Poverty and Social Exclusion in the UK: Vol. 2: The Dimensions of Disadvantage

Glen Bramley (ed.), Nick Bailey (ed.)

https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447334224.001.0001

Published: 2017 **Online ISBN:** 9781447334309 **Print ISBN:** 9781447334224

CHAPTER

Thirteen The multidimensional analysis of social exclusion

Nick Bailey, Eldin Fahmy, Jonathan Bradshaw

https://doi.org/10.1332/policypress/9781447334224.003.0014 Pages 311–342

Published: November 2017

Abstract

The Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix (BSEM) identifies multiple domains of social exclusion, and the PSE-UK 2012 survey successfully operationalised these for the first time in a single UK household survey. There are many approaches which can be used to explore the relationships between the multiple domains. This chapter uses two different approaches to see how consistent the picture is between them. There is considerable overlap or correlation between some of the domains, suggesting that the original ten can be reduced to a smaller number of broader groups. Material resources and hence poverty not only form one of the main dimensions of exclusion, but also correlate with many other aspects of exclusion. In other words, poverty and deprivation are at the core of the concept of exclusion. Nevertheless, there are aspects of exclusion which are much less connected to material disadvantage, if at all. The concept – and its operationalisation in the PSE-UK survey – therefore succeeds in drawing attention to a wider set of processes producing disadvantage.

Keywords: Social exclusion, Poverty, Multi-dimensional

Subject: Social Stratification, Inequality, and Mobility

Introduction

Previous chapters in this volume explore different dimensions of poverty and social exclusion in the UK, while the companion volume (Dermott and Main, 2017) presents evidence on the poverty and social exclusion experienced by different social groups or in different locations. Although many of these contributions also examine how disadvantage in one area relates to disadvantage in others, they essentially focus on one or two aspects of exclusion at a time. This chapter seeks to bring these analyses together by presenting an overarching multidimensional analysis of social exclusion, exploring in more depth the relationships between the dimensions of exclusion. As noted in the Introduction, there are many ways in

which this task could have been approached. Rather than selecting just one, this chapter explores complementary approaches using a range of statistical techniques. By doing so, we hope the results provide a more holistic understanding of how different domains of exclusion relate to each other and of the different forms which social exclusion may take.

The chapter is organised into a number of sections. The first provides an introduction to the concept of social exclusion, while the second describes levels of exclusion using the main indicators available in the PSE-UK 2012 survey and, where available, how these have changed since 1999. The chapter then discusses two different approaches to constructing broader measures of exclusion for each domain or groups of domains, in order to facilitate the multidimensional analysis which follows. The results of this multidimensional analysis are then presented, exploring the relationships between domains, and the variations in the forms of exclusion across different social groups, including between poor and non-poor groups. Lastly, the chapter considers the wider significance of these findings for policies to promote social inclusion and well-being in the UK.

p. 312

The concept of social exclusion

As noted in the Introduction, the concept of social exclusion emerged into UK discourses on poverty and living standards from France in the early 1990s (Bradshaw, 2004). Early advocates, including Room (1995), argued that it expanded on income- and expenditure-based measures of poverty by adopting a more dynamic, multidimensional perspective which emphasised the structural processes underpinning disadvantage. Despite fundamental differences in views on its causes (and appropriate policy responses), some consensus is evident in its conceptualisation in academic and policy research. First, in contrast to the narrower focus upon material resources in poverty research, social exclusion is said to refer to a process of being 'shut out' from, or denied access to, social, economic, cultural, and political systems (Walker and Walker, 1997), and to an enforced inability to participate in widely accepted social norms which can arise from a variety of sources (Gordon et al, 2000; Burchardt et al, 1999, 2002; Duffy, 1995; Room, 1995). Second, social exclusion is typically viewed as a dynamic process rather than as a static condition (Silver, 1994; Madanipour et al, 1998; Room, 1995). Third, social exclusion is a relational concept, and not simply a material state, characterised by powerlessness, denial of rights, diminished citizenship and disrespect (Room, 1995; Walker and Walker, 1997; Lister, 2004).

Initially the concept was greeted with some scepticism within the academic research community, not least because of concerns that it might be used to divert policy attention away from the maldistribution of incomes and material resources. Various commentators have also noted the way in which the concept has been adapted selectively to the changing environments of policy making in ways which reflect different understandings of its antecedents and causation, and hence of appropriate policy responses (for example, Byrne, 1999; Levitas, 1998; Silver, 1994).

Whilst the language of social exclusion has informed European policy debates in this area since at least the 1980s, most recently in the proposed European Pillar on Social Rights in 2016,[1] the UK government was the first national administration to explicitly focus on tackling social exclusion, with the establishment in 1997 of the Social Exclusion Unit by then Prime Minister Tony Blair. Here, social exclusion was defined as:

> A combination of linked problems such as unemployment, low skills, poor housing, family breakdown, high crime ↳ rates that lead people or places to be excluded from the mainstream.
>
> (SEU, 2004)

p. 313

As Levitas (1998) cogently argues, New Labour's adoption of the term reflected a shift away from the redistributive impetus of social democratic politics towards a 'social integrationist' emphasis on inclusion through paid work and an uneasy accommodation with neo-liberal economic orthodoxy. Writing in a similar vein, Fairclough (2000) emphasises the way New Labour's language of social exclusion disguised a discursive shift away from an emphasis on the structural drivers of multiple disadvantage towards an individualised, deficit model focused on the characteristics of the excluded themselves.

These are valid and important criticisms of the use of the concept of exclusion, but they do not constitute grounds to reject the concept in its entirety. First, social exclusion responds to the documented inadequacies of income-based poverty measures, which fail to represent the range of material and social resources envisaged by Townsend (1979) in his classic definition of poverty (see the Introduction in this volume). Second, it illuminates not only the material conditions associated with multiple disadvantage but also the unequal social and political relationships and processes that accompany these conditions and help to sustain them. In doing so, the concept addresses the relational agenda associated with lack of voice, denial of rights, social stigma, disrespect and misrecognition that are central to the lived experience of poverty (Lister, 2002, 2007). Viewed as an enforced exclusion from customary living standards, lifestyles, systems and opportunities, social exclusion describes diverse processes of marginalisation which extend far beyond poverty as material insufficiency. Whilst constrained material resources are undoubtedly a key driver of exclusion (a contention we examine empirically below), the concept encompasses a wider range of exclusionary processes including social discrimination, fear of violence, social isolation, geographical peripherality, and lack of access to services. Whilst these are often associated with poverty, they are clearly distinct phenomena. Moreover, in addressing this agenda, the concept of social exclusion responds to wider concerns about the limitations of distributional politics in addressing problems of misrecognition centred on gender, ethnicity, disability, and sexual orientation (Fraser, 1995; Honneth and Fraser, 2003).

p. 314

From definition to measurement

The Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix (B-SEM)

Whilst social exclusion has been an influential concept, its operationalisation and measurement remain challenging. The abstract character of social exclusion has often limited its utility as a framework for empirical measurement (Levitas et al, 2007). There are many examples of studies which have compiled data on different domains of exclusion using a diverse range of sources (for example, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's *Monitoring poverty and social exclusion* series of reports). While valuable for tracking social developments over time and holding policy makers to account, this approach does not facilitate investigation of how the various domains of exclusion overlap at the individual level, nor understanding of the different forms that exclusion can take. The main barrier to such work has been the lack of household survey data with sufficient breadth of coverage, as Levitas et al's (2007) review showed.

