



Centre for Research in Social Policy

ANNUAL REPORT 2002/2003

***EXCELLENCE
IN
INDEPENDENT
SOCIAL POLICY
RESEARCH AND
EVALUATION***

CRSP 486
ISBN 0 94683 127 0
ISSN 0969-8914

CONTACT DETAILS

NAME	TITLE	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE
Laura Adelman	Research Associate	L.P.A.Adelman@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3392
Nigel Bilsbrough	Finance & Resources Manager	J.N.Bilsbrough@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3381
Andreas Cebulla	Assistant Director	A.J.Cebulla@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3374
Lynne Cox	Research Assistant	L.A.M.Cox@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3677
Abigail Davis	Research Assistant	A.A.I.Davis@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3369
Sandra Reyes de Beaman	Research Fellow	S.De-Beaman@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3785
Barbara Dobson	Research Fellow	B.M.Dobson@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3785
Emma Gregory	Project Administrator	E.Gregory@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3372
Yvette Hartfree	Research Associate	Y.F.Hartfree@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3377
Katherine Hill	Research Associate	K.R.Hill@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3385
Karen Kellard	Assistant Director	K.V.Kellard@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3389
Rita Khatri	Project Administrator	R.Khatri@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3372
Kate Legge	Research Associate	K.E.Legge@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3373
Siobhan MacDonald	Research Student	S.MacDonald@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3674
Sue Maguire	Research Fellow	S.Maguire@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3673
Sue Middleton	Director	S.Middleton@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 2059
Kim Perren	Research Associate	K.Perren@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3378
Joanne Rennison	Research Associate	J.H.Rennison@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3617
Simon Roberts	Research Fellow	S.Roberts@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3876
Phil Sadler	IT Technician	P.Sadler@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3375
Nicola Selby	Project Administrator	N.A.Selby@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3618
Noel Smith	Research Associate	N.D.Smith@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3786
Bruce Stafford	Director	B.R.Stafford@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3784
Liz Sutton	Research Associate	E.A.Sutton@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3679
Sharon Walker	Office Co-ordinator	S.Walker@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3618

Centre for Research in Social Policy
 Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK.
 Telephone +44 (0)1509 223372 Fax +44 (0)1509 213409
www.crsp.ac.uk

CONTENTS

PREFACE	2
CRSP PROJECTS BY THEME	
ADMINISTRATION OF BENEFITS AND SERVICES	5
POLICY EVALUATION	9
POVERTY, SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND THE LIFE COURSE	17
WORK AND WELFARE TRAJECTORIES	25
STAFF PROFILES	31
STAFF CHANGES	38
EVENTS ATTENDED, PRESENTATIONS AND VISITORS TO CRSP	39
PUBLICATIONS AND CRSP WORKING PAPERS	43
CONTACT DETAILS	45

PREFACE

Informing Policy

Social policy research in the UK continues to flourish and to be influential in the formulation and delivery of policies and programmes. Focusing on 'what works' has become paramount for government and other organisations. Indeed, an ever-increasing number of organisations appear to appreciate the value of high quality applied social research in informing their decision-making. The social research produced by the Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) during the course of 2002/3 has provided valuable evidence for policy makers and managers in central government departments and their agencies, charities, the European Commission and local community organisations.

All research undertaken by CRSP is, by definition, 'policy relevant' and much of our work is of direct and immediate relevance to government policy, particularly:

- the formal evaluations of national and local programmes that we undertake, such as of the New Deal for Disabled People and of a local Sure Start scheme;
- the exploration of responses of organisations and individuals to social issues, for instance, employers' responses to forthcoming changes to disability anti-discrimination legislation.

However, it is equally important for organisations such as ours to be involved in policy development, undertaking research which, whilst of less immediate policy relevance, identifies and explores new or under-researched social phenomena and problems in order to propose innovative or different policy solutions. Currently, our research is exploring the previously under-researched social problem of severe and persistent childhood poverty in Britain. Internationally, for example, we continue our work with the University of Leuven to explore the adequacy of European minimum income systems. These are just two examples of work in CRSP which, as with some of our earlier work, we hope will eventually have an impact on policy at both the national and international levels.

The Need for Policy Dialogue

Social policy research can be enhanced and made more effective where those conducting research are able to engage in a regular dialogue and exchange of information and ideas with the users of research, often policy makers. Staff at CRSP welcome such exchanges and are active in giving seminars and presentations where policy makers and others can discuss research findings. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon both the social policy research community and research users to find other effective means of feeding social policy research into policy and practice. Staff at centres like CRSP have a wealth of detailed knowledge about 'what works', which we believe is currently not sufficiently exploited by policy makers outside of the formal research commissioning process, which can be often slow and bureaucratic. Some form of funded academic 'response services' is required whereby researchers can make available their expertise and knowledge.

The Centre and its Programmes

The Centre continues to organise its research programme under four headings:

- administration of benefits and services
- policy evaluation
- poverty and social exclusion
- work and welfare trajectories.

This Annual Report is organised around these four themes, although there are obviously many intellectual, methodological and policy links and overlaps.

The Work and Welfare Trajectories theme is to be renamed Welfare and Life Transitions to reflect more accurately the research undertaken, which is wider than simply changes in people's employment status.

Methodologically, the Centre utilises both so called quantitative and qualitative research methods in its research. A strength of the Centre, in terms of policy relevance, is that its staff can combine both approaches; there are no artificial internal organisational barriers or separate teams in CRSP that can serve to hinder the process of inquiry.

During the year all staff at the Centre attended an 'Away Day'. This provided an opportunity to reflect on the substantive content of our research programme, future directions and the ways in which we work. Following the Away Day the Centre has amended some of its staff development procedures, which further substantiate the Centre's commitment to providing a career for social researchers.

The Centre continues to be supported by a vibrant and informative Consultative Committee comprising external representatives as well as senior colleagues from within the University. The Committee has looked at our marketing strategy and links with the Department of Social Sciences and continues to reflect on our main research themes.

Karl Ashworth

This year we said farewell to Karl Ashworth, Head of Statistical Resources, who has joined the Office for National Statistics. Karl first joined CRSP in 1991, and over the years has made a significant contribution to many projects, including the evaluations of Jobseeker's Allowance, Education Maintenance Allowances and New Deal for Disabled People. However, perhaps more important are the contributions that Karl has made to social policy research as a discipline. Karl was one of the first researchers in the UK to apply dynamic analytic techniques to the study of longitudinal survey data in his work on the US Panel Study of Income Dynamics and to administrative data in his study of Family Credit recipients for the then Department of Social Security. Over the years he has also cascaded his knowledge and experiences, developing the quantitative skills of numerous young social researchers, and thereby expanding the pool of competent analysts of which our profession is so short. We wish him well in his new career.





ADMINISTRATION OF BENEFITS & SERVICES

JOBCENTRE PLUS – QUALITATIVE EVALUATION	6
JOBCENTRE PLUS – PERSONAL ADVISER TRAINING	7
JOBCENTRE PLUS – DEFERRALS	7
PREPARATION FOR 2004 CHANGES: EMPLOYERS' AND SERVICE PROVIDERS' RESPONSES TO THE DDA IN 2003 AND DISABILITY IN THE WORKPLACE	8

JOBCENTRE PLUS – QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Background

Jobcentre Plus was launched in October 2001 with the roll out of 56 pathfinder sites. Further sites were rolled out in October 2002 to cover districts representing one-quarter of the country. The national roll out is due to be completed by 2006.

Jobcentre Plus brings together the services of the Employment Service and the Benefits Agency to provide a single point of delivery for people of working age and in doing so aims to provide a work focus to the benefits system. All customers who enter the benefit system now see: a Financial Assessor who checks their benefit claim form and proof of identity; and a Personal Adviser who conducts a work focused interview.

Case Study Research

In October 2001 the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) commissioned CRSP, in partnership with ECOTEC Research and Consulting to explore the delivery of Jobcentre Plus in pathfinder sites.

A qualitative longitudinal approach with three research phases is being conducted:

- Phase I Oct 2001– Jan 2002
- Phase II Mar 2002 – Jul 2002
- Phase III May 2003 – Oct 2003

Eight case study areas were selected to include a mix of office sizes, urban and rural areas, and ex-ONE sites. In Phase III, just six of the pathfinder case study areas were re-visited, with three new sites from the October 2002 roll out included instead.

The research objectives are to:

- assess whether Jobcentre Plus pathfinder offices and new offices are delivering to policy intent;
- assess the extent to which Jobcentre Plus pathfinder offices have moved closer to policy intent;
- compare the delivery of new offices with that of the pathfinders at Phase II; and
- inform the next stages of Jobcentre Plus roll out.

The research consists of three elements:

- Interviews with a range of staff at both Contact Centres (who are responsible for taking the initial telephone call from customers) and Jobcentre Plus public offices;

- Interviews with customers claiming Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) and other benefits; and
- Non-participative observations.

Phase II Selected Findings

- Contact Centres had made progress since Phase I in: establishing the correct benefit customers needed to claim and issuing claim forms to customers; explaining the next steps; and conducting job searches and job submissions for JSA customers.
- Customers claiming JSA were receiving a work focused service at both the Contact Centre and during their meeting with a Personal Adviser.
- Customers claiming benefits other than JSA were receiving a less consistently work focused service at both the Contact Centre and Personal Adviser meetings. Personal Advisers found it more difficult to raise the subject of work with non-JSA customers because of:
 - a perception that they would not be interested in work;
 - a desire to be sensitive to the needs of non-JSA customers; and
 - a lack of confidence in dealing with people perceived to have more 'complex' circumstances.
- Caseloading, whereby Personal Advisers can offer ongoing support to customers, was taking place with customers closer to the labour market and staff were more aware, compared to Phase I, of the importance of caseloading.
- The number of customers whose work focused interview was deferred by Contact Centres had fallen (see following page for further information on deferrals).

A key focus for Phase III of the research will be exploring the extent to which progress has been made in delivering a work focus to non-JSA customers.

Reference

Lissenburgh, S., et al. (2003), *Experiencing Jobcentre Plus Pathfinders: Overview of Early Evaluation Evidence*, DWP In-house Report 111.
www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/IH11.pdf

ONGOING

Project Team: Yvette Hartfree,
 Karen Kellard, Liz Sutton,
 Katherine Hill, Abigail Davis

Dates: Oct 2001–Oct 2003

Funder: Department for Work
 and Pensions

JOBCENTRE PLUS - DEFERRALS

Background

In January 2003 CRSP (in partnership with ECOTEC Research and Consulting) was commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions to conduct further research into the deferral of customers' work focused interviews at Jobcentre Plus pathfinder sites.

Deferrals – are a short-term postponement of the WFI. For example:

- customers who have a short-term injury, are claiming Statutory Sick Pay and who have a job to return to;
- those due to be hospitalised; and
- customers who are recently bereaved and currently distressed.

Waivers – are where a WFI is never likely to be appropriate. For example:

- those with a terminal illness;
- where a progressive or degenerative illness is well advanced; and
- where the benefit claim is wholly retrospective.

Within the Jobcentre Plus process there is an option for non-Jobseeker's Allowance customers to have their work focused interview (WFI) deferred or waived, when attendance is considered to be inappropriate because of the customer's circumstances.

