as normative deprivation and measured poverty in the earlier traditions of Townsend, Mack and Lansley, Halleröd and Gordon et al., especially of consensual approach. The study also compares poverty situation of Bangladesh with Britain and Sweden. The normative deprivation index for Bangladesh in 2000 is constructed by 17 items out of 69 items listed. Thus more than 50 percent of respondents perceive the absence of 17 items as constituting poverty. More than 70 percent respondents agreed on the importance of 7 items: (i) three meals a day for children, (ii) two meals a day for adults, (iii) quilt for every member of the household; (iv) milk for babies, (v) celebration of religious festivals, (vi) pillow for every member of the household, and (vii) one pair of all-weather shoes. The chi-square

test showed that the deprivation index was significantly related to occupation, education and age followed by residence, income and gender. However, the study did not include items like "items don't have," "items don't have because don't want" and "items don't have because can't afford." In order to fill this research gap and adopt the poverty approach of Gordon et al. (2000), the present is conceived at a micro level to include the Middle part of Dhaka known as Dhanmondi.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Objective of the present research

The main objective of this study is to measure adult poverty in terms of relative deprivation as subjectively perceived and objectively experienced by the respondents in Dhanmondi, an affluent section of urban Bangladesh. In this study, Adult poverty is defined as the multiple forms of deprivation. Following the tradition of Townsend (1979), Mack and Lansley (1985, 1992) and Gordon et al. (2000), it is measured as a consensual poverty, where more than fifty per cent of the respondents agree that the lack of a particular item constitutes a poverty situation. This study adopts measurement of poverty in PSE Survey by Gordon et al. (2000) in the context of Bangladesh.

3.2 Sampling

The data for this study come from a simple random survey (SRS) of 149 respondents from Dhanmondi, Dhaka from January 2008 to July 2008. The survey followed multi-stage stratified sampling procedures. Initially, Dhaka City Corporation (DCC) has purposively selected among urban areas of Bangladesh. In addition, Dhanmondi Thana has been selected randomly through lottery from among its 22 constituent Thanas. Finally, from among 5 wards and 31 mahallas of Dhanmondi Thana, 49 ward is randomly selected for this research. This ward has 10,066 households. From this universe of household a sample household of 149 is estimated by using statistical method of determination of sample size, where .05 errors were allowed. By using a systematic sampling technique, one each adult respondent was selected from among 149 households. It must be noted here that the Interview Schedule for the adult poverty comprises 48 items of which 37 are from PSE Survey and 11 items are constructed from a thorough pre-testing to adapt to the Bangladesh situation.

3.3 Method

Face to face interviews were conducted by using a structured questionnaire for collecting data. Multiple forms of deprivation of poverty were included in the questionnaire. The main task of this study was to produce a measure of poverty based on socially perceived necessities and a scientific definition of deprivation. The measurement of poverty was achieved in three steps, which combined social consensus in determining what should be considered as necessities with scientific methods of using this information to define poverty. The first step of measuring poverty is to make a list of 48 items on the basis of the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey (Gordon et al., 2000). The second step is to ask the respondents were which items they considered as necessities for a comfortable life and which items they have or have not and if they have not whether they do not want or cannot afford. On the basis of 50 per cent of respondents response was constructed a deprivation index. Finally, this index was used to measure which items they do not have because they cannot afford and among those respondents who cannot afford one or more item are considered as poor.

4. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

In this study, 18% of the respondents are in the age group of 50-54, 13% respondents are in the age group of 35-39 and rest 40% respondents are in the age group of 40-44 and 45-

49. However, only 1% respondents are in the age group of 70-74. Moreover, they are educated as more than half of them have completed Bachelor's and Masters Degree. The occupational structure shows that 30% of the respondents are housewives, about 28% are businessman, 9% are professor, 7% are employed in private service and 5% are employed in govt. service. In Dhaka city, Dhanmondi has been considered as an upper class area (on the basis of expenditure). So, this study found that 20% of the respondents monthly expenditure is Tk. 50,000-59,999 and 15% respondents expenditure is Tk. 40,000-49,999.

