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The Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion (CASE) is a multi-disciplinary research centre based at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), within the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD). Our focus is on exploration of different dimensions of social disadvantage, particularly from longitudinal and neighbourhood perspectives, and examination of the impact of public policy.

CASE was originally established in 1997 with core funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). The Centre is now supported by STICERD (including for its Toyota Research Fellowship), the LSE, and a range of other organisations, including ESRC, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the Nuffield Foundation, the British Academy, the Department of Communities and Local Government, the Department for Work and Pensions, and the Scottish Executive. It includes the research and consultancy group LSE Housing. The Centre is affiliated to the LSE Department for Social Policy. It currently houses 13 postgraduate students working on topics related to its core areas of interest.

This report presents some of the main findings from our research and activities during 2007, our tenth year of operation, and over the preceding two years.

More detail can be found in the publications listed in Appendix 2, which include CASE’s own discussion paper series (CASE papers), research and conference reports (CASE reports) and summaries of findings (CASE briefs), all of which are disseminated via the web (with a limited number of printed copies available). The Centre publishes books resulting from its research in The Policy Press’s series, CASE Studies in Poverty, Place and Policy (www.policypress.org.uk/catalog/).

For more information about the Centre and its work, including texts of our publications, please visit our website: http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/
Review of the Year, 2007

The Year at a Glance
This report covers CASE’s activities during the calendar year 2007 (with financial and related information for the 2006-07 academic year). This year marked the completion of the Centre’s ten years with core funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). Having completed that research programme, the Centre is continuing its work, with a number of projects already underway; funding for several new projects was secured during the year for 2008 to 2010, and we are awaiting the results of other applications.

- New projects starting in 2008 include: research over two and a half years for the Nuffield Foundation on the distribution of wealth and its policy implications and a study of the impact of policy since 1997 on poverty, inequality and exclusion for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, which also extended funding for our comparative ‘Weak Market Cities’ programme for a third year. The Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) are providing core support for CASE for the period from 2007-08 to 2009-10, and support from STICERD and LSE will allow expansion of the Centre’s work into new areas.

- Major publications during the year included Anne Power and John Houghton’s book, Jigsaw Cities; Making Social Policy Work, edited by John Hills, Julian Le Grand and David Flachaud; Robert Cassen and Geeta Kingdon’s report, Tackling Low Achievement; and Anne Power’s, City Survivors: Bringing up children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Two further books are already in press for publication in 2008.

- Ends and Means: The future roles of social housing in England by John Hills was launched in February by Communities Secretary, Ruth Kelly, who had commissioned the report, while Tania Burchardt and Polly Vizard’s research led to the Equalities Review adopting their framework for evaluating progress in different dimensions of equality and recommending its use by the new Commission on Equality and Human Rights and by all government departments.

- The Centre maintained its overall level of published output during the year, despite its somewhat smaller scale of operation, with 87 publications in all, including seven books or reports and 19 refereed journal articles, with a further nine articles accepted for later publication.

- Since CASE started its research in October 1997, more than 720 outputs have been published as a result of its work. We have continued to produce one piece of published output for each five days of that time, maintaining this in 2007. This has included more than 150 refereed journal articles, 68 books or reports, and 125 chapters in other books. By the end of the year, we had published 129 papers in our CASE papers series, and 47 CASE reports. Use of the internet to access our papers increased sharply in the year, with 44,000 downloads per month directly from our website.

- The Centre was selected by ESRC as one of two case studies from its portfolio for an independent examination of the economic impact of research supported by the research councils. The report by PA Consulting for Research Councils UK reported that, ‘CASE research work enabled government to make better policy, and faster than would otherwise have been produced’ in areas where public spending runs to many billions of pounds annually.

- We continued to disseminate our work widely through seminars and conferences, in policy forums, and through the media. In June 2007, Rebecca Tunstall made the 1000th presentation based on CASE’s research since its inception. In all, CASE members made 133 conference and seminar presentations during the year, many of them overseas, making it our most active year in this respect. Media coverage was also at its highest level since we began, including over 100 press articles and at least 37 radio and television interviews related to the Centre’s work.

- Events organised by the Centre during the year included the well-attended launches of Ends and Means, Jigsaw Cities, Making Social Policy Work, and City Survivors, as well as a meeting of the European Network for the Sociological and Demographic Study of Divorce, and a further meeting of the City Reformers’ Group, bringing together urban practitioners from Europe and the USA.

- The ESRC provided just over half of the Centre’s total funding of £970,000 in the academic year 2006-07, with host institution support providing 20 per cent of the total and co-funding from other bodies 27 per cent. New grants of £526,535 were secured during the year.

- Overall research staff inputs were 10.2 FTEs. Two-fifths (4.1 FTEs) were ESRC-funded. Associated academic staff contributed 2.6 FTEs, and support staff 4.2 FTEs.
CASE’s future research programme

CASE successfully completed its major research programme funded by ESRC at the end of 2007. The Centre will continue its activities and research into the coming years, however, with support already agreed for a number of new and continuing projects.

The Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) are providing support for CASE’s core activities for the period from 2007-08 to 2009-10, around which we will carry out specific research projects funded from a variety of sources. Support from STICERD and LSE is also allowing expansion of the Centre’s work into new areas, and we will be recruiting a new staff member to lead this activity early in 2008.

New projects to start in 2008 include research over two and a half years for the Nuffield Foundation on the distribution of wealth and its policy implications. We shall also carry out a new study of the impact of policy since 1997 on poverty, inequality and exclusion for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF), extending some of our earlier research in this area (published as A More Equal Society? in 2005). The Foundation also extended funding for our ‘Weak Market Cities’ programme for a third year (see page 18).

Continuing projects include Kitty Stewart’s research on the implications for later labour market involvement of varying employment patterns of mothers with young children, and Tom Sefton’s work (with Maria Evandrou and Jane Falkingham at Southampton University) on the relationship between work and family histories and older women’s incomes in the UK, Germany, and the USA, both funded by the Nuffield Foundation. Eleni Karagiannaki will complete her ESRC-funded research on health, wealth and consumption in later life, and Tania Burchardt her research funded by JRF on time and income poverty. Francesca Borgonovi will resume her British Academy post-doctoral fellowship in 2009, having already had several articles on aspects of volunteering and charitable activity accepted by highly rated journals during the last year. John Hills and Tom Sefton will continue their involvement with an international team producing part of the 2008 European Social Survey.

We have also submitted applications to potential funders for research using attitudinal data on human rights to develop a capability list (freedoms and opportunities that are of central concern); on wider operationalisation of Tania Burchardt and Polly Vizard’s framework for measurement of equalities in different dimensions; and on the ways in which a wide range of social provision does and could react to the dynamics of people’s lives, from short-term week-to-week income fluctuations to changing patterns of intergenerational mobility and immobility.

As well as the ten research staff involved in these and other projects, our research associates based in LSE and other universities, and our support staff, the Centre currently houses thirteen doctoral students. We look forward to continuing our activities and collaborations in the years ahead. Appendix 1 gives more information on the research currently underway within CASE.

The ESRC research programme

The seven specific issues on which our research programme agreed with ESRC for the five years 2002 to 2007 focused, and which has made up a large part of our recent work, were:

- How does education affect patterns of advantage and disadvantage?
- How does the area where people live affect their life chances and opportunities?
- What is the role of social networks and social capital?
- How do processes of inclusion and exclusion operate in the labour market?
- How do these processes in the UK compare with other countries?

The sections which form the main body of this report discuss the progress on these issues, reflecting in particular on what we have achieved over the three years since the Centre was last — very positively — reviewed by the Research Council covering the period up to the end of 2004. We also present results from some of our most recent studies, in what has been a very productive year.

In addition, two overarching themes linked different parts of the ESRC research programme: what experiences and processes generate social exclusion or promote resilience, and what is the impact of policy and policy change? In October 2007, we published our book, Making Social Policy Work: Essays in honour of Howard Glennerster (edited by John Hills, Julian Le Grand and David Piachaud), covering a wide range of policy issues (see box on p. 24), while Tania Burchardt and Carmen Huerta have edited a special issue of the journal, Social Policy and Society, to be published in 2008, containing articles written by members of the Centre crossing our interests on the theme of ‘risk and resilience’.
The year saw the publication of seven books or reports resulting from the Centre’s research. These major publications during the year included Anne Power and John Houghton’s book, *Jigsaw Cities; Making Social Policy Work*; and Robert Cassen and Geeta Kingdon’s report, *Tackling Low Achievement*. Anne Power’s book, *City Survivors: Bringing up children in disadvantaged neighbourhoods*, drawn from our longitudinal qualitative study of families in four low-income neighbourhoods was published, and a third book from the study is in preparation for completion early in 2008.


Abigail McKnight and Richard Dickens (from the LSE’s Centre for Economic Performance) completed their research for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation using longitudinal data on earnings to examine welfare to work transitions and assimilation of migrants into the UK labour market. This will result in a number of publications from early 2008.

We also completed two major pieces of activity commissioned by government. *Ends and Means: The future roles of social housing in England* by John Hills was launched in February by Communities Secretary, Ruth Kelly, who commissioned the report (see box on p.23). In response to the report, which provoked a wide debate in the housing policy field, the government set up an internal policy review to take recommendations forward, with a range of policy proposals promised shortly. Tania Burchardt and Polly Vizard’s research (see CASE papers 111, 120 and 121) led to the Equalities Review chaired by Trevor Phillips adopting their framework for evaluating progress in different dimensions of equality and recommending its use by the new Commission on Equality and Human Rights and by all government departments.

The total number of published outputs maintained the flow of previous years, despite the reduced research staff inputs as the ESRC programme drew to a close (see Appendix 3). The Centre produced 87 publications in all, including seven books or reports and 19 refereed journal articles, with a further nine refereed journal articles already accepted for later publication. These include papers in journals including *American Journal of Sociology, Feminist Economics, Health Economics, International Family Law, Journal of European Social Policy, Journal of Social Policy, Labour Economics, Population Studies, Population, Social Science and Medicine* and *Urban Studies*. 
Looking back over the whole of the ten years of the ESRC research programme at CASE, well over 700 publications have resulted from our research, including more than 150 refereed journal articles, 68 books or reports, and 125 chapters in other books. By the end of the year, we had published 129 papers in our CASE papers series, and 47 CASE reports. As we reported for the mid-term review of our first four years of activity, we have continued to produce one piece of published output every five days, maintaining this rate in 2007.

Dissemination and external impact
Research Councils UK has recently published a report, Excellence with Impact, which examined the wider economic impact of research supported by the research councils, based on an independent evaluation by PA Consulting. CASE was one of the two case studies selected for this exercise by ESRC. The study focussed in particular on the parts of CASE’s research that have examined the links between childhood circumstances and adult outcomes, and that looked at policy options and impacts in this area. The reviewers spoke to a range of users of our research, specifically those involved in the policy process, and reported that, ‘CASE research work enabled government to make better policy, and faster than would otherwise have been produced … and has been one of the key drivers supporting multi-million pound programmes …’. Stakeholders pointed to clear links between the work of CASE and the development and direction of particular policies’.

This favourable assessment of the impact of our research over the last ten years going beyond our academic outputs reflects the efforts which members of the Centre have put into dissemination and contact with potential research users, as well as the quality of analysis.

In the most recent year, members of CASE also continued to be actively involved with academic and non-academic research users in a variety of ways. John Hills continued his involvement with pensions policy as a Non-Executive Director of the Department for Work and Pensions’ Pensions Client Board. He also joined the Green Fiscal Commission, which is examining the potential impacts – including the distributional effects – of a potential shift to a tax base aimed more at achieving environmental objectives. Anne Power continued as a member of the Sustainable Development Commission, Julian Le Grand as Chair of Health England, and Carol Propper as a member of the ESRC Council. Kathleen Kiernan is a member of the Archbishop of Canterbury’s ‘Good Childhood’ inquiry, as well as the ESRC’s expert group for panel and cohort studies. Members of the Centre were on advisory groups on a large number of research projects in other institutions, and were on editorial boards of journals including Benefits; Demographic Research; Fiscal Studies; International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family; Journal of Health Economics; Journal of Policy Analysis and Management; and Social Policy and Administration.

Other dissemination activities again included more than 130 presentations by members of the Centre at conferences and seminars in Britain and in other countries including Austria, Belgium, Brazil, France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Korea, the Netherlands, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden, and the USA. This made it our most active year in this respect since the Centre started. Notably, in June 2007, Rebecca Tunstall gave the 1000th presentation based on research within CASE since the Centre started.

We organised 16 of our own seminars and other events, with attendances ranging as in previous years from 30-40 for seminars to more than 200 for special events and lectures. These included the launches of Ends and Means, Jigsaw Cities, Making Social Policy Work, and City Survivors, as well as a meeting of the European Network for the Sociological and Demographic Study of Divorce, and a further meeting of our City Reformers’ Group (see below).