In the UK, some studies have been conducted using the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS). Drawing upon BHPS data for 1991-95, Burchardt et al (1999, 2002) construct measures on five key dimensions of exclusion: consumption, savings, work, political engagement and social activity. They go on to chart their prevalence and dynamics over this period. Barnes (2005) also uses BHPS data, capturing exclusion on financial situation, material possessions, housing and neighbourhood circumstances, social relations, and physical and mental health. He excludes labour market status from his set of domains since one of his primary purposes is to explore the relationships between paid work and exclusion. Taylor et al (2004) also use BHPS data to investigate multiple disadvantage over the 1991-2001 period. Beyond the BHPS, the 1999 PSE survey was the first to set out to operationalise and measure social exclusion in the UK, although the coverage it provides is similar to that possible using the BHPS. Drawing upon these data, Levitas (2006) examines vulnerability to exclusion across four dimensions: adequate income, labour market, local services and social relations.

These early attempts at survey measurement were often relatively crude because of the limitations of existing surveys and insufficient empirical validation. As the Introduction notes, one of the main aims of the PSE-UK 2012 study was to improve on this situation by operationalising a much richer measure of social
p. 315 exclusion. Drawing ↳ on a review of existing studies in this area, Levitas et al (2007: 9) offer a useful working definition:

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

Levitas et al (2007) then propose an operational measurement framework, the B-SEM, and it is this framework which informed the development of the PSE-UK survey. The B-SEM was constructed as a heuristic device to assess the scope for secondary analysis of social exclusion. It was subsequently adopted by the UK Cabinet Office as a framework for secondary survey analyses of social exclusion across the life course (for example, Cusworth et al, 2009; Fahmy et al, 2009; Oroyemi et al, 2009). It comprises three key themes and ten domains of exclusion (as illustrated in Figure 0.1 in the Introduction[2]).

Indicators of exclusion

Table 13.1 presents prevalence estimates for selected social exclusion indicators across each of the B-SEM domains for the UK private household population in 2012. In selecting indicators, we draw inspiration from Townsend's (1979) seminal relative deprivation theory, conceptualising social exclusion as exclusion from activities, lifestyles and opportunities which are customary, or are at least widely encouraged, in the UK today. While Townsend's relative deprivation theory focuses on the exclusionary effects of insufficient command over resources (principally income), the indicators presented below reflect a wider range of social processes which result in the effective exclusion of people from social norms and lifestyles, including social isolation, poor access to services, labour market exclusion, lack of political voice, poor health, poor housing, and harassment and discrimination. As these are indicators rather than measures, we are not suggesting that each can be used to identify the socially excluded in a direct sense. Rather, we suggest they are likely to be associated with exclusion. The prevalence rates vary from 58 per cent who took no action about local
p. 316 problem or national issue (excluding voting) and ↳

Table 13.1: Social exclusion domains and indicators, UK

	Domain	Indicator	%
A. Resources	A1: Material and economic resources	Less than 60% PSE-equivalised median household income AHC	25.2
		Income less than 60% threshold in PSE and Family Resource Survey	18.4
		Has (well) below average living standards	12.7
		Cannot afford 3+ social or material necessities	34.0
		Genuinely feels poor 'all the time'	8.7
		Income a little or a lot below that needed to avoid poverty	25.0
		Has been often/mostly poor across lifetime	10.1
		In arrears on any bills in last year	23.1
		Falling behind with bills	21.6
		Had to borrow money from friends, family or other	22.3
		Cannot afford unanticipated, necessary expense of £500	36.8
		Not a home owner	33.7
	A2: Access to services	Lacks adequate access to 3+ local services	21.4
	A3: Social resources	Low social support (scores less than 15)	15.5
		Less than monthly contact with friends	5.6
		Less than monthly contact with relatives	6.3
		Speaks to less than 3 friends monthly	24.4
		Speaks to less than 3 relatives monthly	29.8
		Not satisfied with personal relationships	16.8
B. Participation	B1: Economic participation	Not in employment	40.6
		No working-age adults in household in paid work	19.1
		Unemployed more than 12 months in last 5 years	8.0
		Not satisfied with current job (in employment only)	14.2
	B2: Social participation	Does not participate in 6+ common social activities	45.8
	B3: Cultural participation, education and skills	Does not use any listed social and cultural facilities	19.6
		Completed full-time education at age 16 or less	52.2
		Limited language skills (non-native English speakers)	2.6
	B4: Political and civic participation	Not member of any group or organisation	43.4
		Took no action about local or national issue (excl. voting)	57.6

			Did not vote in most recent UK general election	42.0
			Low efficacy: disagrees with all three statements	12.1
p. 317	C. Quality of Life	↳ C1: Health and well-being	'(Very) bad' or 'fair' general health	27.2
			Limiting longstanding illness	22.3
			Poor mental health (GHQ greater than 3 on 0-4 scale)	28.7
			Low life satisfaction (less than 6 on 0-10 scale)	20.0
		C2: Housing and local environment	Multiple problems with accommodation	25.3
			Experiencing 3+ neighbourhood problems	24.1
			Home not in 'good' state of repair	31.2
			Dissatisfied with accommodation	11.1
			Neighbourhood dissatisfaction	14.0
		C3: Crime and social harm	Experienced harassment or discrimination for any reason	15.3
			Has criminal record	5.1

Notes: Data for UK adults. AHC = after housing costs.

52 per cent who completed full-time education at or before age 16, to 3 per cent with limited language skills, and 5 per cent of respondents who have a criminal record.