4.1 Analysis of Deprivation Index

The analysis starts off, in the following section, by looking at how many adults cannot afford commodities that are considered by the majority of the general public to be necessary items. Additionally, it calculates how many can be considered poor on the basis of being deprived of these items. Final section examines a wide range of social and economic characteristics of people who are classified as poor in these terms.

Table - 1
Perception of Adult Necessities and how Many People Lack them (all figures show % of adult population)

| No. | Items for Adults (18 years & above) | Necessary (%) | Have (%) | Don't have, don't want | Don't have, can't afford |
|-----|---|---------------|----------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Three meals a day | 98.7 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Medicine | 97.3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | A fan at home | 96 | 94.6 | 6.0 | .7 |
| 4 | A good job | 96 | 72.5 | 27.5 | 0 |
| 5 | Celebrating especial occasion | 94.6 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Meat, fish, fruits equivalent every other day | 93.3 | 98.0 | 2.0 | 0 |
| 7 | Regular monthly savings | 92.6 | 89.3 | 4.7 | 5.4 |
| 8 | Refrigerators | 91.3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | TV | 91.3 | 100.0 | 1.3 | 0 |
| 10 | Mobile | 91.3 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | Attending wedding | 89.9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | Household furniture | 89.9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Telephone | 88.6 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 0 |
| 14 | Newspaper | 87.9 | 99.3 | .7 | 0 |
| 15 | Gifts to friends | 87.9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | Celebrating wedding day | 87.2 | 96.6 | 3.4 | 0 |
| 17 | Replace broken electrical goods | 84.6 | 84.6 | 15.4 | 0 |
| 18 | A small amount of money spend on self | 81.9 | 89.9 | 6.0 | 4.0 |
| 19 | Own house | 81.2 | 73.2 | 8.7 | 18.1 |
| 20 | Collect children from school | 79.2 | 79.9 | 19.5 | .7 |
| 21 | Ornaments | 77.9 | 100.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | Three pair of shoes | 75.8 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 0 |
| 23 | Standard coaching center | 75.8 | 81.9 | 18.1 | 0 |
| 24 | Visits to friends | 75.2 | 97.3 | 2.7 | 0 |
| 25 | Replace worn out furniture | 74.5 | 77.9 | 21.5 | .7 |
| 26 | Wristwatch | 71.8 | 98.7 | 1.3 | 0 |

Relative Deprivation in Dhaka City: A Case Study of Dhanmondi

| | | | | | |
|----|--|------|------|------|------|
| 27 | IPS/generator | 66.4 | 90.6 | 9.4 | 0 |
| 28 | Charger light | 63.8 | 71.1 | 28.9 | 0 |
| 29 | Home computer | 62.4 | 88.6 | 11.4 | 0 |
| 30 | Holiday away from home once a year | 62.4 | 71.8 | 20.1 | 8.1 |
| 31 | Hobby | 58.4 | 81.9 | 18.8 | 0 |
| 32 | Servant | 56.4 | 95.3 | 4.7 | 0 |
| 33 | Car | 54.4 | 75.8 | 7.4 | 17.4 |
| 34 | <i>Camera</i> | 49.0 | 91.9 | 8.1 | 0 |
| 35 | <i>AC</i> | 43.6 | 69.1 | 23.5 | 7.4 |
| 36 | <i>Microwave oven</i> | 36.9 | 71.1 | 27.5 | 1.3 |
| 37 | <i>Satellite TV</i> | 36.2 | 96.6 | 1.3 | 0 |
| 38 | <i>CD player</i> | 26.2 | 90.6 | 8.7 | .7 |
| 39 | <i>A meal in a restaurant once a month</i> | 24.2 | 55.0 | 43.0 | 2.0 |
| 40 | <i>Access to internet</i> | 17.4 | 51.7 | 47.7 | .7 |
| 41 | <i>Washing machine</i> | 16.1 | 43.0 | 56.4 | .7 |
| 42 | <i>Having trendy cloth</i> | 14.1 | 69.1 | 31.5 | 0 |
| 43 | <i>Cassette player</i> | 12.8 | 53.0 | 47.0 | 0 |
| 44 | <i>New clothes in a month</i> | 6.0 | 16.8 | 81.9 | 1.3 |
| 45 | <i>Carpets</i> | 4.0 | 52.3 | 47.7 | 0 |
| 46 | <i>Motorbike</i> | 2.7 | 14.8 | 83.2 | 2.0 |
| 47 | <i>Dishwasher</i> | 2.7 | 14.1 | 86.6 | 0 |
| 48 | <i>A meal in a restaurant once a weak</i> | 1.3 | 6.7 | 91.3 | 2.0 |

