

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 732

SO 005 162

AUTHOR Stockdale, Jerry D.  
TITLE Poverty and Quality of Life: A Perspective.  
PUB DATE Aug 72  
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, Rural Sociological Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 25, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS Disadvantaged Environment; \*Economic Disadvantage; \*Human Development; Humanism; Low Income Groups; Need Gratification; \*Psychological Needs; Self Actualization; Social Structure; \*Social Systems; \*Sociology  
IDENTIFIERS \*Quality of Life

ABSTRACT

This paper is concerned with conceptualizing from the human potential perspective the quality of life, poverty, the "good social system", service delivery, and social indicators. Theories of Maslow and other humanistic educators which stress the need for self actualization provide a framework to sociologists for improving human conditions by allowing individuals to maximize their potential through a restructured social system. To insure the quality of life, both physiological and psychological needs must be met. Further, the extent to which social members develop their potential will depend on social structural variables. "Goodness" of social systems can be conceptualized in terms of the psychological health of system members, and of the extent to which human potential is realized. Social indicators such as service availability and quality, income levels, and community differentiation are measures of aggregate and structural system characteristics which are indicative of the extent to which system members are able to develop their potential. In conclusion, the paper offers a starting point for a new approach towards a goal directed sociological inquiry. (SJM)

ED 070732

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-  
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**POVERTY AND QUALITY OF LIFE: A PERSPECTIVE**

by

**Jerry D. Stockdale**  
Department of Rural Sociology  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the  
Rural Sociological Society, Baton Rouge, Louisiana,  
August 25, 1972

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

54 00 5/62

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

This paper is specifically concerned with demonstrating how quality of life, poverty, the "good social system," availability of goods and services, and social indicators can all be approached from a single perspective, which we call the "human potential framework." In addition to providing a single focal point for approaching these somewhat diverse topic areas, the "human potential framework" also suggests considerations which might well be missed by more conventional approaches.

We begin by considering first human potential. Then quality of life, poverty, the "good social system," goods and services, and social indicators are considered in turn. The relative incompleteness of the framework and the issue of reductionism are then considered briefly. The paper concludes with a summary.

### Human Potential

As the names, human potential movement or humanistic psychology imply, humanistic psychologists are concerned with having human beings attain the highest possible level of personal development. They are concerned with the needs of man, with specifying the conditions necessary for psychological health and with maximization of human potential. They usually take social institutions and patterns of social organization as given and focus on how the quality of social interaction can be changed. They are concerned with making interaction more personal and with helping individuals become less self-centered and more oriented toward others, in moving them, in Maslow's terms, toward self-actualization (Goble, 1970; Maslow, 1962). Ultimately, the humanistic psychologist's usual approach to bringing about social change is by changing individuals. The possibility of improving opportunities for individuals to maximize their potential through changes in social structure has received relatively little consideration. Even though this is so, the idea of human potential, the concern for human needs and well-being, and thus, the writings of humanistic psychologists have important implications for sociology.

For Maslow, maximization of human potential involves moving to a stage of "self-actualization" (or psychological health). "...the actualization process means the development or discovery of the true self and the development of existing or latent potential." To be "self-actualized" is to be fully human. Characteristics of self-actualized persons include: creativity, flexibility, spontaneity, humility, patience, "desireless awareness," courage, "low degree of self conflict," ability to make "own decisions even in the

face of contrary popular opinion," "ability to see life clearly, to see it as it is rather than as they wish it to be" and dedication to "some work, task, duty or vocation" which they consider to be pleasurable, exciting and important. In addition self-actualized persons are characterized by "better understanding of self," "ability to love," awareness of beauty, less fear and anxiety and a "genuine desire to help the human race" (Goble, 1970: 26-36). The psychologically healthy (self-actualized) person is:

"...both selfish and unselfish; in fact, these two attitudes merge into one. The healthy person finds happiness in helping others. Thus, for him, unselfishness is selfish...The healthy person is selfish in a healthy way, a way which is beneficial to him and to society, too." (Goble, 1970: 29-30).

In order for an individual to attain self-actualization it is necessary, according to Maslow, that needs on two levels be met--basic needs and growth needs. The basic (or deficiency) needs include physiological needs including air, water, food, shelter, sleep and sex; safety and security needs; love and belongingness needs; and esteem needs (self-esteem and esteem by others). "Frustration of basic needs creates psychopathological symptoms, and their satisfaction leads to healthy personalities; both psychological and biologically" (Goble, 1970: 50-51). Maslow assumes that the basic needs are hierarchial, that is, physiological needs are predominant until they are satisfied, then safety and security needs take precedence, then love and belongingness needs, then esteem needs. Once the basic needs (both physiological and psychological) have been satisfied, the individual moves toward and is motivated by a higher level of needs, the growth needs. According to Maslow, because of failure to meet basic needs, few people attain self-actualization (psychological health). This failure is related to social and environmental conditions.