For many of these indicators, it is possible to examine change over the 1999-2012 period, at least for the British sample. Table 13.2 shows the percentage of adults in Britain identified by each of the 27 indicators available for both 1999 and 2012 surveys. While changes in question wording limit comparability for some items, the data show a general picture of worsening exclusion. On resources, the proportion in low-income households remained stable (the first indicator) and the rise in deprivation was not significant but the prevalence of subjective poverty and, especially, financial insecurity (in arrears on bills, having to borrow, lacking home ownership) all increased significantly over this period, as did problems of access to services. On participation, exclusion from economic participation appears broadly stable over this period, but exclusion from social, cultural and civic participation became more widespread on at least one indicator. Quality of life also worsened in relation to mental health problems, as well as problems with poor housing. Across the set of 27 indicators, eleven showed rising exclusion but only one showed significant
p. 318 improvement (social contact with relatives). ↳

Table 13.2: Social exclusion in Britain, 1999 and 2012

Domain	Description	% 1999	%2012	Change	Significance
A1: Material and economic resources	Less than 60% of PSE-equivalised median household income AHC	24.9	25.1	0.2	
	Cannot afford 3+ social and material necessities	31.0	34.0	3.0	
	Genuinely feels poor 'all the time'	6.7	8.7	2.0	
	Income little or lot below that needed to avoid poverty	19.6	24.8	5.2	*
	Has been often/mostly poor across lifetime	8.7	10.2	1.5	
	In arrears on any bills in last year	13.7	23.1	9.4	*
	Had to borrow money from friends, family or other source	11.1	22.2	11.1	*
	Not a home owner	23.6	33.8	10.2	*
A2: Access to services	Lacks adequate access to 3+ local services	12.6	18.1	5.5	*
A3: Social resources	Low social support (scores less than 15)	15.9	15.5	−0.4	
	Less than monthly contact with friends[1]	7.5	5.6	−1.9	
	Less than monthly contact with relatives[1]	8.3	6.4	−1.9	
	Speaks to less than 3 friends monthly[1]	21.7	24.5	2.8	
	Speaks to less than 3 relatives monthly[1]	36.2	30.0	−6.2	
B1: Economic participation	Not in employment	43.6	40.5	−3.1	
	No working-age adults in household in paid work	16.7	19.0	2.3	
B2: Social participation	Does not participate in 6+ common social activities	34.1	45.6	11.5	*
B3: Cultural participation, education and skills	Does not use any listed social and cultural facilities	15.9	19.6	3.7	*
	Completed full-time education at age 16 or less	52.6	52.3	−0.3	
B4: Political & civic participation	Not member of any group or organisation	44.2	43.2	−1.0	
	Did not vote in most recent UK general election	27.6	41.7	14.1	*
↳ C1: Health and well-being	Limiting longstanding illness[1]	23.7	22.3	**−1.4**	*
	Poor mental health (GHQ greater than 3 on 0-4 scale)	18.3	28.8	10.5	*****
C2: Housing and local environment	Multiple problems with accommodation	17.5	25.5	**8.0**	*****

Home not in 'good' state of repair	30.7	**31.4**	**0.7**	
Dissatisfied with accommodation	**7.8**	11.2	**3.4**	*
Neighbourhood dissatisfaction	**14.1**	**14.2**	**0.1**	

Notes: (1) indicates minor changes in question wording between PSE 1999 and PSE-UK 2012 surveys. AHC = after housing costs. No comparable indicators for 'C3: Crime and social harm' domain. Significance p<0.01.

p. 320

Domains and dimensions of exclusion

Theory-driven approach

Two approaches have been adopted to producing summary measures of the domains or dimensions of exclusion. In the first, we take a more theory-driven approach, constructing measures for each of the domains which emerged in the literature review for the B-SEM. We construct an overall B-SEM index as well as scores for each domain, using the 42 items in Table 13.1. For each item, we have chosen a threshold to indicate 'exclusion' so each is a binary measure. We therefore count the number of items on which people are excluded. Our measure reflects prevailing norms, lifestyles and opportunities by weighting the items by their inverse sample prevalence prior to aggregating; in other words, we regard an item as indicating a greater degree of exclusion when relatively few people are in the excluded category. Thus, indicators with a very low prevalence in the sample (for example, criminal record, limited language skills) are weighted more highly than indicators denoting more widespread forms of exclusion (for example, not voting). The overall B-SEM index has a continuous normal distribution.

We then select threshold values for the overall B-SEM index and B-SEM domain scores to facilitate comparisons between domains or between population subgroups (for example, by age, gender). We establish a threshold value for the overall index on statistical grounds at one standard deviation above the sample mean, identifying 17 per cent of households as socially excluded. Whilst this is an arbitrary threshold, it allows us to 'anchor' subsequent descriptive analysis by specifying threshold values for each domain which identify a similar proportion of respondents as excluded.[3]

Empirical approach

Our second approach is to use exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the different dimensions of exclusion empirically. Where the first approach imposes the B-SEM domain structure on the data by constructing scores for each domain, this approach allows the grouping of indicators to emerge from the data to a greater extent, although we still start with a set of measures which try to capture the various aspects identified by the B-SEM. In addition, where the first approach builds scores from binary indicators
p. 321 of exclusion, this approach starts ↳ with continuous scores which try to reflect degrees of advantage or disadvantage across the spectrum, avoiding the use of thresholds.

We construct 18 scores for every adult, drawing on multiple indicators in each case (see the Appendix to this chapter for details). In brief, we first break domains down into multiple sub-domains where the data suggest this is appropriate. For example, the 'Housing and local environment' domain was covered by 29 questions, but these appeared to represent six different sub-domains which were more or less independent. We constructed some domain or sub-domain scores from questions which were only available for specific groups within the population: older people (questions on access to services for this group); working-age adults (questions on employment status and quality of paid work); and families (questions on services for this group and problems with schools or education). For reasons of space, these are not discussed here (see Appendix to this chapter and Bailey and Bramley (2017) for more details).

Using the 18 scores available for all adults, EFA was undertaken to group domains and sub-domains together where appropriate, identifying a smaller number of broader dimensions of exclusion. We did numerous analyses, including additional scores as well as exploring results for various sub-groups (older people, working-age adults, families), and we tested various specifications for the factor solutions (see chapter Appendix for summary). While there is some variation in the number of factors which emerge and in the composition of each, there is also a great deal of stability in underlying patterns. Five factors emerge in almost all the models with a consistent core of components, covering six of the domains of the B-SEM. Each adult is given a factor score for each dimension (mean zero, standard deviation one), with positive scores reflecting higher levels of inclusion (for example, more economic resources or more political participation).

The following shows the descriptive label given to each dimension and summarises the main sub-domains on which each loaded (that is, the sub-domain scores which matter most for the overall factor score) in order of importance:

1. **economic resources and housing (A1/B2/C2)**: economic resources; social activity; (low) housing problems; (low) unpaid childcare;
2. **political, civic and cultural participation (B4/B3/A4)**: political/civic/voluntary activity; cultural activity; educational qualifications; political efficacy;

p. 322

3. ↳ **family and social resources (A3)**: contact with family; social support; contact with friends;
4. **neighbourhood environment (C2)**: (low) neighbourhood dissatisfaction/social problems; (low) neighbourhood problems – physical/litter; (low) neighbourhood noise/pollution;
5. **health and well-being (C1)**: well-being; (low) limiting health/disability.

It is notable how some of these dimensions cross not only domains within the B-SEM but also the broader groupings. The first factor, for example, combines domains from all three of the B-SEM groupings of resources, participation and quality of life. Neighbourhood environment was also closely related to this group (and in some versions of the factor analysis, combined with this factor).