Note: Items in Italics were thought to be necessities by less than 50% of respondents

Table 1 which gives the normative deprivation index for adults in Dhanmondi contains four columns representing four different poverty features--(a) items considered 'necessary', (b) items that respondents have, (c) items that respondents do not have because they do not want, and (d) items that respondents do not have because they can not afford.

The column 2 of the Table 1 which indicates items considered 'necessary' shows that a. More than 50 percent respondents perceive 33 items out of 48 items as socially necessary, the lack of which constitutes poverty;

b. More than 90 percent respondents consider 10 items as socially necessary. They are: (i) three meals a day (ii) medicine (iii) a fan at home (iv) celebrating special occasion (v) meat, fish and fruits equivalent every other day (vi) regular monthly savings (vii) refrigerators (viii) TV and (ix) mobile.

The column 3 of Table 1 which shows items that respondents have, indicates that a. All respondents have eight items--three meals a day, medicine, celebrating special occasion, refrigerator, TV, mobile, attending weddings, household furniture, gifts to friends and ornaments.

b. More than 50% of the respondents have 33 items out of 33 items; The column 4 of the Table 1 which shows items that respondents do not have because they do not want, indicates that

a. More than 50 percent of the respondents do not have only two items--dish washer and

motorbike--because they do not want them; and

b. Less than 50 percent of the respondents do not have 24 items because they do not want them.

The column 5 of Table 1 which shows items that respondents do not have because they can not afford it, indicates that between more than 50% of the respondents do not have 7 items because they cannot afford them, among them the most important items are own house (18%), car (17%), holiday away from home once a year (8%) and regular monthly savings (5%).

Thus Table 1 shows that social construction of the necessities of life is more wide-ranging and multidimensional, which includes food items, clothing, communication, amenities, economic security and sociability.

a. As far as food items are concerned, all respondents think that 'three meals a day' is a necessary item but 24 percent and 1 percent respondents consider 'a meal in a restaurant once a month' and 'a meal in a restaurant once a week' as necessary respectively. Similarly, 93 percent respondents think meat, fish, and fruits equivalent every other day as necessary. b. Regarding clothing, 'trendy cloth' is followed by 'new clothes in a month' as necessary items by 14 percent and 6 percent respondents respectively. Likewise, 81 percent and 76 percent respondents consider owning a house and having three pair of shoes socially necessary respectively.

c. With respect to communication items, degree of necessity varies item-wise, for example, television (91%), mobile (91%), daily newspapers (88%), satellite television (36%), home computer (62%), telephone (89%), and internet (17%).

d. Regarding amenities, degree of necessity also varies item-wise, for example, a fan (96%), refrigerators (91%), replace or repair broken electrical goods (75%), camera (49%), charger light (64%), car (54%), IPS/generator (66%), air cooler (44%), microwave oven (37%) and wrist watch (72%).