Maslow's suggestion that certain needs must be met in order to attain psychological health is somewhat similar to Fromm's suggestion that humans have two kinds of needs--animal needs and human needs. Animal needs refer to the basic necessities for the survival of the organism. Human needs refer to what is necessary for sanity and mental health. According to Fromm:

"The basic psychic needs stemming from the peculiarities of human existence must be satisfied in one form or other, unless man is to become insane, just as his physiological needs must be met lest he die." (Fromm, 1955: 67)

Etzioni is concerned about the alienation and inauthenticity which result when social systems fail to meet the basic needs of their members. It is a basic assumption of Etzioni's sociological perspective that,

"...there is a universal set of basic human needs which have attributes of their own which are not determined by the social structure, cultural patterns, or socialization process." (Etzioni, 1968b: 871)

For Etzioni, alienation refers to "...a social situation which is beyond the control of the actor, and hence unresponsive to his basic needs" (Etzioni, 1968b: 871). Inauthenticity is a special case of alienation in which a system "provides the appearance of responsiveness while the underlying condition is alienating" (Etzioni, 1968a:619).

Etzioni sees differences among social systems in their ability to meet the basic needs of their members. He differs from Maslow in his emphasis on changing patterns of social organization as a way of meeting basic needs. He suggests, "...most alienation is the result of a specific societal and cultural pattern and can be reduced by changing that pattern" (Etzioni, 1968a: 626).<sup>2</sup>

### Quality of Life

The answer to what constitutes quality of life must, ultimately, reside in issues concerned with the nature of man, especially with his needs and potentials. For sociologists it would be helpful if psychologists would clearly specify the conditions under which the needs of individuals would be met and their potential would be maximized. The job of the sociologist would then be to develop knowledge which could be used to help establish social arrangements and social systems to satisfy these conditions and thereby maximize quality of life. Although psychology has not provided such information, the considerations of needs and human potential contained in the writings of Maslow and others are at least somewhat helpful.

If we accept the notion that quality of life has something to do with both the meaningfulness of and satisfaction with one's existence, then for any individual or set of individuals, quality of life is maximized when self-actualization or human potential is maximized. This has some important implications. It implies, for example, that, so far as material goods are concerned, more is not necessarily always better. If material goods are necessary to the attainment of needs then they will help in the development of human potential and improve quality of life, otherwise not. Increasing material goods (including food) and selected services is very important for developing countries and for the poor in more "developed societies." For the more affluent, however, further additions of material goods may well be redundant or even detrimental to quality of life in terms of maximization of human potential or self-actualization. And even for most poor persons, deprivation of self-esteem and feelings of powerlessness may be more serious restrictions on quality of life than deprivation of material goods (assuming at least survival levels of food and shelter).

As conceptualized here, then, quality of life is not, necessarily, a function of material well-being, although some minimum level is needed. Quality of life has more to do with the psychological health of social actors. It has to do with creativity, dignity, courage, ability to love, awareness of beauty, and lack of fear and anxiety. The social system which maximizes development of human potential is one in which quality of life is maximized.

### Poverty

Poverty is an aspect of inequality in social systems. Poor persons are social system members, who suffer deprivations. They are deprived of goods, services, opportunities and dignity and they are deprived in a relative and an absolute sense. In a relative sense they have less of what is valued than other system members. The social system (whether society or community) is characterized by inequality and the poor are at the bottom. In the absolute sense of deprivation the poor are unable to obtain adequate housing, health care, food, recreation, access to respected roles or other goods and services necessary for psychological and physiological health.

According to Miller and Roby,

"Poverty is not only a condition of economic insufficiency; it is also social and political exclusion...a minimum approach by government in any society with significant inequalities must provide for rising minimum levels, not only of (1) incomes, (2) assest, and (3) basic services but also of (4) self-respect and (5) opportunities for education and social mobility and (6) participation in many forms of decision-making." (Miller and Roby, 1970:p. 12).



In a capitalistic society, where money provides access not only to goods and services but also to power and status, poverty exists when some system members have very little money. In such a society, economic well-being, while only one aspect of poverty, is by far the best predictor of other aspects of deprivation. It is by no means an accident that the most commonly used measure of poverty is income level.

While deprivation is the key element in poverty, there are kinds and degrees of deprivation. Given a goal of development of human potential some deprivations are much more serious than others. Poverty is not a matter of deprivation in the abstract but, rather, of specific types of deprivation. According to what criteria should the importance of various types of deprivation be ranked? It is our contention that those deprivations are most serious which have the greatest impact on the ability of system members to maximize their human potential. In terms of the hierarchy of needs, deprivations, such as food, shelter, health care, if they threaten physiological survival, are clearly the most serious. Indeed, the concern of some citizens for the poor extends only to deprivations which clearly threaten the lives of the poor--"After all, you can't just let them die." Even though according to this criterion a large percent of the worlds population and even some of the U. S. population would be classified as poor, the criterion is clearly overly restrictive. Deprivations are also very important which don't immediately threaten physical survival. If Maslow is correct in his suggestion that all the basic needs are necessary to psychological health, then deprivation of any of these needs could reasonably be classified as an incidence of poverty. This would suggest that economic well-being is a necessary but not sufficient condition for quality of life. It suggests that in terms of ability to maximize their potential many persons

with substantial incomes would also be poor.

