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CASE – An Introduction

The ESRC Research Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) is based at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), within the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD). It was established in 1997 with core funding from the Economic and Social Research Council, and its funding now runs until 2007. The Centre is also financially supported by the LSE and by a wide range of other organisations, including the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Nuffield Foundation, Sainsbury Charitable Trusts, the Esmee Fairbairn Trust, HM Treasury and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

CASE is a multi-disciplinary research centre. It employs researchers recruited specifically for its ESRC-funded work programme, and also includes the research and consultancy group LSE Housing. Several staff divide their time between CASE and the Leverhulme Centre for Market and Public Organisation at Bristol University. The Centre is affiliated to the LSE Department for Social Policy, and also benefits from support from STICERD, including funding of its Toyota Research Fellows. It currently houses twelve postgraduate students working on topics related to its core areas of interest.

This breadth of experience and research interests enables CASE to bring a wide range of approaches and methodologies to the study of social exclusion. Our work centres on two main themes: what experiences and processes generate social exclusion or promote resilience, and what is the impact of policy and policy change?

To address these questions, our work is divided into eight main areas:

- Generational and life course dynamics.
- Poverty, local services and outcomes.
- The dynamics of low income areas.
- The CASE neighbourhood study, a longitudinal study of family life in low income neighbourhoods.
- Education and social exclusion.
- Social networks and social capital.
- Employment, welfare and exclusion.
- Policies, concepts and measurement of social exclusion.

This report presents some of the main findings from our research in each area during 2003: most of our sixth and part of our seventh year. It also details the other activities of the Centre. More detail can be found in the publications listed in Appendix 2, which include CASE’s own discussion paper series (CASEpapers), research and conference reports (CASEreports) and summaries of findings (CASEbriefs), all of which are disseminated free in printed form or via the web.

For more information about the Centre and its work, including texts of our publications, please visit our website: http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/
Review of the Year, 2003

The Year at a Glance

2003 was CASE’s sixth full year and the first since its successful mid-term review and the extension of its funding till 2007. The Centre continued its high level of activity and output.

- In all, we published 77 pieces of output during the year, including 11 books or reports, 19 chapters in other books, and 16 refereed journal articles. This more than maintained the healthy rate of output of the previous three years.
- Four major books stemming from our work were published: East Enders: Family and Community in East London by Katherine Mumford and Anne Power; Understanding the Finance of Welfare by Howard Glennerster; Motivation, Agency and Public Policy by Julian Le Grand; and Poverty Street: The Dynamics of Neighbourhood Decline and Renewal by Ruth Lupton.
- We continued to collect and analyse data on our two area-related studies, starting the third round of visits to the twelve low-income neighbourhoods that we are tracking, and completing most of the interviews in the fifth round of interviews with families living within four of them. We continued to produce analysis from the 1958 and 1970 British birth cohort studies, and started analysis of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.
- We held 28 events and seminars, including a public lecture by Professor William Julius Wilson, visiting CASE from Harvard, as part of the ESRC’s Social Science Week.
- Our work was widely disseminated, including through our CASEpaper, CASEbrief and CASEreport series, and our website. CASE members made 91 conference and seminar presentations during the year, many of them overseas. Media coverage was greater than during the previous year, with 97 articles or interviews related to the Centre’s work. We also continued our active engagement with research users in government and elsewhere.
- We maintained our healthy financial position, with the ESRC providing just over half of the Centre’s annual funding of just over £1m in the academic year 2002-3. LSE provided 22 per cent of the total and other bodies 25 per cent. During the calendar year 2003, new grants worth £258,000 were secured from sources including the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Gatsby Charitable Foundation, EAGA, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Department for Work and Pensions.
- Research staff inputs were 13.4 FTEs, slightly down on the previous year, of which just over half were ESRC-funded. Associated academic staff contributed 3.0 FTEs, and support staff 2.8 FTEs.

This review covers some of the activities and highlights of 2003, and sets out some of our plans for the coming year.

Ongoing research and new developments

CASE aims to be at the forefront of analysis of key aspects of social exclusion and related fields, covering a broad spectrum of topics with thorough academic analysis, sound and innovative methodologies, and a close eye on relevance to policy. During the year we have maintained a high level and quality of research activity across the wide range of research interests that we cover. We have continued to work on two main themes: what experiences and processes generate social exclusion or promote resilience, and what is the impact of policy and policy change? Within these, we address several specific issues, cutting across our eight strands of work from life course dynamics to policies, concepts and measures.

- What are the impacts of childhood circumstances on later life?
- How do family structures and parenting contribute to these processes?
- How does education affect patterns of advantage and disadvantage?
- How does the area where people live affect their life chances and opportunities?
- What is the role of social networks and social capital?
- How do processes of inclusion and exclusion operate in the labour market?
- How do these processes in the UK compare with other countries?

Box 1 (overleaf) shows how they are tackled across the Centre.

We made some important strides in 2003. A major highlight was the publication of four books stemming directly from the centre’s work. One was the first major output from the CASE Neighbourhood study, East Enders: Family and Community in East London by Katherine Mumford and Anne Power. Another was the first major output from the CASE 12 Areas Study, Poverty Street: The Dynamics of Neighbourhood Decline and Renewal by Ruth Lupton. Julian Le Grand’s Motivation, Agency and Public Policy: Of Knights and Knaves, Pawns and Queers and Howard Glennerster’s Understanding the Finance of Welfare were also published during the year.

We continued to develop our work on the analysis of large datasets. Kathleen Kiernan, John Hobcraft and Wendy Sigle-Rushon continued their work on the NCDs and BC570 and, with Darcy Hango, began to prepare comparable data from the two cohort studies for a cross-cohort study of childhood origins of social exclusion. Kathleen Kiernan used the new Millennium Cohort Study to analyse unmarried parenthood. Simon Burgess, Carol Propper and John Figg produced their first analyses of the new ALSRRc data (Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children), looking at child health, and Simon Burgess, with Deborah Wilson at Bristol, investigated school segregation using the new Pupil Level Annual School...
Census. John Rigg and Tom Sefton used the British Household Panel Survey to analyse income trajectories over time. Abigail McKnight and Tania Burchardt have been using Labour Force Survey data to look at impacts of the National Minimum Wage, while Ruth Lupton and Anne Power have begun work on urban trends using the 2001 Census data released during 2003. Research students within the Centre have been making use of a range of other data sets such as the ONS Longitudinal Study, the 2001 ONS Omnibus Survey on Participation in the Arts, the Family Expenditure Survey, and international data sources such as the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Study. Analysis of datasets such as these remains one of our key areas of expertise. We have continued to contribute to methodological developments in their analysis, such as John Hobcraft and Wendy Sigle-Rushton’s use of Bayesian model averaging and recursive partitioning to look at links between childhood and adult exclusion, and Christian Schluter’s work on income mobility measures.

We have also continued to build our own unique datasets from our qualitative longitudinal studies of families and areas. During 2003, we started our third round of qualitative fieldwork in the twelve areas and neighbourhoods we have been studying since 1998, and completed most of the fifth round of interviews with the 200 families in the CASE neighbourhood study, jointly funded by the ESRC and the Nuffield Foundation. Social exclusion is now a relatively familiar concept in Britain, but CASE has continued to contribute to its conceptual development and to a theoretical understanding of how social exclusion can be measured, with activity ranging from conceptual development of poverty as a human rights issue (by Polly Vizard) to analysis of attitudes to welfare and inequality (by Tom Sefton and myself) and debate over techniques for measuring neighbourhood effects on individual social exclusion.

At the same time, we have retained our strong focus on policy and continued to work on studies that are directly policy relevant, such as Holly Sutherland, Tom Sefton and David Piachaud’s report Poverty in Britain: the Impact of Government Policy since 1997, a new analysis of ’JobCentre Plus’ involving Eleni Kariagannaki and Tania Burchardt, and Howard Glennerster’s continuing work on the financing of welfare. Members of CASE continued to be actively involved in activities with a variety of non-academic research users. These include acting as Commissioners for the Sustainable Development Commission, Pensions Commission, and Commission for Health Improvement. Julian Le Grand

---

Box 1: Themes and Issues for CASE’s Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Strands of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of childhood circumstances</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structures and parenting</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>■■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area and life chances</td>
<td>■■■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks and social capital</td>
<td>■■■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International comparisons</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

■ Primary focus of research ■ Other aspects of research
was seconded to the Policy Directorate, 10 Downing Street, from October 2003. Other engagement with government departments and agencies included activities with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Cabinet Office, HM Treasury, Inland Revenue, Department for Work and Pensions, Department of Health, Department for Education and Skills, Disability Rights Commission, Basic Skills Agency, and the Environment Agency.

Dissemination
All of this activity has generated a large number of outputs, and we have continued to disseminate our work as widely as possible. We continued with our own series of discussion papers and reports, and also launched a new book series with the Policy Press, Bristol, under the title of CASE Studies in Poverty, Place and Policy: East Enders and Poverty Street became the first two books to be published in the series. Partly as a result of these books and the others published during the year, the Centre was able to increase its media coverage slightly, and continued to maintain its high profile through its website and events. We redesigned our website, implementing some of the recommendations of a review commissioned by ESRC, and hope to make further improvements in 2004. It attracted more than half a million hits during the calendar year, half of which were for specific publications. Thirteen of its papers were downloaded more than 4,000 times, one of them more than 12,000 times.

