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How to Find Us
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 Sutton and Toyota International Centre 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 LSE and by a wide range of other organisations, including the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Nuffield Foundation, the Garfield Charitable Foundation, the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, the EAGA Partnership Charitable Trust, the Asia-Europe Foundation, the British Academy, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Inland Revenue, the Department for Trade and Industry, Birmingham and Bradford City Councils and the East Thames Housing Group.

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 CASE. It works closely with researchers from across the LSE and at the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge, the University of Manchester and the London School of Economics (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 all its Toyota Research Fellowships. It currently houses nine postgraduate students working on topics related to its core areas of interest.

This report presents some of the main findings from our research in each area during 2004: most of our seventh and part of our eighth 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/

The Year at a Glance

2004 was CASE’s seventh full year. The Centre continued its high level of activity and output through the year. Just after the end of it, we submitted our evaluation report to ESRC, covering all our activities since we started work in October 1997. These had resulted in more than 600 publications (including 114 refereed journal articles) and we had made nearly 700 presentations of our work. Depending on the results of the evaluation, the Centre may be allowed to bid for continued funding after September 2007, when our current funding comes to an end.

- Highlights of 2004 included the publication of four major books and reports stemming from the Centre’s work, Human Development Across Age and Generations, edited by Lindsay Chiao-Landale, Kathleen Kiernan and Ruth Friedman, Inequality and the State, by John Hills, One Hundred Years of Poverty and Policy, by Howard Glendinning, John Hills, David Pahlad and Liz Webley, and A Framework for Housing in the London Thames Gateway, by Anne Power, Liz Richardson and colleagues from LSE Housing. In addition, A More equal society, edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart and including contributions from thirteen CASE authors, was completed.

- A series of pre-launch seminars on parts of the book was held at No 11 Downing Street, organised with the Smith Institute.

- In all, the Centre published 64 pieces of output during the year, including four books or reports, 10 chapters in other books, and 11 refereed journal articles.

- We continued to collect and analyse data on our two area-related studies, completing the third round of visits to the twelve low-income neighbourhoods that we are tracking, and starting the sixth 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 from the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.

- Events organised by the centre during the year included the launch of three books and the annual conference of the European Low Wage Employment Research Network (organised jointly with the Centre for Economic Performance). CASE also co-organised conferences in Beijing (with the Center for Social Policy Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) and in Barcelona (with the LSE Cities Programme).

- We continued to disseminate our work widely through seminars and conferences, in policy forums, and through the media. CASE members made 130 conference and seminar presentations during the year, many of them overseas. Media coverage included 54 press articles and 21 radio and television interviews related to the Centre’s work.

- The Centre continued its active engagement with research users in government and elsewhere. Its members were involved in a wide range of official and independent groups and committees.

- The ESRC provided just over half of the Centre’s total funding of £1.1 million in the academic year 2003-04, with the remaining half coming from awards from our other funders. New grants of more than £267,000 were secured during the year, a little up on last year’s total.

- 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 Sutton and Toyota International Centre 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 LSE and by a wide range of other organisations, including the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Nuffield Foundation, the Garfield Charitable Foundation, the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, the EAGA Partnership Charitable Trust, the Asia-Europe Foundation, the British Academy, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Inland Revenue, the Department for Trade and Industry, Birmingham and Bradford City Councils and the East Thames Housing Group.

- 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 CASE. It works closely with researchers from across the LSE and at the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge, the University of Manchester and the London School of Economics (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 all its Toyota Research Fellowships. It currently houses nine 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:

1. Generational and life course dynamics
2. Poverty, local services and outcomes
3. The dynamics of low income areas
4. The CASE neighbourhood study, a longitudinal study of family life in low income neighbourhoods
5. Education and social exclusion
6. Social networks and social capital
7. Employment, welfare and exclusion
8. Policies, concepts and measurement of social exclusion

- This report presents some of the main findings from our research in each area during 2004: most of our seventh and part of our eighth 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/
While the number of articles, books and reports published during the year was down on recent years (see Appendix 3), we have... the output of our own discussion papers and reports, many of which later become published in journals in revised form.

Journal of Marriage and the Family
Policy Journal of Law and Management
Population Studies
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society
Economic Performance are the UK partners in the European Network on Inequality established as part of Harvard University's Multidisciplinary and Comparative Program on Inequality.

CASE and the LSE’s Centre for Economic Performance 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). As part of the network, John Hills, Ruth Lupton and Anne Power visited and made presentations at Harvard and Princeton Universities during the year. Three Harvard PhD students, Michael Forte, Natalia Vaikko and Veela Weaver, spent time at CASE, while one of CASE’s PhD students, Lisan Stelk, spent the Autumn term at Harvard. John Holbrook and Kathleen Kiernan spent part of the year at the Centre for Health and Wellbeing at Princeton University, and will continue to visit Princeton as part of a continuing collaboration.

CASE is also part of the LSE’s partnership with the University of Bremen and WZB, Berlin in a new programme funded by the Volkswagen Foundation. This has established strong and increasing collaborative links between the UK and Germany. Two fellowships were awarded in 2004, allowing two UK fellows to visit Germany. Our German partners are in the process of awarding fellowships for visits to the UK (possibly to CASE, depending on their interests). As well as the events in Beijing and Bari/sarina, CASE co-hosted (with the LSE’s Centre for Economic Performance) the annual international conference of the European Low Wage Employment Research network.

**Arrivals and departures**

The year saw several changes in CASE's research staff. In the Autumn Ruth Lupton took up a lectureship at the Institute of Social and Economic Research at the University of Essex. Emily Silverman, who had spent a year at the World Bank revisiting 20 housing estates first visited in 1980. Our research on low income areas and communities was also helped by the project revisiting 20 housing estates first visited in 1980. Our research on low income areas and communities was also helped during the year by Amy Anderson, Dinara Culsakova, Hannah Liboz and Nic Weidlake. Three members of the Centre successfully completed their PhDs during the year. Abigail McIntyre and Caroline Paikul continue as researchers in CASE, while Shreem Kantilook took up a lectureship at the University of Cambridge. Sabine Bernabe has also now submitted her thesis after joining the World Bank in Washington. Francesco Bastagl became CASE at the end of the year from the World Bank to start her MPH/PhD on conditionality in social security systems, including a study of the impact of the Bolsa Familia in Brazil.

Finally, two of CASE’s senior members, John Holbrook and Kathleen Kiernan, moved from the LSE’s Social Policy Department to the University of York at the start of the 2004-05 academic year, but continue their active research as part of CASE on generational and life course dynamics, while Kathleen Kiernan continues as one of our Directors.