In the first instance deferrals and waivers should be made by First Contact Officers at the Contact Centre, though Personal Advisers also have the discretion to defer or waive customers at the work focused interview.

Research Approach

The overall aim of the research was to explore staff understanding of the application of deferrals and waivers, following the issue of improved guidance to Jobcentre Plus staff in April 2002. Qualitative evidence from the case study research (see previous page) had found that Personal Advisers thought they were seeing some customers who should have been deferred by the Contact Centre. Within Contact Centres, some First Contact Officers had found the guidance on the deferrals process to be too vague.

The research was conducted across four case study areas and included:

- in-depth interviews with staff at both Contact Centres and Jobcentre Plus public offices;
- interviews with non-JSA customers, including some who had been deferred and others who had not; and
- non-participative observations in Contact Centres.

COMPLETED

Project team: Yvette Hartfree, Karen Kellard, Liz Sutton

Dates: Jan 2003–Jul 2003

Funder: Department for Work and Pensions

JOBCENTRE PLUS – PERSONAL ADVISER TRAINING

Based on the qualitative data collected in Phase II of the case study research (see previous page), CRSP was commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions to develop tools for use in Personal Adviser (PA) training modules in order to develop good practice in conducting mandatory work focused interviews for non-Jobseeker's Allowance customers. This was a welcome opportunity for CRSP to be able to use research findings in a way which could directly benefit staff 'on the ground'.

There were three elements to the research.

1. Identification of PA training needs

Interviews with PAs had identified some additional training needs. Further analysis of the transcripts was conducted to provide more information on the issues raised by PAs.

2. Customer case studies

From reviewing the transcripts of customer interviews a number of customer case studies were developed to represent a range of customer 'types' that PAs would be likely to come into contact with.

3. Work focused interview observations

The observation notes of WFIs collected in the case study research were collated to illustrate the different approaches used by PAs in delivering WFIs, as well as the different responses given by customers.

The research materials were presented to members of the Jobcentre Plus Adviser Learning and Development team at a workshop in May 2003.

COMPLETED

Project Team: Yvette Hartfree, Karen Kellard, Liz Sutton

Dates: Jan 2003–May 2003

Funder: Department for Work and Pensions

PREPARATION FOR 2004 CHANGES: EMPLOYERS' AND SERVICE PROVIDERS' RESPONSES TO THE DDA IN 2003 AND DISABILITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Background

For more than 30 years disabled people in Britain have been calling for legislation which protects them from various forms of discrimination and which entitles them to the same rights as other members of society.

The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) came into force in December 1996. It introduced new laws and measures aimed at ending the discrimination which many disabled people face in the areas of: employment; access to goods, facilities and services; the management, buying or renting of land or property; and the duties of trade organisations to their members and applicants.

Requirements under the Act have been introduced in phases. The final phases will become effective from October 2004 when the current exemption from the provisions concerning recruitment and employment for employers with less than 15 employees will be removed and service providers will be required to remove features of their service and physical barriers which make access for disabled people difficult or impossible.

Research aims

This study explores how employers and service providers are responding to both existing and new provisions in the Act.

The research objectives are:

- To explore how employers and service providers have responded to existing requirements of the DDA, in particular to examine:
 - awareness of the Act;
 - awareness of sources of advice and information; and
 - adjustments made and planned.
- To explore whether, and if so how:
 - service providers are preparing for new access duties to be introduced in October 2004; and
 - employers are preparing for the abolition of the 15 employee exemption threshold in October 2004.

- To investigate whether organisations (acting as employers and service providers) are adopting a holistic approach to the requirements of the Act.
- To identify the development of best practice and sources of information.

Research Design and Methods

The study combines a large scale telephone survey with in-depth face-to-face interviews with employers at local and head office level in public, private and voluntary sector organisations across the United Kingdom.

Findings

The findings of the study, which is being carried out in collaboration with British Market Research Bureau (BMRB), will be reported in early 2004.

ONGOING

Project team: Simon Roberts, Claire Heaver, Katherine Hill, Joanne Rennison, Bruce Stafford

Dates: Nov 2002–Oct 2003

Funder: Department for Work and Pensions and the Northern Ireland Equality Directorate



POLICY EVALUATION

EVALUATING NEW DEAL FOR DISABLED PEOPLE NATIONAL EXTENSION	10
DEVELOPING A LOCAL EVALUATION FOR SAFFRON SURE START	11
THE EVALUATION OF THE PILOTING OF EDUCATION MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCES (EMAs)	12
EMA VULNERABLE PILOTS	14
EMA TRANSPORT VARIANT	15

EVALUATING NEW DEAL FOR DISABLED PEOPLE NATIONAL EXTENSION

CRSP leads an international consortium to evaluate the national extension of the New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP). NDDP is an important part of the Government's welfare to work strategy as the major employment programme available to people claiming disability and health-related benefits. This voluntary programme provides a national network of approximately 60 Job Brokers to help clients move into sustained employment.

The programme of evaluation consists of two main strands: summative modules that are designed to establish whether Job Brokers enhance the employability and employment of the customer group; and formative modules that explore in-depth why and how they work as they do.

Summative Evaluation

The centrepiece of the summative evaluation combines a national survey of Job Broker clients and analysis of administrative records. The survey comprises two cohorts each consisting of two waves of face-to-face interviewing. This will be complemented by a national telephone survey of 5,000 members of the eligible population conducted over three waves. This will allow regular feedback on awareness of Job Broker services and on the factors affecting participation.

Employers have a key role in the programme, and a national telephone survey will explore their awareness, understanding and experiences of the New Deal for Disabled People. The sample of 2,000 employers will be selected from those that have had some contact with Job Brokers.

Analysis of the survey datasets and of management information will feed into a cost-effectiveness analysis.

Formative Evaluation

The formative evaluation explores the working of the Job Broker service from the viewpoint of those implementing, supporting and using the programme. The design involves: 18 case studies of Job Brokers that include interviews with customers, Jobcentre Plus and Job Broker staff, and observational studies. All of this qualitative work has a longitudinal element with a second wave of interviewing capturing changes in stakeholders' experiences over time.

Final results from the evaluation should be available after Spring 2004.

The Consortium

Besides CRSP, the other members of the consortium are Abt Associates (Cambridge, Massachusetts), Institute for Employment Studies, National Centre for Social Research, Social Policy Research Unit (University of York) and The Urban Institute (Washington DC). The consortium is also supported by an Advisory Group of academics and representatives of the voluntary sector chaired by Professor Robert Walker of Nottingham University.

ONGOING

Project Team: Bruce Stafford, Karl Ashworth, Abigail Davis, Yvette Hartfree, Katherine Hill, Karen Kellard, Kate Legge, Siobhan MacDonald, Sandra Reyes de Beaman.

Dates: Aug 2001–Apr 2004

Funder: Department for Work and Pensions

DEVELOPING A LOCAL EVALUATION FOR SAFFRON SURE START

The Government's Sure Start programme began in 1999 with the intention of tackling poverty and social exclusion among children. It is targeted at areas with high levels of child poverty and aims to improve the health and well-being of families and children before and from birth (see box). Saffron Sure Start (Leicester) is a third wave programme which began in 2001. Although Sure Start is a national initiative, each local programme is unique, involving local people in its design, management and running. The Government has set national targets, and local programmes have also set their own targets. All projects are therefore required to monitor and evaluate their progress.

The Government's five objectives for Sure Start

- Improving social and emotional development
- Improving health
- Improving the ability to learn
- Strengthening families and communities
- Increasing the productivity of operations.

A team from CRSP are working with Saffron Sure Start to help to create an evaluation 'toolkit' or framework, for use by all stakeholders in the programme. The evaluation is adopting an 'action research' approach, which aims simultaneously to increase knowledge and bring about change. A continuous cycle of planning, acting, observing and reflecting is being established, thus enabling the intervention to adapt and develop throughout the process in response to the needs of the community.

Questions that the local evaluation strategy will seek to answer include:

- Is the programme reaching those for whom it was intended?
- Is the programme making an impact or difference? If so, how, and for whom?
- Are there any unanticipated outcomes or impacts?
- What makes a service or intervention successful?
- What, if anything, is hindering success and how can this be addressed?
- What can be done to make the programme more efficient?
- Is the programme meeting the needs of its users, or its staff?
- Is the best use being made of resources?
- How are the management structure(s) and organisation working?

The programme consists of a broad range of projects or initiatives, all of which will be subject to some form of evaluation. Two initiatives have been selected for a more in-depth case study approach.

Research Design and Methodology

Quantitative methods are being used to collect numerical data, for example through surveys, administrative and monitoring data. Qualitative methods, such as focus groups and in-depth interviews are being used in order to provide explanatory data which will contextualise and complement the quantitative data. The instrumentation involved is designed and tested in conjunction with the stakeholders in order to ensure it is user-friendly for both staff and service users. In-house training and ongoing support is being developed by CRSP for those involved in the local programme evaluation.

ONGOING

Project Team: Lynne Cox, Abigail Davis, Karen Kellard, and Sue Middleton.

Dates: Aug 2002–Mar 2004

Funder: Saffron Under 8s Forum in partnership with Barnardos

THE EVALUATION OF THE PILOTING OF EDUCATION MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCES (EMAs)

Does paying young people from lower income families to stay on in full-time education increase participation, retention and achievement rates in post-16 education? The end of 2003 concludes the fourth year of the large scale longitudinal evaluation which has measured the impact of the piloting of Education Maintenance Allowances (EMAs). The evaluation has been undertaken by a consortium of research organisations, co-ordinated by CRSP and funded by Department for Education and Skills. On the basis of evaluation evidence, the decision to roll out EMAs nationally from 2004 was announced in the 2002 Spending Review.

The Evaluation Framework

Four variants of EMAs were tested in the original 15 EMA pilot areas. These offered varying weekly allowances and bonuses for retention and achievement. A number of strands were included in the evaluation, with each focusing on different aspects of EMA and its impact on post-16 education, participation, retention and achievement rates. Each strand combines both quantitative and qualitative research methods (see box).

<i>Evaluation of Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots</i>	
<i>Main Pilot Evaluation</i> 10 urban and rural areas and 11 control areas	<i>Longitudinal Methods</i> Implementation studies Surveys of young people and parents Qualitative interviews with young people and parents Collection of socio-demographic information
<i>Leeds and London</i> Leeds and 4 Inner London LEAs	Secondary analysis of Careers Services and LEA databases Qualitative interviews with education providers Implementation studies
<i>Vulnerable Pilots</i> 4 of the main EMA pilot areas	Longitudinal 'nested' case studies involving longitudinal qualitative interviews with young people and their 'significant' others Implementation studies
<i>EMA Transport</i> 5 urban and rural areas and 11 control areas	Implementation studies Surveys of young people and parents Qualitative interviews with young people and parents Collection of socio-demographic information Interviews with transport providers

Measuring the Impact of EMA on Participation, Retention and Achievement Rates in Post-16 Education

Survey findings from both the first and second years of the evaluation demonstrated that EMA had a positive effect on post-16 participation and retention rates. In the first year of its operation, EMA was estimated to have raised participation in post-16 education amongst EMA eligible young people in the pilot areas by between three and eleven percentage points (Ashworth et al., 2001).