Papers were also disseminated through academic journals including Labour Economics, Journal of Population Economics, Journal of Law and Policy: Population Trends, Journal of Comparative Family Studies, and the Journal of European Social Policy, as well as at conferences and events. CASE members made more than 90 presentations at conferences and seminars in Britain and in other countries including Australia, Barbados, Brazil, Belgium, Denmark, France, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, South Korea, Spain, Switzerland, and the USA. We organised 28 of our own seminars and other events during the year, with attendances ranging from 30-40 for seminars to 100 for our special events, and 200 for public lectures.

International Links
Our international research links continued to be strong. In addition to the 12 international networks to which CASE members belong, three new collaborations started during the year. First, CASE and the Brookings Institution, Washington DC, have started joint research on cities, neighbourhoods and urban policy. Initial research, funded by the LSE and Brookings, is comparing trends in population, household and ethnic change, housing, work, and de-urbanisation in the UK and USA, using data from the 2001 UK and 2000 US censuses. Second, CASE and the Centre for Economic Performance (LSE) are the UK partners in the European Network on Inequality established as part of Harvard University’s Multidisciplinary and Comparative Program on Inequality and Social Policy (led by William Julius Wilson, Katherine Newman, David Ellwood and Christopher Jencks). CASE is also a partner with the University of Bremen and WZB, Berlin, in a new programme to be funded by the Volkswagen Foundation. This will establish T H Marshall Fellowships, supporting academic and practitioner exchanges in social policy between the UK and Germany. The first fellowships will be awarded in 2004.

Plans for 2004
Our work in 2003 has provided a strong platform for future developments and we are looking forward to another successful year. One major output, which we hope will be published at the end of 2004, will be a book reviewing the impact of policies towards poverty and social exclusion since 1997. We also hope to complete a book comparing the experiences of families living in four of our study neighbourhoods, as well as completing a new round of interviews with the families. We are involved in organizing two international conferences, one in Beijing in July on urban housing and regeneration, and one on low wage employment in London in April. We are also looking forward to the first outputs from our new collaboration with the Brookings Institution in Washington DC.

As can be seen in the articles that follow, the group involved in CASE is producing exciting new work on topics of more than just research interest. We hope you enjoy reading about the Centre’s work and perhaps engaging with us in the future.

John Hills
Director, CASE
February 2004
Generational and Life Course Dynamics: Pathways into and out of Social Exclusion

Contact: Darcy Hango, John Hobcraft, Kathleen Kiernan, Wendy Sigle-Rushton

The research undertaken this year in generational and life course dynamics has made extensive use of the major birth cohort studies, the NCDS and BC570, and applied innovative methods to further our understanding of the pathways to adult disadvantage.

Wendy Sigle-Rushton completed a broad analysis and report (forthcoming as a CASE paper) of the childhood precursors of social exclusion, using comparable variables from the NCDS and BC570. In a further analysis which is nearing completion, she also examined the consequences of young fatherhood, using propensity score matching techniques, and found that although young fathers were disadvantaged on a range of adult outcomes among men with similar childhood backgrounds, men who became fathers before the age of 22 were little different from men who did not. This suggests that selection into young fatherhood explains a good part of the association between young fatherhood and subsequent disadvantage. Wendy Sigle-Rushton also completed a chapter (with Sara McLanahan) that reviewed the literature on the statistical evidence of the effects of father absence and well-being in childhood and young adulthood.

John Hobcraft has been further pursuing his analysis of gendered pathways to social exclusion, which was reported in last year’s annual report, and also extending his results for the origins of adult social exclusion in the NCDS to encompass adult outcomes at age 42. In addition, he has been widening his thinking on the links of biological and behavioural sciences to social behaviour. Some of the recent focus in this area has been on understanding demographic behaviour, particularly reproductive behaviour, which is a key element of social exclusion. John Hobcraft and Wendy Sigle-Rushton completed a draft of a methodological study that explored the links between female adult malaise and childhood antecedents for the 1958 and 1970 birth cohorts, using Bayesian model averaging and recursive partitioning methods. This study identified important interplays between childhood test scores and childhood anxiety in determining adult female malaise. Highly anxious but bright girls were likely to experience adult malaise, but those with poor test scores who showed any childhood anxiety were also at risk of adult malaise. Strong continuities in childhood correlates of adult malaise across the two cohorts also appeared.

Kathleen Kiernan has been working on a paper on the legacies of unmarried parenthood using data from the BC570. A three level comparison of those who were married, cohabiting or non-partnered at the birth of their first child showed different patterns for men and women, after taking into account a wide range of background factors. Amongst the women there was a hierarchy of disadvantage (in the social, economic, emotional and health realms) down from married through cohabiting to solo motherhood, whereas amongst the men the contrast was between married and unmarried fathers. The analysis also showed the importance of post-birth partnership behaviour in tempering or enhancing the disadvantage experienced by these families. Kathleen Kiernan also completed a paper on unmarried parenthood using new data from the Millennium Cohort Study (see opposite) and has been co-editing a book (with Chase Lansdale) which takes a multidisciplinary approach to studying the potential for change across lives and generations.

Jason Strelitz continued his PhD research on second generation immigrants using the ONS Longitudinal Study and wrote a piece on his research for the Celsius Newsletter. His earlier work with Donald Hirsch and David Darton on tackling disadvantage was also published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2003. Finally Darcy Hango joined the Centre in the summer from Ohio State University and has been guided by John Hobcraft and Wendy Sigle-Rushton in preparing the comparable NCDS and BC570 data required for a study of family and childhood origins of adult socio-economic disadvantage: a cross cohort comparison. This investment in generating comparable data sets from the two cohorts is also an essential investment for the broader cross-cohort comparisons on a variety of topics that are planned for the remaining period of CASE’s funding.

Until relatively recently in most western societies marriage was the normative setting for having children, but nowadays this is much less the case. In this study we used information collected in the new Millennium Cohort Study to examine the characteristics of families where children are born within a marriage, within a cohabiting union or outside of a co-residential partnership. Additionally, for the latter group, for the first time in a national data set, we are able to assess the ‘strength’ of the parents’ relationship at the time of the birth.

Our analysis showed that the partnership contexts in which the Millennium cohort of children were born varied substantially across different subsets of the population in the extent to which they were born to unmarried or to parents not in a co-residential partnership. Briefly, the context of childbearing varied according to ethnic group; with Asian mothers being the most likely to be married, Black women the most likely to be non-partnered and White women the most likely to be cohabiting. Older mothers and those having their second or later child were more likely to be married than were younger or first time mothers. Married mothers were more educated than cohabiting mothers who in turn were more educated than non-partnered mothers. There was a similar hierarchy with respect to the socio-economic circumstances of the families in that married couples were the most well off and the non-partnered the worst off. Cohabiting couples were substantially better off than the non-partnered but were not as advantaged as the married couples. A closer look at the non-partnered parents showed that the extent to which the fathers were involved with the mother of the child around the time the baby was born mattered in that those fathers who were closely involved at that time were more likely to move in with the mother (but only a minority did so) and even amongst those who did not move in they were more likely than other absent fathers (including erstwhile married fathers) to see their children on a regular basis and to contribute money to the child’s maintenance.

The findings highlight the complexity and fuzziness of parental relationships that exist at the beginning of the 21st century and suggest that simple dichotomies of married versus unmarried or even comparisons such as married versus cohabiting versus non-partnered can disguise a good deal of variation that exists in the connections between parents, particularly fathers, and their children.

2003 has seen CASE continuing its work on income risk and mobility, and on child poverty and its consequences, including the development of a programme of analysis of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC) dataset.

Christian Schluter has completed work with Stephen Jenkins (SER Essex, UK) on the consequences of child poverty on schooling. He continues to work with Xavi Ramos (UAB, Spain) on the informational gain obtained from using subjective expectations data in models of income and the measurement of risk. Work has also continued with Dirk Van de Gaer (Ghent, Belgium) on a new class of measures of income mobility. The techniques developed in this paper enable analysis of the welfare properties of many popular mobility indices, revealing that these are very unsatisfactory. Christian has also begun research with Jacky Whaba (Southampton, UK), which investigates whether poor Mexican parents are altruistic with respect to their children. The analysis is based on a properly randomised policy intervention aimed at children (PROGRESA) which uses a variety of instruments to improve the health of children and makes transfers to families conditional on school attendance.

Tom Sefton and John Rigg have been working on income mobility using data from the British Household Panel Survey, examining people’s income trajectories over a ten year period. After identifying six broad types of income trajectory, they investigated the types of trajectories associated with different stages in the life cycle and specific life events, such as partnership formation, the birth of a child, and retirement. Frank Cowell began work on a survey of empirical models of intergenerational mobility of incomes and other measures of individual and family status, and in a more theoretical vein, has also published his book on The Economics of Poverty and Inequality (see opposite).

Simon Burgess, Carol Propper and John Rigg have been investigating the relationship between family income and child health, using the ALSPAC data, which contains detailed information on children born in the former county of Avon between 1991 and 1992. This data set contains rich information on the child’s health, the child’s family circumstances and on the child’s mother’s health.