4.2 Poverty Categories

From the list of items in Table-1, 33 items were considered as adult necessary and an acceptable standard of living by 50 percent or more respondents in Dhanmondi. For each respondent, we then calculated the number of items that they did not have because they could not afford. The category of did not have because they do not want represents that about 61 per cent were lacking no items because whether they have those items or they don't want. A further 25 per cent were lacking only one of the items. The greatest number of items lacking was 3, by four respondents.

Table - 2
Number of items Respondents 'don't have, can't afford'

| Items lacking | Number | Percentage | Cumulative % |
|---------------|--------|------------|--------------|
| 0 | 91 | 61.1 | 61.1 |
| 1 | 37 | 24.8 | 85.9 |
| 2 | 17 | 11.4 | 97.3 |
| 3 | 4 | 2.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 149 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: Fieldwork

The deprivation index was used to measure which items the respondents do not have because they cannot afford and among those respondents who cannot afford one or more

item are considered as poor and those who can afford all those items are classified as 'not poor'. On this basis, people could be considered to be 'poor' if there were at least one socially defined necessities that they were unable to afford; otherwise they could be classified as 'not poor'.

Table - 3
Poverty Classification

| | Number of respondents | Percentage |
|----------|-----------------------|------------|
| Poor | 58 | 38.9 |
| Not Poor | 91 | 61.1 |
| Total | 149 | 100.0 |

On the basis of possession of necessities only, Table-3 shows that just over 61 per cent of people would be classified as not poor and about 39 per cent as poor, with a poverty threshold set at being unable to afford one or more necessities. The rest of this study concentrates on the 39 per cent whom this analysis has identified as poor, they are not absolute deprivation but they are poor in case of relative deprivation.

4.3 Classification of Poor

Table-4 shows how the poverty rate (the percentage who are poor) varies according to the characteristics of the individual and the household they are living in. Thus, for example, in the second column, 43 per cent of male respondents were poor compared with 34 per cent of female respondents. The third column shows the poverty proportion - what proportion of all the poor is made up of individuals/households with a given characteristic.

Table - 4
Classification of Poor in different categories.

| | Poverty Rate (%) in Poverty) | Poverty Proportion (%) of all in Poverty) | Number |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------|
| All | 38.9 | 100 | 149 |
| Gender of respondent | | | |
| Male | 43 | 56 | 79 |
| Female | 34 | 44 | 70 |
| Age of the Respondent | | | |
| 20-24 | - | - | 1 |
| 25-29 | 56 | 11 | 9 |
| 30-34 | 53 | 10 | 15 |
| 35-39 | 30 | 6 | 20 |
| 40-44 | 35 | 7 | 20 |
| 45-49 | 50 | 10 | 20 |
| 50-54 | 26 | 5 | 27 |
| 55-59 | 33 | 6 | 21 |
| 60-64 | 50 | 10 | 8 |
| 65-69 | 25 | 5 | 4 |
| 70-74 | 100 | 20 | 2 |
| 75+ | 50 | 10 | 2 |
| Marital status of Respondent | | | |
| Married | 39 | 47 | 140 |
| Unmarried | - | - | - |

