

THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

BY

**Ruth Levitas, Christina Pantazis, Eldin Fahmy, David Gordon,
Eva Lloyd and Demi Patsios**

**Department of Sociology and School for Social Policy
Townsend Centre for the International Study of Poverty
and
Bristol Institute for Public Affairs
University of Bristol**

January 2007

Views expressed in this report are not necessarily those of the Social Exclusion Task Force or any other government department.

This report was funded by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) when the Social Exclusion Unit (the predecessor of the current Social Exclusion Task Force based at the Cabinet Office) was based at DCLG.

CONTENTS

List of tables and figures	4
List of abbreviations	5
Acknowledgements	8
Executive Summary	9
Chapter One Background and Introduction	13
Chapter Two Concepts and Definitions of Social Exclusion	18
conceptualising social exclusion	18
deep exclusion	25
Chapter Three From Concepts to Indicators	32
single indicator sets	32
children	38
young people	43
working age adults	47
later life	49
additional indicator sets	51
Chapter Four Survey Analyses of Social Exclusion	55
<i>Millennium Survey of Poverty and</i>	
<i>Social Exclusion</i>	55
<i>British Household Panel Survey</i>	68
<i>Families and Children Study</i>	78
<i>English Longitudinal Study of Ageing</i>	80
Chapter Five Devising and Applying the Bristol Social	86
Exclusion Matrix (B-SEM)	
the matrix	86
applying the B-SEM to survey data sets	96
administrative sources	105
Chapter Six Conclusions and Recommendations	117
further research	118
survey data	120
administrative data	125
specialist research on non-household and	126
under-represented population groups	

Appendix 1	<i>Opportunity For All</i> Indicators 2005	128
Appendix 2	<i>Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion</i> Indicators	131
Appendix 3	Index of Multiple Deprivation	135
Appendix 4	Audit Commission Quality of Life Indicators	138
Appendix 5	Proportion of the population perceiving items or activity as necessary	141
Appendix 6	A Survey of Surveys	
Appendix 7	Applying the B-SEM	
Appendix 8	Statistical analyses of social exclusion indicators	
Bibliography		

List of tables and figures

Tables

- 2.1 Definitions of social exclusion or inclusion
- 3.1 Harmonised indicators of social exclusion adopted by the EU in 2001
- 3.2 Proposed European indicators of social exclusion (Atkinson indicators)
- 4.1 Association between social exclusion and other dimensions of exclusion
- 4.2 Percentage of young people excluded using the PSE approach, on a selected number of indicators
- 4.3 Percentage of pensioner households excluded using the PSE approach
- 5.1 Major cross-sectional surveys used in the application of B-SEM
- 5.2 Major panel/cohort surveys used in the application of B-SEM

Figures

- 4.1 Number of indicators of social exclusion and poverty reported by PSE respondents, out of a possible eight
- 6.1 Causal relationships between the 10 domains

List of abbreviations

ACORN	A Classification of Residential Neighbourhood
ALSPAC	Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
ADMID	administrative data sets for measuring impact on disadvantage
APS	<i>Annual Population Survey</i>
ASBO	Anti-Social Behaviour Order
ASHE	Association for the Study of Higher Education
BCS70	<i>British Cohort Study 1970</i>
BHPS	<i>British Household Panel Survey</i>
BMA	British Medical Association
B-SEM	Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix
CAB	Citizens Advice Bureau
CAPI	computer-assisted personal interviewing
CASI	computer-assisted self-interviewing
CDRP	Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CMPO	Centre for Market and Public Organisation
CRSP	Centre for Research in Social Policy
CSV	Community Service Volunteers
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DCMS	Department of Culture, Media and Sport
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
DfT	Department for Transport
DH	Department of Health
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
ECHP	<i>European Community Household Panel</i>
EFS	<i>Expenditure and Food Survey</i>
ELSA	<i>English Longitudinal Study of Ageing</i>
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
FACS	<i>Families and Children Study</i>
FRS	<i>Family Resources Survey</i>
GHQ	General Health Questionnaire
GHS	<i>General Household Survey</i>
GLM	General Linear Model
GSS	Government Statistical Service
GWR	geographical weighted regression
HBAI	Households Below Average Income
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
HMRC	Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
HOCS	<i>Home Office Citizenship Survey</i>
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IMD	Index of Multiple Deprivation