Burgess, Propper and Rigg studied child health up to the age of 7, finding that children from poorer households were in worse health, even by age 7. When the child was in a low income household during the first 4 years of his or her life did not appear to matter. They also investigated the mechanisms by which low income gets translated into poorer health. They did not find any relationship between poor health and the mother working, whether the mother smoked, or the diet fed to the child, even though all these factors varied by household income. However, they found a strong association between poor maternal health before the child was born, low income and poor health of the child at age 7. Mothers who were in poorer mental health before their child was born were more likely to have sicker children, suggesting that more focus on the impact of mental health of mothers on their children is needed.

1 S Jenkins and C Schluter. ‘Family income during childhood and late-life attainment: evidence from Germany’ (paper submitted for publication).
Frank Cowell's book, *The Economics of Poverty and Inequality*, focuses on the economics of distributional equity and the way general criteria for comparisons of income distributions can be used to inform the analysis of inequality and poverty. It consists of a critical analysis of the principal theoretical strands connecting key ideas in the modern approach to poverty and inequality analysis and also a collection of classic papers in the area. The main issues addressed are:

- The nature of general ranking rules for comparing economic states based on simple ethical principles.
- The close relationship between the analysis of poverty and that of inequality or social welfare.
- The structure and properties of inequality and poverty indices.

The book argues for a unified approach to the core ideas of poverty and inequality measurement, even though the practical applications and the policy implications of the two phenomena may be very different. The main reason for this is the reliance on similar structural axioms that are typically introduced to make the abstract concepts easier to grasp and interpret. An example of this is the idea of scale independence (double all the incomes and you leave inequality unchanged). Furthermore both poverty and inequality concepts have a natural interpretation in terms of social welfare, whether or not you choose to use a social-welfare function in arguing for a particular inequality or poverty concept. The attraction of this unified approach is that it carries over into empirical analysis. Essentially the same statistical results on estimation and inference apply in both fields, for example.

The papers republished in the book are arranged to show how this unified approach works in practice. Volume 1 concentrates principally on inequality and covers the philosophical and welfare-economic basis of distributional analysis as well as an analysis of specific inequality measures and techniques. From these building blocks one can derive more sophisticated approaches, such as those involving decomposition by population groups and the extension to multidimensional concepts of income as well as an extension to related concepts such as polarisation, horizontal inequality and progressivity. Volume 2 not only focuses on the issues involved in the practical implementation of poverty measurement but also illustrates the way in which the poverty-ranking approach is related to welfare analysis including the specification of the poverty line and the modelling of household needs. It also includes the principal approaches to poverty dynamics and the measurement of relative deprivation. The volume also addresses a number of technical issues related to the empirical analysis of income distributions that are relevant to both poverty and inequality, including statistical estimation and inference and the use of specific functional forms in modelling.

The Dynamics of Low Income Areas

Contact: Jake Elster, Ruth Lupton, Caroline Paskell, Anne Power, Liz Richardson

CASE’s ESRC-funded study of twelve low-income areas moved into its seventh year in 2003. Results of the first four years of the study, including the first two rounds of qualitative fieldwork in 1999 and 2001, were published by The Policy Press in Ruth Lupton’s book Poverty Street: The Dynamics of Neighbourhood Decline and Renewal (see opposite).

In the second half of the year, Caroline Paskell took over as the research officer on the study, having completed her PhD in CASE on community action around youth crime, drug use and anti-social behaviour, and a project with Ian Joseph on gangs and serious youth conflict. She began a new round of fieldwork, focusing on housing – changes to housing stock, lettings policies, demand and tenure – and major regeneration programmes, and also on the impacts of smaller-scale efforts to improve quality of life, from environmental maintenance, neighbourhood and street wardens, to community engagement in local decision-making and additional funding for community efforts. Initial visits to the twelve areas to interview key housing, regeneration and community workers, and resident activists showed that while the full impacts of the larger initiatives were only starting to be widely noted, smaller-scale efforts such as improvements to street cleaning were often seen as having had a significant impact on local quality of life. Housing changes had also brought improvements, most notably through choice-based lettings in the social sector and funds to upgrade housing in both the social and private sectors. Detailed findings from this most recent round of fieldwork will be published in the spring of 2004.

CASE staff have also been involved in several other projects looking at low-income neighbourhoods in their wider local, regional, national and global context. Jake Elster, with Anne Power, has been working on a project as part of the ESRC’s Environment and Human Behaviour programme, investigating links between local environmental issues in low-income neighbourhoods, global environmental issues, and people’s experiences and behaviour. They have conducted focus groups in 6 of the 12 locations in the area study, and collated existing evidence. In 2004 they will highlight lessons for policy to influence behavioural change towards the environment.

Liz Richardson, Anne Power and Kelly Seshimo have, as part of a team from LSE Housing, LSE Cities Programme and LSE London, produced a housing framework for the Thames Gateway London Partnership. They argue for integrating new development by building out at high density from existing centres, using existing transport infrastructure, and for the need for the regeneration of existing communities alongside attracting newcomers to East London.

Anne Power has also updated her earlier report for the Social Exclusion Unit on Neighbourhood Management, in collaboration with the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, and written a review of the Sustainable Communities Plan, jointly published by the Sustainable Development Commission and CASE.

Ruth Lupton and Anne Power have been working on an analysis of urban and neighbourhood trends over the last decade, using 1991 and 2001 Census data, as part of a collaborative project with the Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution in Washington DC. The first outputs from this project will be a series of ‘urban trends’ reports, published by CASE in 2004, covering shifts in population, ethnic composition, employment and housing patterns. They have also begun a literature review for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, pulling together existing knowledge on ‘neighbourhood change’ to help shape the department’s future research programme. Looking further afield, Hyun-bang Shin, together with Bingqin Li and Anne Power, has been planning an international workshop, funded by the Asia-Europe Foundation and the European Alliance for Asian Studies, and bringing together academics and practitioners from 10 Asian and European countries to discuss the experiences of housing and urban regeneration in different political and socio-economic settings. The workshop will take place in Beijing in 2004.


3 London’s Thames Gateway: Its housing potential, growth pressures, community needs and environmental limits - A study by the LSE Housing and Cities Programmes for the Thames Gateway London Partnership.


Poverty Street: The dynamics of neighbourhood decline and renewal

Ruth Lupton

The trajectories of poor neighbourhoods are diverging, with major implications for regeneration policy. This was the key finding emerging from the first phase of CASE’s study of twelve disadvantaged areas and neighbourhoods, from 1998-2001.

The twelve areas were selected to be representative of wards in the most deprived 5 per cent in England and Wales, and varied by region, location, housing type and tenure and ethnic mix. At the start of the study in 1998, they shared some common social and economic problems: unemployment three times the national average; Income Support claims twice as high; health and educational attainment well below average; and often sub-standard housing, poor environments and high crime.

Following these areas over time through interviews, observations and secondary data analysis, we found that some of these problems could be ascribed in part to ‘neighbourhood effects’, particularly the failure of public management, and the development of inward-looking social networks. But the fundamental causes of neighbourhood decline were wider. The areas had long histories of poverty because they were built to house low-paid workers in industries that had subsequently declined, or because they were in inner urban areas which had lost value as the middle classes had moved out to the suburbs.

In the 1990s, changes in economic geography, housing demand, and migration began to pull the neighbourhoods in different directions. In the North, declining population and low housing demand caused some neighbourhoods to be semi-abandoned, with high levels of vandalism and crime and high concentrations of social problems. There was ‘between neighbourhood’ polarization. While large cities experienced some economic recovery, peripheral industrial areas were in deep trouble, continuing to experience net job losses and population exodus. By contrast, inner London neighbourhoods experienced rapid gentrification, in some cases at the cost of social housing, and at the same time a big influx of disadvantaged refugees. There was ‘within neighbourhood’ polarization.

While the study showed that government regeneration policies were having an ameliorative effect, they were principally focused on better management and services, rather than addressing the spatial implications of economic restructuring, changing housing preferences and immigration. Further progress will demand differentiated policies, designed to match different neighbourhood trajectories and, in particular, strategies for active management of the decline of former industrial communities as well as for ‘regeneration’.

Moving into its fifth year, the ESRC-funded neighbourhood study continued to provide a rich source of insights into what life is like for families in low-income areas of Britain: Leeds, Sheffield and East London (Hackney and Newham). By including four of the places covered by our twelve areas study, but approaching them from the perspective of parents and children, this study extends our understanding of the opportunities, pressures, and dynamics of low-income areas.

All of the families have dependent children but otherwise they are a diverse sample. Most of the families are council tenants, around half are headed by lone parents and nearly half (except in the Leeds area) are from ethnic minority backgrounds – British-born and recent immigrants. The ongoing research with these 200 families provides both continuity and the opportunity to focus the study on different aspects of life in these neighbourhoods. Over the course of five rounds of interviews, the study has produced many detailed sets of findings on how policy, personal opportunities and choices, local social relations and local conditions affect these parents and children. We are uncovering unique ground level insights into how life is for low income families in poor neighbourhoods by gathering over 32,000 responses over four years from these mothers.