The second year statistical analysis was able to produce more precise estimates of the impact of EMA on post-16 education participation and on retention rates, as young people moved into the second year of non-compulsory education. EMA significantly increased participation in post-16 education among eligible young people in the pilot areas by 5.9 percentage points.

The effect of EMA was particularly pronounced in urban areas, among young men and amongst those eligible for a full EMA award. The estimated impact of a national scheme is for similar increases in participation amongst EMA eligible young people. EMA also appears to have had a positive effect on retention, increasing the EMA induced participation gain to 7.3 percentage points in Year 13 for the first cohort included in the survey (Ashworth et al., 2002).

The results of statistical analysis which was undertaken in the third year of the evaluation, and which focused on measuring the impact of EMA on both retention and achievement rates, will be published later in the year.

ONGOING

Project Team: Sue Maguire, Sue Middleton, Karl Ashworth, Yvette Hartfree, Kate Legge, Kim Perren, Joanne Rennison

Dates: May 1999–Dec 2004

Funder: Department for Education and Skills

The Local Implementation of EMA

During the piloting of EMA, responsibility for the local delivery of the scheme rested with Local Education Authorities. Differences emerged between the pilot areas in the way in which EMA was implemented. This included variations in the membership of implementation groups, which managed local delivery of EMA, as well as in the roles and responsibilities of those representing LEAs, education providers and other local agencies (Maguire et al., 2001 and Allen et al., 2003). Collaboration between local agencies was integral to the success of encouraging vulnerable groups of young people (including homeless young people, teenage parents and young people with disabilities) to apply for EMA (Allen et al., 2003).

Perceptions of EMA

Both the qualitative interviews undertaken with young people and parents and the round table discussions with local stakeholders highlighted that the introduction of EMA had been broadly welcomed as an incentive to encourage more young people to remain in education (Maguire et al., 2001; Legard et al., 2001 and Allen et al., 2003). In addition, EMA was enthusiastically received as an initiative which seeks to address some of the problems facing the pilot areas (Maguire et al., 2001).

The EMA Evaluation Consortium

EMA is being evaluated by a consortium of research organisations, co-ordinated by CRSP. The other organisations are:

- Institute for Fiscal Studies;
- National Centre for Social Research;
- National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling; and
- Institute for Employment Research.

Bibliography

Allen, T., Dobson, B., Hardman, J., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Graham, J. and Woodfield, K. (2003), *Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots for Vulnerable Young People and Childcare Pilots: Implementation and Reported Impacts in the First Year*. DfES RR396.
<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR396.pdf>

Ashworth, K., Hardman, J., Woon-Chia, L., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Dearden, L., Emmerson, C., Frayne, C., Goodman, A., Ichimura, H. and Meghir, C. (2001), *Education Maintenance Allowance: The First Year. A Quantitative Evaluation*. DfEE RR257.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR257.pdf>

Ashworth, K., Hardman, J., Hartfree, Y., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Smith, D., Dearden, L., Emmerson, C., Frayne, C. and Meghir, C. (2002), *Education Maintenance Allowance: The First Two Years. A Quantitative Evaluation*. DfES RR352.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR352.pdf>

Heaver, C., Maguire, M., Middleton, S., Maguire, S., Youngs, R., Dobson, B. and Hardman, J. (2002), *Evaluation of Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots: Leeds and London First Year Evidence*. DfES RR353.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR353.pdf>

Knight, T. and White, C. (2003), *The Reflections of Early Leavers and Second Year Participants on the Education Maintenance Allowance Scheme. A Qualitative Study*. DfES RR411.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR411.doc>

Legard, R., Woodfield, K. and White, C. (2001), *Staying Away or Staying On? A Qualitative Evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance*. DfEE RR256.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR256.pdf>

Maguire, M., Maguire, S. and Vincent, J. (2001), *Implementation of the EMA Pilots: The First Year*. DfEE RR255.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR255.pdf>

Maguire, S., Maguire, M. and Heaver, C. (2002), *Implementation of the EMA Pilots: The Second Year*. DfES RR333.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/rr333.pdf>

Maguire, S. and Maguire, M. (2003), *Implementation of the EMA Pilots: The Third Year*. DfES RR395.

<http://www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR395.pdf>

EMA VULNERABLE PILOTS

This year saw the completion of the evaluation of the EMA Vulnerable Pilots. These were introduced in 2000 and extended the scope of the main EMA pilots by focusing on young people believed to be especially vulnerable to economic and social exclusion in four LEA areas. The evaluation concentrated on three specific groups of young people: homeless, teenage parents and young people with disabilities. Eligibility criteria are similar to those for the main EMA in terms of age and parental income, but EMA is more flexible for young people eligible for the vulnerable pilots (see box):

EMA Flexibilities in Vulnerable Pilots

- EMA can be claimed for up to three years, instead of two years.
- Study can take place outside mainstream education.
- Non-mainstream courses, such as life skills, numeracy and literacy courses, can be studied.
- EMA payments do not have to be made into a bank account.
- Bonus payments can be spread throughout the year.
- Young people who are homeless do not have to provide proof of residence.
- Young people who are estranged from their families are classified as independent students.
- Teenage mothers are entitled to a proportion of backdated payments of EMA on their return to education following maternity leave.

The evaluation used both quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the delivery and outcomes of the scheme. Findings included:

- partnership between agencies at the local level was crucial to successful implementation in terms of identifying vulnerable young people and raising awareness of the aims of the pilots, but data protection problems persisted;
- the financial element of EMA was important in initial decisions to return to education, and for teenage parents the provision of childcare had been crucial; and
- a high level of ongoing advice and support was necessary to support the return of vulnerable young people to education and encourage their retention in post-compulsory education.

The evaluation also suggested that the following guidelines would enhance practice and make the pilots more effective and responsive to the needs of vulnerable young people:

- the application form should be simplified, shortened for independent students and made available in languages other than English, and applications should be fast-tracked to avoid demoralising delays in payments;
- good liaison between education providers and key staff is necessary to verify authorised absences, and stoppages of EMA should be used as an early warning system to trigger advice and support;
- learning agreements need to be made more relevant to the needs of vulnerable groups of young people;
- the role of bonus payments could be enhanced if they were used to reward short-term achievements;
- the process of identifying vulnerable young people could be improved by including a self-identification option in application forms;
- clearer definitions of vulnerability would ensure consistency between LEAs;
- data protection issues need to be resolved to allow the necessary exchange of data between agencies;
- key agencies should be made aware of the Vulnerable Pilots scheme through face-to-face meetings;
- clearly agreed policies about the referral of young people who are at risk of dropping out of the scheme, or drop out, are needed; and
- effective support that meets the individual needs of vulnerable young people is vital.

Publication

Dobson, B., Hardman, J., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Allen, T., Graham, J., Hill, E., Woodfield K. and Maguire, M. (forthcoming 2003), *Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots For Vulnerable Young People And Childcare Pilots: Implementation And Reported Impacts In The First Two Years (2000-2001/2001-2002)*

COMPLETED

Project Team: Barbara Dobson, Jay Hardman, Sue Maguire, Sue Middleton, Tracey Allen.

Dates: Sep 2002–Jul 2003

Funder: Department for Education and Skills

EMA TRANSPORT VARIANT

The EMA Transport Pilots were introduced in September 2000 to encourage young people from low income households to remain in post-16 education, by assisting with the costs of travel to and from an education provider.

The original intention was that two models of EMA(T) should be piloted for young people who were in full-time post-16 education and whose parents' income was £30,000 or less per annum (see box). Each model was to be piloted in rural and urban LEAs.

Original Design of EMA(T)

'Pure' EMA(T) - Free travel to and from school or college plus termly retention and end-of-course achievement bonuses.

'Hybrid' EMA(T) - Subsidised travel to and from school or college plus weekly payment tapered according to parental income. No bonuses.

However, prior to the introduction of the scheme, the five LEAs involved agreed with the DfES a number of variations on the basic model of EMA(T) that they were to implement so that, in effect, five different variants of EMA(T) were piloted.

The findings of the analysis using Propensity Score Matching techniques were disappointing in that no consistent significant impact of EMA(T) on the education decisions of eligible young people was found.

Using descriptive analysis, there was evidence that the availability of pure or hybrid variant EMA(T) awards was associated with eligible students' modes of travel in some circumstances. For example, within the two urban areas, for distances of less than six miles, use of public transport was greater in the pure variant (where travel was free) than in the hybrid variant (where it was subsidised). This seemed to represent a shift from walking or cycling as a mode of transport. A similar pattern was seen in the rural areas, but only among eligible students living three to five miles from their education provider.

There was no indication that the availability of free transport in pure variants encouraged eligible students to travel further afield to attend preferred education providers. Among EMA(T) recipients who used public transport on their journeys to and from school or college, only a fifth reported that the availability of EMA(T) had influenced their choice.

Awareness of EMA(T) differed considerably across the five pilot areas but, overall, levels of awareness were much lower than those reported in the main EMA study. Awareness of EMA(T) was higher in the two hybrid variants and lower in the rural variants. In the variant with the lowest awareness, application rates for EMA(T) were also very low.

Compared with the main EMA study, a high proportion of EMA(T) recipients did not recall signing a Learning Agreement. Recall was lowest in one of the rural pure variants and in the rural hybrid variant. Recipients who recalled signing a Learning Agreement were most likely to recall that they were required to attend all of their lectures and classes. They were least likely to recall the commitment to seek careers advice before they chose or changed a course. On average, recipients in the three pure variants recalled a higher number of commitments within their Learning Agreements compared to recipients in the two hybrid variants.

Publication

Perren, K., Middleton, S. and Emmerson, C. (forthcoming 2003), *Education Maintenance Allowance Transport Pilots - Quantitative Findings from Year 1 and 2 (2000-2001/2001-2002*

COMPLETED

Project Team: Kim Perren and Sue Middleton.

Dates: Aug 2002-Jul 2003

Funder: Department for Education and Skills





POVERTY, SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND THE LIFE COURSE

ASSESSING THE COVERAGE GAP	18
EUROPEAN OBSERVATORY ON SOCIAL SECURITY FOR MIGRANT WORKERS	19
DEVELOPING BUDGET STANDARDS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE	20
NAVIGATING THE E-SOCIETY: THE DYNAMICS OF PARTICIPATION AND EXCLUSION	21
MARRIAGE IN THE 21ST CENTURY	22
BRITAIN'S POOREST CHILDREN: SEVERE AND PERSISTENT POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION	23
SOCIAL CHANGE AND LATER LIFE	24

ASSESSING THE COVERAGE GAP

CRSP assembled and led an international team of renowned experts to assess the gaps in social security provision in 15 countries around the world for the International Social Security Association (ISSA). Assessing the coverage gap identifies which groups are excluded from social security coverage and examines the factors leading to exclusion, and the trajectories and impacts of relevant policies and programmes.

The case study countries

The countries were carefully chosen to:

- ensure that the full range of coverage issues is represented;
- allow examination of the possibilities for policy transfer; and
- illustrate contrasting situations and models of social security.