ISEW	Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare
JCSHR	Joint Centre for Scottish Housing Research
JRF	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
JUVOS	Joint Unemployment and Vacancies Operating System
LFS	<i>Labour Force Survey</i>
LLFS	<i>Local Labour Force Survey</i>
LSE-CASE	Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion at the London School of Economics and Political Science
LSYPE	<i>Longitudinal Study of Young People</i>
MAR	missing at random
MAUP	modifiable areal unit problem
MDP	Measure of Domestic Progress
MUD	moral underclass discourse
NAPincl	national action plan on social inclusion
NatCen	National Centre for Social Research
NCDS	<i>National Child Development Study</i>
NDS	National Data Strategy
NEF	New Economics Foundation
NES	New Earnings Survey
NeSS	Neighbourhood Statistics Service
NFER	National Foundation for Educational Research
NINOs	National Insurance numbers
NPD	National Pupil Dataset
NPI	New Policy Institute
NS-SEC	National Statistics socioeconomic class
NS-SEG	National Statistics socioeconomic group
OCJS	<i>Offending, Crime and Justice Survey</i>
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
OLS	ordinary least squares
ONS	Office for National Statistics
PLASC	Pupil Level Annual School Census
PLUG	PLASC/NPD User Group
PSA	Public Service Agreement
PSE Survey	<i>Millennium Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion</i>
RED	redistributive
SARs	Samples of Anonymised Records
SEH	<i>Survey of English Housing</i>
SEU	Social Exclusion Unit
SID	social integrationist approach
SLFS	<i>Scottish Labour Force Survey</i>
SPLS	Supporting People Local System
SPSS	Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
SQOL OA	<i>Survey of Quality of Life in Old Age</i>
SSSI	site of special scientific interest

UCAS Universities and Colleges Admissions Service

WLFS *Welsh Labour Force Survey*

WLPS *Work and Pensions Longitudinal Study*

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the help and cooperation, often to very tight deadlines, of academic colleagues and researchers in government departments during this project. Especial thanks are due to Matt Barnes, Chris Cuthbert and Anita Krishnamurthy, initially based in the Social Exclusion Unit at the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), for their help in setting up the project and for supportive liaison during major institutional re-organisation. We would also like to thank Mohib Rahman, Tim Crozier, Peter Stubbs and Penny Allen from the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG); Bill Sheppard and Fraser Macleod from the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP); Richard Bartholomew and Isabella Craig from the Department for Education and Skills (DfES); Pete Watson and Rachel Peto from the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB). We are grateful to Peter Elias from the UK National Data Strategy (NDS) for access to the draft report on administrative data. At the University of Bristol, we would like to thank Alan Crowther, Elaine Escott and Rachel Ireson, as well as George Davey-Smith, Andy Ness and Lynn Molloy, as well as give particular thanks to David Herrick for extensive advice on ALSPAC (Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children). Dawn Rushen undertook the copy-editing of a long and complex report at very short notice, and we are grateful for her expertise, professionalism and patience.

Executive summary

The purpose of this project was to review existing sources on multi-dimensional disadvantage or severe forms of social exclusion characterised as ‘deep exclusion’; to recommend possibilities for secondary analysis of existing data sets to explore the dynamics of ‘deep exclusion’; to identify any relevant gaps in the knowledge base; and to recommend research strategies for filling such gaps.

The first task was to define social exclusion and deep exclusion and to identify the appropriate ‘dimensions’ contributing to multi-dimensional disadvantage. A working definition of social exclusion was adopted after exploration of the wide range available in the literature:

Social exclusion is a complex and multi-dimensional process. It involves the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in a society, whether in economic, social, cultural or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole.

‘Social exclusion’ itself is universally regarded in the academic and policy literature as involving multi-dimensional disadvantage. ‘Deep exclusion’ cannot therefore be clearly differentiated from social inclusion on this basis. However, there are degrees of severity of social exclusion. Severe or deep exclusion was therefore defined as follows:

Deep exclusion refers to exclusion across more than one domain or dimension of disadvantage, resulting in severe negative consequences for quality of life, well-being and future life chances.

Although there are several indices relating to social exclusion and related matters, many of these are principally descriptive and do not allow for analysis of interacting variables. The multivariate analysis that has been done on social exclusion is of variable quality and is inconsistent in the definitions of social exclusion and the domains and indicators used.

It is not clear that ‘deep exclusion’ is separable from social exclusion more generally, or produced by different ‘drivers’. The demonstration of causality in social science is extremely difficult. However, there is overwhelming evidence that poverty is a major risk factor in almost all domains of exclusion that have been explored. Bradshaw et al (2004) stress the importance of distinguishing between *macro-drivers* that increase the overall levels of social exclusion, or particular aspects of it such as homelessness, and the causes or correlates of individual vulnerability. It is also useful to distinguish between *risk factors* which signal the

greater vulnerability of a category of individuals, and *triggers* which have a direct causal impact.