**Plans for 2005**

Now in the middle of our second five years of core funding from ESRC, we will be continuing with our major pieces of research using longitudinal data sources such as the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children, the National Child Development Study, the 1970 Birth Cohort Study, the Millennium Cohort Study. We are also now analysing the unique data collected by the National Centre for Social Research tracking the incomes of a sample of families week by week over the whole year. This was delayed by staff illness and maternity leave, but a final report will be submitted to our funders, the Inland Revenue and HM Treasury, in the summer. We are also continuing our 12 areas and 200 families studies (the latter supported by the Nuffield Foundation as well as ESRC), with new rounds of visits and interviews that are giving us a unique view of change in low income neighbourhoods since CASE started in 1997. Progress with all of these is described in the sections that follow. We will start work in 2005 on two new projects examining the dynamics of employment, particularly for low-paid workers. The first, funded by the Nuffield Foundation, will look at what happens to the labour market position and other outcomes for mothers who follow different patterns of employment while they have young children. The second, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, will explore earnings mobility over the last 25 years for individuals entering the labour market from unemployment. We will also start work on an evaluation of the Trafford Hall Young Movers programme, funded by the National Lottery, and on a project for the Home Office exploring ways to strengthen communities by changing individual and household behaviour, for example through good neighbour agreements.

One focus of the coming year is an evaluation by ESRC of our achievements since the Centre started in 1997. We submitted our report on this to the Council at the start of 2005, and we will hear later in the year whether the evaluation has been successful and whether we will be allowed to submit a bid for continued core funding after 1997. In the Autumn, when the results of this are known, we will review the options for continuation of the Centre’s research after 2006-07, and develop proposals for securing new funding. We are also preparing a joint bid to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation for continued collaboration with the Brookings Institution, bringing together lessons from what has been happening in seven ‘weak market’ cities in the USA and seven in Europe.

During 2004 CASE was awarded one of the first Research Councils UK ‘Academic Fellowships’ following a national competition. We will be making this appointment in 2005. It allows someone who has been working as a contract researcher within one of our fields of interest to spend five years working as part of CASE, while building up their teaching experience, and then becoming a permanent member of the academic staff of the LSE’s Social Policy Department at the end of the fellowship.

As can be seen from the articles that follow, CASE is fortunate to contain a very active and able group of researchers and collaborators, who are working on an exciting variety of topics of both research and policy interest. It continues to be a pleasure to be part of such a community.

John Hills
Director, CASE
February 2005
Human development across lives and generations: the potential for change

Kathleen Kiernan

"...human development continues throughout adulthood and into old age as adults focus on these same goals as well as providing leadership, care, training, and support for the next generation."

How much change is possible over a lifetime and across generations? What is realistic in what we can do to promote healthy human development? These questions motivate policymakers, teachers, community leaders, service providers, and researchers. These questions have also motivated this volume.

To answer these questions, one needs first define human development. By human development, we mean the ways in which children grow to become healthy, educated, and productive members of societies and nations. Moreover, human development continues throughout adulthood and into old age as adults focus on these same goals as well as providing leadership, care, training, and support for the next generation.

This volume highlights three important dimensions of human development: human capital, partnership behaviour, and psychological well-being.

We chose these dimensions because they represent widespread goals in society. How can individuals reach their full potential? Such a goal involves educational attainment and earnings development. What is the role of family formation? How does marriage and the family influence human development? Are there effects of parenthood and subsequent divorce? How do health and well-being vary across and within generations?

In the first section, "Human Capital", three chapters by Nolan and Maitre, Hobcraft, and Duncan and Magnuson summarize the economic and social opportunities in...
Poverty, local services and outcomes

This year has seen the continuation of work on inequality and risk. Work on the ALSPAC study has also continued, with an exploration of the links between poverty and health and the quality of local GP practices. Other new work has examined changes in spending patterns as incomes rise for the poorest families.

Paul Gregg, Jane Waldigell and Liz Washbrook examined the impact on spending patterns of recent increases in real incomes of poorer families, in a chapter in the CASE book examining Labour policy since 1997. Incomes have risen for the lowest-income families with children as a result of welfare and labour market reforms, but are these families buying more goods that contribute to children’s well-being? Using data from the Family Expenditure Survey, the authors find clear evidence that extra spending has been focused on child-related goods such as children’s clothing, toys and books, while less is going on housing, alcohol and tobacco.

Spending on child-centred goods among low-income families can be said to be converging to that of more affluent families. However, there are areas where low-income families are not catching up, most notably in holidays and the presence of computers within the household.

In work using a very different dataset, Christian Schluter and Jackie Walba (Southampton) explore a similar question for poor Mexican families. The Mexican anti-poverty programme, Progresa, makes cash transfers to poor families, conditional on school attendance and health check-ups. Schluter and Walba examine how the extra money is spent by the families who receive the transfers. They find evidence of increased spending on children’s clothing, but no effect on adult clothing or tobacco.

They argue that the findings provide strong evidence of parental altruism, and of the effectiveness of cash transfers in improving children’s living standards.

In a second project, carried out with Xaer Ramos (UIA, Spain), Christian Schluter has been examining the merit of using data on subjective expectations when examining data on income changes. Expectations are central to behaviour, but despite the existence of subjective expectations data, the standard approach is to ignore these and to infer expectations from realisation. The study examines whether data on expectations can help to explain income changes.

Frank Cowell has continued research on the relationship between inequality and risk in people’s perceptions, with an article joint with Guillermo Cruces (STICERD). Recent experimental work with Arna and Wolf Gaezter (Osnabrueck) has examined whether people view judgments about risk and inequality in the same way as they view judgments about fairness, social justice and welfare.

John Hills published his book bringing together his own and other CASE research on inequality and poverty, their relationship with public policy, and public attitudes towards them (see opposite).

We know from earlier research undertaken at CASE that children from less affluent homes have poorer health. John Riggs, Carol Propper and Simon Burgess have been examining whether this is due to the quality of the GP practices these children use. Using the ALSPAC cohort of all children born in Avon between 1991 and 1992, each child has been matched to the practice with which their mother was registered at birth. A range of indicators of quality of these practices has been mapped to each practice.

There is evidence that children in poorer families with GPs who are of lower quality on some of these measures, but who are of higher quality on others. However, it is also known that these quality measures may be unreliable because they reflect the nature of the practice population rather than the quality of the GP. After purging the quality measures of this association, the research finds little evidence to support the argument that the quality of the GP adversely affects the health of children, and concludes that GP quality does not appear to be a determinant of the difference in child health between more and less affluent children.

Contact: Simon Burgess, Frank Cowell, Carol Propper, John Riggs, Christian Schluter

Inequality and the state

John Hills

There has been a dramatic widening of the UK income distribution since the end of the 1970s. While relative poverty is now falling slowly, it remains at twice the level of the 1960s and 1970s. At the top, 40 per cent of the total increase in the country’s real net income between 1979 and 2002-03 went to the top tenth. Within this, about 17 per cent of the total increase between 1979 and 1999 went to the top 1 per cent, and about 13 per cent went to the top half per cent.

But this is not solely a result of international pressures that have affected all countries equally. Policy matters: the scale and structure of social spending and the taxes that pay for it have major effects on inequality. In some countries, policies resulted in redistribution over the last 25 years; in the UK and USA they did not.

The dilemma facing policy-makers in this area is likely to become more acute over coming decades. For instance, the total of education, health, and social security spending would have to be 4.5 per cent of GDP greater than in 2001, to maintain today’s levels of social spending at any given age in relation to incomes, given the forecast age structure of 2051.