| | | | |
|---|-----|----|----|
| Widow | 44 | 53 | 9 |
| Divorced | - | - | - |
| Deserted | - | - | - |
| Level of Education of Respondent | | | |
| S.S.C | 22 | 14 | 9 |
| H.S.C | 54 | 35 | 13 |
| B.A | 38 | 25 | 50 |
| M.A | 39 | 26 | 77 |
| Household Size | | | |
| Two | 44 | 16 | 9 |
| Three | 46 | 16 | 24 |
| Four | 31 | 11 | 35 |
| Five | 39 | 14 | 46 |
| Six | 42 | 15 | 24 |
| Seven | 29 | 10 | 7 |
| Eight | - | - | - |
| Nine and above | 50 | 18 | 4 |
| Occupation | | | |
| Business | 46 | 11 | 41 |
| Housewife | 36 | 8 | 45 |
| Professor | 46 | 11 | 13 |
| Govt. service | 13 | 3 | 8 |
| Private service | 36 | 8 | 11 |
| Doctor | 17 | 4 | 6 |
| school teacher | 43 | 10 | 7 |
| lawyer | - | - | 3 |
| Army officer | 50 | 12 | 2 |
| Engineer | - | - | 3 |
| Banker | 67 | 16 | 6 |
| Retired | 75 | 17 | 4 |
| Monthly Expenditure | | | |
| 10,000-14,999 | 25 | 5 | 4 |
| 15,000-19,999 | 75 | 15 | 4 |
| 20,000-24, 999 | 79 | 16 | 19 |
| 25,000-29, 999 | 29 | 6 | 17 |
| 30,000-34, 999 | 31 | 6 | 16 |
| 35,000-39, 999 | 63 | 13 | 8 |
| 40,000-49, 999 | 35 | 7 | 23 |
| 50,000-59, 999 | 33 | 7 | 30 |
| 60,000-79999 | 3 | 5 | 22 |
| 80,000-99, 999 | - | - | 4 |
| 100000-150000 | 100 | 20 | 1 |
| 150,000+ | - | - | 1 |

So, for example, married people make up 47 per cent of all the poor, although the chances of a married person being poor is lower than average, at 39 per cent.

For all respondents the average proportion of people who are poor is 39 per cent. There

are some groups where the proportion is more than double this average rate

- Retired people who are not working (75%)
- 70-to 74 year olds (100%)
- Widows are more likely to be poor (44%) and there are also higher proportions of poor people in households of certain types:
- Households with nine and more members (50%) are more likely to be poor than households with four members (31%)

4.4 Correlates of Relative Deprivation in Dhanmondi

After constructing the deprivation index, it is pertinent to ask which factors are associated with the index. The deprivation index is found significantly related to selected demographic and socioeconomic variables. The key variables gender, age, education, occupation, expenditure and household size are tested against all 33 items that comprise the deprivation index. Given the predominance of nominal level of measurement, the chi-square test is preferred for measuring the association between variables. Many associations between independent variables and items of the deprivation index are found significant at $\alpha=.001$, $\alpha=.01$ and $\alpha=.05$ levels of significance. Table-5 gives the summary of the significant association found at chi-value and shows that monthly expenditure, occupation and age are the key determinants of the consensual poverty in terms of number of items in the deprivation index they are significantly related to. Next in importance are household size and education. Gender appears to be least influential in the construction of social necessity.

Table - 5
Summary of Chi-square Test on Deprivation Index by Gender, by Age, by Education, by Expenditure and by Household size (N=149)

| Items | Gender | Age | Education | Occupation | Monthly Expenditure | Household Size |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Three meals a day | | | | | $X^2=20.826$ df=11 $\alpha=.05$ | |
| Medicine | | | | $X^2=21.707$ df=11 $\alpha=.05$ | | $X^2=15.329$ df=6 $\alpha=.05$ |
| A fan at home | $X^2=3.317$ df=1 $\alpha=.01$ | $X^2=30.069$ df=11 $\alpha=.01$ | | | | |
| Celebrating especial occasion | | $X^2=27.648$ df=11 $\alpha=.01$ | | | $X^2=37.993$ df=11 $\alpha=.001$ | |
| Meat, fish, fruits or vegetarian equivalent every other day | | | | $X^2=29.038$ df=11 $\alpha=.01$ | $X^2=24.787$ df=11 $\alpha=.01$ | |
| Regular monthly savings | | | | | $X^2=20.035$ df=11 $\alpha=.05$ | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Refrigerators | X ² =8.826 df=1 a=.01 | X ² =21.661 df=11 a=.05 | | | X ² =23.444 df=11 a=.05 | |
| TV | | X ² =20.022 df=11 a=.05 | | | | |
| Mobile | | X ² =34.974 df=11 a=.001 | | | | X ² =24.233 df=6 a=.001 |
| Attending wedding | | X ² =20.933 df=11 a=.05 | | | X ² =21.060 df=11 a=.05 | |
| Telephone | | X ² =28.391 df=11 a=.01 | X ² =8.865 df=3 a=.05 | | | X ² =17.655 df=6 a=.01 |
| Newspaper | | X ² =26.270 df=11 a=.01 | | X ² =20.697 df=11 a=.05 | | |
| Celebrating birthday/wedding day | | X ² =28.155 df=11 a=.01 | X ² =9.363 df=3 a=.05 | | | X ² =19.960 df=6 a=.01 |
| Replace broken electrical goods | | | | X ² =33.713 df=11 a=.001 | | |
| A small amount of money spend on self | | | X ² =10.740 df=3 a=.01 | X ² =29.271 df=11 a=.01 | | |
| Collect children from school | | | X ² =10.611 df=3 a=.01 | X ² =32.374 df=11 a=.001 | | X ² =21.566 df=6 a=.001 |
| Ornaments | | | | | X ² =28.857 df=11 a=.001 | |
| Three pair of shoes | | | | | | |