It is also evident that some B-SEM domains do not feature at all (or only very weakly) in these dimensions. Access to services (A2) is absent, reflecting the fact that variations in that measure are not closely related to variations in any of our other exclusion measures. As Chapter 4 shows, access to services is not strongly related to factors such as income or deprivation, in part because of the conscious efforts of policy to ensure a fair distribution of these. In other cases, such as crime and social harm (C3), the absence may reflect limitations of measurement, with very few people recording any instances of harms on our set of indicators. The omission of economic participation (B1) reflects the fact that this is available only for working-age adults: we wanted to use a set of scores covering all adults.

Profiles of social exclusion in the UK

We can use these two approaches to look at variations in forms of social exclusion across the population. Using the first approach, Table 13.3 shows the proportions excluded on each domain. These results reveal that the social patterning of exclusion varies according to the domain in question. This is most obvious in relation to demographic differences. For example, older respondents (aged 65+) are at greater risk of exclusion from cultural participation, education and skills and political and civic participation, as well as exclusion on the grounds of health and well-being. However, they are less vulnerable than younger respondents to exclusion on the basis of material and economic resources or social resources, poor housing and local environments, or crime and social harm. Lone parents and single working-age adults show high levels of exclusion across a range of domains.

Table 13.3: The prevalence of social exclusion by B-SEM domain and selected respondent characteristics

		Proportion excluded on domain:								
		A1: Material and economic resources	**A2: Access to services**	**A3: Social resources**	**B1: Economic participation**	**B2: Social participation**	**B3: Cultural participation, etc.**	**B4: Political and civil participation**	**C1: Health and well-being**	**C a e**
All		17	18	18	15	17	22	24	16	1
Age group	18-29	25	16	17	**21**	16	18	28	10	2
	30-44	22	16	**19**	12	**19**	15	21	12	2
	45-64	15	**19**	**21**	**19**	17	26	19	**19**	1
	65+	5	**19**	15	7	17	29	23_	22	8
Sex	Male	17	17	20	12	15	20	16	15	2
	Female	**19**	17	17	13	**19**	19	19	***11***	2
Family type	Pensioner couple	3	**19**	10	13	13	25	20	19	7
	Pensioner single	9	17	22	7	24	35	28	27	1
	Couple and 1+ child	**18**	16	18	7	**19**	9	12	11	2
	Couple	8	**19**	15	11	11	26	18	11	1
	Lone parent and 1+ child	50	18	25	***YL***	34	14	17	26	3

	Single	24	17	25	28	**18**	27	23	**21**	2
Employment status	Employed	13	16	17	0	12	20	20	8	1
	Unemployed	55	16	28	75	37	22	42	23	2
	Inactive	23	**19**	20	37	22	25	27	29	2
Work intensity	↳ All working-age adults in work	11	15	17	0	11	17	14	8	1
	1+ working-age adult in work	16	17		4		17	16	12	**2**
	No working-age adults in work	**41**	19		69		24	24	34	**3**
	All adults over retirement age	4	**21**	14	1	16	27	22	22	8
Ethnicity	White British	17	18	18	13	17	20	16	***11***	2
	Mixed	23	18		8	27	6	12	22	2
	Asian	16	13	15	12	**19**	20	23	13	1
	Black	44	14	26	13	25	18	17	14	3
	Other		13	23	11	13	23	25	11	**2**
Occupational class	Employers; professional higher managerial/	3	14	18	0	4	17	8	5	7

	Lower managerial/professional	7	14	16	0	8	15	10	6	1
	Intermediate	10	17	15	0	12	22	18	7	1
	Small employers/own account	14	18	16	0	20	23	32	10	**2**
	Lower supervisory and technical	14	20	16	0	16	23	24	7	2
	Semi-routine	23	17	17	0	16	17	29	11	**2**
	Routine		18	**1!**	0	24		38	10	2
Settlement type	Urban areas	20	13		13	18	20	18	16	2
	Rural/sparsely populated areas	10	32		12	14	19	14	16	1
Housing tenure	Owner occupier	4	***11***	**15**	7	***11***		***11***	***11***	**1**
	Social renter	52	***11***	26	26	34	25	28	32	3
	Private renter	37	**16**	29	**19**	28	20	24	***11***	3
	Other	5	**51**		**14**	**15**	**12**	***11***	27	**1**

Notes: Underlining shows values above average for population as a whole, i.e. greater than the value in 'All' row at top of table. Breakdown by occupational class is only for those 18-79. Economic participation refers to labour market engagement (workless households). Respondents with occupational class data are, by definition, not living in workless households.

p. 323 In general, groups identified by socio-economic status (for example, occupational class, worklessness, or housing tenure) show more consistent relationships with exclusion than those defined by demographic differences (for example, of age, gender, family type, and ethnicity). For example, social renters and, to a slightly lesser extent, private renters have above average levels of exclusion on almost every single domain – the exception being access to services. Those in routine occupations are above average on six out of nine domains. The economically disadvantaged are consistently and significantly more vulnerable to nearly all forms of disadvantage covered by the B-SEM domains. One partial exception here are those identified as small employers or own account works, that is the self-employed. This group has below average levels of exclusion in terms of material or economic resources (A1) but is above average on four of the other domains, covering three of the four participation domains as well as housing and living environment.

For comparison, Table 13.4 shows the factor scores for the five dimensions obtained using the second approach, with broadly similar results. Looking at variations by age, for example, we see some dimensions where younger adults have greater risks of exclusion, most notably in relation to economic resources and housing but also neighbourhood environment. By contrast, older people have greater exclusion risks in relation to civic and cultural participation, while the middle aged are more excluded in relation to family and social resources. Health and well-being as measured in this approach are not as clearly related to age. Gender differences do emerge more clearly, with women's greater risks of economic exclusion and men's greater risks of exclusion through weak family and social resources more evident.

Table 13.4: Social exclusion factor scores by selected respondent characteristics

		Economic resources and housing (A1/B2/C2)	Civic/cultural participation (B4/B3/A4)	Family and social resources (A3)	Neighbourhood environment (C2)	Health and well-being (C1)
All	All	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Age	18-29	–0.46	–0.01	0.03	–0.25	**0**
	30-44	–0.33	0.06	–0.08	–0.12	0.04
	45-64	0.17	0.03	–0.04	0.07	–0.04
	65+	0.52	–0.11	**0.15**	0.24	**0**
	Male	0.06	0.03	**–0.11**	**0**	**0**
	Female	–0.06	–0.02	**0.1**	**0**	**0**
Household type	Pensioner couple	0.51	–0.02	**0.2**	0.22	0.12
	Pensioner single	0.46	–0.23	0.08	0.26	–0.17
	Couple and 1+ child	**–0.5**	0.11	0.01	**–0.2**	0.16
	Couple	0.21	0.04	–0.05	0.01	0.06
	Lone parent and 1+ child	–1.02	–0.29	–0.06	–0.34	–0.38
	Single	–0.19	**–0.2**	–0.37	–0.11	–0.51
	Other	**0.14**	0.16	0.04	0.09	**0.1**