Given such pressures, policy-makers face an uncomfortable trade-off between accepting rising costs and taxes in the long-term, reductions in generosity that increase relative poverty, or changes in structure that increase reliance on means-testing and reduce the value of services for those with middle incomes.

For more details, see John Hills (2004) Inequality and the State, published by Oxford University Press.

Perceptions of annual earnings before tax, 1999, GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What people think cases usually earn (median response)</th>
<th>What people think they should earn (median response)</th>
<th>Actual average earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop assistant</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled factory worker</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled factory worker</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor in general practice</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-manager of large factory</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Minster</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>£45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal court judge</td>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of large national corporation</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Someone in your occupation’</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Amount actually drawn. ‘Stirfle’ was £111,300.
2. Figures for 2000-01 may be lower than those for 1999-2000, as the numbers of cases are smaller.
3. Median earnings for all full-time workers.

Source: British Social Attitudes survey and sources.
The dynamics of low income areas

Contact: Caroline Paskell, Anne Power, Liz Richardson, Rebecca Tunstall

Caroline Paskell took over from Ruth Lupton on CASE’s ESRC-funded study of 12 low-income areas and has focused this year on the area’s physical condition, in particular on the structure and quality of their housing and environments. Having visited the areas in 2003, and revisited four (Leeds, Sheffield, Hackney and Newcastle) in 2004, Caroline used the research to assess how Labour’s housing, local environment and physical regeneration policies have impacted on the areas, comparing conditions now with those recorded when the study began in 1998. The resulting paper, written with Anne Power, was published in January 2005. Areas Study research was also used in a European Commission report. Caroline Paskell wrote two case studies, on Hackney and Newham, for the 2004 independent review of the UK’s National Action Plan on Social Inclusion. These offered an overview of the area’s economic, demographic and physical conditions, and outlined how these characteristics had changed since 2002-03. A chapter by Ruth Lupton and Anne Power using the study’s findings was also published in the CASE book, A more equal society? Having moved on from the Areas Study, Ruth Lupton continued her work on disadvantaged neighbourhoods with a literature review of neighbourhood change for the ESRC/ODPM Neighbourhood Research Network. She also worked on a joint LSE-Brookings Census analysis project, summarised on the following page.

Rebecca Tunstall spent 2003-04 working on the same project, analysing the US and UK censuses whilst based at the Brookings Institution. Her reports will be published by Brookings in early 2005. Alan Berube, Fellow in Metropolitan Policy at the Brookings Institution, also worked on the LSE-Brookings Census analytic project whilst visiting CASE on an Atlantic Fellowship. His reports will be published by Brookings in early 2005.

Minority Ethnic Groups in Britain

During the 1990s, population growth in inner urban areas was often only experienced within minority ethnic groups, with younger age structures and ongoing immigration. Even London saw 6 per cent decline in white population while its minority population increased by 41 per cent. Thus, by 2001, people from ethnic minorities made up a higher proportion of the population of major cities. Certain inner neighbourhoods saw rapid growth in their minority populations. However, these localised changes came about in the context of increasing diversity overall – 73 per cent of Britain’s population’s growth 1991-2001 was due to minority ethnic groups, which grew by around 1.3 million people compared with 600,000 in the white population. There was growth in virtually every local authority area, consistent with the pattern of dispersed that was evident in the 1980s. Thus while patterns of increasing segregation were noted for minority communities in some inner urban areas, white people became less likely to live in wholly white areas. Most neighbourhoods became more mixed.

These Census data demonstrate the importance of urban revitalisation for both economic and social reasons. As smaller settlements do better, and as Britain’s population becomes ethnically more diverse, it is important that minority communities do not become trapped in segregated, environmentally deprived and job-poor urban neighbourhoods while white people move out to leafier suburbs or smaller towns with growing economies.

The CASE neighbourhood study

Contact: Rosey Davidson, Anne Power, Helen Willmot

The continuation of the Neighbourhood Study into a sixth round of interviewing covered the following topics: changes to the area and gentrification, income and jobs and courses, family support, friends, and parenting issues such as discipline and daily routines. Added to these was a final section on individual problems and concerns. This was included to enable the respondents to raise issues that the interview questions did not allow for.

Having piloted the sixth round interview schedule in both Leeds and Sheffield we began interviewing in the four areas in the summer. Rosey Davidson joined the team in July, taking over work on the study in the two London areas.

Immediately dominant themes emerging from the interviews included the importance of communicating with children about good and bad behaviour and how behaviour impacts on others; also the very positive images held of the neighbourhoods as they improve. So far our interviews have shown the emergence of a number of key preliminary themes.

The rapid role of ethnic change within Hackney and Newham has left many white and more established minority families feeling outnumbered and uneasy against a backdrop of high turnover, stretched resources and pressurised public services. However, a substantial proportion of mothers view bringing up their children in a racially diverse community as inherently positive.

The role of fathers within family life emerged as a source of tension for some mothers, particularly when the paternal role appeared ill-defined and when relationships were under pressure, unstable and/or insecure. Money could often play a part.

Few mothers said they disciplined their children through smacking yet many recall being smacked themselves, and

at the very least, growing up in a far stricter environment where parental control and influence were paramount. A closeable proportion of the mothers interviewed worked with children in some way (childminders, dinner and playground helpers, Sure Start assistants, teaching assistants). Through training linked to their employment they had been ‘professionalised’ in their interaction with children. As a result smacking was no longer an option, in their eyes, within the family.

Families residing in Newham and Sheffield were acutely aware of impending large-scale demolition in their area. Frustratingly, many felt the council were withholding information from them and communication was generally poor, leading to a lack of certainty in their lives and a sense of being ‘put on hold’. Many of our families had already moved.

Conversely, Hackney families were far more likely to talk about the rapid gentrification occurring around them, although they often felt like bystanders rather than beneficiaries of this change.

Attempts to regenerate the area had not gone unnoticed, but the pace of progress is slow, and there can be unforeseen disadvantages such as a rise in the cost of living, including rapidly increasing house prices and council charges.

Findings from the first five rounds of the study were published in a chapter in the CASE book, *A more equal society?* (see opposite). The chapter explores how policy changes implemented by the Labour government have been perceived by the families. Work also continues on a book which will bring together the study’s insights around the theme of parenting.

Whilst New Deal employment programmes appear to have had little effect in facilitating paid employment among families in the north, in the London neighbourhoods the picture is more mixed.

The Neighbourhood Study has now been tracking 200 families for five years. During this time the Labour government has implemented a raft of social exclusion policies intended to have an impact on poor neighbourhoods like those in the study. This chapter in the CASE book on policy towards poverty and exclusion takes advantage of the unique perspective offered by the study to explore whether programmes and interventions really matter, and whether mothers and their children benefit or not. The chapter begins by examining two areas of government action targeted at the population at large, but with potentially greater impact in the most disadvantaged areas where the problems are most severe: employment and education. It then looks at three sets of area-targeted policy: the New Deal for Communities and Sure Start; community policing and neighbourhood wardens; and community participation and empowerment. In addressing these interventions the chapter considers whether the families recognised and valued them.