Each country was classified into one of the following three groups based on per capita Gross Domestic Product:

Group A countries are: Australia, Finland, Germany, UK and USA.

Group B countries are: Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Hungary, Mexico and Uruguay.

Group C countries are: India, Mali, Morocco, Tanzania and Thailand.

The analysis covers pension provision and statutory health care, whether public or private, compulsory or voluntary in Groups A, B and C, and unemployment in Group A.

Key findings

The findings, which were presented to an international conference in Vancouver in September 2002, show that the groups excluded from pension coverage are:

- agricultural workers;
- urban workers in the informal economy; and
- unpaid family workers.

These excluded groups included a disproportionate number of women.

Coverage was higher in countries with:

- higher per capita GDP;
- lower numbers of self-employed, informal sector and agricultural workers;
- tax-financed social security systems; and
- national rather than sectoral schemes.

The role of the contributory principle

The contributory principle which lies at the heart of most case study countries' social security systems has a strong connection with the labour market and excludes those whose biographies do not conform to the long-term formal sector employee model. Because of their labour market position women and migrants may find themselves without adequate protection under a contributory system.

The need for greater redistribution

The need is for much greater redistribution both within and across national borders. Cichon has recently proposed a 'dollar a day' pension for the elderly population in the poorest countries, paid for through contributions from workers in richer countries (Drummond, 2002). However, as Offe (1996) has argued, the preparedness to grant social rights is more precarious the more costly the granting of rights becomes to those who are not immediate beneficiaries, and the greater the social distance between those who grant the rights and pay and the beneficiaries.

The key political challenge that closing the coverage gap poses is to secure legitimacy at both the national and the global level for the sharing of risks and redistribution of resources.

References

- Drummond, C. (2002) 'Strengthening the Security in Social Security'. Conference on the ISSA Initiative. General Report. Vancouver, Canada, 10-12 September 2002.
- Offe, C. (1996), *Modernity and the State*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K. (2002) 'Gaps in coverage for old age pensions and healthcare in 15 countries' Paper presented to the Conference on the ISSA Initiative, Vancouver, 10-12 September.
- Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K. (2002) 'Assessing the coverage gap: a summary of early findings' Background/discussion paper for the Conference on the ISSA Initiative, Vancouver, 10-12 September.
- Website**
<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm> and see 'ISSA Initiative'.

ONGOING

Project Team: Simon Roberts, Karl Ashworth, Bruce Stafford

Dates: Jun 2001–Dec 2003

Funder: The International Social Security Association (ISSA)

EUROPEAN OBSERVATORY ON SOCIAL SECURITY FOR MIGRANT WORKERS

The Observatory, which is under the direct supervision of the European Commission, is coordinated by the Max Planck Institute in Munich and consists of national 'experts' from each of the member countries of the European Union (EU). Simon Roberts from CRSP is the UK 'expert' and member of the project's Editorial Board.

The role of the Observatory

The role of the Observatory is to provide the European Commission with systematic information on how the regulations that coordinate social security for migrant workers within the EU work in each of the member countries. This involves:

- an overview of the way the social security coordinating regulations are applied in the member countries and any difficulties encountered by the various stakeholders;
- an examination of the application of the four main principles of regulation (EEC) 1408/71 (see below);
- a review of case law of the national courts and the European Court of Justice;
- An analysis of the impact of the coordinating regulations on national legislation;
- an overview of relevant international agreements; and
- an examination of the interface between social security regulations and competition and tax law and human rights.

The origins of the Observatory

The origins of the Observatory can be traced back to 1998 when the European Commission organised a series of seminars on the implementation of Regulation 1408/71 in the 15 EU member countries. Simon Roberts was responsible for organising and reporting the UK seminar.

The coordinating regulations

Regulations (EEC) 1408/71 and 574/72 coordinate the national social security schemes of the member countries of the European Union to ensure that people moving within the EU are not discriminated against and do not lose their social security rights.

The regulations achieve coordination through four main principles:

- discrimination on grounds of nationality is prohibited;
- rules are laid down to determine which member country's legislation the person is subject to;
- rights in the course of acquisition are protected through aggregation of periods of insurance and/or residence spent in each of the respective countries; and
- rights already acquired are protected by allowing certain benefits to be exported.

Over time the coordinating rules have become complex as:

- new countries have joined the EU;
- the 'flexible labour market' has seen an increase in part-time work, fixed-term contracts, self-employment and early retirement; and
- new forms of social protection and modes of financing have been introduced.

Preparations are under way to reform and simplify the regulations.

Outputs

The National Reports serve as the basis for a European Report. The information contained in the National and European Reports will assist the European Commission to develop a global picture of the application of the coordinating regulations in the member countries and identify common problems regarding the operation of the regulations. The Observatory is now in its fourth year. This year, in addition to the report to the European Commission, there will be a book examining the impact of EU case law in each of the member countries.

Reference

Roberts, S. (2000; 2001; 2002), *European Observatory on Social Security for Migrant Workers: National Report: United Kingdom*. Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Social Law, Munich.

ONGOING

Project Team: Simon Roberts

Dates: Rolling

Funder: The European Commission

DEVELOPING BUDGET STANDARDS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

While there is general agreement that disabled people have additional needs there is limited research about the extent of these needs and their cost. As such, the extent to which current benefits and services meet these additional needs and costs cannot be ascertained. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has funded CRSP with the support of Disability Alliance, to investigate the additional financial, practical and social costs of disability from the perspective of disabled people themselves. Preliminary research into these additional needs was undertaken in 2002 and found that:

- basic costs (for example for medical and mobility needs) were often met at the expense of disabled people's social needs, independence and dignity;
- every day was a financial juggling act. The future meant financial uncertainty: disabled people lacked options for increasing income or reducing spending; and
- many felt that statutory services failed to meet their needs, plan for people's long-term needs or provide adequate information.

The preliminary study informed the main study by identifying key areas of additional needs and developing criteria for recruiting research participants. The main study aims:

- to develop consensual budget standards (what disabled people need to maintain an acceptable standard of living, as negotiated and agreed within groups of disabled people);
- to generate detailed information to explain disabled people's additional needs and costs; and
- to provide the Government and disability organisations with a baseline of needs for disabled people to inform policy on benefits and services.

A series of focus groups will be conducted in up to four phases. Each phase includes people who identify themselves as having:

- low to medium support and/or mobility needs;
- medium to high support and/or mobility needs;
- fluctuating or intermittent needs;
- needs arising from visual impairments; and
- needs arising from hearing impairments.

The phases are:

1. Orientation: to pilot tools and concepts, explore topics, and devise case studies.
2. Task: groups develop budget standards by debating and agreeing lists of minimum essential items required by case study individuals.
3. Check-back: to resolve outstanding issues and test consensus.
4. Negotiating final differences (if necessary): to address remaining differences in the budget standards.

ONGOING

Project Team: Noel Smith, Barbara Dobson, Lynne Cox, Sue Middleton, Lorna Reith (Disability Alliance)

Dates: Apr 2003–Apr 2004

Funder: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

NAVIGATING THE E-SOCIETY: THE DYNAMICS OF PARTICIPATION AND EXCLUSION

Digital interactive technologies are increasingly central to every aspect of social life. Over the next few years there will be significant developments in the information and communication opportunities available to households and individuals. These changes are driven by the Government's commitment to bring public Internet access to everyone who wants it, the continuing expansion of broadband connections, and the predicted growth of digital interactive television.

This two year research project, funded by the Economic and Social Research Council, is following a sample of 100 households, purposively selected to represent a range of family types, life stages, income levels and ethnicities, as they navigate the shifting opportunities presented by established and emerging digital information and communication technologies.

It uses a multi-method qualitative approach, which includes two waves of interviews with all household members (including all children aged six and over), diaries, inventories and computer usage logs (see box). The data will enable patterns of digital participation and exclusion to be mapped in detail, and will be used to explore how these variations are shaped both by differential access to economic, social and cultural resources, and by gender and generational dynamics within the household.

Research Methods

- In-depth interviews with all household members over the age of six
- Individual diaries recording Information and Communication Technology use over a week
- Household inventories of ICT equipment and location within the home
- Computer activity questionnaires
- Logging of internet use (sub-sample of the main sample)

The research aims to go beyond the simple notion of a single 'digital divide' separating the 'haves' from the 'have-nots' by exploring and examining hierarchies of access and differences in use. By focusing in detail on everyday supports, incentives and barriers to access and use, the research aims to develop a fuller account of the factors sustaining both participation and exclusion. In addition, it will contribute new data and analysis to debates around ways of overcoming exclusion from new information and communications networks, and ways of encouraging more comprehensive and innovative uses of available digital technologies.

The results will be of interest not only to researchers concerned with the dynamics of digital innovation but to policy makers and practitioners dealing with the everyday consequences of those dynamics.



ONGOING

Project Team: Graham Murdock and Professor Ruth Lister (Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University), Karen Kellard, Liz Sutton

Dates: May 2003–Apr 2005

Funder: Economic and Social Research Council

MARRIAGE IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Much research in the sociology of relationships and the family has focused on the fragility of modern relationships. In particular there is now a rich literature on the nature and causes of divorce. However, less is known about marriages that remain intact over time and which factors, behaviours or attitudes might facilitate sustaining a marriage.

In early 2003, the charity Care for the Family (CFF) commissioned the Centre for Research in Social Policy to conduct an exploratory study of the nature of marriage in the 21st century and to shed some light onto the question 'What makes a marriage last?'.

Methodology

To help in answering this question and to identify areas for further, in-depth exploration, CFF asked CRSP to undertake eight focus groups with married men and women, most of whom were in their first marriage.

Participants in the focus groups had been married for different lengths of time, which allowed researchers to explore and compare differences in attitudes towards marriages, the effects of time-varying social and cultural influences and changing patterns of behaviours inside marriage. Sixty participants were selected; 32 men and 28 women.

Focus Group Composition					
Gender	Income Group		Length of Marriage		
	Low Income Group	Medium/High Income	5-10 yrs	10-30 yrs	More than 30 yrs
Male	14	18	6	18	8
Female	13	15	4	14	10
Total	27	33	10	32	18

Main findings

- Marriage, while important to the participants individually, was perceived as less important for today's generation than for those married in the 1960s or 1970s.
- Marriage in the 21st century was perceived to be changing mainly due to increased opportunities and expectations. The rigid norms that structured society 30 or 40 years ago constraining choice and opportunity, in particular for women, had broken down. This has resulted in more fluid roles for both men and women within the home and has brought about new forms of conflict, requiring patience, tolerance and negotiation, if marriages are to survive.
- This exploratory study produced evidence to suggest that younger married men and women continue to learn from, or at least to be influenced by, their parents' values, which stress the importance of marriage as an institution and of commitment as the means to maintain one's marriage.
- At the same time, the study found that older generations, in particular women, also recognised that there were lessons, which they could learn from younger generations. Renegotiating domestic responsibilities, learning to acknowledge the presence and to support the identity and independence of the partner, and talking about, rather than ignoring or hiding, problems were most participants' ambitions, if not practices, in and for their marriage.