The above table shows that out of 33 items constituting deprivation scale,
 • Monthly expenditure is significantly related to 11 items-three meals a day, television , telephone, car, three pair of shoes, charger light, regular monthly savings, meat, fish, fruits or vegetarian equivalent every other day, celebrating especial occasions (Eid, Puja etc.),hobby/leisure activity and servant.

- Age is significantly related to 9 items of the deprivation index-mobile, fan, TV, telephone, refrigerator, having a daily newspaper, celebrating especial occasions (Eid, Puja etc.), celebrating wedding day/birth/death anniversary and attending weddings/funerals.
- Occupation is significantly related to 9 items of the deprivation index- meat, fish, fruits/vegetarian equivalent every other day, IPS/generator, celebrating wedding day/birth/death anniversary, ornaments for especial occasion, holiday away from home, collect children from school, a small amount of money spend on self weekly, medicine prescribed by doctor and servant.
- Household size is significantly related to 5 items of the deprivation index-having a daily newspaper, replace/repair broken electrical goods, ornaments for especial occasion, attending weddings/funerals and medicine prescribed by doctor.
- Education is significantly related to 4 items of the deprivation index- having a daily newspaper, collect children from school, and replace electrical goods and ornaments for especial occasion.
- Gender is significantly related to 3 items of the deprivation index-a fan at home, refrigerators and visits to friends or relatives.

4.5 Limitations of the Study

Any social research dealing with the dynamics of societal living is confronted with a variety of obstacles. Some important limitations are as follows-

- (a) To begin with, the selection of a suitable study area was the most challenging task.
- (b) Time frame for such an important research work is too narrow to take a larger representative sample size for the in depth study.
- (c) Many respondents were hesitant and reluctant to answer certain issues like- ornaments, car etc.
- (d) No up to date government statistics is available relating to the problem.
- (e) The published and unpublished information is not sufficient.

In spite of the above limitations, researcher tried its best to collect data and express the information which is valuable for the understanding and making the decision about this issue.