The findings outlined in the chapter include the following. Whilst New Deal employment programmes appeared to have had little effect in facilitating paid employment among families in the north, in the London neighbourhoods the picture is more mixed. Many respondents had mixed views about their children’s schools, but a number of recent education policies had been well received, including smaller class sizes, literacy and numeracy hours and key stage testing. Sure Start is in place in the two northern neighbourhoods and one of the London ones and has been high-profile and popular: positive aspects highlighted include one-to-one contact, home visits, and the way in which it helps people to be less cut off. On the other hand, some respondents raised negative points about Sure Start, including divisions arising from its rigid boundaries. Views on the New Deal for Communities, which is in place in two of the neighbourhoods, are also mixed. The dominant criticism concerns the way in which it increases segregation along ethnic lines within the neighbourhoods, a point captured well in the following extract from a Round Four interview in one of the northern neighbourhoods:

New Deal and the big partnership groups are excluding, they’re dividing and ruling. Why are they separating people off when the translation services can be there? People like being involved. Segregation is easier for them – telling you what they want you to know. They shouldn’t divide, they’re supposed to be building a community. There’s enough racism and separation without dividing black and black. I could take four friends and we’d have to go to different meetings. (*0135, Round Four*)

Community police and neighbourhood wardens have had little impact on the neighbourhoods so far and the respondents are largely sceptical about whether they can really make a difference to their neighbourhoods via community participation. One of the most important conclusions that the chapter draws is that family life and experience within disadvantaged neighbourhoods is complex and each family’s views contain contradictions and ambiguities. It is therefore a mistake to expect a simple pattern of neighbourhood improvement. The programmes and interventions discussed in the chapter are chipping away at the barriers families face in these neighbourhoods.

Families, disabled children and the benefit system

Gabrielle Preston

‘Other improvements identified included: increase in self-esteem for the parent, less anxiety and conflict for parent and child, paying off debts, paying for additional therapy and support services, more social activities for parent and child.’

Since 1997, the government has introduced a number of improvements to financial support for low-income families with disabled children, including extending eligibility for the mobility component of Disability Living Allowance (DLA) to younger children. However, there are concerns that take up of DLA is low and that the process of claiming is unduly complex.

This qualitative study, based on semi-structured interviews with 20 families who have a disabled child or children, set out to investigate the experience of these families in applying for DLA, how they used the additional income, and what difference the benefit made, if any, to the social inclusion of the disabled child and the rest of the family.

The interviews revealed that although families are in touch with a large number of professionals, hearing about DLA is a very random business:

‘Everybody kept telling me this is a child with special needs… but nobody actually told me that I was entitled to help – my health visitor, my GP, my social worker – I’m on good terms with all of them but they didn’t tell me …’ (Caroline, mother of a 3 year old son)

Far from benefits providing a stable source of income, the process of claiming DLA often meant families’ incomes fluctuated hugely as a result of awards, terminations, appeals and backpayments:

‘There’s the added fear that… sooner or later they’re going to pull the rug out from under our feet. If you’re working at least you can get another job, but in this life you’re relying on them… you’re frightened they will take it away. You don’t feel financially secure.’ (Aracena, a mother of four children, two of whom are severely disabled)

However, when benefit was awarded, it could make a significant difference not just to the disabled child, but to the whole family:

‘The mobility helps get us into London – we can go to Hyde Park – it’s something we can do as a family – we wouldn’t have been able to do it before…’ (Margaret, mother of three disabled children)

Other improvements identified included:
1.增加自信
2.缓和焦虑
3.偿还债务
4.支付额外的治疗和支持服务
5.增加社会活动

为了了解更多详情，请参阅Gabrielle Preston的论文推荐：

Helter Skelter: Families, disabled children and the benefit system. CASEPaper 92.
Research this year has looked at low achievement and ethnic segregation in compulsory schooling, at the impact of Labour government policy on educational inequalities, and at the educational aspirations of disabled young people.

Simon Burgess and Deborah Wilson continued their work on ethnic segregation in secondary schools, using indices of dissimilarity and isolation to compare the patterns of segregation across nine ethnic groups in England. They find that levels of ethnic segregation in England’s schools are high, with considerable variation both across LEAs and across different minority ethnic groups. There are some areas which have particularly high levels of segregation. Interestingly, ethnic segregation is only weakly related to income segregation.

In a parallel piece of research, Simon Burgess and Deborah Wilson worked with Ruth Lupton to explore how ethnic segregation in schools compares to that in neighbourhoods. They find that segregation in schools is linked to that in neighbourhoods, but that the mapping is not one-to-one. For most ethnic groups, segregation is greater in schools than in neighbourhoods: children are likely to find less diversity in the school playground than in their neighbourhood at home.

Robert Cassen continued work on his project on Low Achievement in British Education, including desk research, data analysis and visiting schools. The project, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Sutton Trust, aims to produce a demographic profile of low achievers in British education, and to provide a multi-faceted analysis of current low achievement using the Pupil Level Annual School Census and associated Census and OFSTED data.

Abigail McKnight, Howard Glennerster and Ruth Lupton collaborated on a chapter for the CASE book, *A more equal society?*, analysing how Labour policy has affected educational inequalities (see opposite). Teresa Buchardt continued her work on disabled young people’s aspirations for education and employment. She finds that young disabled people have similar aspirations to their non-disabled counterparts, although tempered in some cases with a recognition that there are likely to be obstacles in the world of work. There is also some – tentative – evidence that young disabled people feel less well served by advice and support services. SEN coordinators in secondary schools and further education, and Connexions advisors, need to ensure that they encourage positive aspirations, especially among young people from disadvantaged backgrounds, while offering practical support in overcoming disabling barriers.

Finally, Howard Glennerster chaired the Basic Skills Agency Steering Group for the ‘Link Up’ project that completed its work this year. This mobilised over 6,000 volunteers in 20 of the most deprived neighbourhoods in the country to help those lacking basic reading, writing and numeracy skills – helping them access courses and supporting them while following courses often in non-traditional settings. It demonstrated the importance of mobilising fellow workers, neighbours and friends in making that difficult transition. Embedding these lessons fully in local services still has to happen.

In his 1996 Labour Party Conference speech, Tony Blair announced that the three highest priorities in government would be ‘Education, education, education’. This chapter in the CASE book on Labour policy towards poverty and exclusion, *A more equal society?*, assesses the impact of Labour’s education policy, focusing particularly on policy designed to tackle educational inequalities.

Several aspects of Labour policy simply followed on from policies first introduced or developed by the previous administration – the National Curriculum, literacy and numeracy hours and Key Stage testing were all policies inherited from the Conservatives and taken forward by Labour. In addition, however, the new government committed itself to substantial real increases in funding – up from the low point of 4.5 per cent of GDP in 1998-99 to 5.3 per cent in 2002-03, with planned expenditure rising to 5.6 per cent in 2007-08. It also reviewed the school funding system, increasing the share going to local authorities with the most deprived populations. It made class size reduction for five to seven year olds a flagship policy – one of the few ‘tory pledges’ in the 1997 election manifestos.