Use of the internet to access our papers increased sharply in the year, with 44,000 downloads per month directly from our website. Our papers are also accessed via REPEC (Research Papers in Economics) website, with more than 3,000 downloaded this way during the first 10 months of 2007. More than 100,000 downloads were made of Ends and Means: the future roles of social housing in England in the first nine months after it was published. Partly as a result of the publicity surrounding that report, media coverage of the Centre’s work increased, which included more than 100 press articles and at least 37 radio and television interviews related to the Centre’s work, the highest level since we began.

International links
Our international research links continued to be strong. As well as the dissemination and international events noted above, our collaboration with the Brookings Institution in Washington, DC continued through the joint ‘Weak Market Cities’ programme, bringing together lessons from what has been happening in US cities and seven cities in Europe, and through a further meeting of the City Reformers Group in September. This involves practitioners, policy-makers and city leaders and discusses how the process of revitalising cities is working on the ground.
John Hills and Tom Sefton are partners in the design of a module on ‘Welfare Attitudes in a Changing Europe’ selected to be included in the 2008 European Social Survey, with partners from Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK. The questionnaire for the survey was finalised by the end of 2007, and will be translated and tested in a wide range of countries early in 2008.

CASE and the LSE’s Centre for Economic Performance continue to be the UK partners in the European Network on Inequality with Harvard and Princeton Universities. John Hobcraft and Kath Kiernan visited and made presentations at Princeton University. One doctoral student from Harvard, Ann Owens, spent time at CASE as part of the network.

CASE also hosted a visit from Dr Vincent Vandenberghe from the Université Catholique de Louvain, carrying out work on tertiary education and its financing. Other international visitors this year included Gianluca Busilacchi from Ancona University, Liliana Fernandes from Universidade Católica Portuguesa, and Robyn Martin from Curtin University, Australia.

Arrivals and departures
The year saw several changes in CASE’s research staff. Carmen Huerta left CASE at the end of September 2007 to join the National Centre for Social Research, with which CASE and the LSE have a long and strengthening association. She continues to work with Tania Burchardt on completion of the ‘risk and resilience’ project. Francesca Borgonovi was promoted to Research Fellow during the year, the second of her British Academy post-doctoral fellowship. She is now on secondment to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris, and will complete her fellowship when she returns to CASE in January 2009. Polly Vizard formally rejoined CASE as a Research Fellow, and is developing a research programme with Tania Burchardt, extending their influential work on measuring inequalities and human rights. Kitty Stewart was on maternity leave during the year, returning in January 2009, while Tom Sefton spent the first half of the year away from his CASE activities in the USA and Fiji. Meanwhile, Carol Propper, who has been a Co-Director of CASE since 1998, has taken up a Chair in Economics at Imperial College, London, but will continue as a Research Associate of CASE as part of her continuing activities at the Centre for Market and Public Organisation at the University of Bristol, with which CASE maintains its strong association.

Julia Morgan and Emily Silverman were awarded their PhDs during the year, while Sarah Thomas de Benitez submitted her thesis. We were very pleased to welcome Ben Baumberg, Ludovica Gambaro, Suyoung Kim, Sarah Mohaupt, and Stephen Wang as new PhD students within the Centre during the year.

As can be seen, the Centre continues to flourish, and we look forward to a productive year ahead.

John Hills
Director, CASE
December CASE
The impact of childhood circumstances on later life has been a prominent feature of our research.

John Hobcraft, Wendy Sigle-Rushton and Carmen Huerta brought together data from the 1958 and 1970 British birth cohort studies. A wide range of comparisons have been made, posing the question as to whether the two cohorts show differential responses to childhood disadvantage and the extent to which responses differ by gender. The adult outcomes examined included: low income, receipt of non-universal benefits, living in social housing, and being in a low skill occupation; the timing and partnership context of entry into parenthood; and general health, mental health, limiting long-standing illness, and life satisfaction. For the vast majority of childhood antecedents there is no evidence of differential responses to disadvantage by cohort or by gender. These remarkable continuities in the legacies of disadvantage across cohorts, and commonalities for men and women suggest that few short term policies alter such legacies.1 2

John Hobcraft and Wendy Sigle-Rushton extended their work on recursive trees to examine resiliency factors involved in the childhood pathways to achieving qualifications amongst children who grew up in foster care.3 Wendy Sigle-Rushton, Kathleen Kiernan and John Hobcraft examined the associations of parental disruption with subsequent well-being for children born in 1958 and 1970. They found that, contrary to what might be expected, there was little evidence for the hypothesis that divorce has become less selective over time.4 Darcy Hango researched the extent to which greater parental involvement in childhood mediated the effects of socioeconomic disadvantage on children’s educational attainment.5

Youthful parenthood, an important element in social exclusion, has been the focus of a number of our studies. Carmen Huerta and Wendy Sigle-Rushton examined the timing and pathways associated with early motherhood. Using data from the 1970 cohort, they assessed the mechanisms through which childhood antecedents influence the likelihood of becoming a young mother, and investigated the extent to which links are stronger or weaker at different points in time – early childhood, pre-adolescent, or the adolescent years. The results suggest that, regardless of when they are measured during childhood, educational test scores and socio-economic characteristics are linked to early motherhood, whereas adolescent behavioural attributes have a greater effect on young motherhood than those earlier in childhood.6 Carmen Huerta found that the findings for young fatherhood mirror those for motherhood. Wendy Sigle-Rushton also published a paper on young fatherhood and subsequent disadvantage.7

The early years of childhood have been a focus of our research drawing on data collected in the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS). Kathleen Kiernan examined the extent to which non-resident fathers are engaged with their off-spring at the time they are born and in later infancy.8 With Kate Picket, she used the MCS to examine whether the closeness of the tie between parents, as assessed by their partnership status at birth, was related to smoking during pregnancy, breastfeeding and maternal depression. In each case, there was a statistically increased risk of adverse health and health behaviours by decreasing degree of parental connectedness.9 Kathleen Kiernan and Carmen Huerta are using the MCS to examine how parenting practices play a mediating role between parental resources and child outcomes (see box).

Comparative analyses are also an important feature of our research. Examples include: Wendy Sigle-Rushton and Jane Waldfogel’s examination of the extent to which parenthood is selective of higher or lower income families in seven European countries;10 Wendy Sigle-Rushton’s collaborative work, examining the association between parental divorce and educational outcomes in Norway;11 Kathleen Kiernan’s work on divorce and cohabitation across nations and generations;12 and her work with Petra Nahmias and Sara McLanahan of Princeton University on unmarried parents in the US and UK using the MCS and the Fragile Families Study. Other aspects of our work include John Hobcraft’s exploration of how British work on social exclusion might inform work on chronic poverty in the developing world.13 He has also been developing ideas on the need for, and means of, integrating genetics and neuroscience into the study of human behaviour.14

At the other end of the life course, Tom Sefton, Maria Evandrou and Jane Falkingham have been investigating the relationships between the work and family histories of older women and their incomes in later life. His findings, based on analysis on the UK data, show that even relatively long periods of part-time employment are not associated with significantly higher personal incomes in retirement and that, as a consequence, women retiring over the next two decades (at least) may benefit little in later life from the additional years they have spent in employment compared with younger birth cohorts (see box).


13 J Hobcraft (2007) Child development, the life course, and social exclusion; are the frameworks used in the UK relevant for developing countries? Chronic Poverty Research Centre WP 72, University of Manchester.

Economic deprivation, maternal depression, parenting and children’s cognitive and emotional development in early childhood

Kathleen Kiernan and Carmen Huerta

Kathleen Kiernan and Carmen Huerta used data from the UK Millennium Cohort Study to examine the extent to which economic circumstances in infancy and mother’s mental well-being are associated with children’s cognitive development and internalising and externalising behaviours at age 3 years, and what part parenting plays in mediating these factors. Structural equation modelling methods were used to assess the extent to which these factors directly and indirectly affect a child’s development (see below the statistical model in pictorial form).

As with much statistical modelling, the model was a simplification of a more complex reality, nevertheless it provided a number of insights and findings. With respect to cognitive development, their findings included:

- the influence of poverty on a child’s intellectual development was substantially mediated by the parenting factors.
- cognitively enhancing activities, such as reading to the child, were particularly influential in mediating the effect of poor economic circumstances on intellectual development, with impoverishment exerting a fairly large negative effect on cognitive stimulating activities, and these types of activities in turn exerting a fairly large positive effect on intellectual development.

At age three there were already notable disparities in children’s cognitive development and emotional well-being. The analyses showed that economic deprivation mattered more for a child’s cognitive development and mother’s mental well-being for children’s behaviour, but economic deprivation also engenders poorer maternal well-being, which in turn leads to a reduction in children’s emotional well-being. Many social science studies have shown the importance of parental characteristics for the educational and emotional well-being of children but studying what parents do is also important. This study highlights the importance of parental behaviours characterised by parental attitudes and discipline for children’s conduct problems and emotional well-being, and parental involvement characterised by active participation in activities such as reading that promote cognitive development. Our findings only relate to a narrow window in early childhood but what happens in these early years, without appropriate interventions, are likely to have far reaching legacies.


Cognitive and Emotional Development in Early Childhood: Hypothesised Pathways

Control variables: ethnicity, birth order, family status, maternal age first birth, maternal education, maternal working status

Control variables: age, sex, ethnicity, birth order, maternal age first birth, maternal education, temperament

Control variables: age, sex, ethnicity, birth order

---

- poverty had a negative effect on the warmth of the relations between the mother and child, which in turn was important for a child’s intellectual development.
- in contrast with economic circumstances, the association between maternal depression and children’s cognitive development was much weaker.

With respect to behaviour problems, their findings included:

- maternal depression was strongly associated with children’s behaviour problems.
- maternal depression was associated with a reduction in the mother’s ability to engage positively with her child, which in turn was associated with the increased likelihood that the child exhibited conduct and emotional problems.
- maternal depression was most noticeably associated with the use of harsh disciplinary practices (more frequent smacking and shouting) which in turn were very strongly related to conduct problems amongst the children.
- additionally, a substantial part of the effect of economic deprivation on child behaviour problems was mediated through the mother’s depression.

- poverty had a negative effect on the warmth of the relations between the mother and child, which in turn was important for a child’s intellectual development.

- in contrast with economic circumstances, the association between maternal depression and children’s cognitive development was much weaker.

With respect to behaviour problems, their findings included:

- maternal depression was strongly associated with children’s behaviour problems.
- maternal depression was associated with a reduction in the mother’s ability to engage positively with her child, which in turn was associated with the increased likelihood that the child exhibited conduct and emotional problems.
- maternal depression was most noticeably associated with the use of harsh disciplinary practices (more frequent smacking and shouting) which in turn were very strongly related to conduct problems amongst the children.
- additionally, a substantial part of the effect of economic deprivation on child behaviour problems was mediated through the mother’s depression.
Women’s employment histories and incomes in later life

Tom Sefton, Maria Evandrou and Jane Falkingham

This study examines the relationship between older women’s employment histories and individual incomes in later life in the UK, using retrospective data from the British Household Panel Survey. How have the shorter and more interrupted work histories often associated with marriage and having children impacted on these women’s ability to build up pension entitlements? And, to what extent has the British welfare state helped to cushion some of the adverse effects on women’s pension outcomes? This study is part of larger research project for the Nuffield Foundation investigating the links between the life course, the welfare state, and incomes later in life in the UK, US and Germany.

As expected, longer periods in employment are associated with significantly higher individual incomes for older women, due largely to differences in private pension income. Public transfers, including the basic state pension and means-tested benefits, weaken the association between older women’s incomes and work histories, especially at the bottom end of the income distribution. Our analysis confirms the importance of extended full-time employment for the accumulation of pension rights. Compared with women who were inactive for most of their working lives, even long careers are not associated with significantly higher incomes if they were in predominantly part-time employment. Many women return to work part-time for at least part of their subsequent working career to fit around their caring responsibilities, which is often concentrated in lower status occupations and, until recent years, had very low rates of private pension coverage.

Timing also appears to matter: women who were economically inactive during most of their 30s or 40s have significantly lower incomes, more so than women who were inactive early or late on in their working lives, presumably because employment and occupational stability helps to foster the accumulation of pension rights.

The ‘breadwinner’ model is still relevant to many older women. The association between women’s work histories and incomes in later life is much weaker for widows than for married women, because work history-related differences in older women’s incomes are offset by derived rights to a former husband’s private pension and substantially diluted by public transfers based on their former husband’s contributions record, which disproportionately benefit those women with the weakest contributions record of their own. Work histories also matter more for younger cohorts of pensioners, at least in part because of the introduction of an earnings-related component into the public pension system which mainly affected later cohorts. Work history matters less for women with no formal qualifications, as the majority of these women are not in receipt of a private pension even if they have worked full-time for most of their working lives.