5. CONCLUSION

This study was undertaken to replicate Gordon et al.'s Poverty and Social Exclusion (PSE) Survey in Britain, 1999 in the context of Bangladesh. In this study, poverty has been measured as relative deprivation. This is done by measuring consumption of socially perceived necessities, both goods and activities. For poverty to be at hand, not consuming some of the goods or not engaging in some of the activities must be a consequence of lack of economic resources, not of personal preference. It was found that poverty measured as relative deprivation is also related to respondents' social status. We tend to decide how well-off or deprived we are not from any absolute standard or how hungry are, but by comparing ourselves with other people. In particular, we decide on what we deserve and what we should expect from looking at other people. We then compare ourselves with this standard. This is why; relative deprivation has become an important measure of poverty. This study shows that on the basis of possession of necessities only, over 61.1 percent of people would be classified as not poor and just under 38.9 percent as poor, with a poverty threshold set at being unable to afford one or more necessities. This study also shows how the poverty rate (the percentage who are poor) varies according to the characteristics of the individual and the household they are living in. About 43 per cent of male respondents were poor compared with 34 per cent of female respondents.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A. I. Mahbub Uddin. 2004. Socio-demographic Correlates of Rural Poverty in Bangladesh: A Case Study of Gaibandha Sadar and Tanore Upazilas. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology* 1(2) July.
- Ahmed, A. I. Mahbub Uddin. 2007. Consensual poverty in Britain, Sweden and Bangladesh: A Comparative study. *Bangladesh e-Journal of Sociology* 4(2) July.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. 1998. *Household Expenditure Survey, 1995-96*. Dhaka: Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Planning Division, Ministry of Planning.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. 2001. *Preliminary Report of Household Income and Expenditure Survey 2000*. Dhaka: Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Planning Division, Ministry of Planning.
- Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. 2004. *Report of the Poverty Monitoring Survey 2004*. Dhaka: Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, Planning Division, Ministry of Planning
- Callen, N. and Whelan, eds. 1993. Resources, Deprivation, and the Measurement of Poverty. *Journal of Social Policy* 22 :141-172.
- Davis, R. and William S. 1998. The Basic Necessities Survey: The Experience of ActionAid Vietnam. *ActionAid Vietnam*, September. (Accessed March 19,2008).
- Desai, M. 1986. Drawing the line: On Defining the Poverty Threshold. P. Golding (ed.), *Excluding the Poor*. London:CPAG
- Gordon, D., Ruth, L. and Christina, P., eds. 2000. *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Halleröd, B. 1994a. A New Approach to the Direct Consensual Measurement of Poverty. *Social Policy Research Center*, University of New South Wales Discussion paper 50.
- Halleröd, B. 1994b Poverty in Sweden: A New Approach to Direct Measurement of Consensual Poverty. *Umeå Studies in Sociology*, No. 106, University of Umeå.
- Halleröd, B. 1995a. Perceptions of Poverty in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare* 4(3): 174-89
- Halleröd, B. 1995b "The Truly Poor: Indirect and Direct Measurement of Consensual Poverty in Sweden. *Journal of European Social Policy* 5(2), 111-29.
- Halleröd, B. 1998 Poor Swedes, Poor Britons: A Comparative Analysis of Relative Deprivation. *Halleröd, Björn and Jonathan Bradshaw, and Hilary Holmes*.
- Kangas, O. and Ritakallio, V.M. 1998. Different Methods . Different Results? Approaches to Multidimensional Poverty. *Empirical Poverty Research in a Comparative Perspective* Ashgate: Aldershot
- Mack, J. and Stewart L., eds.1985. *Poor Britain*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Mack, J. and Stewart L., eds.1992. *Breadline Britain 1990s: The Findings of the Television Series*. London: London Weekend Television.
- Muffels, R. et al. 1990. *Poverty in the Netherlands: Report on the Dutch Contribution to an International Comparative Study on Poverty and the Financial Efficacy of the Social Security System*. The Hague: VUGA.
- Nolan, B. and Christopher T. W. 1996a. *Resources, Deprivation and Poverty*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rowntree, B. S. 1901. *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*. London: Macmillan
- Sen, B. and David, H. 2004. *Chronic poverty in Bangladesh: Tales of Ascent, Descent, Marginality and Persistence*. Dhaka: Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies and Manchester: Chronic Poverty Research Centre, University of Manchester.
- Townsend, P. 1979. *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Van. D. B., K. 1998. Perceptions of the minimum standard of living in Belgium: Is there a consensus? *Empirical Poverty Research in a Comparative Perspective*. Ashgate: Aldershot.