It introduced a number of programmes targeted at the most deprived areas and the lowest-attaining schools, including Education Action Zones, Excellence in Cities and the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant.

What has been the combined effect of these policies on inequalities in educational attainment? There is evidence of a narrowing of the performance gap in Key Stage test results between rich and poor schools (respectively, those with less than 5 per cent or more than 40 per cent of pupils qualifying for Free School Meals (FSM)), and of improvements in GCSE results for children from different social class backgrounds. However, some have also narrowed, and there is limited evidence of gradual reduction in the differentials between genders and across ethnic groups.

Edexcel GCSE passes and achieving 5+ A*-C by gender, ethnicity and free school meal status – 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non FSM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All pupils</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social networks and social capital

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

During 2004 we were involved in several new pieces of work related to social capital and community engagement: research on the role of community engagement in improving service delivery; an overview of New Labour’s policy impacts on participation in decision making; and the development of community involvement ‘tools’. We launched a Framework for Housing in the London Thames Gateway with a strong emphasis on mixed communities. This was alongside our ongoing work on small scale community activity.

LSE Housing was part of a consortium led by SQW Ltd, undertaking a piece of research commissioned by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit. Using 15 case studies from across the country, the aim was to examine whether service provision in which communities are meaningfully involved produces better outcomes in deprived areas than services delivered in other ways. LSE focused on a case study of the Hastings resident Service Organisation (RSO), a community based social enterprise delivering environmental services under contract to a social landlord. We found that community delivery of services is particularly appropriate where there is an unmet need for the service alongside a need for employment and training, and where the service could produce communal as well as individual benefits. The study will publish final conclusions and recommendations in Spring 2005.

We contributed to the CASE book examining New Labour policy with an overview of the government’s policy impacts on participation in decision making (see opposite).

Two pieces of work in 2004 were about developing ‘tools’ for community involvement. We organised a ‘Hands-On Participatory Symposium’ in partnership with the Scarman Trust and Dr Tony Gibson. Over 50 practitioners came and tried out existing materials, among them a visual way to record decisions made in meetings and various 3D modelling kits for planning neighbourhood change. The consensus was that tools can be good for resolving conflict within groups and widening access to discussions, but to be effective they need to generate realistic goals for action and have action follow through. A report of this event is available on the LSE Housing website.

The second project, funded by Shell Better Britain Campaign, is producing a tool to help community groups with project development. Based on our interviews with hundreds of community groups and previous experience of action research, the tool outlines common problems encountered at each stage of project development, offering possible solutions and courses of help. To be published in Spring 2005, the tool will be available through the Community Development Foundation and Trafford Hall, home of the National Tenants Resource Centre as well as LSE.

Alongside colleagues from Enterprise LSE Cities and LSE London, we launched a Framework for Housing in the London Thames Gateway. The proposed framework strongly emphasised the importance of a ‘train track’ approach, that is, building out from existing residential and town centres, using infill where possible, as well as creating large planned new mixed communities. We argued that this would maximise the chances of new development benefiting existing residents, of integrating newcomers to east London and of creating genuinely mixed communities.

We also continued with three long term evaluations of training and small grant programmes for community groups, all based on work at Trafford Hall, home of the National Tenants Resource Centre. Our ongoing work had a stronger focus on dissemination of findings in 2004. We published findings that showed how intensive residential training at Trafford Hall had stimulated and facilitated community activity for half of the participants after three months, and had encouraged another 40 per cent to make plans. The training and small grant programmes use an innovative ‘Training First’ model, and had resulted in new facilities, activities and skills for the groups involved and their wider communities. Activities included working in partnership with mainstream services to regenerate estates, working on the changing ownership and management of social housing, and small scale community activity such as running community facilities and working with young people’. A summary of findings is available on the LSE Housing website, which we created this year to widen access to our research and materials. We produced three Briefing Notes looking at Trafford Hall programmes in relation to wider policy agendas including involving black and minority ethnic tenants, tenant involvement in housing, and involving tenants in meeting the Decent Homes Standard.


...continued feelings of powerlessness for the majority despite the improved responsiveness of agencies to public involvement and therefore feelings of stronger influence for the minority that are actively involved.

Has the Labour government given disadvantaged people a greater say over decisions affecting their lives? Participation of all types – formal, social participation, and involvement in decision making – has been a priority for Labour, although target-setting has been less developed. Despite poor results in closing gaps in participation rates on a grand scale, there have been successes: encouraging voting in local elections; targeting social participation programmes on socially excluded groups and areas (notably changes to National Lottery funding); starting to bring together the previously fragmented infrastructure for volunteering; and strengthening the institutional context for involvement in decision making. Therefore, New Labour can be judged well on its record on participation if we look at its work on quality, rather than quantity. The government has created an involvement-friendly environment across nearly all government departments that could mean participation is more difficult to marginalise in the future.

While our overall conclusions are optimistic, there are inevitably still gaps and tensions. There are still many political and practical challenges in making genuine participation a reality. These include:

- policy gaps within central government
- failure to excite people about formal politics around a big idea
- criticisms of Labour’s attempts to bring in non-elected bodies and other participatory structures to national policy formation
- difficulties at local level: for example, resistance to change from grass-roots councillors
- slow progress in getting social participation (as practised by middle class volunteers) to take hold in lower income areas, and the time needed for New Labour’s ‘capacity building’ efforts to yield results
- continued feelings of powerlessness for the majority despite the improved responsiveness of agencies to public involvement and therefore feelings of stronger influence for the minority that are actively involved.


Policies, concepts and measurement of social exclusion

Contact: Tania Burchardt, Howard Glennerster, John Hills, Tom Sefton, Kitty Stewart, Polly Vizard

This year's work in this strand has seen considerable output on policy towards poverty and inequality, with the publication of three books, as well as work on early years policies, pensions and fuel poverty.

Conceptual work has included work on capabilities and human rights and capabilities and disability.

John Hills completed his book examining public policy and public attitudes towards inequality and poverty, Inequality and the State (see page 11).

Howard Glennerster, John Hills, David Piachaud and Jo Webb wrote a book for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation centenary celebration, examining changes in poverty – and in what we mean by poverty – over the past one hundred years, as well as the evolution over the century of policy towards poverty. One Hundred Years of Poverty and Policy was launched at the Rowntree centenary conference in York in December.

The third policy book, A more equal society?, was a joint CASE production, including chapters by thirteen CASE contributors and five external authors.

The book examines the impact of Labour policy towards poverty, inequality and social exclusion since 1997 (providing the material for the last few years of the Rowntree oversee). It includes chapters on employment, education, health and political participation, as well as chapters considering how life has changed for groups living in severe poverty or in other ways particularly vulnerable when Labour came to power – among them children, the elderly, minority ethnic groups and asylum seekers.