COMPLETED

Project Team: Andreas Cebulla, Liz Sutton

Dates: Feb 2003 – Jun 2003

Funder: Care for the Family

BRITAIN'S POOREST CHILDREN: SEVERE AND PERSISTENT POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION

In the Government's efforts to abolish child poverty by the year 2020, a number of targets have been set and indicators of progress are being reviewed annually. However, tackling severe child poverty does not feature in these targets or indicators. In fact, although there is now a wealth of information about child poverty in Britain, very little is known about either the extent of severe child poverty or the children who are affected.

Save the Children UK commissioned CRSP to investigate severe child poverty. Two areas of particular importance were identified: the experience of poverty using a combination of poverty measures; and the length of time for which children experience (severe) poverty. Therefore, in this study severe child poverty was defined and analysed in two ways:

children who experienced a combination of household income poverty, child deprivation and parental deprivation (using the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain); and

children who lived in households that experienced income poverty that was both persistent and severe (using the British Household Panel Survey).

The research also aimed to establish whether severely poor children were more likely to experience different dimensions of 'social exclusion' than other children.

The Extent of Severe and Persistent Poverty

Severe poverty affected a relatively large proportion of children in Britain.

In 1999, eight per cent of children experienced a combination of income poverty, child deprivation and parental deprivation; and

over a five year period nine per cent of children experienced income poverty that was both persistent and severe.

Children most likely to experience severe poverty, using either measure were those:

- living in a household in receipt of Income Support or Jobseeker's Allowance;
- living in a household with no workers;
- with a large number of children and/or young children in the household;
- living in local authority accommodation;
- living in the Midlands;

- whose parents had no, or low, educational qualifications;
- living in a lone parent family; and
- of non-white ethnicity.

In addition, persistent and severe income poverty was more likely to occur in households which experienced one or more changes:

- in their main source of annual income (from benefits to work or vice versa);
- in the number of workers in the household (from no workers to one worker, or vice versa); and
- in their family type (from a couple to a lone parent household, in particular).

Experiences of Social Exclusion

Levels of social exclusion were generally higher amongst children experiencing severe poverty than among other children. For example, severely poor children were more likely not to be able to participate in social activities, to be in households unable to afford to pay household bills, to live in households with a lack of savings, and to have parents who experience poor mental health.

Policy Implications

The findings contain important lessons for measuring child poverty including:

- the need for deprivation-based measures of poverty over time;
- the need to include child-based indicators when measuring child poverty and social exclusion; and
- the multiple manifestation of poverty and social exclusion means that there is a need to ensure that these are measured in the same survey.

The findings also highlight a number of policy implications in order to tackle child poverty, most crucially the need for adequate financial protection for children whose families are not in work, or who are moving into and out of work.

Publication

Adelman, L., Middleton, S. and Ashworth, K. (2003), *Britain's Poorest Children: Severe and persistent poverty and social exclusion*. London: Save the Children.

COMPLETED

Project Team: Laura Adelman, Sue Middleton, Karl Ashworth

Dates: Mar 2002–May 2003

Funder: Save the Children UK

SOCIAL CHANGE AND LATER LIFE

This research is funded by a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship. It uses British and international social surveys to investigate change and continuity in the experience of ageing across the last three decades of the twentieth century. In so doing, it highlights an under-researched dimension of later life - the impact of social change on the lives of older people. It considers two interlinked themes: social and community relationships and social attitudes. These facets of life are viewed as complementary measures of 'connectedness'. Locally-based relationships reflect social engagement, while having values which are at odds with those of the majority are viewed as an indicator of social exclusion.

The study investigates the claim that rapid and profound social change increasingly renders the world-views and lifestyles of older people obsolete. From this perspective, modern society is individualistic and privatised. These characteristics are manifested in novel family arrangements (such as pre-marital cohabitation and divorce) which are often in conflict with traditional family values. In any historical period, older individuals may feel marginalised where they do not have the resources to engage in the full range of normal social activities and where they hold minority views. At times of great change, this sense of exclusion may be magnified.

The study also utilises the General Household Survey to track changes in the community relationships of older people over the past two decades. The number of single occupancy households has burgeoned as more working age people live outside of family units. Concomitantly, car usage has increased, with many people commuting long distances to work and relying on distant facilities to meet their consumption and leisure requirements. These shifts may have a negative impact upon the environment of older people who are more likely to have home-based lives and who are less likely to have access to a car. The combination of these two areas of investigation contributes to an understanding of the processes whereby, for some people, ageing is associated with marginalisation.

In work-oriented societies, recipients of social assistance risk being stigmatised, although state pensioners are generally viewed as more worthy of support than working-age unemployed people. However,

this 'dispensation' may be undermined where state pensions are viewed as over-generous and where unemployed people of working age are redefined as disabled pensioners.

One part of the study uses data from the International Social Survey Programme to analyse variations in the self-assessed social position of people in Hungary and Germany between 1987 and 1999. Across this period, both countries witnessed a substantial growth in the numbers of people claiming social assistance. In Hungary, this was accompanied by a significant decline in income for the majority of the population.

These changes within the economic sphere were associated with shifting self-perceptions among social groups with differing relationships to the labour market (i.e. workers, working-age non-workers, and pensioners). These shifts form the basis for a paper to be delivered to the 6th Conference of the European Sociological Association Annual Conference in September 2003.

References

- Perren, K., Arber, S. and Davidson, K. (2003), 'Men's organisational affiliations in later life: the influence of social class and marital status on informal group membership', *Ageing and Society*, Volume 23, pp69-82.
- Arber, S., Davidson, K. and Perren, K. (2003), 'Involvement in Social Organisations in later life: Variations by gender and class' in *Cultural Gerontology*, Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, Connecticut.
- Davidson, K, Daly, T, Arber, S. and Perren, K. (2001), 'La masculinité dans un monde féminisé: le genre, l'âge et les organisations sociales', *Cahiers du Genre* 31(special): 39-57.

COMPLETED

Project Team: Kim Perren

Dates: Sep 2002–Aug 2005

Funder: British Academy

WORK AND WELFARE TRAJECTORIES

META-ANALYSIS OF UNITED STATES WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMMES	26
EMPLOYERS' PENSION PROVISION SURVEY 2003	27
MINIMUM INCOME AS THE 'SOCIAL PROTECTION OF LAST RESORT': SAFETY NET, TRAP AND/OR SPRINGBOARD?	28
DRUGS AND ALCOHOL MISUSE AS BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT	29
EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND: 2001 LEAVERS' SURVEY	30

META-ANALYSIS OF UNITED STATES WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMMES

Welfare-to-work programmes in the US continue to attract the interest of researchers and policy-makers in Britain and beyond as we seek to understand why programmes work or do not work, and explore opportunities for transferring international best practice to national programmes.

Implemented by individual states rather than by the federal government, US welfare-to-work programmes vary in content, and are set within different social and economic environments. Moreover, US welfare-to-work programmes are amongst the most thoroughly evaluated interventions in the field of active labour market policies.

With the proliferation of programmes, it is becoming increasingly difficult to obtain a coherent overview of their effectiveness and to identify key lessons for best practice. Between 2000 and 2002, with support from the Economic and Social Research Council and the Rockefeller Foundation, CRSP started its work on aggregating the evaluation evidence of mandatory US welfare-to-work programmes and conducted a first meta-analysis of their impacts (see Annual Report 2001/02).

Interim Findings

The meta-analysis showed that the effectiveness of US welfare-to-work programmes depended on the socio-economic conditions prevailing in the locations in which they were implemented. Client characteristics also affected impacts and a preference for Work-First (i.e. immediate job search and placement) over Human Resource Development (i.e. training) strategies was shown to increase the proportion of participants moving off social security benefit (Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)) and led to greater earnings increases among participants. However, regression analysis also found that programme impacts peaked after about two and a half years, declining thereafter.

Current work

Further work is currently underway to expand the meta-analysis database by updating evaluation data, adding further years' impact data where available for specific programmes, and by appending impact data for voluntary programmes. Existing information about the use of financial incentives and sanctions has been refined to add further detail and allow greater differentiation between programmes. Moreover, the database is being expanded to include information about the impact of US welfare-to-work programmes on the health and educational achievements of the children of programme participants.

The aim of the project is to enhance our understanding of the effectiveness of US welfare-to-work programmes by increasing the diversity and detail of programmes included in the database and increasing the number of years for which impact data are available. The database, already the most comprehensive source of evaluation evidence of US welfare-to-work programmes presently available, will thus be further expanded and remain an invaluable source of analysis of the effectiveness of welfare-to-work programmes in the US, yielding important lessons for similar programmes elsewhere.

This project is funded by the US Department of Health and Human Services and is conducted jointly with Professor David Greenberg of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County.

ONGOING

Project Team: Andreas Cebulla, Abigail Davis, David Greenberg (University of Maryland)

Dates: Jan 2003–Mar 2004

Funder: US Department of Health and Human Services

EMPLOYERS' PENSION PROVISION SURVEY 2003

The Centre for Research in Social Policy has joined up with British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) to conduct and analyse the 2003 Employers' Pension Provision Survey. The survey is the fifth of its kind, previous surveys having been conducted in 1994, 1996, 1998 and 2000. Commissioned by the Department for Work and Pensions, the aim of the survey is to monitor the provision of occupational and group pension schemes among British businesses, to establish the extent of businesses' contribution to private pensions and, for the first time in 2003, their provision of access and/or contributions to stakeholder pensions.

The fieldwork was conducted in Spring 2003 by BMRB, who surveyed a representative sample of some 2000 small, medium-sized and large enterprises in England, Scotland and Wales. Businesses were asked about the type of provisions they offer, the level of their contributions, and any changes they have made in recent years to their pension provisions. The Employers' Pension Provision Survey allows a cross-sectional comparison of employers' pension provisions and of changes in the pattern and level of provision over time. The survey analysis is being undertaken by CRSP.

The current survey will be of particular importance because of the introduction of the stakeholder pension in 2001 - a low-cost personal pension for employees on low or medium incomes. Employers with five or more employees and not providing an occupational or group pension scheme are required to provide employees with access to a stakeholder pension. However, employers are not required to contribute to these schemes.

Financial and social researchers as well as policy-makers are interested in obtaining firm evidence of the extent to which employers provide access to stakeholder pension schemes and the impact this has had on employers' pension provisions in Britain. Moreover, there is only sketchy evidence on the uptake of stakeholder pensions among employees and this survey will produce estimates of the proportion of employees who have joined stakeholder pension schemes.

A further development that has captured the attention of policymakers (as well as the financial markets) within the last 12 months, has been reports of closures of occupational pension schemes or their conversion from final-salary (defined benefit) to money-purchase (defined contribution) pension schemes. Again, this survey will provide robust information about the extent of the closure or conversion of occupational pension schemes in Britain.

Finally, in the face of such changes to the existing system of pension provision, the analysis of the 2003 Employers' Pension Provision Survey will explore the interaction between scheme closures or conversions (of private and group pension schemes as well as occupational schemes) and the introduction of the stakeholder pension. The aim is to investigate whether the arrival of the stakeholder pension has led to a net increase in employers' pension provision and a net increase in employees covered by pension schemes, or whether there is evidence of pension substitution.