Employment status (working age only)	Employed	−0.04	0.12	−0.03	−0.01	0.18
	Unemployed	−0.86	−0.36	−0.08	−0.45	−0.57
	Inactive	−0.42	−0.13	**−0.12**	−0.23	−0.49
Household work intensity	↳ 0	−0.82	−0.58	−0.28	−0.42	−1.04
	<0.4	−0.7	−0.1	−0.16	−0.63	−0.4
	0.4 to 0.8	−0.2	0.07	0.03	−0.02	0.15
	0.8 to 0.99	−0.02	0.18	−0.15	−0.04	0.14
	1.0	0.07	0.11	−0.09	0	0.17
	Pensioner household	0.49	−0.09	0.16	0.24	0.02
Ethnic group	White	0.02	0	0.02	0	0.01
	Asian/Asian British	−0.06	0.03	−0.08	0.01	−0.02
	Black/Black British	−0.61	−0.08	−0.3	−0.17	−0.27
	Other	−0.39	0.19	−0.37	−0.17	−0.09
Occupational class	Employers and higher managerial/professional	0.27	0.5	−0.11	0.12	0.38
	Lower managerial/professional	0.09	0.43	−0.05	0.03	0.32
	Intermediate	0.03	0.08	0.04	−0.02	0.19

	Small employers/own account	−0.12	−0.13	−0.02	0.04	0.05
	Lower supervisory/technical	−0.14	−0.15	0	−0.08	0.2
	Semi-routine	−0.26	−0.23	0.09	−0.09	0.04
	Routine	−0.27	−0.41	−0.05	0.03	−0.04
Urban-rural (4 cat, UK)	Large urban	−0.05	0.01	−0.04	−0.09	−0.03
	Other urban	−0.04	−0.09	−0.01	−0.03	−0.04
	Small town	0.13	0.04	0.11	0.24	0.05
	Village, rural	0.19	0.15	0.08	0.25	0.2
Tenure	Owner occupier	0.26	0.16	0.07	0.11	0.2
	Social rented	−0.63	−0.46	−0.13	−0.28	−0.58
	Private rented	−0.49	−0.12	−0.23	−0.17	−0.17

Notes: Breakdown by employment status is for working-age only, and by occupational class is for 18-79 only.

With household type, there is a general sense of a gradient from pensioners (single or couple) who face the lowest exclusion risks through to lone parents and single adults of working age who face the highest risks, as the previous approach also identified. Couples, with or without children, are somewhere in between. This is particularly stark in relation to the economic resources and housing dimension and the neighbourhood environment dimension, but also social resources. There are further domains where lone parents and single adults share greater risks of exclusion with pensioners, all being worse than the couple households: health and well-being, and political and civic participation, notably.

With markers of socio-economic status, we see a similar picture to the previous approach. Those in higher
p. 326 status occupations enjoy far lower risks of exclusion not just on the economic resources and ↳

p. 324 ↳

p. 328 housing, and related neighbourhood domains but also on civic and cultural participation, and on health and well-being, although they do not have advantages in relation to family and social resources. The greatest levels of exclusion are for renters, especially social renters, and for those in routine and semi-routine occupations while the high levels of exclusion in more urban centres are also apparent, although it is in other urban areas that civic and cultural exclusion is greatest.

Relationships between domains of exclusion

Table 13.5 shows the pattern of association between the ten B-SEM domains. For each domain, it shows the risk of exclusion across the other nine domains for 'excluded' respondents relative to 'non-excluded' respondents (that is, the relative risk ratio). The domains have been sorted by their association with material and economic resources (A1). The strongest relationships are between the domains of material resources, economic and social participation, housing and local environment, and health and well-being. These emerge as closely related in the factor analysis approach with several of these domains combined into a single dimensions there.

Table 13.5: Relationships between domains of social exclusion, relative risk ratios

	A1: Material and economic resources	B2: Social participation	C2: Housing and local environment	C1: Health and well-being	B1: Economic participation	C3: Crime and social harm	B4: Political and civil participation	A3: Social resources	B3: Cultural participation, etc.	A2: Access to services
A1: Material and economic resources	..	1.76	1.59	1.41	1.37	1.31	1.23	1.22	1.08	1.06
B2: Social participation	1.79	..	1.32	1.43	1.23	1.17	1.38	1.33	1.20	1.06
C2: Housing and local environment	1.51	1.31	..	1.16	1.10	1.23	1.03	1.16	[1.00]	1.05
C1: Health and well-being	1.49	1.47	1.19	..	1.34	1.27	1.17	1.37	**1.21**	1.10
B1: Economic participation	1.58	**1.24**	1.16	1.34	..	1.28	1.29	1.18	1.09	1.03
C3: Crime and social harm	1.29	**1.15**	1.22	1.22	1.23	..	0.96	**1.21**	[0.99]	1.04
B4: Political and civic participation	1.24	1.25	1.04	**1.11**	1.18	0.97	..	1.09	1.28	0.98

A3: Social resources	1.21	1.31	1.16	1.30	1.16	1.21	1.12	..	**1.11**	1.05
B3: Cultural participation, etc.	1.07	**1.15**	[1.00]	**1.15**	1.05	[0.99]	**1.24**	1.09	..	1.07
A2: Access to services	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.09	1.02	1.04	0.98	1.05	1.08	..
Mean number of exclusions	3.6	4.1	3	4.1	3.8	3.4	3.2	3.6	2.8	2.3

At the other extreme, the domain of access to services is barely associated with any of the others. It not only has the lowest association with material and economic resources but also shows very little relationship with any of the other domains. This reinforces the idea that it has a very different and particular set of drivers, primarily rural location. This is of course well recognised in the literature on rural disadvantage, as Chapter 10 in the companion volume shows (Bailey and Gannon 2017). The domain of cultural participation, education and skills also has relatively weak associations. It has most positive relationships with social participation, health and well-being, and political and civic participation. Again, several of these domains get combined in the factor analysis approach.