As women’s employment rates have been rising, today’s younger women will retire with fuller employment histories than today’s pensioners – and this, it is often argued, will mean that future cohorts of women will be better off in retirement. However, our findings indicate that only women with long and predominantly full-time careers are likely to reap the benefits of working longer. Analysis of the early employment histories of successive cohorts of women born up to the end of the 1950s shows that most of the increase in employment was in part-time work and that there was no increase in the proportion of women who worked mainly full-time for 20 or more years up to the age of 45 (see table). On the evidence presented here, it seems unlikely that women retiring over the next two decades at least will benefit significantly in later life from the additional years they have spent in employment.

Changes in early employment histories of women by birth cohort up to age 45\(^1\,2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment pattern aged 20-45:</th>
<th>Born pre-1920</th>
<th>Born in 1920s</th>
<th>Born in 1930s</th>
<th>Born in 1940s</th>
<th>Born in 1950s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed &lt;10 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed %</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed part-/full-time employed, 10-20 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly full-time employed, 10-20 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed part-/full-time employed, 20+ yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly full-time employed, 20+ yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: waves 1-15 of the British Household Panel survey

\(^1\)Based on a sample of 2,581 women with full employment histories between the ages of 20 and 45.

\(^2\)‘Mainly full-time’ is defined as having worked full-time for at least two-thirds of the total number of years in employment. Other employment histories are described as mixed.
Our research has focused on understanding the associations between low income and poorer life outcomes, mainly, but not exclusively, for children. Within this, we have focused on the role in intergenerational transmission of inequality played by neighbourhood and parental behaviours. In parallel, we have also continued our examination of poverty dynamics.

Neighbourhood In earlier work we have shown an income gradient in the health of children as young as seven in the UK.

Burgess, Propper and Rigg use data on over 6,000 children born in Avon in the early 1990s to investigate this by examining whether poorer children have lower quality GPs. They find that, contrary to expectations from the small area literature, children from poor families do not seem to have access to markedly worse quality primary care.

Burgess, Lupton and Wilson examine ethnic segregation of Britain’s children across school and neighbourhood. They find consistently higher segregation for South Asian than for Black pupils and find that schools are more segregated than the neighbourhoods in which they are located, suggesting that policy is needed if schools are to represent the neighbourhoods in which they are located.

Janke and Propper focus on adult health and examine whether the current levels of pollution permitted in England – permitted on the belief that these levels are not harmful to health – have an impact on population health. Many previous studies examine only one area, so that it is not possible to separate out changes in pollution from characteristics of cities and their inhabitants. In contrast, our research examines variation in pollution levels over several years across all local authorities, allowing us to net out the effect of the city or local authority. Our research shows that current levels of air pollution are associated with excess deaths in adults. In particular, the research suggests that the current UK regulated limits for Ozone and Particulate matter may be too high.

Propper and others examined the impact of neighbourhood on the income and mental health of adult social renters. Whilst they found that social renters tended to live in more deprived communities and have both lower income and lower mental health than those who were not social renters, they found no evidence that changes in either income or mental health were associated with the population living in the neighbourhood (see box).

Parental behaviour There is growing evidence that children of poorer families suffer not just penalties in terms of schooling but also health and behaviour. Even by seven, poorer children are less healthy, do less well even at school and have more behavioural problems. What is less understood is how low income translates into these poorer outcomes. Do low income parents behave in particular ways that disadvantage their children? Does behaviour which leads to disadvantage in one dimension of children’s lives, say their schooling, also have negative impacts on other dimensions, such as their obesity levels or their self esteem?

To examine this, Paul Gregg, Carol Propper and Liz Washbrook have used data from the ‘cohort of the 1990s’ – over 6,000 children born in Avon between 1991-92 (see box).

Income dynamics Aassve, Burgess, Dickson, Propper build on Aassve et al to present an economic approach to analysing poverty. They focus on endogenous demographic and employment transitions as the driving forces behind changes in poverty. They find employment, and particularly employment of disadvantaged women with children, is important. These findings support an emphasis on work as a way out of family poverty. Sefton and Rigg examine income dynamics over the life cycle and show the importance of employment in generating fluctuating income trajectories.


The impact of neighbourhood on the income and mental health of British social renters

Carol Propper and Simon Burgess

The argument that neighbourhood affects life chances is long standing in the social sciences. The issue has been given impetus by research on US cities where it is argued that the poor are concentrated in small areas that create additional impacts which prevent individuals in them from escaping poverty and is given importance by the high levels of income segregation found in the US and also in Britain. But the emerging empirical evidence is mixed: the quasi-empirical evidence finds little impact of neighbourhood on adult outcomes, while observational studies find somewhat more.

There are formidable methodological problems in identifying area or neighbourhood effects. One key issue is that of selection, which arises because individuals choose where they live. This selection effect means that simple regressions of area effects on individual outcomes cannot be straightforwardly interpreted, as the correlation between individual and area characteristics will bias the estimates of the area effect. In addition, the direction of this bias cannot necessarily be determined a priori.

CASE researchers Simon Burgess and Carol Propper, in conjunction with Ron Johnston and Kelvyn Jones of the University of Bristol, sought to overcome this issue by examining the impact of neighbourhood for a set of individuals who are more constrained in their choice of residential location than others in society. We focus on those who were social renters in the UK in the early 1990s. During this period, allocations to social housing were mainly on the basis of points systems. These points systems were broadly based on categories of need and often local residence. Prior to the advent of choice-based letting policies, first introduced in England during the late 1990s, once in social housing individuals often had little chance of moving voluntarily from their initial allocation. ‘Right to buy’ policies that operated in the 1980s had also caused the exodus of more affluent tenants, leaving those in social housing to become more narrowly based socially and economically.

In parts of the sector the quality of housing stock is low (the result of under-investment in the sector) and the housing located in broader areas characterised by poorer physical appearance, poorer amenities, and poorer access to transport. If the local environment is poor – either in terms of human connections or physical conditions – individuals trapped in these areas may be more likely to experience poorer outcomes than those who can choose where they live. Social renters are therefore a group for which neighbourhood may be particularly important in shaping life outcomes.

To test this idea we examine the impact of neighbourhood on two aspects of life chances – household income and individual mental health – amongst adults in social housing in the UK. We took a large scale household survey – the British Household Panel Study (BHPS) – and for each individual in the survey define a small neighbourhood based on their location in 1991. This small neighbourhood is based on the 500 to 800 people closest in distance to the study individual. We then characterised these neighbourhoods on the basis of the social deprivation of the population who lived in them in 1991 using census data. This very local focus is in contrast to much of the previous quantitative analyses that examine relatively large areas such as wards in the UK and census tracts in the US.

For all those who were social renters in 1991, we differentiate between those living in the most socio-economically disadvantaged neighbourhoods and all other social renters. To test for neighbourhood effects we compare the changes in the incomes and mental health of people across the two groups. By examining changes in these outcomes we can control for unobserved attributes of the individuals that may be correlated with their location in poorer neighbourhoods and so address the selection problem. If we find that living in a neighbourhood with more deprived individuals in it in 1991 is associated with lower income growth or less improvements in mental health ten years later then we can conclude that neighbourhood has had a causal effect.

We find that social renters who were in poorer neighbourhoods in 1991 had lower income and poorer mental health both in 1991 and ten years later. But we do not find evidence that there is an impact of neighbourhood on the change in income and mental health over the ten-year window. We, therefore, find clear evidence of a correlation between people and place: the social renters who have lower income and poorer mental health live in neighbourhoods which contain more socially deprived individuals. But we find no support for the independent effect of these neighbours on the trajectories of income and mental health. This suggests that some of the association of poverty and poorer outcomes is due to selection in where people live, rather than an impact of neighbourhood and neighbours per se.
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The relationship between parental income and outcomes in middle childhood

Paul Gregg, Carol Propper and Liz Washbrook

It is now established that children from poorer families in the UK begin school less ready to learn than their peers from richer families, have poorer non-cognitive behaviours and physical health. What is less understood is how low income translates into these poorer outcomes. Do low income parents behave in particular ways that disadvantage their children? Are the local environments in which low income families live worse for the children? Does behaviour which leads to disadvantage in one dimension of children’s lives, say their schooling, also have negative impacts on other dimensions, such as their obesity levels or self esteem?

To examine this, Paul Gregg, Carol Propper and Liz Washbrook used data from the ‘cohort of the 1990s’, a group of around 6,000 children born in Avon between 1991-2. They examine several aspects of development including school performance at age 7, IQ, self-esteem, behaviour and obesity. These are rarely considered together by academic researchers – yet parents are concerned with all these aspects of their child’s development.

The researchers looked at the links between income, these outcomes and a large set of parental behaviours and circumstances that may be associated with poor outcomes in children. These range from maternal anxiety and depression, the extent to which parents read to their children, the food their children eat, whether they attend out-of-school classes, and the physical environment in which the families live.

They find that by age 7 children of low income families are doing worse than their peers on all these outcomes. The figure below shows the gradient across income in the different outcomes. All are socially graded. The differences between rich and poor children are greatest for cognitive outcomes. But poor children are also falling behind in terms of non-scholastic outcomes – they have lower self esteem, are more likely to manifest difficult behaviour, and (even by age seven) are at greater risk of obesity.

The researchers also find that the risk factors associated with parental poverty vary markedly in their association with different outcomes. Unsurprisingly, schooling deficits of low-income children are strongly related to lack of parental education. Poor parental psychological functioning and poor health-related behaviours are drivers behind the greater behavioural problems and risk of obesity of low-income children. But they also find important links in unexpected places. The poorer schooling outcomes of poor children are just as closely related to the poorer health-related behaviours of their parents, such as greater smoking, less breastfeeding and feeding their children less good diets, as they are to their parent’s lack of education. This finding supports calls for better food as a way of improving not just children’s diets but also their schooling achievement.

And even more surprisingly, some aspects of poor children’s upbringing that are generally viewed as harmful may even be protective. The learning-focused environments of children in more affluent families, along with their greater car ownership, appear to increase the risk of childhood obesity by discouraging physical activity. The use of long hours of childcare at age 3 and 4 also appears to foster greater behavioural problems in the children of the better-off. Finally, what appears to matter at this age – if not later – is the quality of the home environment. The impact of school appears to be very weak in comparison to the role of the home environment provided by low-income parents.

These results indicate that the effect of income on child-wellbeing operates through a number of different channels. This may be no surprise to many, but does emphasise that policy interventions which are narrowly targeted on one aspect of the home environment of the poor will miss the point.

Estimated income gradients in child outcomes in middle childhood

Higher scores reflect more favourable outcomes on all six measures. All scores are normalised at mean 100, with standard deviation 10. Pink lines show cognitive outcomes, blue lines self esteem measures, and yellow lines health measures (behavioural problems and obesity).
Our work has covered the study of disadvantaged neighbourhoods and concentrated poverty, communities and self-help, area regeneration and the sustainability of existing homes, social housing, housing management, educational performance and family life and community. We have also studied major regeneration areas such as the Thames Gateway and Housing Market Renewal areas.

Low Income Areas
Our 12 areas study tracked the progress of 12 representative disadvantaged neighbourhoods between 1998 and 2006, looking at key factors associated with neighbourhood decline and renewal. We used case studies to look at cross-cutting issues within our research programme such as housing, crime, schools. In 2005, Caroline Paskell and Anne Power documented the local impacts of government regeneration and housing renewal. They found enhanced environmental quality and increased neighbourhood management in the targeted low-income areas. Policies and initiatives implemented since 1997 were predominantly leading to recovery in the most disadvantaged and declining areas, while the most peripheral estates on the edge of struggling cities were still declining.

In 2006, Caroline Paskell completed the fourth and final round of visits looking at community infrastructure, the distribution of local facilities and resources and community safety initiatives. This fieldwork evidence, will form part of the final report on area change over eight years focusing on housing, regeneration, neighbourhood management and community involvement. This work also led to two international conference papers on the national distribution and local character of social exclusion and a book chapter and journal article on communities and crime control. Overall, areas closer to city centres with more mixed populations and mixed uses with a denser built form were recovering more strongly, whilst areas furthest away from recovering cities were struggling the most to find a new rationale.

The CASE Neighbourhood Study
The Neighbourhood Study is a unique longitudinal study of families living in high poverty neighbourhoods tracking 200 families living in four neighbourhoods within the 12 low income areas we have been studying more generally (two in East London, one in Sheffield and one in Leeds). The study started in 1999, and followed the families over seven years with yearly interview visits. The families’ experience of area change while bringing up children has been documented in three books and four reports. We explored what factors pushed and pulled families into the neighbourhoods, what held them there, and what made them want to move out. In the final book (now in draft) the researchers – Rosey Davidson, Helen Willmot and Anne Power – have measured the main elements of social exclusion, including work, skills, educational attainment, crime, housing and environment, from the perspective of parents. They found considerable progress in some aspects of neighbourhood life, but many remaining barriers to family stability in low income neighbourhoods.