Other work on policy has stretched across the age spectrum. Jane Waldflögel spent the academic year 2003-04 as a CASE visitor, working chiefly on a book examining the evidence on the forms of childcare which work best for young children whose parents work. Jane also wrote a CASE paper examining the current UK policy framework for the early years in light of research about what affects early child development.11

At the other end of the age spectrum, John Hills examined the implications of the decline of National Insurance in Britain for the future of the state pension and the contributory principle. He put forward a proposal for a system which could guarantee a total state pension at a fixed percentage of average earnings.

In separate work, John has been involved in wider thinking about the future of pensions as a member of the Pensions Commission, which published its first report in October 2004.

John Hills and Jane Waldflögel also celebrated their co-authorship of the one hundredth CASE journal article, which contrasts welfare-to-work reforms in the UK with those in the United States.12

Tom Sefton carried out an evaluation of the likely impact on fuel poverty of the government's Warm Front scheme. He asked how far the scheme is likely to contribute to reducing the number of fuel poor households, and proposes changes which might be expected to increase its impact.

Briggin Li and David Piachaud examined poverty, inequality and social policy across three phases of development in China, from 1949 to 2004. They examine the nature of economic and social policy in each phase, along with its effects on poverty and inequality, and consider the limitations of a social policy that has remained subservient to economic development.

Conceptual work in the strand was rooted in Amartya Sen's capabilities framework. Polly Vizard completed her book examining how Sen's work has advanced international thinking about global poverty as a human rights issue (see opposite). Tania Burchardt has sought to illuminate the complementarity between the capabilities framework and the social model of disability.13 She argues that both can benefit from exposure to the other: the capabilities framework provides a more general theoretical framework in which to locate the social model of disability, while the social model provides a thorough-going application of the capabilities framework.


Individual substantive freedoms as the primary focus of evaluative exercises concerning basic human interests in ethics and economics

Sen’s Contributions in Ethics

Critique of ethical frameworks with other informational focus (e.g., utilitarian, formal freedoms and rights/liberty ‘primary goods’)

Classification of a class of fundamental freedoms and human rights (and associated obligations) that focus on the valuable things that people can do and be

Support for the admissibility of poverty, hunger and starvation as ‘freedom restricting’ conditions

Sen’s Contributions in Economics

Critique of ethical frameworks in theoretical and empirical economics that focus on income and utility

Development of a ‘freedom centered’ economics that takes direct account of valuable things that people can and do achieve

Support for the intrinsic and instrumental valuation of fundamental freedoms and human rights in theoretical and empirical economics, whilst practical applications have advanced knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon of poverty, hunger and starvation, and resulted in an important body of statistical findings on human rights-focused concerns.

A ‘scholarly bridge’ between human rights and economics

The more practical need for a ‘scholarly bridge’ between human rights and economics has been highlighted by Mary Robinson, former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. The book finally addresses the ways in which Sen’s research agenda has promoted cross-fertilisation and integration across traditional disciplinary divides, and provides a prototype and stimulus for an interdisciplinary research programme on human rights.

Poverty and human rights: Sen’s ‘capability perspective’ explored (OUP, forthcoming)

Polly Vizard

Polly Vizard’s book analyses the ways in which the work of the Nobel Laureate Professor Amartya Sen has advanced international thinking about global poverty as a human rights issue. Sen’s work in ethics and economics has emerged as a key influence on international debates about poverty and human rights, and has deepened and expanded theoretical thinking about poverty as a human rights issue in important and innovative ways. His research programme has resulted in the development of new paradigms and approaches that focus on poverty and human rights concerns, and has promoted cross-fertilisation and theoretical integration on poverty and human rights issues in ethics, economics and international human rights law.

Moving the ethics and economics agenda forward

In ethics, Sen’s work is shown to have challenged the exclusion of poverty, hunger and starvation from the characterisation of fundamental freedoms and human rights, and to have contributed to the development of a framework in which authoritatively recognised international standards in the field of poverty and human rights can be meaningfully conceptualised and coherently understood. In economics, Sen has established a far-reaching critique of frameworks that fail to take account of fundamental freedoms and human rights, and has developed a series of far-reaching proposals for new paradigms and approaches that are more reflective of these concerns. He has argued for a move away from approaches that focus on income, growth and utility, towards a focus on entitlements, capabilities, opportunities, agency, freedoms and rights. The book examines how these proposals have moved the economics agenda forward by providing a framework for the intrinsic and instrumental valuation of fundamental freedoms and human rights in theoretical and empirical economics, whilst practical applications have advanced knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon of poverty, hunger and starvation, and resulted in an important body of statistical findings on human rights-focused concerns.
Appendix 1 – Research and research staff

Helen Beck continued her research focus on the impact of a capacity building and training grant and small grant programme for tenants and residents of social housing and community volunteers based at Trafford Hall, home of the National Tenants Resource Centre (NTRC). Her research monitors and evaluates the quality of training and the impact of the programme. In addition she helped produce a scoping study for Engage Partnership. Cheryl Trist, to inform Engage’s future research and explore the links between basic skills and other access issues and fuel poverty. She helped organize an event, in conjunction with the Scarmen Trust, showcasing practical ‘hands on’ tools for participation. She also carried out background research on changes to levels of political and social participation since 1997. She has also been writing a practical guide on supporting resident involvement through residential training and small grant fund.

Sabine Bernabe continued her work on informal labour markets and poverty in transition economies and submitted her PhD thesis. She left CASE in July 2004 to take up a job at the World Bank and is now working on research analysing the relationship between poverty, economic growth and the labour market.

Francesca Bastañí joined CASE in November from the World Bank, to begin work on her PhD thesis on the design, implementation and assessment of formal social safety nets, focusing on conditional cash transfers for the poor.

Francesca Borgonovi continued her doctoral research on the intended and unintended consequences of public subsidies to the performing arts, focusing on the impact and cost effectiveness of arts policy and the labour market. She has also been working with John Hills and held a research project investigating links between local environmental issues and people’s experience and behaviour, based in some of the areas CASE is following as part of its twelve areas study. She also worked with Liz Richardson to help community groups with project development, funded by the Shell Better Britain Campaign.

John Coburn has continued his work on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. He has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition he has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

Simon Burgess has continued work on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project, collaborating with Carol Propper and John Higgs, focusing on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. He has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition he has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

Jacob Elster has continued work on an ESRC-funded project investigating links between local environmental issues and people’s experience and behaviour, based in some of the areas CASE is following as part of its twelve areas study. He also worked with Liz Richardson to produce a tool to help community groups with project development, funded by the Shell Better Britain Campaign.

Martin Evans has conducted research on three main themes: first, the analysis of employment dynamics of lone parents—especially those ‘trapped’ between work and benefits; second, a new lifetime analysis of British social security in 2004, and lastly an evaluation of the New Deal for Communities. New inca history involves an analysis of European anti-poverty social exclusion and its relationship to ‘exclusion’ and a review of welfare reform for the New Zealand government.