If poverty is conceptualized in terms of deprivations, then we can think in terms of two levels of poverty. At the lowest level is First Degree Poverty (Poverty I) which corresponds to deprivation of physiological needs. Above this would be Second Degree Poverty (Poverty II), corresponding to deprivation of needs for safety and security; love and belongingness, self-esteem and esteem by others.

In this approach an individual is poor if his basic needs are not satisfied at a level sufficient to sustain physiological (Poverty I) or psychological health (Poverty II). This is an unusual way of conceptualizing poverty. It rests on the assumption that poverty is a matter not only of access to goods and services but also involves much more. Implicitly, access to goods and services, e.g., housing and medical care, is very important since Poverty I is considered to be more serious than Poverty II. In terms of national goals, development programs and strategies of social change, one would expect elimination of Poverty I to have priority over Poverty II. But if complex industrial societies are concerned with increasing quality of life, they must also explicitly direct attention to considerations of the safety, security, belongingness and esteem needs of all citizens (Poverty II).

It is a basic assumption of this paper that the extent to which social system members develop their potential is primarily a function of social structural variables (rather than individual level variables). This is as true of the poor as of other system members. When we consider the characteristics of the poor we should be careful not to fall into the trap of confusing the symptoms with the causes of poverty. Poverty is an aspect of

social inequality in social systems and the poor are victims (Ryan, 1972). Knowledge of the characteristics of heads of poor households is useful in predicting which families will be poor but it is the structure of economic and political systems which determines whether or not extreme deprivations will exist. For example, the present structure of American Society guarantees that some will be poor (Stockdale, 1972(a)).

### The "Good Social System"

If the ability of social actors to develop their potential is to be enhanced, extensive changes in social systems are necessary. This position was forcefully put forth by Marx and Engels who

"...believed that whether self-actualization did or did not take place was largely, if not wholly, a social question.... The humanization of man could occur only as society itself was reconstructed so that all systems of exploitation were ended once for all." (Bensman and Rosenberg, 1966: 213).

The main thrust of Skinner's Beyond Freedom and Dignity is that it is possible to remake man by redesigning the social environment.

"It is the environment that is "responsible" for...objectionable behavior, and it is the environment, not some attribute of the individual, that we must seek to change." (Skinner, 1971: 52).

"Perhaps we cannot now design a successful culture as a whole, but we can design better practices, piecemeal." (Skinner, 1971: 73).

Etzioni's Active Society is a prescription for changing societies in order to make them more responsive to the needs of their members. "There is a need for dynamic interchange between personal self-realization and societal activation" (Etzioni, 1968a:15). "Our main concern...is...for the societal and political conditions under which history will be made more responsive to man" (Etzioni, 1968a: 13).

The literature on utopian systems from Plato, through Thomas More and on to the present, expresses repeatedly the need to remake social systems in order to maximize certain human values. But which values should be maximized and how can this be accomplished? What constitutes a "good social system?" And how can it be attained?

Although we can't yet fill in the specifics, the human potential framework does suggest some general characteristics of "good" communities and societies. Such systems would be structured to satisfy basic needs. They would make available to all members adequate goods and services, e.g., food, housing, medical care, to assure their physical well-being. The structure and content of social relations would be such that needs for love, belongingness, and esteem would be met. In such a system individuals would have the opportunity to develop their creativity and to be involved in meaningful activity. Individuals and their abilities would be taken seriously--persons would be ends, rather than means. Individual freedom and responsibility for the well-being of others would be optimized. Neither Poverty I nor Poverty II would exist. Such a system would, in short, provide opportunities for all members to meet their physiological needs and would be responsive, authentic and just.

These general considerations tell us little about the specific structure of a "good social system" since there is no necessary one-to-one correspondence between specific structural arrangements and satisfaction of specific needs. The problem of designing the good social system is thus, extremely complex. A wide range of structural alternatives are possible and it is likely that arrangements which facilitate satisfaction of one need may well thwart satisfaction of others (Warren, 1970). And, as has already been indicated,

### Summary

The concern of this paper has been with conceptualizing quality of life, poverty, the "good social system," service delivery and social indicators from one perspective, the human potential perspective. We have shown not only that each of these important areas can be approached from this perspective but also that this perspective raises certain unique issues, e.g., the possibility of considering two levels of poverty based on severity of deprivation. Table 1 summarizes the application of the human potential perspective to each of the areas of inquiry considered in the various sections of the paper and to the problem of selecting, analyzing and evaluating social change strategies, programs and policies (see Table 1).