2003 saw the publication of findings from the early rounds of work1 and the analysis of the third and fourth rounds of the study. Data from these interviews showed that mothers usually have strong connections with their own mothers and other relatives; they attach great importance to local connections and a sense of community; they have much lower satisfaction than people in other areas with neighbourhood conditions and services; they feel they have little or no control over their housing as council tenants and very little influence over decisions that affect them. They do not like the term ‘social exclusion’ but they do think that the areas they live in create barriers to integration with the wider community. Some of the greatest concerns of parents are to do with conditions beyond their immediate control. The common experience of bullying among nearly half of their children, mainly in schools, the prevalent fear of drugs and the violence associated with it, are two of the most prominent concerns. At the same time parents believe their children have better prospects and opportunities than they had; they enjoy spending time with their children and going on outings with them when they can; they see schools and head teachers as generally more supportive; and their families and close friends as a life-line.

With Helen Willmot joining CASE in 2003 to work on the study in the North, we also commenced a fifth round of interviews. These have uncovered how families feel the areas and communities are changing. They are impressed by local school improvements and other neighbourhood renewal programmes. But many despair of wider social conditions and end up wanting to move, either within the area (a majority in the North) or away altogether. The comparisons between North and South are striking – for example even more contact between extended families, fewer housing opportunities but more desire to move out in the South. We will produce our second book on these issues, organised around the theme of parenting in poor areas, in the coming year.

What makes life more difficult for you as a parent?
‘Holly’s eight and she should be able to walk but I’d never let her, which is partly my problem but it’s inspired by the area.’

‘The kids in the area are badly behaved. They start fires but my kids would never join in.’

‘He’s starting high school this year and he’s going to get killed.’

‘I just hope they don’t end up living here when they get older.’

‘No – apart from me not being at home enough. But it’s either work or being on the Social.’

‘Yes, that (crime) is what pushed me to move. A group of boys held my son and a piece of glass to him. I contacted the police.’

‘My kids were screaming when their dad got thumped.’

Source: Interviews in the four neighbourhoods in Rounds 3 and 4.

What helps you as a parent?
‘Community spirit helps with parenting because people know each other and some people can pick up my children from school if I can’t get home in time.’

‘I like being out with them. We went last half-term, organised by families in the area’

‘People stereotyped me because I was on benefits but now I have a bit of spare money to treat him. It’s also a good example for him, me working.’
Many projects in this area of the Centre’s work were continuing from previous years but 2003 also saw some important new developments. One was the creation of a new Research Officer post, to work both on employment and education themes. Eleni Karagiannaki joined the centre in October, and has begun work on a project examining the effectiveness of Jobcentre Plus in delivering social security to non-jobseekers. When the new agency was formed from a merger of parts of the Benefits Agency and the Employment Service, concern was expressed that the emphasis on ‘work for those who can’ might lead to a down-grading of the service for ‘those who cannot’. This project is comparing evidence on the performance of Jobcentre Plus to that of its predecessors in order to confirm or disprove these fears.

Another aspect of the work of Jobcentre Plus is being examined by Gerry Mitchell through her doctoral thesis on the New Deal for Young People voluntary sector option. Gerry’s ethnographic approach has illuminated the gaps between policy intent on the one hand, and the perceptions of participants and service delivery organisations on the other.

Welfare to work has been a key concern of the Labour government since 1997, but of course it is also important to consider the quality and sustainability of the jobs which people access. Abigail McKnight has continued her work on low-wage employment this year, some of it in collaboration with colleagues in the LoWER network, examining low wage employment in Europe. A major conference at LSE is planned for 2004. A joint project with Tania Burchardt and funded by the Nuffield Foundation, examined the impact of the introduction of the National Minimum Wage, focusing on one group of particularly vulnerable workers (see overleaf).

The employment area of CASE’s work is mainly focused on the UK and Europe, but we have for some time also maintained an interest in countries in transition. This year, Ceema Namazie and Sabine Bernabe continued their investigations of labour markets in countries in transition. The Centre’s continuing research on the economic circumstances of disabled people includes employment as a key concern, but also considers welfare more broadly. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation funded a study looking at the risk of onset of disability and its consequences. One striking finding from this work was the steep socio-economic gradient in the risk of becoming disabled, with those in the poorest fifth of the income distribution two-and-a-half times more likely to become disabled during a year than those in the top fifth.

‘One striking finding from this work was the steep socio-economic gradient in the risk of becoming disabled, with those in the poorest fifth of the income distribution two-and-a-half times more likely to become disabled during a year than those in the top fifth.’
policy. In the UK we have seen the introduction of Child Trust Funds (which, from 2020, will give all young people a cash lump-sum at the age of 18) and a number of pilot programmes designed to assist and incentivise low income families to save. However, there is still little hard evidence that assets improve outcomes. Abigail McKnight and Ceema Namazie are conducting a large quantitative study (supplemented by a qualitative investigation based at IPPR) to assess the impact of financial assets on a range of different outcomes (funded by the Esmee Fairbairn Trust). Results will be published in 2004.

Another recently developed form of welfare is tax credits. CASE is involved in a major project with the National Centre for Social Research and the Inland Revenue to track the incomes of low income households on a week-by-week basis. This project is funded through the Treasury’s Evidence Based Policy Fund and is being led in CASE by John Hills and Abigail McKnight. It breaks new ground in attempting to record contemporaneously the size and source of fluctuations in household incomes. The increasing importance of tax credits, assessed on annual income, means it is vital to understand the way in which incomes vary over shorter time periods. The data-collection phase of the project is now coming to an end and the exciting process of analysis is just beginning.

It is all too easy to lose sight of the bigger picture when examining specific policies and parts of the welfare state. Abigail McKnight and John Goldthorpe have been examining the economic basis of social class by looking at the key employment characteristics which underpin the conceptual basis of social class (security, stability and prospects). They show that there remains a strong social class gradient in the experience of unemployment, the security of pay and lifetime earnings prospects. In 2004 they plan to continue their collaboration by contrasting the different approaches sociologists and economists take when analysing inequality and mobility.

Tom Sefton analysed attitudes to the welfare state and how they have changed over time. He found that there has been sustained resistance in public opinion to government attempts to cut spending on public services, though there is also increased support for more targeting of cash benefits on specific vulnerable groups.

John Hills uses some of this evidence from attitudinal surveys in his argument about the future of national insurance and the contributory principle. National insurance is in turn among the mechanisms which Howard Glennerster considers in his overview of what the welfare state costs and how it is – and should be – paid for. He concludes that we will probably have to pay higher taxes and lengthen our working lives to pay for the kind of services and benefits we want. Persuading taxpayers that this is the best alternative is one of the key challenges that public services face.

Disability and the National Minimum Wage: A special case?

Tania Burchardt and Abigail McKnight

In the debate which preceded the introduction of a National Minimum Wage (NMW) in the UK in April 1999, concern was expressed by some campaigners that it could jeopardise the jobs of low paid disabled workers. Disabled workers were more likely to be earning less than the NMW rate than non-disabled workers (see table) and hence were particularly likely to be affected by it – for better or worse. This project, funded by the Nuffield Foundation, examines whether the NMW had an adverse effect on the employment retention of disabled workers or resulted in a reduction in the hours they worked.

We apply a difference-in-difference methodology to data from 5-quarter panels of the Labour Force Survey for the period prior to the NMW and a period which spanned the introduction of the NMW. A difference-in-difference methodology allows us to estimate the impact of the NMW taking account of the fact that, for example, low paid workers tend to have lower employment retention rates than higher paid workers. The results show that employment retention rates improved for low paid disabled employees over the period of the introduction of the NMW but that, relative to others, disabled employees earning less than the NMW rate before its introduction did not enjoy the same improvement. However the difference-in-difference is not statistically significant.

Exempting disabled employees from the NMW could certainly not be justified on the basis of these results. The majority of disabled workers whose earnings were below the level of the NMW before its introduction retained their employment, and benefited from higher wages. The minority who left employment could benefit from better enforcement of the Disability Discrimination Act and/or an increase in public funding for supported employment programmes.


Wage distribution of employees prior to the NMW (Summer-Winter 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wage band</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Non disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage &lt; NMW rate</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW &lt;= wage &lt; NMW+20%</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW+20% &lt;= wage &lt;NMW+40%</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW+40% &lt;= wage &lt;NMW+60%</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW+60%&lt;= wage &lt; NMW+80%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW+80% &lt;= wage &lt; NMW+100%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage &gt;= NMW+100%</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (=100%)</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>8589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Labour Force Survey panel datasets. Wage is hourly wage at wave 1. NMW rate deflated by RPI.
Education and Social Exclusion

Contact: Simon Burgess, Robert Cassen, Howard Glennerster, Eleni Karagiannaki, Ruth Lupton, Abigail McKnight

During 2003, CASE continued to expand its work under the educational theme, looking at funding, processes and outcomes in the compulsory schooling phase, and at participation and outcomes in higher education. We were pleased to welcome Robert Cassen, who has funding from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and Sutton Trust to work on low achievement in British education, and Eleni Karagiannaki, who is working with Abigail McKnight.