A matrix of appropriate domains and topic areas was constructed looking across four stages of the life course: childhood, youth, working-age adulthood and later life. This matrix, the *Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix*, or B-SEM, contains 10 dimensions or domains of potential importance in social exclusion:

Resources:	Material/economic resources Access to public and private services Social resources
Participation:	Economic participation Social participation Culture, education and skills Political and civic participation
Quality of life	Health and well-being Living environment Crime, harm and criminalisation

The interactive nature of social exclusion means that these domains and topics are often both outcomes and risk factors. The substantive coverage and the methodological adequacy of a range of data sets was then assessed. While there is a great deal of data collected on aspects of disadvantage in existing surveys and administrative data sets, very few cover the range of aspects of multiple disadvantage or social exclusion included in the B-SEM.

Some people most at risk of social exclusion are omitted entirely from household surveys. They include all of the population living in institutions, such as some children in local authority care or in young offenders' institutions; disabled children in residential care; disabled adults; those hospitalised or in prison; older people in residential care; and some asylum seekers, notably those in holding institutions. Homeless people are also missed by household surveys. Other groups are under-represented in household surveys, including some of those most vulnerable to social exclusion, such as some minority ethnic groups, those on low incomes and residentially mobile populations including travellers.

There are also sections of the population who, although technically eligible for inclusion, are under-represented in social surveys. Again, these are often groups who may be particularly vulnerable to social exclusion, such as those on low incomes. Even where representation is proportionate, the numbers in vulnerable groups may be too small for further analysis unless original sample sizes are very large. This applies, for example, to the numbers of minority ethnic respondents in many surveys. Different research strategies need to be put in place to

investigate the dynamics of social exclusion in vulnerable groups excluded from or underrepresented in household surveys.

The best existing surveys for secondary analysis of multi-dimensional disadvantage were identified as: *Families and Children Study* (FACS); *British Household Panel Survey* (BHPS); *English Longitudinal Study of Ageing* (ELSA); *General Household Survey* (GHS); *Millennium Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion* (PSE Survey); *Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children* (ALSPAC). For young people, the best sources are the cohort studies initiated in 1958, 1970 and 2000. The *Longitudinal Study of Young People* (LSYPE) is likely to become an important addition although meaningful results for this group will not become available for some years. Pooled data from the GHS is also a useful source for looking at social exclusion among young people.

A new household survey, the *UK Longitudinal Household Survey* (UKLHS), is under construction that will have a sample size of 40,000 and is expected to generate data from 2008. Steps should be taken to ensure there are appropriate questions on social exclusion.

Administrative data sources may be considered as an alternative to survey data. Two major reports, Pleace and Bretherton (2006) reporting for the DWP and Jones and Elias (2006), reporting for the NDS, have recently been published. Both note the potential advantages of linking administrative data sources, or linking them to survey data, but both raise issues of data quality as well as ethical and legal issues in the use of such data, and questions of public trust.

Recommendations

1. We recommend secondary analysis using B-SEM to identify appropriate domains and indicators of the surveys listed above.
2. The PSE Survey has the most extensive coverage of social exclusion. We recommend repeating an improved version of the PSE Survey with a larger sample size and an ethnic booster. If possible we would recommend re-contacting the households in the original survey to provide a longitudinal element.
3. We recommend the generation of a 'Social Exclusion Module' based on the B-SEM for inclusion in the future UKLHS (or in the BHPS or GHS).
4. We recommend that qualitative research work using in-depth interviews and life history techniques be undertaken with those groups at particular risk of social

exclusion, especially those who are excluded from or under-represented in household surveys. Such qualitative work should use biographical methods to explore the experience of social exclusion and the nature and sequence of precipitating events and events and interventions that reduce or prevent exclusion.

5. We recommend that the findings from this qualitative work be used where possible to inform specialised surveys of social exclusion among the non-household population.

There are also changes that could be made to existing data collection practices that would improve the adequacy of existing data in relation to measuring social exclusion:

6. We recommend that more consideration is given to the use of ethnic and other boosters in existing survey research to improve the overall usefulness of these sources.
7. We recommend that a religious variable be routinely included in surveys, and that administrative data such as IMD (Index of Multiple Deprivation) scores are also added to existing surveys.
8. We recommend that the UKLHS builds on BHPS best practice and includes a children's cohort. In general, we recommend that more survey research collects data directly from children, with the age of respondents taken as far down as possible, certainly from about seven years of age.
9. In view of the inconsistent use of age categories in relation to young people, we recommend the more consistent application of the United Nations 16-24 age boundaries.
10. We recommend that in future sweeps of ELSA a sample for Wales be included.
11. We recommend further consideration of the use of administrative data. However, in line with recent reports from the DWP and National Data Strategy, we recommend that the interrelated questions of ethics, public trust and data quality are kept to the forefront when considering the use of administrative records for purposes other than those for which they were originally generated.