Anne Power has been systematically exploring whether different childhood antecedents or differential responsiveness to the same childhood antecedents are required across the 1958 and 1970 birth cohorts or by gender, for poor socioeconomic adult outcomes (with Abigail McKnight and John Hills), and has continued her research on the intended and unintended consequences of public subsidies to the performing arts in the United Kingdom. She has also been working with John Hills and Martin Evans, and continued her research on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project, collaborating with Carol Propper and John Higgs, focusing on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. She has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition she has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

Carol Propper has been systematically exploring whether different childhood antecedents or differential responsiveness to the same childhood antecedents are required across the 1958 and 1970 birth cohorts or by gender, for poor socioeconomic adult outcomes (with Abigail McKnight and John Hills), and has continued her research on the intended and unintended consequences of public subsidies to the performing arts in the United Kingdom. She has also been working with John Hills and Martin Evans, and continued her research on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project, collaborating with Carol Propper and John Higgs, focusing on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. She has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition she has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

Tania Burchardt has continued work funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation on disabled young people’s occupational aspirations. She also worked with LSE Health and Social Care on a systematic literature reviews of the two-way links between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

John Hobcraft has been systematically exploring whether different childhood antecedents or differential responsiveness to the same childhood antecedents are required across the 1958 and 1970 birth cohorts or by gender, for poor socioeconomic adult outcomes (with Abigail McKnight and John Hills), and has continued her research on the intended and unintended consequences of public subsidies to the performing arts in the United Kingdom. She has also been working with John Hills and Martin Evans, and continued her research on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project, collaborating with Carol Propper and John Higgs, focusing on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. She has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition she has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

John Hobcraft has been systematically exploring whether different childhood antecedents or differential responsiveness to the same childhood antecedents are required across the 1958 and 1970 birth cohorts or by gender, for poor socioeconomic adult outcomes (with Abigail McKnight and John Hills), and has continued her research on the intended and unintended consequences of public subsidies to the performing arts in the United Kingdom. She has also been working with John Hills and Martin Evans, and continued her research on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project, collaborating with Carol Propper and John Higgs, focusing on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. She has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition she has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).

John Hobcraft has been systematically exploring whether different childhood antecedents or differential responsiveness to the same childhood antecedents are required across the 1958 and 1970 birth cohorts or by gender, for poor socioeconomic adult outcomes (with Abigail McKnight and John Hills), and has continued her research on the intended and unintended consequences of public subsidies to the performing arts in the United Kingdom. She has also been working with John Hills and Martin Evans, and continued her research on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project, collaborating with Carol Propper and John Higgs, focusing on the Arts to Financial Inclusion research project. She has been working with the Arts Council and the Arts and Business Council to produce a tool to assess whether there is an income gradient in the responsiveness to price changes of the Arts. In addition she has been focusing on the link between mental health and social exclusion (funded by Gatsby). Other work in the employment and welfare strand included a critical assessment of the government’s policy towards support for asylum seekers (a chapter in A More Equal Society?), edited by John Hills and Kitty Stewart. Broader issues of social justice were addressed in work on happiness and social policy, in equality and equal opportunity, and an objective adaptation to changes in income (article forthcoming in Social Indicators Research).
she presented papers at the European Society of Population Economics conference in Bergen, Norway, and the International Association of Feminist Economists meeting in Oxford. She left CASE in September to take up a temporary lectureship in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cambridge.

Eleni Karagiannaki continued her work on a project which seeks to assess the performance of Jobcentre Plus in terms of the service provided to clients whose personal circumstances limit their work focus. She has also done some preliminary work concerning the Jobcentre Plus performance, exploring differences between integrated and non-integrated offices with respect to job entry and customer service outcomes. In addition she has been working with Abigail McKnight on a project looking at the relationship between job separations and low pay using cross-sectional and longitudinal data from the Labour Force Survey.

Kathleen Kiernan co-edited a book on the potential for change across lives and generations and continued her work on co-habitation and pre-marriage using comparative data as well as the BC570 and MCV.

Julien Le Grand continued his previous work on No 10 Downing Street as a full-time policy adviser. Bingqin Li worked with Tania Burchardt and colleagues in LSE Health on a review on mental health and social exclusion, and with David Piachaud on a paper on poverty, inequality and social policy in China.

Rachel Ruthven spent much of the year analysing patterns of urban and neighbourhood change in the UK using 1991 and 2001 Census data, as part of the CASE-Abbreviations collaboration. She also completed a literature review of neighbourhood change for the ESRC/DJM Neighbourhood Research Network, and started a new project with Emily Silverman on families in mixed income communities, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. In September, she left CASE to take up a lecturing post at the Institute of Education, University of London, but continues as an associate of the Centre.

Abigail McKnight continued her work on low pay through a number of projects. She organised a major international Low Wage and Employment Research conference and helped to secure funding from the EU to continue the network for a further three years; she worked with Eleni Karagiannaki on analysis of job separations among the low paid, with Richard Dickens at the Centre for Economic Performance on the Lifetime Labour Market Database; and with John Hills and Rachel Snezhko, tracking low income families’ incomes on a weekly basis. She also pursued her interests in asset-based welfare, analysing the cohort studies in a joint project with Eceema Namazie and RPI, and writing on assets and education with Howard Glennerster. She contributed two chapters to A More Equal Society: on Labour’s progress on employment and education policy. Gerry Mitchell-Smith continued work on her PhD thesis examining the New Deal for Young People’s Voluntary Sector option in London.


Caroline Paskell has been continuing her work on the ESRC Areas Study, tracking 12 low-income areas in England and Wales. Her focus this year has been on how Labour’s efforts to improve housing and local environments have affected these areas. Her report on this, written with Anne Power, will be published in January 2005. She also produced reports on two of the areas as case studies for a forthcoming European Commission review of the UK government’s social inclusion policies.

David Piachaud has continued work on the ALSPAC dataset with Simon Burgess and John Rigg, examining the link between poor child health and the quality of GP practices, and completed research with Arstein Aasve (Lancaster), Simon Burgess and Matt Dillan (British) on the relationship between family formation and employment and poverty.

Liz Richardson worked on a project looking at mechanisms for improving the planning and delivery of mainstream services, in particular user involvement. She contributed to the CASE book on the Labour government, A more equal society?, with a chapter tracking changes in social and political participation since 1997. She continued working with Helen Beck and Alice Coutler to evaluate community training and small grant programmes, and has been involved in the development of practical tools for community use.

John Rigg has continued his research with Carol Propper and Simon Burgess on child health using the ALSPAC data. Their research questions have included: What is the relationship between low-income and child health and the quality of GP practices, and completed research with Arstein Aasve (Lancaster), Simon Burgess and Matt Dillan (British) on the relationship between family formation and employment and poverty.

Liz Richardson worked on a project looking at mechanisms for improving the planning and delivery of mainstream services, in particular user involvement. She contributed to the CASE book on the Labour government, A more equal society?, with a chapter tracking changes in social and political participation since 1997. She continued working with Helen Beck and Alice Coutler to evaluate community training and small grant programmes, and has been involved in the development of practical tools for community use.