Segregation of ethnic minorities between schools can arise from, amongst other things, residential segregation and parental choice (possibly on the basis of the desire for religious instruction). There may in fact be some positive aspects from segregation for the children but there are likely to be negative externalities. Simon Burgess and Deborah Wilson have been using data from the 2001 Census and from the Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) to assess the extent of ethnic segregation in England’s state maintained secondary schools in 2001 according to different ethnic minority groups. They found high levels of ethnic segregation particularly for pupils of Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi origin. Segregation was found to be weaker among pupils with black Caribbean or African heritage.

Burgess and Wilson also showed that the areas which suffered severe rioting by Asian and white youths in the summer of 2001 were characterised by some of the highest levels of segregation. They plan to extend this work to examine the relationship between school and residential segregation, the role of markets and competition between schools and the impact of segregation on the educational attainment of minority ethnic pupils.

Howard Glennerster focused on the financing of education in one chapter of his new book Understanding the Finance of Welfare. The chapter reviewed the cost of education in the UK compared with other developed countries and how spending on education relative to GDP has changed over time. It showed that, even with recent increases, expenditure on education institutions in the UK is below the OECD average. In terms of funding per school pupil, Glennerster showed that there was very little change between 1995 and 2000, after which it rose significantly. There have also been some quite significant changes in how education funds are allocated. He outlined the way in which schools facing higher costs (for example, if they are located in a high pay area or have a high proportion of disadvantaged children) receive higher levels of funding via the additional money paid to the Local Education Authority and through direct payment from special pots of money. In 2000 the Labour Government introduced payment of direct grants to schools, the sum of which has increased over time, and the indications are that the government will increasingly move towards this model, effectively cutting out the role of the LEAs in allocating funds.

Educational attainment and school quality are generally below average in disadvantaged areas. Although there is a real issue around the level of funding required to compensate schools for the additional costs associated with a high intake of disadvantaged pupils, funds alone will not solve the problem. The challenges faced by schools in disadvantaged areas are gaining recognition and solutions are being sought. Ruth Lupton’s doctoral research showed that there are no easy quick fixes. The impact of disadvantage on the organisation and processes of schools varies from one area to another and cannot be accurately identified by the usual indicators of disadvantage (free school meal eligibility and minority ethnic population). She concludes that improvement will only be possible through policies tailored to disadvantaged areas and sensitive to differences between these areas. She offers a range of practical ways in which progress could be made, highlighting the areas where we still have little understanding of what ‘best practice’ might be.

Abigail McKnight has continued her collaboration with colleagues at the University of Warwick on research into higher education. Their forthcoming article on University Performance Indicators (PIs) shows how sensitive graduate employability PIs are to variation across universities in non-response to the official survey and non-completion of undergraduate programmes. These factors result in a non-random sample of universities’ intake of students being included in PIs. McKnight and colleagues caution the use of official league tables of universities which do not adjust for these differences.

Schools in Disadvantaged Areas: Recognising context and raising quality

Ruth Lupton

Academic attainment is low in schools in high poverty areas, because of the barriers that poverty presents to learning. But data from the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) shows that there is also a quality problem: schools in poor areas score worse on measures of process (such as the quality of teaching or management) as well as on the progress made by pupils (see graph).

Ruth Lupton’s research, based on case studies of four schools in very different deprived areas, shows that this is not a coincidence. Schools in poor areas face downward pressures on quality because of recruitment difficulties, extra pressures on resources, and strained relationships. Headteachers and staff are working in an emotionally charged and unpredictable learning environment. They have to run to stand still. Moreover, schools in poor areas are not the same as each other. Local socio-economic and cultural characteristics interact with the characteristics of the local educational market and the characteristics of the school as an institution to create different levels of pressure. In this study, the schools in very high poverty areas, with concentrated ethnic minority populations, had higher levels of Free School Meal eligibility and English language needs, but a more pro-school context, in terms of the attitudes and behaviour of pupils and parents, than lower poverty schools in white working class areas. The beneficial effects of pro-school cultural contexts, however, could be offset by highly competitive market contexts; steep hierarchies of schools that left the most disadvantaged pupils clustered in the least popular schools.

Making these schools work well, consistently, demands different organisational designs, with more staff and more broadly conceived notions of education and the school’s role. Systemic changes are needed, to redistribute funding, to protect high poverty schools from market pressures and to incentivise and train high quality staff. There are funding implications. However, effective schooling in these circumstances also needs to be based on tailored pedagogic and management practices, underpinned by contextually sensitive school improvement research. There is a lot we still need to know about ‘what works’ in the most disadvantaged schools and areas.

Contact: Helen Beck, Alice Coulter, Anne Power, Liz Richardson

Our work in 2003 continued its focus on community activity, and developed our thinking about the links between this grass roots work and wider work and policy on neighbourhood renewal and urban issues.

Liz Richardson and Helen Beck continued to work on the monitoring and evaluation of a national self help, capacity building training and small grant programme, located at Trafford Hall, home of the National Tenants' Resource Centre, and funded by ODPM. The 'Making Things Happen' Capacity Building programme is targeted at social housing residents and community volunteers, and aims to increase the level and quality of involvement of community volunteers in decisions that affect their neighbourhoods.

CASE's interim evaluation, which will be published in 2004, demonstrates that the training courses and small grants have long term benefits in encouraging the development of community activity and social capital in neighbourhoods. Out of every 10 community groups that sent members on courses have taken some sort of follow up action after training. A further 4 in 10 of the groups are planning to do something. Fewer than 1 in 10 of the groups say they do not plan to do anything. Some of the groups' follow up action was grant funded. The groups are involved in a wide range of activity and projects. These include working in partnership with mainstream services to regenerate estates, alongside small scale community activity such as running community facilities and working with young people.

87 per cent of the participants in the Making Things Happen programme live in social housing neighbourhoods. The programme has helped to unlock the potential within these communities to respond to initiatives from outside and play a more active role in solving their own and neighbourhood problems. It reaches down to local groups working at the level of the street or neighbourhood. We have found that the action of mainstream services cannot replace the knitting together of neighbourhoods that happens between people informally on a voluntary basis. However, we have also found that groups may be unaware of the wider significance of their work and its potential. A second main theme of our work on social capital in 2003 was therefore to explore further the links between smaller-scale efforts to regenerate disadvantaged areas and attempts to improve mainstream service delivery and housing provision. Liz Richardson, Anne Power and Alice Coulter organised a think-tank event, jointly funded by the Gatsby Charitable Foundation and the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, to examine the role of neighbourhood management in relation to community involvement. This work emphasised the roles of resident volunteers in poor neighbourhoods in relation to the delivery of public services and neighbourhood renewal, eg providing a brokering role between services and the wider population; an advisory role for services on user perspectives; and intelligence gathering for services on local issues.

We also ran a similar think-tank event looking at how to tackle low demand for housing in the North and Midlands, funded by ODPM. Policy recommendations included work to create positive neighbourhood cultures in addition to regional level action such as limiting green belt housebuilding to promote housing market renewal in areas of low demand.

Finally, Liz Richardson and Alice Coulter continued working on a summative and formative evaluation of the Glass-House, a national service that offers design training, design advice and other technical support to residents in renewal areas across the UK (see opposite).


The Glass-House: design training and advice in low income communities

Liz Richardson and Alice Coulter

The Glass-House is a service that offers design training, design advice and other technical support to residents in renewal areas, including ‘Places by Design’, a three day residential training course at Trafford Hall, a residential training and conference centre near Chester. The idea of the training is to help community groups from neighbourhoods undergoing large scale redevelopment to understand the principles of good urban design, and then apply those principles to their own neighbourhoods.

CASE is contracted as an outside evaluator for The Glass-House. Our monitoring, evaluation and research work is used to record the progress of programmes, monitor quality and recommend changes, demonstrate participants’ action outcomes, improve and adapt work as a result of feedback, and to develop additional pieces of work in responses to changing needs.

Our evaluation has found that the project uses innovative tools to challenge residents’ existing thinking on current pressing urban problems such as the need identified in urban policy for higher density housing in cities. The training has caused some of the participants to change their views about Masterplans for the redesign of their neighbourhoods, as the Glasgow example shows (see box).

The generally positive results from the Glasgow experience appear to be repeated in findings from residents’ groups across the UK. These show that participants in Glass-House training felt the experience was extremely instructive and worthwhile:

● 92 per cent had gained new ideas from the courses
● 84 per cent were more determined to take forward an existing idea or project.

And after the events, when people returned to the neighbourhoods, they continued to feel the benefits of training:

● 96 per cent found the training generally useful or very useful for their local community activity
● 80 per cent had given feedback about the training to others back home.

Glasgow Housing Association

Following the transfer of ownership of Glasgow’s council housing to a new housing association landlord, tenants and staff from one of Glasgow Housing Association’s Local Housing Organisations attended Places by Design in May 2003. The Housing Association wanted to ensure residents were involved in decision-making about future design proposals, but recognised they needed to understand the design constraints and design options in order to make informed decisions.

One of the design constraints was the need to look at providing quality housing that took account of previous investment in the area.

The residents favoured low-rise developments and therefore lower density development, and this was challenged by the course tutors.