For comparison, Table 13.6 shows the correlations between the social exclusion dimensions produced using factor analysis. Since these factors are already groups of domains in some cases, this shows relationships at an even broader level. The strongest associations are between economic resources and neighbourhood, and between health and well-being and civic and cultural participation. In other respects, the dimensions appear relatively independent, with very little association between neighbourhood environment and civic or cultural participation, and rather weak associations between family and social resources and both economic
p. 329 resources and housing, and civic and cultural participation. ↳

Table 13.6: Relationships between dimensions of exclusion, factor score correlations

	Economic resources and housing	Neighbourhood environment	Health and well-being	Civic and cultural participation	Family and social resources
Economic resources and housing	1	0.52	0.38	0.22	0.18
Neighbourhood environment		1	0.27	0.07	0.25
Health well-being and			1	0.52	0.45
Civic and cultural participation				1	0.18
Family and social resources					1

Notes: [] indicates 95% Cl spans 0. Estimates show the relative risk (by column) for each B-SEM domain (by rows). For example, for respondents excluded on material and economic resources (A1), they are 76% more likely (1:1.76) to experience exclusion on social participation (B2). Since these are *relative* risk estimates,
p. 330 their distribution is not symmetrical. ↳

Relationships between exclusion and poverty

The previous section has shown how lack of material resources is associated with many but not all domains of exclusion. To make the relationships with clearer, we explore here the relationships with various measures of poverty. Poverty is often measured using income poverty measures and indicators of deprivation, and these are of course both components of the B-SEM domain representing material and economic resources described above. We examine four measures of poverty (see the Introduction for details):

- **relative low income**: respondents living in households with incomes less than 60% per cent equivalised median after housing costs;
- **deprivation**: respondents unable to afford three or more consensually-defined social and material necessities;
- **PSE poverty**: respondents classified as poor on both income and deprivation measures;
- **subjective poverty**: respondents reporting incomes 'a little' or 'a lot below' that needed to avoid poverty.

Table 13.7 shows the proportion of PSE adult respondents who were excluded on each domain by poverty
p. 331 status on each of our four measures. Not surprisingly, the greatest differences are for levels of ↳

Table 13.7: Levels of exclusion on domains by poverty status

Poverty status		Proportion excluded on domain:									
		A1: Material and economic resources	**A2: Access to services**	**A3: Social resources**	**B1: Economic participation**	**B2: Social participation**	**B3: Cultural participation, etc.**	**B4: Political and civil participation**	**C1: Health and well-being**	**C2: Housing and local environment**	**C3: Crime and social harm**
Low income AHC	No	13	19	25	19	18	**17**	**17**	23	**24**	16
	Yes	75	21	40	52	45	**29**	**32**	39	**45**	26
	Diff	***62***	***2***	75	33	***27***	***12***	**75**	***16***	***21***	***10***
Deprivation	No	**2**	16	21	14	9	**21**	**15**	15	17	13
	Yes	**61**	22	38	43	41	**22**	**28**	40	43	30
	Diff	***59***	6	77	***29***	***32***	**7**	**73**	***25***	***26***	77
PSE poor	No	8	18	24	14	**14**	**20**	**17**	19	19	15
	Yes	75	21	39	57	**47**	**24**	**31**	43	49	31
	Diff	***67***	3	75	43	***33***	**4**	**74**	***24***	30	***16***
Subjective poverty	No	9	16	25	18	**14**	**20**	**16**	**17**	24	16
	Yes	75	25	38	49	**47**	**23**	**32**	**48**	43	30
	Diff	***66***	9	73	37	**33**	**3**	***16***	**37**	***19***	74

Notes: Figures show the proportion excluded on each domain using the thresholds for each noted above. AHC = after housing costs.

p. 332 exclusion on the material and economic resources domain, whichever measure of poverty is used. For example, of those PSE-deprived (lacking three or more necessities), 61 per cent were excluded on this domain compared with just 2 per cent of those not deprived. Poverty also has strong relationships with both economic and social participation, as well as the quality of life domains. There are much weaker relationships with other domains, including services exclusion, cultural participation and social resources.

Table 13.8 presents a similar analysis using the factor analysis approach, showing average scores for each of the five dimensions by poverty status; lower scores indicate a higher degree of exclusion. As previously, the poor experience greater levels of exclusion whichever poverty measure we use and whichever dimension of exclusion we examine. but the strength of the relationships varies considerably. The gap between poor and non-poor is greatest in relation to the economic resources and housing dimension, although differences in health and well-being are also substantial. Differences are least in relation to family and social resources.

Table 13.8: Levels of exclusion on dimensions by poverty status

Poverty status		Economic resources and housing	Civic and cultural participation	Family and social resources	Neighbourhood environment	Health and well-being
Low income AHC	No	0.18	0.12	0.03	0.08	0.16
	Yes	−0.67	−0.44	−0.12	−0.31	−0.59
	Diff	*−0.85*	*−0.56*	*−0.15*	*−0.39*	*−0.75*
Deprivation	No	0.43	0.21	0.08	0.18	0.3
	Yes	−0.9	−0.44	−0.16	−0.38	−0.63
	Diff	*−1.33*	*−0.65*	*−0.24*	*−0.56*	*−0.93*
PSE poor	No	0.3	0.14	0.05	0.13	0.21
	Yes	−1.07	−0.52	−0.19	−0.46	−0.77
	Diff	*−1.37*	*−0.66*	*−0.24*	*−0.59*	*−0.98*
Subjective poverty	No	0.38	0.2	0.09	0.17	0.29
	Yes	−0.78	−0.41	−0.18	−0.34	−0.59
	Diff	*−1.16*	*−0.61*	*−0.27*	*−0.51*	*−0.88*

Notes: Figures show the mean factor score for each group on each dimension. Factors scores have mean zero and standard deviation one. Negative scores indicate greater exclusion. AHC = after housing costs.

p. 333

Conclusion

As a concept, social exclusion appears to be less salient in the late 2010s than it was in the 2000s, at least in UK and European public and social policy discourses. The UK Social Exclusion Unit was downgraded and subsequently dissolved well before the end of the Labour government in 2010. In the European Union, social exclusion has become associated with the 2020 Poverty and Social Exclusion strategy, which has narrowed the target to evaluating progress in relation to three indicators – the at-risk-of-poverty measure (low income), material deprivation (lacking three or more items) and low household work intensity.

However, whilst the term is less visible in policy discussions or documents, the concept remains highly germane, not least to contemporary debates about quality of life, well-being, life satisfaction and happiness. A growing body of UK evidence on the connections between subjective and societal well-being, quality of life, and life satisfaction now exists (for example, ONS, 2016; NEF, 2009; Donovan and Halpern, 2002). This also reflects wider international interest in the empirical measurement of these concepts (Kahnemann and Krueger, 2006; Diener and Suh, 1997) and in their policy applications (for example, Eurostat, 2015; OECD, 2011; Layard, 2011; Stiglitz et al, 2009). This 'well-being' agenda has become increasingly prominent in policy rhetoric, including in right-leaning UK policy circles, because of the UK National Well-being Programme launched in 2010 and then Prime Minister Cameron's avowed commitment to 'measuring our progress as a country not just by our standard of living but by our quality of life' (Cameron, 2010).

At the same time, social exclusion remains critically relevant in understanding the unequal distribution of life opportunities and prospects that informs the current (2015-2017) government's new Life Chances Strategy and the wider suite of (non-statutory) indicators of life chances the government intends to develop. In January 2016, the then Prime Minister's speech setting out the principles for this strategy repeated his pledge of an 'all-out assault on poverty' and talked of a 'more social approach' (Cameron, 2016). As with well-being, many of the key concerns prompting action on life chances and social mobility overlap with the social exclusion agenda, for example, in relation to the priorities underpinning the Life Chances Strategy: family life and the early years; improving the education system, including expanding National Citizen Service; promoting opportunity for everyone, including through work experience,
p. 334 mentoring, community arts, ↳ and urban regeneration; and helping people in crisis (for example, addiction, poor mental health).