City Survivors’ offers more in-depth, qualitative evidence based on the life stories of twenty four families who explain over time from the inside, how neighbourhoods in and of themselves directly affect family survival. These stories illustrate how different families and neighbourhoods can be, and yet how dominant the pressures of poor neighbourhood conditions are on families. It also shows that families can counter wider problems by creating support networks that have the potential to help the wider city as well as themselves.

In addition, Rosey Davidson produced a report for Sport England on the impact of the Olympics on families in the two East London areas; and Helen Willmot used evidence from the 100 Northern families for a report to DEFRA on social capital among low income families.

Social networks and social capital
Liz Richardson, who is now based at the University of Manchester, studied social networks and social capital with Anne Power, Helen Beck, Alice Coulter, Laura Lane and other research assistants. They have run think tanks and evaluated community training programmes and pump-priming grant support to small, mutual aid and self-help projects in disadvantaged areas. In July 2005 and July 2007 they ran two workshops for community groups from all over the country opposing demolition plans for their areas. In 2006/07, they also ran two consultation events in order to gather the views of residents in low income housing estates to feed into John Hills’ Review of Social Housing (see box on pg 23) and to respond to the policy initiatives that are following from the Review.

Liz Richardson completed her study of community development, based on her involvement in Gatsby’s training and grant programme that CASE evaluated over a six year period (see box).

Weak Market Cities programme:
Since January 2006, Anne Power, Jörg Plöger and Astrid Winkler have been analysing the strategies of urban recovery in seven Western European cities that have suffered from industrial decline (see box). Funding from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has been secured to continue this research until the end of 2008.

Three students have gained their PhD’s since 2003. Caroline Paskell studied action taken by residents of low-income, high-crime areas to deter young people from involvement in crime, drug use and antisocial behaviour. Emily Silverman completed her thesis on mixed-income new communities in the UK and Hyun Bang Shin completed his thesis on urban neighbourhood regeneration in Seoul and Beijing.
Power, A (2007) Paper for the Foresight Programme on energy and the built environment: does demolition or refurbishment of old and inefficient homes help to increase our environmental, social and economic viability? Available at www.foresight.gov.uk/


Power, A (2007) Communities and demolition – findings from a Workshop at Trafford Hall, the National Communities Resource Centre 27th June 2007. LSE: CASEReport 47.

DIY community action: neighbourhood problems and community self-help

Liz Richardson

The contribution of active citizens to making good neighbourhoods is high on policy agendas across political lines. There is a consensus that we need to facilitate people to take more control of their own lives. But the promotion of community self-help raises many questions. How can we understand the value of seemingly trivial community activity? Is it patronising residents to talk of community self-help? What legitimacy do community representatives have? What stimulates people to get involved? Does it matter that only a minority are involved? What is the relevance of community given a fast changing society? How can participatory democracy and representative democracy work together?

Liz Richardson’s new book explores these questions, based on detailed real life evidence from community groups trying to combat neighbourhood problems. The groups were supported by the Trafford Hall Gatsby Project, the results of which demonstrate that investing in community self-help can unlock people’s desire and potential to solve community problems, and that their DIY community action has a critical role to play in community building. Liz puts forward seven lessons based on her research, arguing that:

- problems of achieving neighbourhood renewal and social inclusion are about more than poverty, and economic success cannot compensate for neighbourhood disorder;
- neighbourhoods and communities matter to people;
- self-help in all forms is at the base of community building, both individual and collective forms of self-help;
- in particular, community self-help solutions are positive human responses to difficult situations by the minority that produce benefits for the majority;
- community self-help in poor communities provides triple benefits in improving mainstream services, in generating neighbourhood renewal and reviving democracy, and these benefits are not widely enough championed in this complex set of tasks;
- the legitimacy of community groups engaged in community self-help was questioned by many other bodies, and often misunderstood;
- community action is strong, yet fragile, and is boosted by community development supports.

The book puts forward a framework for community building that recommends ways in which: local people can genuinely feel improvements in public services and contribute to outcomes on a personal level; civic engagement can be reformed using more deliberative approaches; trust and community spirit can be bolstered; and community self-help can be accelerated or supported.

For more details, see L Richardson (March 2008, forthcoming), DIY Community Action: neighbourhood problems and community self-help, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Ways to judge the legitimacy of small informal groups

The group’s relationship to the wider community
- The groups organised activities, and people used the services the groups provided
- Residents sought out help and advice from the groups’ members informally
- Residents helped to fundraise for or gave financial backing to the groups
- Lack of vandalism of the groups’ projects
- An absence of criticism
- The groups reached out to the wider community using information and consultation

The groups’ relationship to external bodies
- They were open to scrutiny
- The groups had positive approaches to promoting diversity
Industrial collapse and its aftermath: seven European cities in the recovery ward

Anne Power, Jörg Plöger and Astrid Winkler

The CASE Weak Market Cities Programmes looks at seven case study ‘weak market’ cities across Europe. A parallel study in partnership with the Brookings Institution in Washington explores similar problems facing older industrial cities in the United States. During the industrial era, these cities were the demographic, cultural and economic hubs of their respective regions, maturing at a time when access to raw materials, dense transportation networks and proximity to markets were clear competitive advantages for the development of strong manufacturing industries producing goods for local and national needs. Since the oil shocks of the 1970s and the decline of industry and manufacturing in the West, however, these spatial attributes have decreased in importance, leaving these cities struggling to find their economic niche.

The CASE team's research focuses on seven European cities in five countries: Sheffield and Belfast (United Kingdom), Saint-Étienne (France), Bilbao (Spain), Torino (Italy), Leipzig and Bremen (Germany). These cities are each marked by heavy losses in manufacturing jobs (see chart) and a subsequent haemorrhaging of their population, economic and socio-spatial polarisation, a low skills base and high levels of unemployment. An overall pattern is recognisable: steep growth until the mid to late 20th century followed by a sharp decline. Common challenges included a diminishing tax base, large-scale vacant and abandoned property, concentrated poverty, and a low-educated workforce.

The turning points arose broadly 15-20 years after the economic decline. Our research indicates that in all cases it took a real crisis to spark decisive action. The acute and cumulative nature of the economic and social crises in these cities galvanized new political action and threw up new leadership. The major challenges were to stop the leakage of people and jobs; to cultivate and attract new industries and entrepreneurs; and to retain the higher-skilled middle-class populations (many of whom were leaving to seek work elsewhere). The populations who stayed in the cities were lower-skilled and more marginal to the new economy.

In cities where civic pride was damaged as much as urban landscapes, where social exclusion and inequality were rampant and where skills mismatches played a big role in impeding recovery, the growth of new industries and the upgrading and overhaul of city infrastructure seemed an almost impossible challenge. The Western world had moved on from heavy-footed intensive manufacturing to a much lighter-footed, more service-based economy and the mismatch between what former industrial cities could offer and the requirements of the new economy was extreme.

Cities adopted many different approaches to aid recovery. There are, however, some common traits:

- Firstly, they all relied on strong government support for physical renewal projects, involving funding for transport upgrading, reclamation of derelict sites, neighbourhood regeneration, restoration of historic buildings and other infrastructure investment. The money to do these things came slowly and piecemeal from many different programmes. Often it was heavily supplemented by social and regional development funds from the European Union.

- Secondly, the cities themselves focused on reducing unemployment and preparing their lower-skilled population for new jobs through training programmes and intermediate, semi-subsidised supported employment programmes.

- Thirdly, they developed programmes to foster the development of high-value-added sectors linked to their existing strengths (for example, advanced manufacturing in Sheffield, optics in Saint-Étienne), mainly by linking local universities’ research activity with private enterprise.

- Fourthly, they aimed to increase their residential appeal by creating cultural attractions and upgrading their housing stock.

A major focus of all efforts has been on how to create new jobs within a new economic environment. The core role of the cities had to be ‘reinvented’ and strengthened following the rapid and stark decay of de-industrialisation. Economic concerns lay behind most decisions, as the cities had been weakened most by the loss of their economic base.

To do this, all seven cities built on their heritage and culture, launching physical upgrading programmes focused on updating their gritty industrial images and creating an attractive cultural and residential ‘offer’. In poorer neighbourhoods, conditions urgently required reinvestment. Social tensions and ethnic conflict dominated much of the local political agenda, but all the cities have major neighbourhood regeneration programmes underway.

To shake off their image of ‘grime, sweat and toil’ linked to their industrial past, the cities adopted innovative reinvestment strategies which concentrated on the following areas.

Leadership and ‘City Strategies’. Strong leaders capable of uniting local actors around a focused vision for the city’s future were key to recovery. Most cities developed a ‘City Strategy’ in consultation with a range of civic and business leaders. They also founded new partnerships and institutions to take forward each element of the strategy.

Land and building reclamation and environmental upgrading. Large port areas, contaminated land, disused steel works, gas works, mills and warehouses all needed restoration and reuse.

Physical redesign and upgrading of major landmarks. Former industrial era buildings such as old town halls, theatres, civic halls and even older department stores were ready for new uses. Whole city centres were redesigned.

Transport infrastructure. All cities sought funding to improve internal and external connectivity. New transport links also opened up employment opportunities.
Building new skills within the population to attract new companies became crucial. This approach was often linked to social integration and neighbourhood renewal efforts.

The cities are at different stages in the process of doing this but in five of the seven cities unemployment rates have fallen to the country average or lower. Unemployment levels have fallen in all the cities, except Leipzig where particular economic conditions make recovery more difficult. All the cities now show a slowing in population decline and re-growth in four of the seven cases. There is significant recovery in unemployment rates, although probing the nature and sustainability of job creation efforts, the flows in employment and the nature of the new investments that these cities are attracting has been one of the biggest challenges of this research.

There is widespread agreement that improvements in education fostering higher-level skills and aspirations, more socially integrated communities, continuous physical renewal and environmentally sustainable behaviour are essential to tackling future urban challenges. We are exploring city by city how these themes are being integrated in specific regeneration projects, and in 2008 we will draw on US and European experience to develop a recovery index for former industrial cities.

The CASE Weak Market Cities Programme is funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, with contributions from the Academy for Sustainable Communities and the Department for Communities and Local Government. For more details, see http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/_new/research/weakmarketcities/default.asp
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The CASE Weak Market Cities Programme is funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, with contributions from the Academy for Sustainable Communities and the Department for Communities and Local Government. For more details, see http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case/_new/research/weakmarketcities/default.asp
Education, Employment, Welfare and Exclusion

Contact: Tania Burchardt, Simon Burgess, Robert Cassen, Howard Glennerster, John Hills, Eleni Karagiannaki, Abigail McKnight, David Piachaud, Tom Sefton and Kitty Stewart

Education
We have sought to deepen our understanding of how education affects the patterns of advantage and disadvantage in society. Ruth Lupton’s work in a sample of schools and the areas from which they drew their pupils showed the powerful interaction between neighbourhood and school. What use schools make of their resources, how they define their goals and structure the learning environment is strongly influenced by the local context.1

Robert Cassen and Gita Kingdon combined various national data sets to test the (conditional) correlation of low achievement with a range of risk factors, the role played by sorting into different schools, by differences in school quality and the impact of school resources.2 It found that ‘sorting’ students into low and high quality schools and neighbourhoods plays an important part in explaining low achievement. Higher school expenditure reduces the chances of low achievement by a small amount overall but some groups of students benefit significantly – notably girls, ethnic minority students and those with some kind of social disadvantage. This suggests targeted use of additional resources can make a difference. Ethnic minority students overcome disadvantage better. Such pupils have a greater chance of being low achievers at 11 but by age 16 language and ethnic disadvantage is powerfully reversed. These findings were reinforced by those of Deborah Wilson, Simon Burgess and Adam Briggs which showed that all ethnic groups make more gains in school than white pupils and this is especially true of Indian students prior to external examinations. They out perform their white peers in 90 per cent of the schools they attend. This finding supports the conclusions of others that aspiring family and strong local community ties can be powerful positive factors.2

Jane Waldfogel reviewed the international literature on the needs of children in working families and on the impact of early years experience on social mobility and later life chances. She developed a programme of policy action.4 Vincent Vandenberghe modelled the likely impact of reforming the funding of higher education in different countries.3

Employment
Tania Burchardt showed that 16 year old children with disabilities now have similar aspirations to other children of that age, a positive improvement from the past, but these are not matched by labour market experience.5 Eleni Karagiannaki reviewed the effectiveness of Jobcentre Plus in integrating those excluded from the labour market.7 John Rigg examined the labour market experience of disabled people and found they experienced slower earnings growth and more job exits, especially men. It is not enough, he concluded, to focus on barriers faced by the disabled in accessing jobs.8

Kitty Stewart tracked a sample cohort of lone mothers from 1991 to 2001 to examine their employment histories and found little evidence that early return to work makes stability in employment more likely. Wages steadily declined in relation to male earnings and movement into low paid work was more common than movement out. Abigail McKnight examined the employment trajectories of low paid workers over long periods of time using the Lifetime Labour Market Database (see box).