The area in question, Gallowgate in the East end of Glasgow, has 480 properties, including 348 flats in two tower blocks that are currently the subject of option appraisal. The training centred on the understanding of design concepts including looking at maps of the actual area, with overlays of street layouts, housing, and different uses. As the residents grew more familiar with the plans they could interpret the options put before them better. In undertaking the training participants changed their preferences from initially wanting ‘up and down semis with private gardens and cul de sacs’ to examining other house types including ‘looking at building up the housing on the main road frontage and increasing density; developing new access roads across the area’ and retaining a Victorian Bath House that they had initially sought to demolish. Notably participants concluded that if they had had the opportunity to undertake the course prior to the completion of recent major fabric improvements to selected houses in the area they may not have supported that decision. Debates about the financial feasibility of the Masterplan are still ongoing.
Policies, Concepts and Measurement of Social Exclusion

Contact: Francesca Borgonovi, Tania Burchardt, John Hills, Julian Le Grand, Ruth Lupton, Kitty Stewart, Polly Vizard

This strand of CASE’s work has continued to cover a diverse set of research areas. In 2003 the strand has seen work providing a broad overview of concepts, policies or outcomes; new conceptual work; and work shedding further light on specific measurement issues.

John Hills worked on a book on Welfare and Distribution, to be published by Oxford University Press in 2004.1 This brings together and updates research he and others at CASE have carried out over recent years on inequality and poverty, their relationship with public policy, and public attitudes towards them. He and Kitty Stewart are also editing a book (to be published in December 2004) with contributions from staff and associates from across CASE’s interests that will assess the impact of policies towards poverty and social exclusion since 1997.2 Drawing on new and existing work within and outside CASE, the book includes chapters on employment, inequalities in education and health, income inequality, political participation, poor neighbourhoods, child poverty, older people and vulnerable groups.

Conceptual work included a new framework for explaining and exploring the processes of social exclusion. Sally Witcher, a CASE User Fellow in Summer 2001, proposes that we think about social relationships as ‘transactions’ for which we need ‘currencies’, currency may be financial, but may also be human – who people are or what they do.3 The currency required depends on the nature of the transaction, but even where people have currency, transaction may be prevented by e.g. inaccessible infrastructure or by failure to recognise currency. Sally’s argument draws attention to the distinction between poverty and social exclusion, and to the fact that inequality goes beyond the distribution of income.

Tania Burchardt contributed to the analysis of the Sen/Nussbaum phenomenon of ‘adaptive preference’.4 Her empirical work establishes that individuals who have experienced a recent downward shock to their income are more likely to express dissatisfaction with their financial situation than individuals who have experienced long-term low income. These findings provide evidence of a process of subjective adaptation to material deprivation and suggest that subjective assessments of wellbeing may provide an inappropriate basis for judgements about inequality and social justice.

Polly Vizard’s work5 focuses on the development of an interdisciplinary framework for conceptualising poverty as a human rights issue. Her projects this year included a CASE Seminar analysing the contributions of Amartya Sen to theoretical thinking in this area and a paper that extended the use of deontic logic to capture, formalise and classify internationally recognised legal standards in the field of poverty and human rights.

Julian Le Grand’s book, Motivation, Agency and Public Policy, explored the concepts of agency and motivation and their importance for society in general and for the public services in particular (see box).6 Francesca Borgonovi has also been concerned with issues of motivation, considering the effect of government grants to non-profit art organisations on individuals’ incentive to behave altruistically by making private donations.7 Francesca’s PhD work looks at inclusion in the arts, often overlooked as an area of participation. This year she has used English and American data to examine the barriers that prevent people from participating in the performing arts.

On the measurement side, Shireen Kanji has questioned the use of lone mother as a category for poverty analysis in the Russian context.8 She shows that poverty rates for children in lone mother households differ significantly depending on the route mothers took into lone parenthood, suggesting that it is misleading to treat the group as homogenous. Finally, Ruth Lupton raised questions about the usefulness of recent attempts to identify neighbourhood effects using large datasets.9 She argues that data and methodology problems mean that these studies are not yet capable of delivering robust results that adequately capture ‘neighbourhood’. However, she also suggests that the existence of neighbourhood effects is not as important to area policy as is often assumed: much area policy is still useful simply because of the geographical concentration of target groups, regardless of the existence of independent effects.

Doctors protest at the setting up of new private treatment centres. Public sector unions vow to stop foundation hospitals. Teachers vote to abolish league tables. Are they all just trying to protect their public service from destruction and its users from exploitation? Or are they out simply to save their jobs, incomes and cushy working conditions? Are professionals and public service workers self-interested egoists: knaves, in the terminology of the 18th century philosopher David Hume? Or are they noble altruists defending the public service ethos – not knaves, but knights?

The idealists who built the post-war welfare state did so on the basic assumption that those who worked within it were knights. They considered that professionals could simply be trusted to provide a good service. But this turned out to be naive. Many doctors, nurses, teachers, social workers appeared to have their own more knavish agendas: income, status, working conditions.

And there was another problem. Schools, hospitals, GP practices treated their users as little more than passive victims of circumstance – especially if they were poor. But users felt that they wanted more personalised services. They wanted to be treated not as the least powerful piece on the chess-board, the pawn, but as the most powerful, the queen.

So successive governments, both Conservative and Labour, have replaced the knightly welfare state by one based on more knavish assumptions concerning motivation, and by one more consumerist in focus. League tables, targets, inspection, competition, choice: all rein in professionals’ freedoms, while making it more in their self-interest to pay attention to the wants of users.

These arguments are summarised in the diagram. The horizontal axis represents policy-makers’ assumptions about what motivates professionals and public sector workers ranging from extreme altruism (the pure knight) on the far left to pure self-interest (the complete knave) on the far right. The vertical axis refers to policy-makers’ assumptions about the capacity for agency of users of public services, from completely passive individual (pawn) at the bottom to active, autonomous agent (queen) at the top. The changes in policymakers’ assumptions about motivation and agency, just described, have moved the welfare state from being in the bottom left hand quadrant to the top right hand one.

Julian le Grand’s book addresses the implications of this change. Was it well grounded? Or should policy-makers have continued to rely upon the public service ethos to deliver high quality public services?

Julian le Grand’s book addresses the implications of this change. Was it well grounded? Or should policy-makers have continued to rely upon the public service ethos to deliver high quality public services? It draws on evidence from Britain and abroad to show that, in fact, public policies designed on the basis that professionals are a mixture of knight and knave, and recipients a mixture of pawn and queen, deliver better quality and greater social justice than policies based on more simplistic assumptions about motivation and agency. In particular, contrary to popular mythology, the book shows that policies that offer choice and competition within public services such as education and health care can deliver both excellence and equity – so long as they are properly designed. And policies aimed at building up individual assets and wealth ownership can empower the poor and powerless more effectively than those aimed simply at bolstering their current income.

Appendix 1 – Research and Research Staff

Helen Beck has been researching the impact of a capacity building and small grant programme, based at the National Tenants Resource Centre (NTRC), for tenants and residents of social housing and community volunteers. Her research monitors and evaluates the quality of training, provides support and developmental research, and also documents follow-up local action and project development after training. She has particularly been exploring the practical difficulties of community involvement and the motivations of community activists. In addition to her research role, she has produced good practice case study examples of community activity, support materials and handouts for NTRC’s Information Room.

Sabine Bernabe continued her work on informal labour markets and poverty in transition economies. The research examines the relationship between formal and informal labour market activity in Georgia and poverty with a view to assessing whether informal labour markets are providing a social safety net in the absence of formal employment opportunities and social security.

Francesca Borgonovi continued her doctoral dissertation work on inequalities in participation in the performing arts in England and the United States using data from the 2001 ONS Omnibus Survey on Participation in the Arts and the Family Expenditure Survey (England) and the 2002 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts and the Consumer Expenditure Survey (US). She also continued her work on non-profit organisations, studying whether government spending displaces or leverages private charitable donations using a panel of American non-profit organisations. Finally she worked for Culture Online, a new initiative funded by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport to develop a new strategy to use digital technologies to reduce barriers to participation in the arts and promote social inclusion.

Sheere Brooks has continued with her PhD research examining key factors in Jamaican residential patterning between 1980 and 2000, from the process of social exclusion in developing countries to the effects of return overseas migration on the spatial development of housing in Jamaica and the politics of neighbourhood gate-keeping. It combines quantitative analysis of the Jamaican Census with case studies of low and high-income communities.

Tania Burchard continued her work on employment and welfare policy with projects on the risk of becoming disabled (funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation), a systematic review of the evidence on links between social exclusion and mental health (with Bingxin Li and LSE Health and Social Care, funded by the Gatsby Foundation), and preliminary work on asylum policy under New Labour. In a more theoretical vein, she continued her work on the capabilities framework, re-evaluating the argument based on adaptive preferences as a motivation for the framework, and drawing out the connections between the social model of disability and the capabilities framework (article forthcoming in Disability and Society).

Simon Burgess has been working with Carol Propper and John Rigg on the links between low income and child health, using the ALSPAC dataset. He has also been using the new Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) data to investigate patterns of pupil segregation by ethnicity.

Robert Cassen joined the Centre as an associate, and has obtained funding from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Sutton Trust for a project on low achievement in British education, starting in 2004.