What then can these data tell us then about the nature of the challenges facing government in acting to promote social well-being, quality of life, and greater opportunities for all? First, although we have only a limited range of comparable indicators in the 1999 and 2012 PSE surveys, they suggest that the prevalence of different aspects of social exclusion in Britain have mostly either remained constant or have increased, sometimes significantly, over this period. Financial insecurity and financial hardship have become much more widespread, due to the recession and ensuing unequal growth, combined with austerity. Compared with 1999, social, cultural and political participation seem to have diminished, and mental health and housing problems also appear to have become more widespread. As with poverty, vulnerability to social exclusion remains strongly socially patterned, although the risks vary across domains.

Second, poverty remains strongly associated with almost all aspects of social exclusion. This is most evident for social resources, social participation and quality of life measures. Indeed, the association with material resources may be stronger in 2012 than in 1999 because it is no longer the case, as it was in the 1999 PSE study, that lack of social support is more prevalent among the non-poor.

Third, these data begin to shed some light on the dimensional structure of social exclusion. In addition to constrained material circumstances, limited social resources (networks, contact, support), economic and social non-participation, and poor health and wellbeing seem especially central to the experience of social exclusion in Britain. Despite the evidence of overlaps between poverty and exclusion, we believe there is still a strong case for considering other dimensions of social exclusion in poverty studies. Income poverty and deprivation do not give the whole picture. This chapter has shown that there are many people who are not poor or deprived yet who experience exclusion on other one or more domains.

Social exclusion thus describes a range of interconnected but discrete processes including material impoverishment, as well as social isolation, discrimination, poor heath and lack of voice, which limit people's capacity to fully participate in society in the ways envisaged within Townsend's classic definition of deprivation (Townsend, 1979). As such, we believe that the concept of social exclusion can enrich our understanding of the processes driving the effective marginalisation of substantial numbers of people from contemporary norms of social, cultural, economic and political participation in the UK, and the ↳

opportunities and lifestyles to which they give rise. Critics have rightly been sceptical about the ways in which the concept of social exclusion has often been misapplied in policy making to obscure the persistence of material inequalities and the maldistribution of resources that underpins it. Whilst these are valid criticisms, they do not amount in our view amount to a case for abandoning the study of social exclusion in its entirety, but rather should serve as an impetus to future research in this area.

Notes

1 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, *Launching a consultation on a European Pillar of Social Rights*, Strasbourg, COM(2016) 127 final.

2 In this chapter, we revert back to the original version of the B-SEM produced by Levitas et al (2007). As the Introduction notes, this underwent some revision in the development of the PSE-UK survey.

3 Threshold values (percentage excluded on B-SEM domain) are as follows: A1: Material and economic resources 1.50 (17.4%); A2: Access to services 0.36 (17.1%); A3: Social resources 0.45 (16.5%); B1: Economic participation 0.41 (12.4%); B2: Social participation 2.53 (17.5%); B3: Cultural participation, education & skills 1.65 (19.6%); B4: Political & civic participation 1.12 (17.0%); C1: Health & well-being 0.50 (14.9%); C2: Housing & local environment 0.57 (19.5%); C3: Crime & social harm 0.05 (15.3%).

References

Bailey, N. and Bramley, G. (2017), 'Introduction', in G. Bramley, and N. Bailey (eds) *Poverty and social exclusion in the UK: volume 2 – the dimensions of disadvantage*, Bristol: Policy Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Bailey, N. and Gannon, M. (2017) 'More similarities than differences: poverty and social exclusion in rural and urban populations', in E. Dermott and G. Main (eds) *Poverty and social exclusion in the UK: volume 1 – the nature and extent of the problem*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 219-238.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Barnes, M. (2005) *Social exclusion in Great Britain: An empirical investigation and comparison with the EU*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Bradshaw, J. (2004) 'How has the notion of social exclusion developed in the European discourse?', *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 14(2), 168-86.
Google Scholar WorldCat

p. 336 Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (1999), 'Social exclusion in Britain, 1991-1995', *Social Policy and Administration*, 33(3), 227-44.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (2002) 'Degrees of exclusion: developing a dynamic, multidimensional measure', in J. Hills et al (eds) *Understanding social exclusion*, Oxford: OUP.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Byrne, D. (1999) *Social exclusion*, Buckingham: OUP.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Cameron, D. (2010) 'PM speech on wellbeing', a transcript of a speech given by the Prime Minister on wellbeing on 25 November 2010, London: Cabinet Office.

Cameron, D. (2016) '*Prime Minister's speech on life chances*', 11 January 2016, https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prime-ministers-speech-on-life-chances.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Cusworth, L., Bradshaw, J., Coles, B., Keung, A. and Chzhen, Y. (2009) *Understanding social exclusion across the life course: Youth and young adulthood*, London: Social Exclusion Task Force, Cabinet Office.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Dermott, E. and Main, G. (2017) *Poverty and social exclusion in the UK: volume 1 – the nature and extent of the problem*, Bristol: Policy Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Diener E. and Suh, E. (1997) 'Measuring quality of life: economic, social and subjective indicators', *Social Indicators Research*, 40: 189-216.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Donovan R. and Halpern D. (2002) *Life satisfaction: The state of knowledge and implications for government policy*, London: Cabinet Office Strategy Unit.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Duffy, K. (2005), *Social exclusion and human dignity in Europe*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Eurostat (2015), *Quality of life indicators*, Online publication, ISSN 2443-8219, http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Quality_of_life_indicators.
WorldCat

Fahmy, E., Gordon, D. and Patsios, D. (2009) *Understanding social exclusion across the life course: Working age adults without dependent children*, London: Cabinet Office.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Fairclough, N. (2000) *New Labour, new language*, London: Routledge.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Fraser, N. (1995) 'From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age', *New Left Review*, 212: 68-93.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Gordon, D. et al (2000) *Poverty and social exclusion in Britain*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Honneth, A. and Fraser, N. (2003) *Redistribution or recognition? A political-philosophical exchange*, London: Verso.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Kahneman, D. and Krueger, A. (2006) 'Developments in the measurement of subjective well-being', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(1): 3-24.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Layard, R. (2011) *Happiness: Lessons from a new science* (2nd edn), London: Penguin.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Levitas, R. (1998) *The inclusive society: Social exclusion and New Labour*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Levitas, R. (2006) 'The concept and measurement of social exclusion', in Gordon et al (eds) *Poverty and social exclusion in Britain*, Bristol: Policy Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Levitas R., Pantazis C., Fahmy E., Gordon D., Lloyd E. and Patsios D. (2007) *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*, Bristol: University of Bristol.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Lister, R. (2002) 'A politics of recognition and respect: involving people with experience of poverty in decision making that affects their lives', *Social Policy and Society*, 1(1): 37-46.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Lister, R. (2004) *Poverty*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Lister, R. (2007) 'From object to subject: including marginalised citizens in policy making', *Policy and Politics*, 35(3): 437-55.
Google Scholar WorldCat

Madanipour, A., Cars G. and Allen, J. (1998) *Social exclusion in European cities*, London: Jessica Kingsley.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

NEF (New Economics Foundation) (2009) *National accounts of wellbeing*, London: New Economics Foundation.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

OECD (2011) *Compendium of well-being indicators*, Paris: OECD.

Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2016) *Measuring national well-being: Life in the UK, 2016*, London: ONS.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Oroyemi, P., Damioli, G., Barnes, M. and Crosier, T. (2009) *Understanding the risks of social exclusion across the life course: Families with children*, London: Social Exclusion Task Force, UK Cabinet Office.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Room, G. (1995) *Beyond the threshold: The measurement and analysis of social exclusion*, Bristol: Policy Press.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

SEU (Social Exclusion Unit) (2004) *Breaking the cycle: Taking stock of progress and priorities for the future. A report by the Social Exclusion Unit September 2004*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Silver, H. (1994) 'Social exclusion and social solidarity: three paradigms', *International Labour Review*, 133(5-6).
Google Scholar WorldCat

Silver, H. (2007) *The process of social exclusion: The dynamics of an evolving concept*, Chronic Poverty Research Centre, Rhode Island, USA: Brown University.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Stiglitz J., Sen A. and Fitoussi J-P. (2009) *Report of the Commission on Economic Performance and Social Progress*, http://www.stiglitz-sen-fitoussi.fr/en/index.htm.
WorldCat

Taylor, M., Berthoud R. and Jenkins S. (2004) *Low income and multiple disadvantage 1991-2001. Analysis of the British Household Panel Survey*, London: Social Exclusion Unit/Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, London: Allen Lane and Penguin Books.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Walker, A. and Walker, C. (1997) 'Poverty and social exclusion in Europe', in A. Walker and C. Walker (eds) *Britain divided*, London: Child Poverty Action Group.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Appendix: Factor analysis for multidimensional social exclusion

With this approach, the aim was to combine measures to capture levels of inclusion or exclusion in relation to each domain of the B-SEM as fully as possible, and then to use these scores to explore the multidimensional nature of exclusion. The approach had two stages, described much more fully in Bailey and Bramley (2017). In the first, exploratory factor analysis and other techniques were used to identify questions which could be grouped together to provide fewer and more continuous measures for each domain or sub-domain. At times, factor analysis was used to confirm that a group of questions reflected a single latent variable or factor, but the questions were then combined using simple averages because they were all measured on the same scale (for example, for 'A3: Social Support', we used the average of scores on seven questions on this topic). At other times, factor analysis was also used to produce the combined score (for example, for 'A1: Economic Resources').

We did not assume that the questions in the survey which had been designed to capture a particular domain did indeed form a single, coherent group. Rather we sought to check whether this was the case using exploratory factor analyses. Where these suggested multiple factors were present, we split the domain into sub-domains. For example, analysis of the questions in the survey designed to capture the 'C2: Living Environment' domain from the B-SEM suggested multiple different factors, for both housing and neighbourhood elements.

In the second stage, factor analysis was used on the set of domain and sub-domain scores to explore whether the domains of the B-SEM could be reduced to a smaller set of factors. This is an inherently subjective approach. Results are affected by choices made about the specification of the factor solution, for example. We conducted some sensitivity testing using different specifications, but ultimately used a specification which permitted factors to correlate ('oblimin'). There was also an iterative process of refining the domain and sub-domain scores in the first stage after examination of initial results from the second stage suggested problems with multi-collinearity.

Some variables are measures for all individuals but others only for the household. In the latter case, these
p. 339 are attributed to all members of the ↳ household. Some variables are measured only for those of working age or in paid work or only for older people, so models which include these must be restricted to sub-groups of the population. These restricted measures do not therefore form part of the final model reported in the chapter although they were used in exploratory analyses.

Three domain scores emerge as having very little relationship with the others and hence only weakly correlated with any of the factors emerging in the results. These were: 'A2: Access to services', 'C3: Criminal record' and 'C3: Fear of Crime'. There were dropped from the final model. The final model was based on a
p. 340 set of 18 domain and sub-domain measures available for all individuals. ↳

Table A13.1: Sub-domain scores and indicators for factor analysis

Domains/sub-domains	Components/questions
A1 Economic resources	Factors score from:
	Income (log) [equivalised, AHC]
	Income 1yr ago (log) [equivalised, AHC]
	Adult deprivation [lacking PSE adult/household necessities]
	Debt: mortgage/rent arrears etc
	Debt: credit arrears etc
	Debt: money lender etc
	Subjective poverty [average from three questions]
	Luxuries [count of seven luxury items]
	Quality of items [average across seven items]
A3 Social support	Average from seven questions on social support (perceived)
A3 Contact with family	Combine ordinal qns on (i) frequency and (ii) number of contacts
A3 Contact with friends	Combine ordinal qns on (i) frequency and (ii) number of contacts
A4 Education	Highest qual (patched from hhld if missing)
B1 Participation in unpaid childcare	Banded hours on childcare
B2 Participation in social activity	Count of activities done or not wanted (excl. necessities items)
B3 Participation in cultural activity	Count of cultural activities from seven qns
B4 Participation in civic, political or voluntary activity	Factor score from:
	Civic participation [no. memberships of organisations]
	Political participation [no. of political actions taken]
	Volunteering [no. of hours volunteering]
p. 341 ↳ B4 Political efficacy	Average from three qns on sense of political efficacy
C1 Well-being	*Factor score from*:
	–Well–being: day-to-day [one qn]
	–Well-being: community [one qn]
	–Well-being: life [one qn]
	– Shame [two qns]
	– Mental health [GHQ12]
C1 Limiting health problems or disability	*Factor score from*:
	General health [one qn]

	Health/disab limiting [poor health/disability and limiting]
C2 Housing dissat/space prob	Overall satisfaction
C2 Housing repair prob	Disrepair qn and five qns on problems with dwelling conditions
C2 Housing heating prob	Seven qns on problems with costs of heating home
C2 Neighbourhood – dissatis/social prob	Overall satisfaction and six qns on social problems
C2 Neighbourhood – noise/pollution	Three qns on noise or pollution
C2 Neighbourhood – phys prob/litter	Five qns on physical environment, litter, etc.

Notes: An additional domain (A4: cultural resources) has been added to the B-SEM framework for this element while two domains (A2: access to services and C3: crime and social harm) are omitted from the final analysis. AHC = after housing costs. ↳