Welfare policy
John Hills and colleagues used data from regular interviews with a sample of families over a year to analyse variations in income and circumstances. Incomes for many families varied considerably and were aggravated by the working of the then unformed Child Tax Credit system.10 John Hills was heavily involved in the work of the Pensions Commission and has published reflections on pension policy resulting from it.11 Hills also undertook a review of the current and possible future role for social housing (see box).

Rachel Smithies analysed trends in the balance between public and private welfare provision and its finance from 1979-1999, updating earlier work by Burchardt. Perhaps most striking was the relatively small shift, for example, towards private provision and finance in a period when discussion of such moves have had a high political profile.12

Howard Glennerster put together a time series showing the extent to which taxes and social benefits in cash and kind had reduced the scale of inequality of final incomes over the period since 1937. Taxes and benefits were reducing the scale of inequality by twice as much in 2005 as they were in the immediate post war period, even so not fully offsetting the rise in labour market inequality.13 Tom Sefton contributed an analytical overview of redistributive policy for the Oxford Handbook of Public Policy.14 Having previously analysed the effectiveness of various energy efficiency schemes in reducing fuel poverty, he also carried out a review of the Government’s methodology for calculating the number of households in fuel poverty.15,16

Kitty Stewart and John Hills pulled together contributions from across the Centre to discuss what impact the Labour Government had made on inequality and social exclusion (published as A More Equal Society? in 200517), which will be updated and extended in 2008. In the last year, several CASE authors contributed to the volume edited by John Hills, Julian Le Grand and David Piachaud entitled Making Social Policy Work, focusing in particular on the ways in which social policy in Britain has been reshaped in the first decade of the 21st century and implications for the future evolution of policy (see box).


7 E Karagiannaki (2005) Job Centre Plus or minus: Exploring the performance of Job Centre Plus for non-job seekers CASEpaper 97; Exploring the effects of integrated benefits systems and active labour market policies; Evidence from Job Centre Plus CASEpaper 107.


Not enough rungs? Welfare to work transitions

Abigail McKnight and Richard Dickens

The employment trajectories of low paid workers are still not well understood. Very large samples of workers tracking the employment experience of the same individuals over long periods of time are required before any meaningful analysis can be conducted. The Lifetime Labour Market Database (LLMDB), an administrative data source which is comprised of linked information on earnings, benefit receipt and a range of personal data, for the same large random sample of individuals since the mid 1970s, provides such an opportunity. In a research project funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Abigail McKnight and Richard Dickens (CEP) have been analysing the LLMDB to gain a better understanding of the evolution of the employment trajectories of low paid workers. They have focused on three main areas for analysis.

Firstly, they have exploited the longitudinal nature of the LLMDB to assess the extent to which the mobility of employees, in terms of their earnings, has changed over time. Making use of recent methodological developments, they are able to compare different groups of workers with a particular focus on low paid employees. They find that earnings mobility fell through the 1980s and 1990s but changes since 1997 are mixed and sensitive to the measure of mobility used. Taking a closer look at different earnings levels they find that most mobility which tends to equalise longer term differences in individuals’ earnings occurs mainly among lower paid employees, but that this has fallen overtime. This might indicate a fall in the opportunity for lower paid employees to progress in the labour market.

Secondly, they focus on immigrants as they are a group of individuals who are known to be disadvantaged in the labour market. The LLMDB provides a unique opportunity to track different waves of migrants, including the recent influx of migrants from the EU accession countries. Using information on the date these individuals entered the UK and longitudinal information on their earnings and benefit receipt, it is possible to assess their labour market disadvantage when they start working and the length of time it takes for them to fully assimilate into the British labour market. The raw data reveals that newly arrived immigrants earn a wage that is, on average, half the average non-immigrant wage. This wage gap declines the longer migrants remain in the UK until 7-9 years after they enter when immigrant and non-immigrant wages converge. Assimilation is faster for women (3 years) than for men (10 years).

Further statistical analysis revealed that the wage gap is much lower for more recent cohorts of migrants; particularly women among whom the most recent cohort for which we have data (2000-2003) actually record a relative wage premium. Controlling for age and year of arrival reveals that younger immigrants have a lower wage penalty and assimilate faster than older workers and women assimilate faster than men. It is also the case that the country of origin is an important determinant of wage assimilation with migrants from Asia and the Middle East faring the worst. No change in the rate of wage assimilation for women was found while for men the wage gap has fallen for more recent cohorts and the rate of assimilation has increased markedly.

Finally, they explored the role of in-work benefits in helping individuals retain their jobs and progress in the labour market. In the statistical analysis they focus on assessing the impact of the Working Families Tax Credit/ Family Credit on employment retention and advancement. Many individuals claim in-work benefits for long periods of time and many claimants go on to have repeat claims in short succession. They find that employment retention is higher for in-work benefit recipients than non-recipients and that the introduction of WFTC in 1999 was associated with an increase in employment retention among recipients above that observed for non-recipients. When controls are made for a range of factors which may independently affect employment retention, they find no statistically significant impact associated with the introduction of WFTC for women. For men, the results suggest that WFTC increased employment retention rates by 2 percentage points. Preliminary results suggest that WFTC has had no impact on wage growth.

Findings from this research project will be published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation early in 2008.
The roles of social housing in the 21st century

John Hills

In July 2006 I was commissioned by Ruth Kelly, then Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, to write a report, published in February 2007 as *Ends and Means: The Future Roles of Social Housing in England*.

Social housing plays a crucial role for nearly four million households in England, giving stability and security in a fundamental part of families’ lives. The quality of housing it provides is usually significantly higher than low income tenants could afford in the private sector. Its existence has protected affordability for tenants while real house prices have doubled in the last decade. Social landlords often play a leading role in the renewal and regeneration of some of the most deprived areas.

In one sense, then, the answer to the core question for the review was clear: there is no reason why social housing should not continue to play this vital role, and in considering policy change its benefits should not be put at risk. However, the evidence suggests that in terms of the key reasons for using social housing as a policy instrument, some of the outcomes are at present disappointing: aspects of tenant satisfaction have deteriorated, despite the improved physical quality of the stock; half of social housing is located in the poorest fifth of neighbourhoods; and levels of worklessness are high, even when one starts allowing for the particular labour market challenges that many tenants face (see figure).

In part these problems reflect the sheer pressure the sector is under as alternatives become less affordable and as the supply of social housing available to re-let declines. But more could be done to achieve better outcomes for existing tenants and for others in housing need. The report suggests four directions in which policy could better achieve the underlying objectives of social housing and of housing policy more generally. It asks, what can be done:

- To increase the attention given to the existing stock and tenant population?
- To support mixed-incomes within existing communities?
- To support the livelihoods of tenants and others in housing need?
- To offer a ‘more varied menu’ to both prospective and existing tenants?

How far policy moves will depend on priorities and, in some cases, on available resources. But if social housing is to fulfil its potential, new approaches are needed. We need to move beyond an approach where the key function is one of rationing and trying to establish who is not eligible for social housing to one where the key question is ‘How can we help you to afford decent housing?’ and ‘Here are your options’.

Within this, housing in itself is not the only issue. The overall policy aim may remain the traditional one of achieving ‘a decent home for all at a price within their means’, but historically we may have given too little attention to the last part of that – doing enough to support people’s livelihoods and so boosting the means at their disposal.


### Worklessness by tenure and indicators of labour market disadvantage, Spring 2006

![Bar chart showing worklessness by tenure and indicators of labour market disadvantage](chart.png)

Source: Labour Force Survey
Making social policy work: essays in honour of Howard Glennerster

John Hills, Julian Le Grand and David Piachaud (eds)

How to make social policy work? How can policies be designed so as to achieve the aims of government in the social arena? How can these policies be implemented in such a way so as to promote the desired aims but without damaging other aims that we might wish to pursue? Can we ensure that social policies have only those consequences that are intended? Howard Glennerster, whose work has inspired the contributions to this book, published in 2007, has devoted much of his professional life to answering such questions and the book attempts to build on his contributions. It is thus concerned, not so much with the theory of social policy, but with its practice. The chapters of the book, written by his colleagues, focus on the historical development and the practical implementation of policy in key areas of social concern.

The main focus of the book is on contemporary issues, particularly on the ways in which social policy in Britain has been reshaped in the first decade of the 21st century and the issues that they raise for the future evolution of policy. The first part of the book looks at the underlying aims of social policy. Jose Harris deconstructs some of the mythology surrounding the history of the welfare state, arguing that seemingly quite dated policies and institutions of past eras may contain elements that are constant and universal in many different contexts and epochs, while other apparently ‘timeless’ models are actually time-specific. There are lessons to be learned from history about what works; but they may not always be the most obvious ones. Tania Burchardt emphasises the need to clarify the objectives of policy, especially with respect to social justice, and points to contradictions in this respect between recent developments in different aspects of policy.

The second part of the book looks at the ways in which social policies are delivered. Jane Lewis examines why family issues are so hard for policymakers. She looks at how recent policy in the UK has ‘muddled through’, examining in particular changes in policy towards the balance between work and family life since 1997. Anne West brings out some of the tensions that arise when trying to meet different goals in education policy, using the evolution of the Labour Government’s policies towards school education as an illustration. Nick Barr focuses on higher education, looking in particular at the system for financing higher education that had emerged after a series of reforms by 2006, making the important distinction between strategic policy design, political implementation, and administrative and technical implementation. Julian Le Grand examines the UK experience of quasi-markets in health care, and concludes that the essential elements of these markets – notably user choice and provider competition – can achieve the ends of health care policy, so long as the measures concerned are properly designed. Martin Knapp examines policy developments in social care, aimed at both increasing individuals’ choice over service providers, but also their control over that choice. He traces the development of ‘direct payments’ and ‘individual budgets’, where service users are using combined resources from a variety of funding streams within what becomes a real, rather than a ‘quasi-market’. Anne Power looks at the delivery of policy on the ground, in the shape of policies towards neighbourhoods, particularly those with concentrations of households with low incomes. She examines why neighbourhoods affect social conditions, evidence of recent progress in neighbourhood renewal, and whether more mixed urban communities are likely to emerge as a result of it.

The third part of the book looks at the distributional effects of policy. David Piachaud reviews the many developments in social security and anti-poverty policy in recent years under the Labour Government. He concludes that the evidence up to 2004-05 shows that ‘redistribution works’, but at the price of increased complexity, high effective marginal tax rates and a split in responsibility between government departments. John Hills discusses the major reforms under way in pension policy. Drawing on evidence collected by the Pensions Commission, he looks at public priorities for pensions, but also contradictions in attitudes. He emphasises the need to make hard choices, and for those choices to carry popular support. Finally, Tony Travers reviews the development and use of funding formulae for distributing resources geographically between different local jurisdictions in the United Kingdom. He traces the historical roots of today’s systems back to the ideas of the Webbs and others in the early 20th century, forward to the changes in local government finance proposed in the Lyons report early in 2007.

Howard Glennerster’s work served to improve the lives of millions who have never heard his name – and it continues to do so. There can be no better tribute for a true scholar of social policy. This book attempts to follow along the path he has cleared, and continues to explore.

Policies

CASE has developed a strong theme of work around child poverty, including microsimulation of the predicted impact of various government policies, assessment of what combination of material and parental resources are needed to support young children’s development, and exploration of policies to support children in diverse countries including Britain, Southern Europe, countries in the ex-USSR, Mexico and Brazil (see box).

In 2007, three new projects began in this area: Sarah Mohaupt’s PhD on intergenerational patterns of childhood disadvantage in Indonesia, using panel data, Yuka Uzuki’s PhD on the varying effects of growing up in poverty on the use young people in Britain can make of their education, using cohort data, and a ‘think piece’ by David Piachaud on the commercialisation of childhood.

Children’s well-being is of course intimately bound up with the circumstances of their parents. We were delighted to host Stephen Morris, a CASE User Fellow from the Department for Work and Pensions, who carried out a timely analysis of child support arrangements, in the light of proposals to move towards more voluntary agreements.

Social security and pensions have been an important thread running through the Centre’s work, ever since the Welfare State Programme was absorbed into CASE in 1997. Currently, Martin Evans, John Hills and Holly Sutherland are working on the impact of indexation (or lack of it) for the value and effectiveness of UK social security in a project funded by the Joseph Rowntree foundation. Ben Baumberg began his PhD this year on incapacity benefit recipients, focusing on psychological aspects of wellness to work, while Aaron Grech continued his doctoral work on the funding of pensions systems.

CASE has also produced a number of overviews of welfare policy. Howard Glennerster has written a chapter for the forthcoming Oxford University Comparative Handbook on Social Policy on the future of welfare states, and revised his best-selling British Social Policy: 1945 to the present for its third edition. David Piachaud challenged the discipline’s exclusive focus on services, arguing for a broader conception of the relationship between individuals, policies and social outcomes.