Frank Cowell began work on a survey of empirical models of intergenerational mobility of incomes and other measures of individual and family status. He also published his book on The Economics of Poverty and Inequality.

Jake Elster, with Anne Power and Liz Richardson has completed an Esmee Fairbairn Trust project investigating how local action on sustainability develops and can be supported. They have received further funding to develop a practical tool to help community groups develop new projects and, together with Encams, Forward Scotland, the Sustainable Northern Ireland Project, and IDeA, have raised funding to develop a national programme to support and promote local sustainability action. They have also worked with the UK Government’s Sustainable Development Commission, contributing to their sustainable regeneration work. Lastly, they have begun an ESRC-funded project investigating links between local environmental issues in low-income neighbourhoods, global environmental issues, and people’s experiences and behaviour, based in some of the areas CASE is following as part of its twelve areas study. Rebecca Gibbs and Catalina Turcu worked as research assistants on this project.

Martin Evans completed his work on social exclusion and poverty in the thirteen applicant countries for the European Commission and also completed the final synthesis of evidence for the UK’s New Deal for Lone Parents. With colleagues at Oxford and Herriot Watt Universities he also completed the study of public expenditure flows into and outcomes from mainstream public programmes in deprived wards in England and Scotland. New projects on lifetime simulations of the 2003 tax benefit regime and on lone parents cycling between work and benefits were begun. In September and October Martin visited the USA giving seminars at Columbia and Berkeley and at the Urban Institute.

Jane Falkingham has been working with Maria Evandrou on policies towards older people for the forthcoming CASE book on the impact of New Labour policies on social exclusion.
Howard Glennenerst completed and published his textbook 'Understanding the Finance of Welfare (Policy Press). This combined a discussion of the economics of social policy with a comparative account of the way social policy institutions are actually funded in this and other countries. This stream of work continued with a survey of the impact of changing population structures and rising expectations on our capacity and willingness to fund public services. He began writing the history of poverty measurement and an evaluation of anti-poverty policy in Britain in the twentieth century.

Darcy Hango has spent his first six months at CASE becoming acquainted with various UK data sources, most notably the NCDS and BCS70. He has been working with John Hobcraft, Kathleen Kiernan, and Wendy Sigle-Rushton on a project, involving the two cohort studies, which looks at a cross cohort comparison of family and childhood origins of adult socio-economic disadvantage. This work is planned for presentation at one of several conferences in the United States and/or Europe, as well as eventual publication. He also completed his PhD from Ohio State University in December 2003.

John Hills spent most of the year working on a new book bringing together some of the work within the Centre in recent years covering inequality, the distributional impact of public policy, the scale of social spending and public attitudes towards it. The book will be published in Autumn 2004. He has also been working with Kitty Stewart on a project assessing the impact of New Labour’s policies on social exclusion.

John Hobcraft has continued his analysis of gendered pathways to social exclusion and also extended his results for the origins of adult social exclusion in the NCDS to encompass adult outcomes at age 42. He has also been developing his thinking on the links of biological and behavioural sciences to social behaviour. He and Wendy Sigle-Rushton have been working on a methodological study using Bayesian model averaging and recursive partitioning methods to examine links between female adult malaise and childhood antecedents in the NCDS 1958 and BCS 1970 cohorts.

Carmen Huerta has continued to work on her PhD thesis evaluating the impact of PROGRESA, a national antipoverty programme operating in Mexico, on children’s well-being. She is specifically looking at changes across time in the nutritional and health status of poor children living in rural marginal localities. These findings are relevant for policy makers, especially as other Latin American countries are implementing programmes similar to PROGRESA. This work is expected to be finished in 2004.

Shireen Kanji continued her PhD research into child poverty in lone mother households in Russia, using data from the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey. She presented findings at the annual conference of the International Association of Feminist Economists in Barbados and has also prepared a paper for publication in Feminist Economics in 2004. Shireen also contributed to DFID sponsored research on poverty in two oblasts (districts) of Russia.

Eleni Karagiannaki is working on a project evaluating the performance of Jobcentre Plus for non-jobseekers. She has also been analysing the relationship between job separations and low paid jobs, using cross-sectional and longitudinal data from the Labour Force Survey.

Kathleen Kiernan worked on a paper on the legacies of unmarried parenthood using data from the BCS70, and has also been looking at unmarried parenthood using new data from the Millennium Cohort study. She has been co-editing a book on the potential for change across lives and generations.

Julian Le Grand published his book ‘Motivation, Agency and Public Policy: of Knights and Knaves, Pawns and Queens: Oxford University Press, 2003) and is currently on part-time secondment to No 10 Downing St as a policy adviser.

Bingqin Li has been working on urban social exclusion in China, exploring the importance of looking at urban social exclusion in the context of transitional and developing countries like China, and in particular the relationship between poverty, disadvantage and rising expectations on our social and economic changes. She is also working with Tania Burchardt and colleagues in LSE Health on a research project on mental health and social exclusion developed countries. She has been helping Anne Power and Hyun-bang Shin prepare for a European-Asian workshop on ‘The Enabling Role of the State in Urban Housing and Regeneration’ to be held Beijing, China in July 2004.

Ruth Lupton completed her book on the first four years of CASE’s study of 12 low-income areas, and her PhD on schools in disadvantaged areas. In the latter half of the year she has been developing proposals for a programme of work around schools, poverty and neighbourhoods. Meanwhile, she has been working on a literature review of neighbourhood change for OPM, an analysis of urban trends using 2001 Census data, and a book chapter (with Anne Power) on the impacts of New Labour’s neighbourhood renewal policies.

Abigail McNab worked with Ceema Namazie and the IPPR on a project which seeks to assess the impact of financial assets on economic outcomes. Findings from this research have direct policy relevance to the development of asset-based welfare in the form of the Child Trust Fund and the Saving Gateway and will be published in early 2004. She is currently completing two book chapters assessing the impact of the Labour Government’s attempts to tackle poverty through education and labour market policies. She is also working with John Hills on a project...
investigating how low income families’ incomes fluctuate on a week-to-week basis over the course of a year.

Bani Makkar continued her work on the Neighbourhood Study in London, looking at the experiences of families and how they cope in low income communities. She began a fifth round of interviews with 100 families in two East London neighbourhoods.

Gerry Mitchell-Smith is in the final year of an ESRC funded PhD researching the New Deal for Young People’s Voluntary Sector Option in London. This work is divided into three: 1) a focus on methodology: what is gained from applying ethnographic methods to current social policy evaluations? 2) analysing New Deal delivery on the ground and 3) exploring the construction of identities around work in the narratives of young unemployed people. She is also working with the Policy Studies Institute on an evaluation of ethnic minority experiences of jobcentres.

Julia Morgan is in the final year of her PhD, investigating the relationship between parenting and anti-social behaviour in young children. The work has implications for policy on parenting preferences, especially those that focus on smacking. She has collaborated on two papers, published this year, with Professor Avshalom Caspi of the Institute of Psychiatry. These examine how far maternal warmth moderates the effect of low birth weight on child anti-social behaviour, and how far differential maternal negativity explains differential anti-social behaviour within twins.

Ceema Namazie worked with Abigail McKnight and the IPPR on a project which seeks to assess the impact of financial assets on economic and non-economic outcomes. Findings from this research have direct policy relevance to the development of asset-based welfare in the form of the Child Trust Fund and the Saving Gateway and will be published in early 2004. She has also published a journal article (with Wulf Gaertner) in Mathematical Social Sciences examining attitudes to risk and inequality, a report on the macroeconomics of poverty reduction in Cambodia, joint with Melanie Beresford, Nguon Sokha, Rathin Roy and Sau Sisovanna for UNDP; and two CASEpapers, examining labour market issues over a period of transition in the Kyrgyz Republic.

Caroline Paskell has been finishing her PhD – a study of community action around youth crime, drug-use and anti-social behaviour – and extending on this research with work on youth gangs’ involvement in crack-dealing and violent disorder. In October 2003 she took over from Ruth Lupton on the ESRC Areas Study, visiting the twelve areas in November and December. She will be producing an initial report on this research in 2004.

David Piachaud worked with Tom Sefton and Holly Sutherland on a project funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation looking at the impact of New Labour policies on poverty.

Anne Power has revised her neighbourhood management CASEreport which was produced for the Social Exclusion Unit with the help of the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit and their Neighbourhood Management and Neighbourhood Warden teams. She has also done a review of the Sustainable Communities Plan jointly for the Sustainable Development Commission and CASE. With Ruth Lupton, Anne is carrying out a detailed census analysis to show population, household and ethnic change in towns and cities, looking closely at neighbourhood change. With the Neighbourhood Study researchers, she has analysed the first 4 rounds of the interviews with 200 families, and she has also been working with Liz Richardson, Kelly Seshimo and colleagues from LSE Cities Programme and LSE London, to produce a housing framework for the Thames Gateway London Partnership.

Carol Propper has been working on the ALSPAC dataset with Simon Burgess and John Rigg, looking at low income and child health.

Megan Ravenhill left the centre having completed her PhD into single persons’ homelessness.