Hyun-bang Shin continued his PhD research on urban housing and regeneration in Seoul and Beijing, working with the field work data collected through a series of field research conducted in 2002 and 2003. His thesis seeks to explore the dynamics of residential redevelopment in times of rapid urban growth, and their impacts upon the housing welfare of the low-income residents therein. He has also worked with Anne Power and Bingqin Li to organise an international workshop on urban housing and redevelopment, which took place in Beijing, China in July 2004. The workshop was partly funded by the Asia-Europe Foundation and the British Council. Some of his initial research findings were presented in the workshop.

Emily Silverman has completed field work for her doctoral dissertation on mixed income communities – new housing developments in disadvantaged urban areas that offer homes for market sale or rent as well as social housing. She is also working on a joint project on this topic with Ruth Lupton. Funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, this research uses case studies, census analysis and a survey of major house-builders to explore the extent to which market rate families are being attracted to mixed income new communities, and to examine what accounts for their presence or absence.

Rachel Smithies continued her work with John Hills on a series of analyses of the distributional effects of the welfare state. A substantial project updated Tania Burchardt’s (1997) analysis of the balance between public and private welfare services, while a second major piece of work updated the Fillingham and Hills (1995) analysis of intergenerational welfare equity in Great Britain (both forthcoming as CASEpapers; key findings outlined in Inequality and the State by John Hills). She has also begun analysis of a longitudinal dataset tracking, for one year, incomes for families in receipt of family tax credits, examining variations in income levels and sources. Income measurement methodology was also addressed in work on incorporating

Wendy Sigley-Ritchison completed a paper with John Hucks and Kathleen Kiernan making cross cohort comparisons of the short- and long-term effects of parental divorce and separation. She also completed, with Jane Waldofogel, a book chapter and an article on the lifetime earnings and family incomes of mothers and non-mothers in nine European countries. She has also completed an article on the adult outcomes of young fathers in the British Cohort study. Finally, she continues her work on cross cohort comparisons of the life course with other researchers from the Family Stramd.
housing information in income measures (in italics forthcoming).

Kitty Stewart completed work on the CASE review of the impact of government policy since 1997, A More Equal Society? (Russell Sage) and funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Her contribution included chapters on child poverty and the early years strategy and on international comparisons. She also helped the End Child Poverty Campaign to draw up a ten-point charter of policies aimed at halving child poverty by 2010.

Jason Striztitz continued his PhD research on second generation immigrants using the ONS Longitudinal Study. He spent the autumn term at Harvard University on an ESRC visiting studentship.


Rebecca Tunstall spent most of the year based in the Metropolitan Program at the Brookings Institution in Washington DC, carrying out comparative demographic analysis on UK and US urban areas. She returned to CASE in the autumn to start work with Anne Power and Alice Coulter on a fourth round of research, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, on 20 unpopular council estates in England which LSE has tracked since 1982.

Polly Vizard has further developed her work on poverty, capability and human rights as a Research Associate. In 2004 she completed work on a book to be published by Oxford University Press, Poverty and Human Rights: Sen’s Capability Perspective Explained. She also completed a project for the UN Independent Expert on the Right to Development/ The Norwegian Human Rights Institute on the Capability Approach and Human Rights.

Jane Waldofgol was a visitor at CASE during much of 2004 (January to August) and spent most of that time writing a book about work-family policy, tentatively titled ‘Getting it right: Meeting children’s needs when parents work’. The book draws on developmental science and research to identify what children need at each stage of the lifecycle, what policies provide, and how child care and other policies can help meet children’s needs when parents work. During her visit, Jane also provided advice to UK policy makers on issues related to the early years and child care, leading up to the 10 year child care strategy announced in the pre-budget report in December. In other work, her paper with John Hills analysing the recent UK welfare reforms and drawing out lessons for the US was published in the Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. And she completed analyses with Paul Gregg and Elizabeth Washbrook on how low-income families’ spending patterns have changed since 1997 as their incomes have risen, as reported in a chapter in A More equal society?.

Natasha Warkins is writing her PhD dissertation, which compares youth culture among children of immigrants at a secondary school in London with students at a comparable school in New York City. She is a Visiting Scholar from Harvard’s Department of Sociology. Her work has been published this year in becoming New Yorkers: Ethnographies of the New Second Generation (Russell Sage) and Race, Ethnicity, and Education; an article is forthcoming in Ethnic and Racial Studies.

Helen Willmot continued work on the Families Study, with the sixth round of interviews in Leeds and Sheffield.

Appendix 2 – List of Publications 2004

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

A1 Books and reports


Forthcoming


Forthcoming


Burchard, T, ‘Selective inclusion: asylum seekers and other marginalised groups’.

Gregg, P, Waldofgol, J and Washbrook, E, ‘Thats the way the money goes: expenditure patterns as real incomes rise for the poorest families with children’.


Power, A and Willmot, H, ‘Bringing up families in poor neighbourhoods under New Labour’.

Waldfogel, J, ‘That’s the way the money goes: expenditure patterns as real incomes rise, as reported in a chapter in A More equal society?’ (article forthcoming).

Gregg, P, Waldfogel, J and Washbrook, E, ‘That’s the way the money goes: expenditure patterns as real incomes rise, as reported in a chapter in A More equal society?’ (article forthcoming).
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A3 Other publications

British Academy Committee on the Contribution of the Arts and Humanities (2004) 'That Full Complement of Riches': the contribution of the arts, humanities and social sciences to the nation's wealth, British Academy (H Glennerster is a contributor and signatory).


### 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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Books and reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Book chapters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Refereed journal papers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Non-refereed journal articles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Other publications: CASEpapers and CASEreports</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Covers 15 months, October 2001-December 2002. Previous figures for academic years.
† Excludes chapters in *Understanding Social Exclusion*.
§ Excludes chapters forthcoming in *A More Equal Society*.

#### B: External relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Membership of committees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Membership of networks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Overseas visitors (more than 2 days)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Overseas visitors (over 3 months)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Substantial advice and consultancy (excluding grant and journal refereing)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Conference papers and seminar presentations</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 Media coverage: newspapers</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Media coverage: radio and TV</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 CASE events: Conferences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 International collaborative research projects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></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>Year</th>
<th>C1 ESRC core funding</th>
<th>C2 Other ESRC funding</th>
<th>C3 Host institution</th>
<th>C4 Other funding</th>
<th>C5 Overall total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D: Staff resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>D1 Research staff (of which ESRC funded)</th>
<th>D2 Associated academic staff (ESRC funded)</th>
<th>D3 Support staff</th>
<th>D4 Research students</th>
<th>D5 Staff development days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals (13 (6))</td>
<td>Individuals (12 (7))</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time equivalents (9.7)</td>
<td>Full-time equivalents (3.4)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>equivalents</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (7.5)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8.8)</td>
<td>10 (5.5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 (9.9)</td>
<td>12 (6.6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 (13.0)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CASE is situated in the Research Laboratory, on the fifth floor of the Lionel Robbins Building, Portugal Street.
The School seeks to ensure that people are treated equitably, regardless of age, disability, race, nationality, ethnic or national origin, gender, religion, sexual orientation or personal circumstances. The information in this annual report can be made available in alternative formats, on request. Please contact: CASE.