Concepts

A series of interconnected projects have examined social attitudes to various aspects of social policy, including redistribution and inequality (both among the general public and among the very rich), and discrimination against disabled people. A new project is planned by Polly Vizard in 2008 on social attitudes to citizenship and the proposed Bill of Rights, including whether there is support for inclusion of social and economic rights.

Social attitudes are one of the constraints which may operate on policy. Other constraints – or facilitators – are the underlying motivations and capacities of the policymakers, the staff delivering the policies, and citizens themselves. Julian Le Grand brought together his thinking over many years on the dynamics of individual motivation and social policy in a book with the intriguing sub-title ‘of knights and knaves, pawns and queens’. This year, a range of CASE work is being brought together on a theme of resilience, a concept which locates individual’s motivations and strategies within the context of their family, community and wider social structures (see box).

Analysis of any area of social policy is difficult without an account of what values or objectives the policy is, or should be, promoting. A number of aspects of CASE work in recent years has related to theories of what matters: happiness, human rights, central and valuable capabilities, or other interpretations of social justice. Some of this work is being taken forward in 2008 in developing a framework relating equality and human rights.

In a separate study, Francesca Borgonovi examines the relationship between formal volunteering and self-reported well-being in the USA (see box).

Measurement

Translating theoretical concepts into measurable indicators is always challenging. CASE work has tackled this challenge both cross-nationally and across disciplines. Kitty Stewart explored whether the EU’s proposed framework for measurement of well-being could sensibly be operationalised at a regional level, while David Piachaud responded to a request from the Scottish Government to consider how Scotland’s economic and social policy context compared to the ‘arc of prosperity’ identified by Alec Salmond as stretching across Scandinavia and Ireland.

Tania Burchardt joined colleagues in the Personal Social Services Research Unit at LSE to conduct a systematic mapping exercise of the literature on mental health and social exclusion, a project which led to the development of new methods to cope with the challenges of inter-disciplinary systematic reviewing.

Measurement of income inequality is on a sounder methodological footing than measurement using multi-dimensional indicators, but of course income does not generally capture a range of other disadvantages. A series of projects have explored ways of adjusting income to take account of these different needs, through equivalisation, examining the relationship with consumption, and taking into account time budgets as well as income constraints.

Contact: Francesca Borgonovi, Tania Burchardt, Julian Le Grand and Polly Vizard


Variations in terms of transfer amounts to beneficiaries are considerable, with CCT amounts ranging from about 4 per cent of beneficiary expenditures in Honduras to 20 per cent of beneficiary expenditures in Mexico and Nicaragua. Low transfer amounts, coupled with the failure in some countries to index or regularly uprate transfer amounts, condemns CCTs to a residual net. In terms of population coverage and duration, the trend in most countries has been one of expansion. Where CCTs were initially limited to particular geographic areas (Mexico and Nicaragua) they have expanded to cover previously excluded areas. In countries where CCTs originated at a local level (Brazil), efforts have led to the national regulation of a national policy. Furthermore, in countries where CCTs were originally introduced as primarily short-term compensatory measures, payments have been extended over time (Colombia and Nicaragua).

Targeting
The target population varies by breadth, usually reflecting whether the CCT pursues as its priority objective human capital accumulation among particular subgroups of the poor population (Chile, Mexico) or the provision of a minimum income (Brazil). Targeting systems vary by level of complexity. Some CCTs require information on numerous indicators for the implementation of proxy means-tests and include multiple verification procedures (Chile, Mexico). Others apply less onerous information requirements for eligibility verification, based, for example, on unverified declared income (Brazil). Proponents of targeting mechanisms of the first kind argue that they attenuate errors associated with simple targeting procedures such as those arising from the potential bias in declared income. Our comparative analysis shows, however, that simple means-tests can perform as well as, or even outperform, more complex targeting mechanisms in terms of targeting efficiency.

Conditionality
The conditionalities of the CCTs in the study countries share basic common definitions, but vary substantially by design and implementation. Conditionalities are central to CCT implementation when beneficiary compliance is first verified and benefit payment is only subsequently made (Mexico). Elsewhere, once eligibility is verified, transfers are paid to beneficiaries and conditionality compliance is monitored (if ever) at a later stage. Response to non-compliance also varies, leading to the automatic suspension of benefit payments in some countries and in others to additional services in the first instance and the gradual reduction of benefits if non-compliance persists.

Finally, conditionalities vary depending on whether they are accompanied by measures to improve service provision or focus entirely on beneficiary behaviour.

Conclusions
This paper argues that, along with other developments in the area of social assistance, CCTs represent an opportunity for countries to develop an integrated and inclusive set of social policies. However, the emphasis on narrow concepts of risk and risk management has contributed in some instances to the development of short-term, narrowly targeted measures that circumvent more demanding institutional reforms. As they stand, CCTs in several countries have been implemented because of their relatively low cost and affordability – both financial and political. The challenge is to ensure that in the longer term such interventions are integrated into national social protection systems. With regards to CCTs as specific interventions, ‘the devil is in the details’: as this paper shows, cash transfer coverage and amounts, targeting practices and conditionality implementation can be modified to reflect a priority concern for social inclusion and long-term institutional development.

For more details, see Francesca Bastagli, From social safety net to social policy? The role of conditional cash transfers in welfare state development in Latin America, CASEpaper, forthcoming.
A themed section of the journal Social Policy and Society is being prepared drawing together CASE work on resilience and social exclusion.

Over the years, much of our analysis has focused on risk factors for individuals and areas becoming or remaining socially excluded, and the ways in which social policies have failed to protect people from the impact of exclusion, or, in some cases, have actively contributed to its creation. Much less attention has been given to resilience: to the individuals who survive and thrive despite seriously disadvantageous circumstances, and to the individual and collective resources, structures and policies which enable them to do so. In this themed issue, we seek to take a new cut through our existing and on-going research, to reveal some of the lessons which can be learnt for designing social policies which support and promote good outcomes in the face of adversity.

The common definition of resilience which authors will use is ‘positive adaptation, given what usually occurs within the adversity under consideration’ (Luthar, Cicchetti, and Becker, 2000, p.575). In the table below, we have identified for each article the context of adversity within which resilience with respect to a specific outcome will be investigated. The contexts can broadly be described as social exclusion in childhood or adult life, although the particular focus varies between authors. The majority of the articles will focus on the UK, although two of them offer a comparative perspective. The outcomes of interest range across several areas of social policy: education, mental and physical health, income and employment, and parenting and social interaction. The range of protective factors that will be investigated operate on a number of different levels, from individual characteristics (such as genetic endowment or personal efficacy), through family and community (including social capital), to local and national institutions and policies (such as social security). Many authors will examine factors at several different levels.

CASE authors working on material for possible inclusion in the issue include Francesca Bastagli, Francesca Borgonov, Robert Cassen, Rosey Davidson, Carmen Huerta, Eleni Karagiannaki, Sarah Mohaupt and Wendy Sigle-Rushton. The issue is being edited by Tania Burchardt and Carmen Huerta, for publication in Social Policy and Society January 2009.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context of adversity</th>
<th>Outcomes of interest</th>
<th>Protective factors investigated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low income household, poor neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Educational attainment at age 16</td>
<td>Genetic endowment, home learning environment, school policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a low-income neighbourhood</td>
<td>Parenting; employment</td>
<td>Sense of control / personal agency; neighbourhood regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood poverty, low education</td>
<td>Malaise in adult women</td>
<td>Family structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty, low educational attainment, low social class, unemployment</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering old age with low income</td>
<td>Income, health and social interaction in old age</td>
<td>Family and state support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Income, health and education</td>
<td>Conditional social security transfers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Doing well by doing good: the relationship between formal volunteering and self-reported well-being in the United States

Francesca Borgonovi

People who volunteer enjoy good physical and mental health: they have lower rates of mortality and are more likely to report and have medical records indicating good or excellent health. They are also more likely to report being happy and satisfied with their lives and are less likely to suffer from depression. While volunteers overwhelmingly enjoy good health and happy lives, it is possible that volunteering is not the cause of greater well-being but its effect? Does volunteering improve well-being, or does a healthy and happy life lead individuals to volunteer?

This study used county level data for the United States from the 2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey to examine whether engaging in formal volunteer work leads to greater well-being, as measured by self-reported health and happiness indicators. Results suggest that people who volunteer report better health and greater happiness than people who do not, a relationship that is not the result of socio-economic differences between volunteers and non-volunteers. After controlling for a large number of background variables – socio-economic characteristics, psychological coping resources and social support – volunteers are four percent more likely to report being in excellent health and seven percent more likely to report being very happy than non-volunteers (see table).

Individuals might differ in ways that are not observable and such differences could be at the basis of both why some individuals volunteer and why they report being in good health and happy. Statistical analysis of this issue suggests that volunteer labour for religious groups and organizations has a positive, causal influence on self-reported happiness, but not on self-reported health. Formal volunteer work for religious groups and organizations translates into a happier but not necessarily healthier life. Possible explanations that could account for the observed causal effect of volunteering on happiness are explored. Findings indicate that low status is associated with unhappy states only among those who do not volunteer, while volunteers are equally likely to be happy whether they have high or low status. The paper hypothesises that volunteering might contribute to happiness levels by increasing empathic emotions, shifting aspirations and crucially by moving the salient reference group in subjective evaluations of relative positions from the relatively better-off to the relatively worse-off.

For more details, see F Borgonovi (forthcoming) ‘Doing Well by Doing Good. The Relationship between Formal Volunteering and Self-reported Health and Happiness’, Social Science and Medicine.

Difference in the probability of being in ‘excellent’ health and ‘very happy’ among non volunteers and volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent health</th>
<th>Very happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Less than monthly</td>
<td>0.045 0.037 0.031</td>
<td>0.072 0.055 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Monthly</td>
<td>0.062 0.049 0.039</td>
<td>0.122 0.091 0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers Weekly</td>
<td>0.066 0.05 0.039</td>
<td>0.161 0.122 0.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic background</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Coping Resources</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contacts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: analysis based on 2000 Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey

All changes in probability are significant at the 1% level.

Reference case: white non-hispanic, female, with a High school degree or less, commuting less than half hour to work, with a total household income of $20,000 per year or less, with no young children, living alone, never divorced, not unemployed and not volunteering.
Francesca Bastagli continued her PhD research on the effectiveness of conditional cash transfers (CCTs) targeted to the poor, focusing on Brazil’s national cash transfer programme, the Bolsa Familia. She worked on three related pieces. She completed an analysis of the distributional impacts and targeting performance of public cash transfers in Brazil, using Brazil’s annual national household income survey. The analysis exploits state level variations in conditionalities and targeting, which will lead to a report in 2008. She has worked on the relationship between individual and community level social capital and physical and mental health in England using data from the Health Survey for England. She has examined the effect of formal volunteer work on health and happiness indicators using county level data from the United States (see box on p. 29). She also examined the role of religious diversity and pluralism in fostering giving and volunteering to both religious and non-religious causes in the United States. Finally, she used BCS1970 and the NCDS to examine the role of social integration and social capital in explaining differences in mental health and life satisfaction across cohorts, genders and socio-economic groups. During 2008 she will be on secondment to OECD in Paris.

Sheere Brooks continued work on her PhD, focusing on the implications of tourism expansion on squatter settlements in a case study of a Jamaican tourist resort town. Having completed all her fieldwork abroad, she is now in the process of analysing and writing up chapters of her thesis. In addition to this, she has been working with the Policy Studies Institute on a number of welfare to work longitudinal studies for the Department for Work and Pensions. She has recently had a book chapter accepted for inclusion in a forthcoming edited book to be published early next year by Routledge, NY.

Tania Burchardt worked with Polly Vizard developing a measurement framework for the UK government’s Equalities Review – a framework which was adopted in full in the Review’s final report. Her research on time and income poverty, supported by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, continued and is expected to conclude in the next year. She secured a two-year research contract for CASE with the Scottish Executive and contributed to a successful bid to the Nuffield Foundation for a major programme of work on wealth inequality.

Simon Burgess’s work relevant to CASE has continued to focus on education, and on poverty. In terms of the latter, earlier work with Assaeve, Propper and Dickson is being revised. This looks at the joint dynamics of employment, partnership and fertility, and the relationship of these with poverty dynamics. He has also worked on education and ethnicity, jointly with Wilson of CMPO, and for some papers also with Harris and Johnston of CMPO. They have used data from PLASC to examine whether there has been any change in ethnic segregation in schools over the past seven years. The results suggest that for all groups there is no overall trend towards greater segregation. For some minority groups (eg Indian ethnicity students), segregation has if anything slightly declined, whereas for others (eg Pakistani ethnicity children) it is slightly increased. In a number of cities, the change is largely driven by the change in the population, but not in all cases, for example Blackburn. In ongoing research, we have also investigated whether ethnic segregation impacts on educational outcomes. This again uses PLASC with matched in spatial data. They have modelled variation in the minority-white test score gap across LEAs, and we have compared minority student test scores across LEAs. This research is on-going but results to date suggest that segregation may have a role to play in influencing test score outcomes. Ongoing work for 2007-08 remains focussed on education and ethnicity. The project on the impact of segregation on educational outcomes remains on-going. We are also exploring differences between ethnic groups in educational aspirations, and the correlates of these. This uses a new dataset, the Longitudinal Study of Young People in England.