Liz Richardson has been continuing her ODPM funded qualitative evaluation of the Making Things Happen Capacity Building programme for community volunteers. Her developmental research and evaluation work is ongoing with the Glass-House, a national design advice service for community groups. She was involved in organising and writing up two Think Tank policy development events on low demand for housing, and neighbourhood management. Later in the year she was part of the team working on a housing framework for new development in the London Thames Gateway.

John Rigg has continued his work with Carol Propper and Simon Burgess on the relationship between low-income and poor child health using the ALSPAC dataset. He has also completed projects with Tom Sefton on income dynamics and Stephen Jenkins (ISER) on disability and disadvantage.

Chris Schluter completed his work with Stephen Jenkins on child poverty and schooling in Britain and Germany. He has continued his work on the measurement of income mobility and risk, and also begun research with Jacky Whaba (Southampton) investigating the altruism of Mexican parents towards their children, based on the PROGRESA programme.

Tom Sefton continued his work on the targeting of energy efficiency schemes to reduce fuel poverty in a new piece of research for the Eaga Partnership Charitable Trust, using administrative data provided by the company responsible for delivering the scheme in large parts of England. The results of this work will feed into the government’s review of the Warm
Front scheme. With John Rigg, he completed an ESRC project examining people’s income trajectories over a ten year period using longitudinal data from the British Household Panel Survey. He also prepared a chapter on changing attitudes towards public spending and the welfare state for the British Social Attitudes Survey 20th Report, which was published in December. Later in the year, he carried out a short project for Save The Children, examining the amount spent on public services and cash benefits for children in England to help inform their input to the government’s review of child poverty. He is currently working on a chapter on inequality for the CASE book assessing New Labour’s record on poverty and social exclusion.

Wendy Sigle-Rushton completed a chapter (with Sara McLanahan) that reviews the literature on the statistical evidence of the effects of father absence and well-being in childhood and young adulthood. She has also worked on a paper that compares the life-time earnings of mothers and non-mothers in nine European countries, and has meanwhile continued her work using data from the British Cohort Study on Bayesian Model Averaging (with John Hobcraft) and on adult experiences of the 1970 cohort.

Hyun-bang Shin has continued with his PhD on urban housing and regeneration in Seoul and Beijing. In 2003, he has made two fieldwork trips to Beijing, China to conduct interviews with local residents in redevelopment districts, which are to be analysed and compared with another set of interviews conducted previously in a redevelopment district in Seoul.

Emily Silverman has continued with her doctoral research investigating the experience of raising children in mixed income new communities, and the factors affecting their parents’ decisions to move to remain in these neighbourhoods. The methodology combines five case studies with a broader survey of deliberately planned new mixed-income urban neighbourhoods in the UK.

Rachel Smithies is working with John Hills on a series of analyses of the distributional effects of the welfare state, updating the findings of earlier CASE projects and examining implications for the welfare state of projected population changes. She is also preparing for publication an article based on her MSc research, on methods of calculating housing costs for use in income distribution analysis.

Kitty Stewart has been co-editing, with John Hills, a CASE book on New Labour’s policy towards poverty, inequality and social exclusion. She is writing two chapters: the first examines changes in child poverty and child deprivation since 1997, including the impact of the early years agenda; the second seeks to place developments in the UK in international context.

Jason Strelitz has continued his research looking at outcomes for children of immigrants in adulthood. Using the ONS Longitudinal Study he is able to track over 8000 children with two immigrant parents from 1971 through to 1991 exploring a wide range of childhood circumstances and adult outcomes, for people from a diverse range of immigrant groups.

Holly Sutherland worked with Tom Sefton and David Piachaud on the JRF project ‘Policy and Poverty Post 1997’ which published its report in November. She also worked with John Hills on a paper explaining for a US audience the prospects for ending child poverty in the UK. She and Tom Sefton continued to jointly organise the DWP-funded Welfare Policy and Analysis seminar.

Rebecca Tunstall has been a Visiting Fellow at the Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution in Washington DC since September 2003. She has been working with colleagues at Brookings and in CASE on comparative demographic analysis of US and UK urban areas, alongside comparative housing and urban policy, as part of a developing collaboration between the two centres. She will be based in the US until summer 2004.

Polly Vizard completed her ESRC funded postdoctoral research fellowship on poverty and human rights in October. She has applied for ESRC funding for a further period of three years to extend this project. The completed funding would facilitate the publication of an interdisciplinary book on poverty and human rights to be published by Oxford University Press.

Jane Waldfogel continued work with John Hills on a paper analyzing the recent UK welfare reforms and drawing out lessons for the US. She also began work with Wendy Sigle-Rushton on a comparative analysis of the effects of children on women’s earnings across Anglo-American, Continental European, and Nordic countries, to be presented at a conference at Princeton in January 2004. She worked with Paul Gregg and Elizabeth Washbrook on an analysis of how low-income families’ spending patterns have changed since 1997 as their incomes have risen, which will be a chapter in the upcoming CASE book on the impact of New Labour policies on social exclusion.

Helen Willmot joined the centre in April 2003 and has been working on the neighbourhood study in Leeds and Sheffield.
Appendix 2 – List of Publications 2003

(*) denotes publications largely attributable to work outside the centre. Non-CASE authors indicated by italics.

A1. Books and reports


Forthcoming


Vizard, P, Poverty and Human Rights: new thinking in ethics, economics and international law, Oxford University Press.

A2. Book Chapters


Forthcoming


A3. Refereed journal articles


Forthcoming


Burchardt, T ‘Capabilities and disability: the capabilities framework and the social model of disability’, Disability and Society.


Huang, C, Garfinkel, I and Waldfogel, J, ‘Child support and welfare caseloads’, Journal of Human Resources. (*)


A4. Other journal articles


A5. Other publications

Borgonovi, F (2003) Culture Online: removing barriers to participation in the arts and culture, Department for Culture, Media and Sport.


### CASE Papers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE/64</td>
<td>Comparing incomes when needs differ: equivalence for the extra costs of disability in the UK</td>
<td>Tania Burchardt, Asghar Zaidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/65</td>
<td>Cohabitation and divorce across nations and generations</td>
<td>Kathleen E Kiernan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/66</td>
<td>Continuity and change in pathways to young adult disadvantage: results from a British birth cohort</td>
<td>John Hobcraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/67</td>
<td>Reviewing the terms of inclusion: transactional processes, currencies and context</td>
<td>Sally Witcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/68</td>
<td>Inclusion or insurance? National Insurance and the future of the contributory principle</td>
<td>John Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/69</td>
<td>Why labour hoarding may be rational: a model of firm behaviour during transition</td>
<td>Ceema Zahra Namazie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/70</td>
<td>Is targeting deprived areas an effective means to reach poor people? An assessment of one rationale for area-based funding programmes</td>
<td>Rebecca Tunstall, Ruth Lupton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/71</td>
<td>Identifying vulnerable groups in the Kyrgyz labour market: some implications for the National Poverty Reduction Strategy</td>
<td>Sabine Bernabe, Alexandre Kolev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/72</td>
<td>The effect of unobservables on labour supply decisions: the formal and informal sector during transition</td>
<td>Ceema Zahra Namazie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/73</td>
<td>‘Neighbourhood Effects’: Can we measure them and does it matter?</td>
<td>Ruth Lupton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/74</td>
<td>Disability and disadvantage: selection, onset and duration effects</td>
<td>Stephen P. Jenkins, John A. Rigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/75</td>
<td>Individual choice and social exclusion</td>
<td>Julian Le Grand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other CASE publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASEreport 20</td>
<td>Annual Report 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEreport 21</td>
<td>Being and becoming: social exclusion and the onset of disability</td>
<td>Tania Burchardt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3 – Key Performance Indicators

### Summary 2003

#### Summary of performance indicators

**A: Publications (excluding those largely attributable to work outside the Centre)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Books and reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15†</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Refereed journal papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Non-refereed journal articles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Other publications:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASEpapers and CASEreports</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Covers 15 months, October 2001-December 2002. Previous figures for academic years.
† Excludes chapters in Understanding Social Exclusion.

**B: External relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Membership of committees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Membership of networks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Overseas visitors (more than 2 days)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Overseas visitors (over 3 months)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Substantial advice and consultancy (excluding grant and journal refereeing)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Conference papers and seminar presentations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>Media coverage: newspapers</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Media coverage: radio and TV</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>CASE events:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conferences:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminars:</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>International collaborative research projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Covers 15 months, October 2001-December 2002. Previous figures for academic years.
## C: Financial resources (October-September, £000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 ESRC core funding</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Other ESRC funding</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Host institution</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Other funding</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST and other research councils</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK foundations</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK industry and commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK local authorities</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK central government</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK voluntary sector</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other overseas</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Overall total</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>1048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## D: Staff resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Research staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of which ESRC funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>14 (6)</td>
<td>18 (9)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalents</td>
<td>9.7 (4.3)</td>
<td>11.5 (5.3)</td>
<td>10.9 (4.5)</td>
<td>11.3 (4.1)</td>
<td>14.3 (4.6)</td>
<td>13.4 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Associated academic staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ESRC funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalents</td>
<td>3.4 (2.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.8 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalents</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Research students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Staff development days</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASE is situated in the Research Laboratory, on the fifth floor of the Lionel Robbins Building, Portugal Street.