ONGOING

*Project Team: Bruce Stafford,
Andreas Cebulla, Sandra
Reyes de Beaman*

Dates: Nov 2002–Oct 2003

*Funder: Department for Work
and Pensions*

MINIMUM INCOME AS THE 'SOCIAL PROTECTION OF LAST RESORT': SAFETY NET, TRAP AND/OR SPRINGBOARD?

Guaranteed minimum income systems are among the key instruments used to combat poverty and social exclusion in Europe.

Research aims

This project, which is being undertaken in collaboration with Dr Ides Nicaise of the Higher Institute for Labour Studies (HIVA), University of Leuven in Belgium, aims to:

- develop performance indicators of minimum income schemes; and
- study related processes of prevention (safety nets), inclusion (springboards) and exclusion (traps) in national social protection schemes.

The framework fits with the current conceptual approach to social inclusion, where structural and dynamic processes are emphasised rather than static individual characteristics. Data are drawn from the European Community Household Panel (ECHP).

Context

The study is being carried out in the context of:

- the 1992 European Council recommendation (92/441/EEC) inviting Member States to include a basic right to adequate resources and services into their social protection systems;
- the 1999 European Commission report which suggested further improvement of national minimum income systems, including better coverage and quality of protection as well as closer links to labour market integration measures; and
- the common objectives for social inclusion adopted by the European Council in Nice (2000), the first objective of which recommends that member countries "organise social protection systems in such a way that they can help, in particular, to (i) guarantee that everyone has the resources necessary to live in accordance with human dignity; (ii) overcome obstacles to employment...".

Building upon 'Traps and Springboards in minimum income standards'

The project builds on a previous study 'Traps and Springboards in minimum income standards' which covered four countries – Belgium, Denmark, Greece and the UK – which was also carried out by CRSP and HIVA in 2000-2001. The aim of 'Traps and Springboards' was to develop and test performance indicators of minimum income schemes and to study related processes of inclusion (springboards) and exclusion (traps) in national social protection and employment schemes.

Traps and Springboards found that even in countries with well-established minimum income schemes such as Belgium, Denmark and the UK, non-coverage was surprisingly high (between 10 and 30% of the population within a period of three years). The study developed a number of indicators of (non-) coverage by minimum income schemes, including: short-term versus longer-term, duration, and 'gravity' of income gaps. Groups that were over-represented among the non-covered population included:

- older people;
- single parents;
- non-nationals; and
- students and school leavers.

'Traps and Springboards' found that the major causes of people falling through the safety net included:

- partial or total loss of earnings from work and family disruption combined with inadequacy of benefits (particularly for older people);
- non-eligibility for minimum income. For example among foreigners, travellers, homeless people; and
- sanctions and suspensions.

The current study extends 'Traps and Springboards':

- to all countries of the EU;
- over a longer period using more recent waves of the ECHP;
- to further analysis of indicators and inclusion/exclusion processes; and
- to policy implications for the National Action Plans for social inclusion.

ONGOING

Project team: Simon Roberts,
Laura Adelman, Sue Middleton

Dates: Mar 2002–Dec 2003

Funder: The European
Commission

DRUGS AND ALCOHOL MISUSE AS BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT

Background

In June 2002, the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) commissioned CRSP to conduct a study of the barriers that drug and alcohol users experience in obtaining paid employment. The aim was to inform current and future policy to assist former drug and alcohol users' entry or return to work.

The Research

The research included a literature review of the reported barriers to work of drug and alcohol users and a review of national and international programmes of assistance. In-depth interviews were conducted with 20 former and current drug users and ten alcohol users, exploring their perceptions of the conditions and circumstances that delayed or prevented them taking up employment. In addition, interviews were conducted with representatives of ten drug and/or alcohol support organisations to obtain their views on the need for, and nature of, employment support services for their clients. Secondary analyses of the General Household Survey and the British Crime Survey were conducted to estimate the number of drug and/or alcohol users and to describe their social and economic characteristics.

Findings

- The literature and programme review identified some 30 specialist employment service programmes for drug and/or alcohol users. Employment service programmes sought a high level of inter-agency co-ordination, collaboration and communication to ensure a climate of trust between treatment and employment support service providers as well as between providers and substance users. Support for substance users involved one-to-one case management, continuity of support after placement, relapse prevention and referrals to other support services. For example benefits/financial assistance, childcare, transport.
- Substance users and treatment support service providers stressed that, in order to be successful and trusted, employment service providers needed to work closely with treatment service providers. Substance users and treatment service providers emphasised the need for employment service providers to understand the multiplicity and diversity of problems faced by (former) substance users, and the benefits of case management.
- Poor mental or physical health was identified as substance users' main barrier to employment. However, many also suffered from declining social networks, homelessness, living in adverse social environments, low confidence or fluctuating motivation to resist addiction and having to take steps to change one's lifestyle. Interrupted work histories, gaps in CVs, and the need to disclose health problems and criminal records to employers were perceived as the greatest obstacles to obtaining work.
- Substance users had moderate expectations of their future employment. They wished either to return to the type of work they had previously pursued; to update their job skills through training; or to start their entry or return to work by taking on low-skilled, low-stress jobs in order slowly to develop the daily routines required for holding down a job.
- Substance users and treatment service providers argued for a step-wise (re)integration of substance users into the primary labour market.

ONGOING

Project team: Andreas Cebulla, Noel Smith, Liz Sutton, Jill Vincent, Claire Heaver

Start Date: Jul 2002

Funder: Department for Work and Pensions

EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND: 2001 LEAVERS' SURVEY

Background

The European Social Fund (ESF) is designed to address the problems identified in the European Employment Strategy. More specifically, it aims to improve the employability of individuals, the competitiveness of businesses and, ultimately, to ensure the continued economic success of the EU and its member states. The fund is mainly channelled into locally designed and managed projects which provide support and training for individuals and, in some cases, employers.

The 2001 Leavers' Survey for England and Wales used beneficiaries' reports of their experiences and subsequent outcomes to evaluate the effectiveness of the training and support provided through ESF-funded programmes. The final report was completed in September 2002 and was published by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) in Spring 2003.

Working in Partnership

The 2001 Leavers' Survey was a joint venture between CRSP and the National Centre for Social Research. CRSP's role was to provide a UK policy context to the survey findings.

Survey Aims and Methods

There were two separate surveys:

i) individual beneficiaries; and **ii)** employers who have benefited from ESF support. Each was administered to a stratified sample of ESF beneficiaries in England and Wales.

Findings

The ESF provides support in five broad areas or policy fields. As a result, there were large differences in terms of the characteristics of beneficiaries, the support provided and the outcomes across each of the policy fields.

- *Policy Field 1: Development of active labour market policies to combat and prevent unemployment.*

The proportion of ESF beneficiaries in employment increased from 28 per cent a year before their ESF course (18 per cent in the week before) to 46 per cent at the time of the survey.

- *Policy Field 2: Promotion of equal opportunities for all in terms of access to the labour market, with particular attention to persons at risk of social exclusion.*

Training and help for this group of beneficiaries was more focussed on job search and work, basic skills and interpersonal skills.

- *Policy Field 3: Promotion and improvement of vocational training, education and counselling in the context of a lifelong learning policy.*

Beneficiaries in this group had an older profile; nearly two-thirds were aged 35 or over (65 per cent). Fifty-nine per cent of beneficiaries were in work. The type of support received varied depending on whether beneficiaries were in work or not.

- *Policy Field 4: Promotion of a skilled, well-trained and flexible workforce, innovative and adaptable forms of work organisation, and entrepreneurship.*

Over half of beneficiaries (52 per cent) reported enhancing their skills for their existing job and 30 per cent received training in management or leadership skills.

- *Policy Field 5: Specific measures to improve access and active participation of women in the labour market.*

Beneficiaries were more likely to receive help with literacy skills, study skills and interpersonal skills.

Reference

Finch, S., Humphrey, A., Hardman, J., Rennison, J., Maguire, S. and Middleton, S. (2003), *ESF Leavers' Survey 2001*, DWP In-House Research Report 112, London. ISBN 1 368 244X.
<http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/IH112.pdf>

COMPLETED

Project Team: Joanne Rennison, Jay Hardman, Sue Maguire, Sue Middleton

Dates: Sep 2001–Sep 2002

Funder: Department for Work and Pensions

Laura Adelman

Laura is a Research Associate at CRSP. Laura has worked on a wide range of projects since joining CRSP in 1999. However, the majority of her work has had a focus on poverty and social exclusion. These include, for example, projects comparing poverty transitions in Europe, minimum budget standards for disabled people in Jersey and, more recently, severe child poverty in Britain. From Autumn 2002, Laura is being hosted by the Social Policy Research Centre at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, whilst continuing to work on CRSP funded research.

**Karl Ashworth**

Karl was the Head of Statistical Resources at CRSP. His main duties involved providing quantitative training and support to staff and research. Karl's main research interests are in labour market and welfare dynamics, poverty and the application of statistical techniques to longitudinal data. In 2002/3 he was mostly involved with the evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance pilots. Karl left CRSP in August 2003 to join the Office for National Statistics.

Nigel Bilsbrough

Nigel is the Centre's Finance and Resources Manager, with responsibility for all aspects of finance, including budgeting and reporting, and heads the support team. He is also a member of the Centre's Management Team. Outside of the Centre he continues as Minutes Secretary to the Research Administrator's Group Network (RAGnet); is on the Executive Committee of the Association of Research Centres in the Social Sciences (ARCISS); and is Treasurer and a Trustee of the Unit for the Arts and Offenders.

**Andreas Cebulla**

Andreas is Assistant Director at CRSP. His research interests include the analysis of risk, economic sociology and comparative analysis. Andreas is a member of the BSA Risk and Society Study Group and of a research advisory group of the Irish Government's Environmental Protection Agency. He is also developing CRSP research in evidence-based policy-making and has led a systematic review and meta-analysis of Welfare-to-Work programmes in the United States.

STAFF PROFILES

Lynne Cox

Lynne joined CRSP in October 1998 to administer an ESRC project, and has progressed from administration to Research Assistant. During the year she has been involved in a feasibility study, exploring the additional needs of disabled adults, which has led into current work on Budget Standards for disabled people, both funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Lynne is also involved in assisting a local Sure Start project with their programme of evaluation and monitoring. She continues to act as CRSP's Health and Safety Officer.

**Abigail Davis**

Abigail joined the Centre in September 1998. She has worked on projects exploring workfare in Europe and the transfer of Welfare-to-Work policies from the US to the UK. Current research includes an evaluation of the New Deal for Disabled People for the Department for Work and Pensions, and assisting a local Sure Start project with their programme of evaluation and monitoring. She is also part of a cross-departmental team working to evaluate the New Opportunities in PE and Sport Initiative for the New Opportunities Fund.

Barbara Dobson (Dr)

Barbara joined CRSP in 1992 as a Research Fellow from the University of Stirling. Since joining CRSP she has worked on a number of research projects, most recently around food, low income and children with severe disabilities. This year she has worked on a project funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, the aim of which is to explore the additional needs of disabled adults. Barbara has been on maternity leave from May 2003.

**Emma Gregory**

Emma joined CRSP in November 2001 as a Project Administrator. As well as providing administrative support to a variety of projects, she is also the Finance Assistant for the Centre, working with the Finance and Resources Manager.