Robert Cassen completed his research for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation this year, together with Geeta Kingdon (Oxford University). It examined the factors lying behind low educational achievement in English schools. The study included a fairly comprehensive survey of existing research, as well as the authors’ own statistical modelling. The main story is one of disadvantage leading to very
early educational deficits; an equalising educational system would do more to correct for this than was found to be the case. The statistical study, based on the National Pupil Database, examined gender, ethnic and school quality differentials as well as disadvantage. UK media picked up in particular on the observations about White British boys doing badly, and gave the report considerable attention.

Following the successful application in 2007 for a project on ‘The Changing Distribution of Wealth’ (with John Hills, Tania Burchardt, Howard Glennerster, Eleni Karagiannaki, Abigail McKnight and Tom Sefton), Frank Cowell will be starting the modelling of the UK wealth distribution using semiparametric techniques developed in conjunction with Maria-Pia Victoria Feser. He also expects to start on work comparing the structure of UK wealth inequality with that of other developed countries using the Luxembourg Wealth Study.

Rosemary Davidson continued to work on the Neighbourhood Study with Anne Power and Helen Willmot, writing a report for Sport England, ‘Families’ and children’s experience of sport and informal activity in Olympic areas of the East End’ (CASEreport 35), and co-writing a book charting the progress of the families over the seven years of the project. From October 2006 to January 2007 she worked with Tania Burchardt on a project collating literature on mental health and social exclusion. In February, Rosemary took up a Research Fellow post at University College London in the Clinical Health Psychology Department to work on a project examining how national health guidelines are formulated.

Mingzhu Dong’s research this year focuses on her PhD thesis, titled ‘Reemployment and Social Exclusion of the Urban Unemployed in Northeast China’. She finished the fieldwork in August 2006 and data analysis by March 2007, and started to write up the thesis. This thesis challenges the traditional view of the reemployment difficulty of laid-offs (from state owned enterprises), which explains it from an economics perspective with labour market dynamics on the macro level and the unfavourable demographical, social and economic characteristics of the laid-offs on the micro level. The thesis re-investigates the situation of the laid-offs while critically reflecting on the theories, methodology and values that have been in use traditionally. It investigates their disadvantaged lives with a focus on the process and agent that transform and generate them with a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods and argues that what disqualifies them for a ticket to join the prosperity pursuing activities lies in both personal factors and, more importantly, the way the economy and society function as well as in policy settings. The thesis is expected to be finished by the end of 2008.

Alex Fenton has continued to investigate socio-cultural and economic dimensions of neighbourhood deprivation, with a particular focus on the UK housing system. A major project this year has been the evaluation of the ‘Mixed Communities Initiative’. This is a set of pilot projects which are seeking to effect ‘transformational’ change in highly deprived urban areas by involving the private sector in changes to the housing stock. Alex has been conducting fieldwork in Gipton, in Leeds, and Canning Town, in Newham, and doing quantitative analysis across the case studies. His other research this year has included modelling future take-up of low-cost home-ownership products, work on regional planning policy in the East and West Midlands, and methodological work on qualitative data analysis in anthropology and sociology. He is currently starting a new project funded by the Barrow Cadbury Trust which will investigate whether and how the disadvantage of some ethnic minorities in Birmingham is compounded by living in areas of concentrated and persistent poverty.

Ludovica Gambaro’s PhD research intends to look at the recent evolution of employment conditions within the occupational sectors related to childcare in the UK, and to study these changes in relation to the increased commitment towards childcare provision by the British government. In particular she is interested in understanding what policy frames and interventions are more likely to be associated with a revaluation of care work carried out by paid workers. She relates the working conditions of the childcare workforce to two crucial outcomes. First, the quality of childcare, as the context in which care is provided tends to shape the content of the care relationship. Second, the overall position of women in the labour market, as personal services are an important source of employment for women.

Howard Glennerster completed a study of income distribution from 1937 to 2005 and the impact on inequality that taxes, cash benefits and services in kind have made over that period. He began revising his book Understanding the Finance of Welfare which will be completed in 2008. He will also make a contribution to the Oxford Handbook of Comparative Welfare States on ‘The Sustainability of Western Welfare States’. He gave various lectures abroad notably one in Madrid on ‘European Welfare States and Economic Efficiency’ and one in Athens on ‘The funding of higher education’. In 2008, he will assist on the Nuffield-funded project studying changes in wealth inequality.

During 2008, Aaron Grech will continue to work on his doctoral dissertation. After having individuated a gap in the pension reform literature – namely the lack of a holistic approach to assessing sustainability – he will proceed to develop a multi-dimensional approach to pension reform evaluation. The aim of this research will be to assess the impact of reforms on the degree to which a pension system can achieve its set goals, and in this way determine possible sources of pressures for policy reversal in the future. The research
will focus on a number of countries, selected on the basis of the different aims they are set up to fulfil.

**John Hills** worked on a variety of projects during 2007. He carried out a review of the aims of social housing in England for the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, published as CASEreport 34, *Ends and Means: The future roles of social housing in England*. The report attracted a great deal of attention, and he has continued to advise the government on its follow-up policy review (see box on p. 23). He worked with Julian Le Grand and David Piachaud editing papers from a conference to mark Howard Glennerster’s seventieth birthday in October 2006, published as *Making Social Policy Work* by the Policy Press in October 2007. He has also been working with Holly Sutherland (Essex) and Martin Evans (Oxford) on the long-run implications of different approaches to indexation of benefit rates and tax brackets. He and Tom Sefton are partners in designing a module of the 2008 European Social Survey on attitudes to welfare services and redistribution. In 2008, he will be working with Frank Cowell and others on the distribution of wealth and with Tom Sefton, Kitty Stewart and colleagues on the impact of policies towards poverty and social exclusion since 1997.

**John Hobcraft** continued to work on the intergenerational and life course issues in CASE, particularly using the combined data file for the 1958 and 1970 British birth cohort studies to explore the antecedents of adult disadvantage and how these differ by gender and by cohort. He has recently examined a range of health outcomes. He also worked with Wendy Sigle-Rushton on an illustration of an innovative methodological approach to the study of resilience. He completed a paper linking his CASE work with its potential for the study of chronic poverty in the developing world. His theoretical work on exploring the linkages between genetics, neuroscience, and the social sciences was also developed further. His future plans include consolidation of existing research and production of a paper summarizing the wide range of results suggesting few differential responses to childhood disadvantage by gender or birth cohort for multiple adult outcomes.

**Carmen Huerta** worked with Kathleen Kiernan examining whether parenting activities play a mediating or moderating role between parental resources (eg, economic resources, mental health, social support) and children’s cognitive development and behavioural problems at age 3. Their study draws on longitudinal data from the UK Millennium Cohort Study, and uses Structural Equation Modelling to assess the extent to which these factors directly and indirectly affect child’s development. Their results show that economic deprivation and maternal depression are negatively associated with children’s well-being, and part of this negative association derives from less nurturing and engaged parenting. An important aspect of this study is that it explores whether parenting activities play a differential protective role by family type and whether it differs across genders. Kathleen Kiernan continues to work on family contexts and child development over the period from birth to age 5.

**Bryan Jones** is currently working on a PhD thesis looking at the social and economic impact on existing communities of new housing and commercial development in Kent Thameside, which is one of the key housing growth areas identified by the Government in the Thames Gateway. He is currently carrying out fieldwork in Swanscombe and Greenhithe; two former cement and paper-making communities with low skills and educational outcomes that lie next to the new Ebbsfleet International Station.

**Eleni Karagiannaki**’s research this year has been focused on the impact of health on the savings and consumption decisions of the elderly. The main objective of this research is to describe how consumption and saving decisions of the elderly adjust to health changes and to disentangle the different pathways through which consumption and savings respond to health changes. To identify the effect of health on consumption and saving decisions, she uses data from the British Household Panel Survey and the English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing and estimates a series of regression models which relate health changes to observed changes in decisions, consumption and savings decisions. Preliminary results from this research suggest significant adjustments in the composition of consumption following the onset of health conditions.

**Suyoung Kim**’s PhD research has been focused on the ‘welfare reform’ in South Korea. In particular, she has been looking into the interweaving impacts of globalization and democratization on the introduction of welfare-to-work programmes in Korea. Her broad research interest has been to find characteristics of social policy formation and administration in the non-western late developed countries (East Asia), which are based on distinctive economical, political, and cultural contexts compared to developed Western European countries. Reviewing the general debates on welfare reform promised on the cases of the Western world and analyzing the interview data and historical documents on the Korean welfare-to-work introduction since the early 1990s, she has tried to reveal how very similar welfare reforms could have different implications and effects according to the societies where they are implemented. Apart from the PhD research, she has also engaged in publishing a book series on Korean feminist ‘herstories’ as a co-author this year.

**Ruth Lupton** has continued to work on issues of poverty and place, and their relationship to education. With Rebecca Tunstall and others, she is involved in the evaluation of the government’s Mixed Communities Initiative demonstration projects, a new urban regeneration programme based on introducing income and tenure mix into low income areas.
The project runs for three years from 2006-2009, and is establishing ways of researching outcomes from these interventions, including displacement and benefits to different groups of residents, as well as looking at delivery processes, risk factors and barriers to success. Other projects this year have included: work with Leon Feinstein and colleagues for the Smith Institute and Housing Corporation to analyse the impact of housing on life chances using the British birth cohort studies; continuing analysis of the effect of school context and composition (the ESRC Hampshire Research with Primary Schools project); and work with Danny Dorling and colleagues on a Joseph Rowntree Foundation report on trends in poverty and wealth in Britain over the last 40 years, which demonstrated increasing polarisation and the squeezing out of the ‘neither rich nor poor’ from London and its hinterland. Continuing her London interest, she is also now directing a London Education Research Unit at the Institute of Education, and has written a book chapter on London’s changing social, economic and demographic make-up as a context for education in the city.

Abigail McKnight has continued her research on the empirical analysis of asset holding to examine the effect of holding financial assets in early adult life on a range of outcomes later in life. This research, partly funded by Esmee Fairbairn, is joint with IPPR who have conducted complimentary qualitative research designed to explore a range of important policy questions. Research findings on the assessment of an ‘asset-effect’ will be published in early 2008. In collaboration with Richard Dickens (CEP), she has been examining ‘ladders out of poverty’ on a research project funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. This project makes use of a large administrative database which has tracked the same individuals since the mid-1970s. They are examining earnings progression and routes off in- and out-of-work benefits to investigate different trajectories with a focus on the lowest paid workers. They are also making use of a large sample of immigrants to examine the ease at which they assimilate into the labour market and how this has changed over time. Results will be published in Spring 2008 (see box on p. 22). In 2008 Abigail intends to continue developing her research on asset-based policy and the empirical analysis of individuals earnings and benefit histories to explore a range of methodological and policy questions.

David Piachaud is currently working in two areas. One is the comparison of the impact on child poverty of government spending on cash transfers and on child care. One of the advantages claimed for extending child care is its impact on mother’s employment and thus on child poverty. How far have changes in child care enabled more mothers to take paid work? This research tackles this question, examining in detail changing patterns of employment among mothers with very young children. The second area of current research is the relationship between growth, inequality and poverty in the UK and the USA. Government definitions of poverty are very different in the UK and the USA with the latter persisting with an absolute definition adopted in the 1960s. Yet on this measure US poverty has changed little over the past 40 years despite substantial growth in the US economy. The reason for this is the increase in inequality in the USA. The aim of the research is to compare records on growth, inequality and poverty in the two countries, using both absolute and relative poverty standards. His future research will focus on the extent to which social expenditure is limited by taxpayers’ willingness to pay, as mediated by the political system. The aim of future research is to explore which forms of public expenditure are most cost-effective in terms of their impact on economic and social inequality.

Jörg Plöger has continued his work on the Weak Market Cities Programme, investigating how seven European cities face the challenge of economic restructuring and urban crisis and manage to find innovative approaches during their recovery process. Jörg has carried out further research trips to his case-study cities of Bilbao, Belfast, Bremen and Leipzig in 2007 and organised a visit of the research team to Bremen. Preliminary research findings were presented at the third meeting of the City Reformers Group at LSE in September. He is currently finishing City Reports which will be published as CASE reports. Jörg has also been involved in the successful bid to secure third-year funding. In 2008, he will continue his research and compare findings with results from the US as well as develop a ‘Recovery Index’ to measure the success of Weak Market Cities.

Anne Power’s research has included work of the Weak Market Cities (WMC) programme. The WMC team have completed seven individual city reports and an overview report that draws together evidence of common problems and recovery themes across the cities, including widely-consulted ‘Strategic Plans’, physical upgrading programmes often focused on the city-centre, and skills programmes for populations with low educational attainment, following on from a strong manufacturing history. Five case-study reports on skills projects have been produced for the Academy for Sustainable Communities. Following the publication of Jigsaw Cities in March 2007, Anne completed the second book from the Families study – City Survivors (published November 2007). City Survivors is about bringing up children in troubled city neighbourhoods, seen through the eyes of parents, mainly mothers. Where you live is all important for survival. Based on evidence collected in the seven year longitudinal study, the book provides a unique insider view on the impact of neighbourhood conditions on family life and explores the prospects for families from the point of view of equality, integration, schools, work, community, regeneration and public services.
Carol Propper, Liz Washbook, Paul Gregg and Lindsey MacMillan have been examining the pathways by which low income gets translated into poor child outcomes in middle childhood. Using a single unified framework, they have examined five outcomes: two cognitive, two behavioural and one health related. They have found that the risk factors associated with parental poverty vary markedly in their association with different outcomes. Unsurprisingly, schooling deficits of low-income children are strongly related to lack of parental education. Poor parental psychological functioning and poor health-related behaviours are drivers behind the greater behavioural problems and risk of obesity of low-income children. But they also find important links in unexpected places. The poorer schooling outcomes of poor children are just as closely related to the poorer health-related behaviours of their parents, such as greater smoking, less breastfeeding and feeding their children less good diets, as they are to their parent’s lack of education. This finding supports calls for better food as a way of improving not just children’s diets but also their schooling achievement. And even more surprisingly, some aspects of poor children’s upbringing that are generally viewed as harmful may even be protective (see box on p. 14).

In future work, Paul Gregg and Carol Propper will be examining the relationship between mother’s mental health when they were in their childhood and the mental health and labour market outcomes of their children in their adulthood. They will examine this across three UK generations – those born in the 1940s, the 1950s and the 1970s. Carol Propper also plans to compare these associations with those across the Atlantic, undertaking comparisons between the experiences of the 1958 cohort and their children in the UK and their counterparts in the USA (the NLSY).

Airborne pollution is a potential killer and is one of the ways in which the quality of where people live may affect their lives.

Carol Propper and Katharina Janke have examined this using local authority level data for 1996-2004. Their research design allows for the fact that pollution is not distributed randomly in space, but is associated with weather, industrial location and other activity that also might be harmful to health, to attempt to net out the direct effect of pollution on death rates. They find that pollution at levels currently permitted in the UK does appear to kill. In future work, they will investigate the impact of pollution on hospitalisation for cardiac and pulmonary conditions.

Tom Sefton was on leave in the US and Fiji during the first half of 2007. On his return, he continued with his research for the Nuffield Foundation on the relationship between women’s family and employment histories and their incomes in later life within a comparative framework, using retrospective data from the British Household Panel Survey and equivalent surveys for two other countries. He has completed the analysis for the UK (see box on p. 11) and is now replicating this for the US and Germany in order to investigate links between the life-course, welfare regimes and older people’s incomes. This project is due for completion early in 2008.

Hyun Shin was awarded his PhD in November 2006. His PhD thesis examined how developer-led partnerships in urban redevelopment in Seoul and Beijing took place in different urban settings, what contributions were made by participating actors and how redevelopment benefits were shared among the existing and potential residents in redevelopment neighbourhoods. Since June 2007, Hyun Shin has also been a postdoctoral research fellow at the White Rose East Asia Centre, University of Leeds, where he is focused on disseminating his thesis findings in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles. As part of his postdoctoral research, Hyun has also been reviewing the potential consequences of hosting the Olympic Games in Beijing on urban poor residents’ housing security. The initial review is available as a conference paper, and is expected to be published as part of a special edition of a peer-reviewed journal on Asian public policy.

Wendy Sigle-Rushton visited the Centre for Advanced Studies in Oslo for two months and co-authored a paper (with Øystein Kravdal and Fiona Steele) which uses registry data to examine the relationship between family dissolution and educational attainment in Norway. Results suggest that selection on time-invariant maternal characteristics is important and works to overstate the effects of divorce on a child’s chances of continuing in education. Nevertheless, the experience of marital breakdown during childhood is associated with lower levels of education, and that the effect weakens with the child’s age at disruption. The effects of divorce are most pronounced for the transitions during or just beyond the high school level. In models that do not allow for selection, children who experienced a father’s death appear less disadvantaged than children whose parents divorced. After controlling for selection, however, differences in the educational qualifications of children from divorced and bereaved families narrow substantially and, at mean ages of disruption, are almost non-existent. Building on previous work she has written, with John Hobcraft, a paper exploring the strengths and weaknesses of using Classification and Regression Trees to identify relationships of resilience. She hopes to continue carrying out comparative work using the NCDS data and the BCS70 data, and expects to produce a paper examining cross-cohort differences in the gendered division of housework in the coming year.

Kitty Stewart was on maternity leave in 2007. In 2008, she will continue work on the impact of mothers’ labour market participation when they have young children, and on the impact of policies towards poverty and social exclusion since 1997.

Sarah Thomas de Benitez submitted her PhD thesis on social policy processes and ‘street’ children in Puebla City.
Mexico; wrote the State of the World’s Street Children: Violence report for the Consortium for Street Children (published by Policy Press), and completed ethnographic field work for a three year project under ESRC auspices on street youth and identity in Mexico, co-authoring two articles (on suicide and bodies) for refereed journals. During 2008, based on findings from the ESRC programme she plans to author two articles (methods and social policy) for refereed journals, and to co-write a book with Dr Gareth Jones (LSE Geography) on Street Youth and Identity: Mexico.

**Rebecca Tunstall** worked on a project with colleagues from Cambridge University, the Institute of Education and Warwick University to evaluate the Department for Communities and Local Government’s Mixed Communities Initiative, as well as a project for London councils on the extra costs of mobile populations, an environmental strategy for Wimpey Homes plc, follow-up to Tunstall and Coulter 2006, a period working on urban regeneration in Kabul, and collaboration with LSE’s Urban Age project. In 2008, she plans to complete a series of articles and a full-length book covering 80 years on 20 English council estates, to continue work on the Mixed Communities Initiative, and with colleagues to gain funding and start work on a further piece of research on cohort studies and housing and neighborhoods.

**Catalina Turcu** continued her doctoral research, focusing on how sustainable are communities in areas of urban renewal in the North of the UK, under the government’s Housing Market Renewal Programme. She is analysing the impact of urban regeneration on community sustainability and whether regeneration helps create sustainable communities. During the year, she worked on consolidating the theoretical framework of her research which was presented at the Housing Studies Association Conference in York and European Network of Housing Research Conference in Rotterdam. In addition, she carried out a survey of over 150 residents in three urban renewal areas in Manchester, Newcastle and Liverpool, and semi-structured interviews with over 60 key actors involved in the regeneration of these areas. She is now in the process of analysing data and writing her thesis, with the expectation of submitting her thesis in Spring 2009. In addition to this, she also worked as a consultant for the British Urban Regeneration Association to author ‘Regeneration Maps in the UK – the case of Manchester/ Salford’.

**Yuka Uzuki** is carrying out her doctoral research on the intergenerational persistence of poverty in the UK. She has been developing analytical frameworks to investigate varying economic returns to post-compulsory non-tertiary education across background characteristics, household formation types, and motivations during youth. In 2008, she will analyse three British longitudinal datasets, the NCDS, BCS and BHPS, with a view to identifying constraints to be removed in order for young people growing up in poverty to make use of their educational attainment in the labour market.

**Polly Vizard** has continued to work on poverty, the capability approach and human rights during 2007. Research plans for 2008 include two projects that will focus on the development and application of the capability approach as a framework for inequality monitoring in the British context. The first (which will be undertaken jointly with **Tanja Burchardt**) will focus on the further development and application of a capability measurement framework as a foundation for the work of the new Equality and Human Rights Commission. The second will examine how nationally representative survey evidence on public attitudes can provide an informational base for developing a human rights-based capability list.

**Jane Waldfogel** is continuing to study the effects of the UK’s anti-poverty reforms. This past year, she wrote a comparative paper on the effects of welfare reforms in the US and UK on child well-being. This year, she is undertaking a study of the links between childcare and child poverty in the UK. She is also beginning work on a new book on the UK’s anti-poverty reforms.

**Stephen Wang’s** research this year has focused on the processes of housing decline and renewal in the People’s Republic of China, with particular emphasis on the ‘shikumen llong’ housing type in Shanghai. In 2008 he will conclude current analytical work on the impacts of urban restructuring, housing marketisation, and the socialist housing legacies on the ‘shikumen llong’, and complete write up for the thesis.

**Astrid Winkler** has continued her research for the Weak Market Cities Programme, investigating the causes of decline and recovery of seven industrial cities across Europe (see box on p. 18). She has conducted further stakeholder interviews in her case-study cities of Saint-Étienne, Sheffield and Torino, and led a research visit to Saint-Étienne during which the team visited residents on a peripheral grand ensemble housing estate and discussed recovery strategies with the Mayor of Saint-Étienne. The research is revealing a pattern of heavy state intervention in Saint-Étienne’s regeneration, in stark contrast to the innovative partnership-based approach in Torino, where the absence of any national urban policy in Italy, a proactive civil society and the powerful mayoral role have seen the emergence of entrepreneurial and well-integrated policies at city level. Astrid’s three City Reports are being published as CASE Reports in Autumn 2007, and the next phase of her research will focus on themed neighbourhood-level recovery projects.
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| CASEreport 42 | Jorg Plöger | Leipzig City Report |
| CASEreport 43 | Jorg Plöger | Bilbao City Report |
| CASEreport 44 | Jorg Plöger | Belfast City Report |
| CASEreport 45 | Astrid Winkler | Sheffield City Report |
| CASEreport 46 | Anne Power | Communities and Demolition: findings from a workshop at the National Communities Resource Centre |
| CASEreport 47 | Anne Power | Tenants and their Communities: Summary report to the DCLG on the consultation with tenants on the future roles of social housing |
Appendix 3 – Key Performance Indicators

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A1 Books and reports</th>
<th>A2 Book chapters</th>
<th>A3 Refereed journal papers</th>
<th>A4 Other publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15†</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1997/8 to 2000/1 figures are for academic years (October – September). 2001/2 figures are for a 15 month period October 2001 to December 2002. 2003 onwards are for calendar years. 2007 figures are provisional.
† excludes chapters in Understanding Social Exclusion, A More Equal Society? and Making Social Policy Work

B: External relations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>B1 Membership of committees</th>
<th>B2 Membership of networks</th>
<th>B3 Overseas visitors (more than 2 days)</th>
<th>B4 Overseas visitors (over 3 months)</th>
<th>B5 Substantial advice and consultancy (excluding grant and journal refereeing)</th>
<th>B6 Conference papers and seminar presentations</th>
<th>B7 Media coverage: newspapers</th>
<th>B8 Media coverage: radio and TV</th>
<th>B9 CASE events: Conferences</th>
<th>B9 CASE events: Seminars</th>
<th>B10 International collaborative research projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>79*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1997/8 to 2000/1 figures are for academic years (October – September). 2001/2 figures are for a 15 month period October 2001 to December 2002. 2003 onwards are for calendar years. # Does not include coverage of Pensions Commission reports. *Figures for 2007 are provisional.
### C: Financial resources (October-September, £000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 ESRC core funding</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Other ESRC funding</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Host institution</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Other funding</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Overall total</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D: Staff Resources (October-September)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Research staff (of which ESRC funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>14 (8)</td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
<td>14 (6)</td>
<td>18 (9)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
<td>25 (13)</td>
<td>20 (10)</td>
<td>17 (7)</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalents</td>
<td>9.7 (4.3)</td>
<td>11.5 (5.3)</td>
<td>10.9 (4.5)</td>
<td>11.3 (4.1)</td>
<td>14.3 (4.6)</td>
<td>13.4 (7.0)</td>
<td>17.6 (8.3)</td>
<td>13.6 (6.5)</td>
<td>14.4 (5.4)</td>
<td>10.2 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Associated academic staff (of which ESRC funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>12 (7)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>14 (6)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
<td>13 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalents</td>
<td>3.4 (2.2)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.8)</td>
<td>2.8 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.5)</td>
<td>3.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.0 (1.6)</td>
<td>4.1 (1.2)</td>
<td>3.6 (1.7)</td>
<td>3.2 (1.4)</td>
<td>2.6 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Support staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time equivalents</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Research students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Staff development days</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How to find us

CASE is situated in the Research Laboratory, on the fifth floor of the Lionel Robbins Building, Portugal Street.