Yvette Hartfree

Yvette joined CRSP as a Research Associate in July 2000. Her main research interests are unemployment and welfare-to-work. This year she has continued work on the evaluation of Jobcentre Plus which follows the progress of Pathfinder offices in delivering the Jobcentre Plus service. Yvette has also worked on the EMA evaluation and the evaluation of New Deal for Disabled People.



Katherine Hill

Katherine joined CRSP as a Research Associate in October 2001 after completing an MSc in Social Research Methods at the University of Surrey. Since joining CRSP she has worked on various aspects of the New Deal for Disabled People evaluation. Other recent projects have included qualitative research on the evaluation of Jobcentre Plus and also Employers and Service Providers' Responses to the Disability Discrimination Act.

Karen Kellard

Karen is Assistant Director at CRSP. Karen has worked on, and managed, a variety of projects covering issues relating to social security and labour market policies, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. This year, she has continued researching factors affecting job retention and progression for new entrants to work, as well as research evaluating the new Jobcentre Plus service, the New Deal for Disabled People and a local Sure Start programme.



Rita Khatri

Rita joined CRSP in July 2002 as a Project Administrator. As well as being the principle administrator for the evaluation of the EMA project, she provides support to the Director, Sue Middleton, and administrative support to the Centre. Rita has a BA honours degree in Business Administration from the University of Derby.

STAFF PROFILES

Kate Legge

Kate joined CRSP in October 2001 as a Research Associate, having gained an MSc in European Social Policy Analysis from the University of Bath. This year she has worked on the evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance pilots, focusing on young people who enter higher education. She is currently analysing the Survey of Registrants on the New Deal for Disabled People evaluation.

***Siobhan MacDonald***

Siobhan is studying for a BSc in Social Policy and Social Issues at Loughborough University and won a scholarship to spend her third year working at CRSP. During her time at CRSP she has worked on a survey of Job Brokers providing New Deal for Disabled People. She has also been involved in the evaluation of the EMA pilots and the Saffron Sure Start evaluation. After completing her degree Siobhan would like to pursue a career in the police service.

Sue Maguire (Dr)

Sue has worked for a number of years as a researcher in the field of employment, education and training. She has conducted research on the youth labour market, notably on the recruitment and selection of young people, and the implementation of government training schemes. Sue is project leader for the evaluation of the EMA pilots.

***Sue Middleton***

Sue is Director of CRSP. With Bruce Stafford, she has overall responsibility for the management and development of CRSP, and leads programmes of national and international work on poverty and social exclusion and young people's transitions to adulthood. She also leads the consortium that is evaluating the EMA pilots. Her main research interests are in social policy for children, young people and families, and in the definition and measurement of poverty and social exclusion.

Kim Perren (Dr)

Kim joined CRSP in August 2002. She has been sponsored by the British Academy to undertake research into the impact of social change on the social relationships of older people. She has also been involved with the evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance pilots and provides quantitative training and support to centre staff. Her main research interests lie in the field of ageing and the life course.



Joanne Rennison

Joanne joined CRSP in August 2002 as a Research Associate. She has previously worked in both commercial and social research environments. Since joining Joanne has been working on a number of projects including the evaluation of the Education Maintenance Allowance pilots and Employers and Service Providers' Responses to the Disability Discrimination Act.

Sandra Reyes de Beaman (Dr)

Sandra joined CRSP in February 2003 as a Research Fellow from the University of Leicester. Previously she worked as head of the research unit on ageing in the Mexican Institute of Social Security. Her main interests are the economic and policy implications of the population ageing process. Since joining CRSP, Sandra has worked on the New Deal for Disabled People evaluation and Employers' Pension Provision Survey project.



Simon Roberts (Dr)

Simon is currently project leader on the 'Assessing the coverage gap' and 'Responses to the Disability Discrimination Act' studies and UK project leader on the 'Minimum income as the social protection of last resort' study. He is the UK expert and member of the Editorial Board on the European Commission's 'Observatory on Social Security for Migrant Workers' and a member of the Working Group looking at the impact of globalisation on European social security systems. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the European Journal of Social Security.

STAFF PROFILES

Phil Sadler

Phil joined CRSP in January 1998 and is responsible for the maintenance and installation of the Centre's IT systems. His skills involve working with all Microsoft operating systems, networking and Novell software. He has a Bachelor of Arts degree with Honours in Business Administration and is currently completing his studies for the Cisco Certified Network Associate (CCNA) certification. Phil also provides support to staff and students in the Department of European and International Studies.

**Nicola Selby**

Nicola joined CRSP in September 2000. As a Project Administrator she provides administrative assistance to a variety of projects within the Centre, supports the Centre's Office Co-ordinator and deals with queries and despatching CRSP publications. Nicola also deals with recruitment administration.

Noel Smith (Dr)

Since joining CRSP as a Research Associate in January 1999, Noel has been involved in research on young people and citizenship, the barriers to employment for drug and alcohol users, and children in need referral procedures. He is currently managing a study of disabled people's additional costs and needs. Previously, he qualified in social work at Humberside University and received a doctorate in social anthropology from Queen's University, Belfast. Noel's research interests include qualitative methodologies, youth, citizenship and social services.

**Bruce Stafford (Dr)**

Bruce joined the Centre in 1996 and is currently Director of the Centre along with Sue Middleton. Together they have responsibility for the development and management of the Centre. His research interests include the administration and delivery of welfare services, welfare-to-work, and the links between social security and specific client groups, notably young people, older people and disabled people. He also has a strong interest in evaluation methodology.

Liz Sutton

Liz joined CRSP in 2001 as a Research Associate from the Department of Social Sciences at Loughborough University. Recent research includes an evaluation of Phase I and II of Jobcentre Plus for the Department for Work and Pensions, research on the barriers to employment for drug and alcohol users also for the Department for Work and Pensions, and the changing nature of modern marriage for the charity Care for the Family. Current research includes a multi-method exploration of technology ownership and use.



Sharon Walker

Sharon joined CRSP in November 1993 and is a Project Administrator in addition to the Co-ordinator of the Centre's General Office. Sharon provides support to the Centre's researchers, CRSP's Management Team and also the Centre's Director, Bruce Stafford.

STAFF CHANGES

This year we were sad to see go...

Jay Hardman who left in August 2002 to take up a post at Leicester City Council.

Tracey Allen who left in December 2002.

Claire Heaver who left in March 2003 to take up a post at the University of Exeter.

Karl Ashworth who left in August 2003 to take up a post at the Office for National Statistics.

...but pleased to welcome...

Kim Perren who joined as a Research Associate in August 2002.

Joanne Rennison who joined as a Research Associate in August 2002.

Siobhan MacDonald, a Social Policy student, who joined on 1st October 2002 for a nine month scholarship.

Sandra Reyes de Beaman who joined as a Research Fellow in February 2003.

EVENTS ATTENDED, PRESENTATIONS AND VISITORS TO CRSP

Conferences

'Strengthening the Security in Social Security' International conference, Human Resources Development.
10-11 September 2002, Vancouver.
Attended and paper presented by Simon Roberts.

'British Educational Research Association Annual Conference 2002', BERA.
12-14 September 2002, Exeter.
Attended and paper presented by Tracey Allen.

'Social Exclusion, Activation & Welfare', DG Research (RTD) with DG Employment and Social Affairs (EMPL).
11 October 2002, Brussels.
Attended by Bruce Stafford.

'Department for Education and Skills Research Conference 2002', DFES.
12 November 2002, London.
Attended by Tracey Allen and Karl Ashworth.

'Learners' Journeys: The Role of Research', Learning and Skills Development Agency.
12 December 2002, Warwick.
Attended by Sue Maguire.

'Eighth Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference. Steps forward for Families: Research, Practice and Policy', Australian Institute of Family Studies.
12-14 February 2003, Melbourne, Australia.
Attended and paper presented by Laura Adelman.

'Improving Policy Responses and Outcomes to Socio-Economic Challenges' (IPROSEC) meeting: Changing Family Structures, Policy and Practice, IPROSEC.
3 April 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Bruce Stafford.

'Fourth International research conference on social security: 'Social security in a long life society'.
5-7 May 2003, Antwerp.
Attended and paper presented by Simon Roberts.

'Final Conference on Harmonisation of Surveys and Data Quality', Federal Statistical Office.
26-27 May 2003, Germany.
Attended by Sandra Reyes De-Beaman.

'Members' Conference - People, Skills and Employability', Careers Research Advisory Centre.
20 June 2003, Cambridge.
Attended by Sue Maguire.

'International conference: 'Free movement of workers and coordination of social security systems', European Commission and the Greek Ombudsman.
20-21 June 2003, Athens.
Attended by Simon Roberts.

'What Works? Evidence, Research and Inference in Social Policy, Social Policy Association Conference', Social Policy Association.
15-17 July 2003, Teesside.
Attended by Kate Legge.

Workshops

'RAGnet Induction Workshop, Research Administrators' Group Network', organised by Nigel Bilsbrough.
23-24 September 2002, Loughborough.
Paper presented by Nigel Bilsbrough.

'Making research useful: Evidence-based practice for voluntary youth service providers', ESRC, The National Council of Voluntary Childcare Organisations (NCVCCO) and the National Council of Voluntary Youth Services (NCVYS).
1 October 2002, London.

Paper presented by Noel Smith.

'Setting the Learning Policy Agenda: Post-19 Series' The Comprehensive Spending Review 2002: Opportunities and Gaps, Campaign for Learning - Learning and Skills Council.
4 October 2002, London.
Attended by Sue Maguire.

'Observatory on social security for migrant workers', European Commission.
7-9 November 2002, Brussels.
UK report presented by Simon Roberts.

'ARCISS Workshop', ARCISS.
19 November 2002, Warwick.
Speaker - Bruce Stafford

'Qualitative Methods Workshop Family and Welfare Cluster', European Commission.
30-31 January 2003, Brussels.
Paper presented by Sue Middleton.

'Family and Welfare: Policy-Relevant Findings Third Family and Welfare Cluster Dialogue Workshop', European Commission.
20 February 2003, Brussels.
Attended by Bruce Stafford.

'Managing the Research Centre's Human Resources', ARCISS Spring Workshop.
27-28 March 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Nigel Bilsbrough.

'The Management and Governance of Research', RAGnet Spring Workshop.
1-2 May 2003, Bristol.
Attended by Nigel Bilsbrough.

Health Research Workshop, Loughborough University.
12 May 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Bruce Stafford, Karen Kellard and Sandra Reyes De-Beaman.

'Europe and Social Exclusion', London School of Economics.
28 May 2003, London.
Attended by Kate Legge.

'Jobcentre Plus Qualitative Evaluation Workshop', Jobcentre Plus Adviser Learning and Development.
13 June 2003, Sheffield.
Paper presented by Yvette Hartfree.
Attended by Liz Sutton.

'Setting the Learning Policy Agenda: Post-19 Series', The National Skills Strategy: Assessment and Next Steps, Campaign for Learning.
11 July 2003, London.
Attended by Joanne Rennison.

Seminars

'Debt and asset-based welfare – synergies and contradictions', Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR).
20 August 2002, London.
Attended by Sue Middleton.

'Policy Research – An Exclusionary Mechanism?', Ingrid Tufvesson (School of Social Science and Policy, UNSW).
1 October 2002, Sydney.
Attended by Laura Adelman.

'Measuring the Effectiveness of Family Support Services: Perspectives of Practitioners', Gabrielle Meagher and Karen Healy (School of Economics and Political Science, University of Sydney).
15 October 2002, Sydney.
Attended by Laura Adelman.

EVENTS ATTENDED, PRESENTATIONS AND VISITORS TO CRSP

'Social Justice Network 'Child Poverty in Britain: what do poor children go without?', University of New South Wales, Anti-Poverty Week.
17 October 2002, Sydney.
Paper presented by Laura Adelman.

'Joint HMT-DWP Labour Market Issues Seminar', HMT/DWP.
25 October 2002, London.
Paper presented by Andreas Cebulla.

'Social Capital, Trust and Recognition', Roger Patulny (School of Sociology and SPRC, UNSW).
29 October 2002, Sydney.
Attended by Laura Adelman.

'Poverty Measurement Measuring Child Poverty in the UK: The Current Debate', Australian Council of Social Service.
5 November 2002, Canberra.
Paper presented by Laura Adelman.

'Assessing the Impact of the Education Maintenance Allowance', CASE London School of Economics.
20 November 2002, London.
Paper presented by Sue Maguire and Karl Ashworth.

'Macro Perspectives of Welfare Dependence of Women and Children', Professor Bob Gregory (Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Canberra).
26 November 2002, Sydney.
Attended by Laura Adelman.

'Financial Knowledge and Older People', Financial Services Authority (FSA) with NIACE.
29 November 2002, London.
Attended by Kim Perren.

'NatCen Annual Seminar – Conflict and Compromise: Families that Work', National Centre for Social Research.
4 December 2002, London.
Attended by Abigail Davis.

'Timing it Right? Tax Credits and How to Respond to Income Changes – Experience in Canada and Australia, and Lessons for the UK', HM Treasury.
5 December 2002, London.
Attended by Sue Middleton.

'Poverty, Social Exclusion and the State A Launch of New Research Studies from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF)', JRF.
11 December 2002, London.
Speaker – Sue Middleton.

'Risk and Inequality', Institute of Civil Engineers.
24 February 2003, London.
Attended by Andreas Cebulla.

'Older Workers: International Trends and Policies' Sol Encel, Social Policy Research Centre.
25 March 2003, Sydney, Australia.
Attended by Laura Adelman.

'Childhood Poverty and Social Exclusion: Developing a Child-Centred Approach' Tess Ridge of Bath University, Social Policy Research Centre.
1 April 2003, Sydney, Australia.
Attended by Laura Adelman.

'Methods and Techniques in Children's Research in International Comparison' German Youth Institute.
3-6 April 2003, Munich.
Attended and paper presented by Sue Middleton.

'European Study of Precarious Employment', ESOPE Project, EC V Framework Programme.
24 May 2003, Warwick.
Attended by Sue Maguire.

'The Missing Million' Supporting disabled people into work, IPPR.
16 June 2003, London.
Attended by Katherine Hill.

'Dimensions of poverty and social exclusion, and persistence of severe poverty in childhood: Discussion seminar', Save the Children.
23 June 2003, London.
Paper presented by Sue Middleton.

'Promoting Professional Standards in Social Research', Social Research Association.
11 July 2003, London.
Attended by Sue Middleton.

Presentations to Government and Other Policy Makers

'Child Poverty: A Scar on the Soul UK and Global Responses', Save the Children Fund.
29 October 2002, Oxford.
Paper presented by Sue Middleton.

'NDDP Evaluation Presentation: Eligible Population and Case Studies', DWP.
9 January 2003, Sheffield.
Presentations by Karen Kellard, Katherine Hill and Bruce Stafford.

'NDDP Presentation on Feasibility Study', DWP.
29 January 2003, Sheffield.
Attended by Kate Legge, Bruce Stafford, Abigail Davis, Karen Kellard and Karl Ashworth.

'Evaluation of the Introduction of Inter-agency Referral Documentation (Children in Need and in Need of Assessment Consent Form) in North East Lincolnshire', Centre for Child and Family Research/North East Lincolnshire local authority.
12 February 2003, Grimsby.
Paper presented by Noel Smith.

'Cross-Government EMA Development Group', DfES.
20 February 2003, London.
Paper presented by Sue Middleton.

'Australian Senate Community Affairs Reference Committee Inquiry into Poverty and Financial Hardship'.
27 May 2003, Sydney, Australia.
Paper presented by Laura Adelman.

'Interim Finding from the Fourth Year EMA Implementation Study', DfES.
4 June 2003, Sheffield.
Paper presented by Sue Maguire.

'Deferrals in Jobcentre Plus: Research into Staff Understanding and Application of Deferral Guidance for Non-Jobseeker's Allowance Customers', DWP.
5 June 2003, London.
Paper presented by Yvette Hartfree.
Attended by Karen Kellard.

'Businesses' responses to the DDA in 2003', DWP.
23 July 2003, London.
Paper presented by Simon Roberts and Katherine Hill (CRSP) and Nick Howat and Penny Tapp (BMRB).

EVENTS ATTENDED, PRESENTATIONS AND VISITORS TO CRSP

Training Courses

'Evaluation Methods', Centre for Applied Social Surveys (CASS).

16-18 September 2002, University of Southampton.
Attended by Kate Legge and Katherine Hill.

'Using PowerPoint', Burleigh College.

15 November 2002, Loughborough.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough, Rita Khatri, Emma Gregory, Nicola Selby and Sharon Walker.

'Health, Safety and Environment Programme - Annual Health & Safety Workshops A-D', Loughborough University Staff Development.

14, 21, 28 January and 4 February 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Lynne Cox.

'Staff Development Statistics: Discriminant Analysis', Loughborough University Staff Development.

11 February 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Joanne Rennison and Kate Legge.

'Staff Development Statistics: Overview of Regression', Loughborough University Staff Development.

25 February 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Joanne Rennison.

'Using Access', Stephenson College

28 February 2003, Coalville.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough, Rita Khatri, Emma Gregory, Nicola Selby and Sharon Walker.

'The Design, Conduct and Analysis of In-depth Interviewing', National Centre for Social Research.

3-7 March 2003, London.
Attended by Kate Legge.

'Staff Development Statistics: Logistic Regression', Loughborough University Staff Development.

4 March 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Yvette Hartfree and Joanne Rennison.

'Statistics: Factor Analysis', Loughborough University Staff Development.

25 March 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Liz Sutton and Kate Legge.

'Communicating Effectively', Loughborough University Staff Development.

27 March 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Liz Sutton, Kate Legge and Yvette Hartfree.

JRF Advisory Group Meeting, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

28 April 2003, London.
Chair - Sue Middleton.
Paper presented by Noel Smith.
Attended by Barbara Dobson and Lynne Cox.

Disability Benefits Consortium Meeting, Disability Alliance/Disability Benefits Consortium.

2 May 2003, London.
Paper presented by Noel Smith.

'SSH Interviewing Techniques - An Introduction to Collecting Qualitative Data', Loughborough University Staff Development.

21 May 2003, Loughborough.
Attended by Joanne Rennison.

Project Advisory Group Meeting - New Policy Institute: Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion 2003, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

4 June 2003, London.
Attended by Sue Middleton.

Data Analysis Summer School, University of Essex.

6-11 July 2003, Essex.
Attended by Kim Perren.

Other Events

RAGnet Committee Awayday.

14-15 August 2002, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

Social Welfare Summer School, Department of Social, Community and Family Affairs/Department for Social Development.

19-23 August 2002, Dublin.
Tutor - Bruce Stafford.

Koestler Awards Scheme Exhibition.

04 September 2002, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

Unit for the Arts and Offenders Trustees' Meeting, International Centre for Prison Studies.

10 September 2002, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

Dr Janet Lewis, Research Director, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, leaving presentation.

27 September 2002, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

Families & Children Research Meeting, DWP.

18 October 2002, London.
Attended by Bruce Stafford, Kate Legge and Kim Perren.

CRSP Awayday.

30-31 October 2002, Breadsall Priory, Derby.
Attended by all CRSP staff.

RAGnet Executive Committee Meeting.

7 November 2002, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

Preparatory meeting FP6 project 'Activation and sustainable inclusion of vulnerable groups in knowledge-based society', Rik Vanberkel Universiteit Utrecht in Netherlands.

9-10 November 2002, Brussels.
Speaker - Bruce Stafford.

Editorial Board of the 'Observatory on social security for migrant workers', European Commission.

21-23 November 2002, Lapland.
Attended by Simon Roberts.

Unit for the Arts and Offenders Trustees' Meeting.

26 November 2002, Leicester.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

RAGnet Focus Group Meeting.

9 January 2003, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

ARCISS Executive Committee Meeting.

20 January 2003, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

EMA Meeting - Connexions Evaluators, DfES.

24 January 2003, Leicester.
Attended by Sue Middleton and Sue Maguire.

RAGnet Executive Committee Meeting.

24 February 2003, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

Unit for the Arts and Offenders Trustees' Meeting.

4 March 2003, International Centre for Prison Studies, London.
Attended by Nigel Billsbrough.

EVENTS ATTENDED, PRESENTATIONS AND VISITORS TO CRSP

National Consumer Council (NCC)
Basic Needs Forum, NCC.
19 March 2003, London.
Attended by Sue Middleton.

RAGnet Advisory Group Meeting.
30 April 2003, Bristol.
Attended by Nigel Bilsbrough.

RAGnet Annual General Meeting.
1 May 2003, Bristol.
Attended by Nigel Bilsbrough.

Unit for the Arts and Offenders Trustees' Meeting.
13 May 2003, Leicester.
Attended by Nigel Bilsbrough.

RAGnet Executive Committee Meeting.
17 June 2003, London.
Attended by Nigel Bilsbrough.

Meeting Basic Needs Forum, National
Consumer Council.
3 July 2003, London.
Paper presented by Sue Middleton.

Participation by 17 Year Olds. A Study of Full-time
Learner Retention in the Second Year of Post
Compulsory Education and Training. Second Advisory
Group Meeting.
8 July 2003, London.
Attended by Sue Maguire.

Summer School, Department for Work and Pensions.
5-12 July 2003, Cambridge.
Tutor: Karen Kellard. Director: Bruce Stafford.

Visitors to CRSP

Care for the Family
Samantha Callan

Disability Alliance
Lorna Reith

Department for Education and Skills (DfES)
John Elliot, Ganka Mueller, Peter Archer, John Kerr,
Sue Rogers, Peter Weller, John Seymour,
Robin Richmond, Paul Froggatt

Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)
Carol Beattie, Tony Martin, George Clark,
Jane Sweeting, Emily Cattell, Jonathan Bailey,
James Calverley, Martin Hill, Mike Daly,
Antony Billinghurst, Vicky Mayhew

ECOTEC Research & Consulting Ltd
Jean Taylor and Vicky Davies

Gingerbread
Margaret Creer

Independent Review Service for the Social Fund
Sir Richard Tilt and Ann Greenshields

IFF
Karen Bunt and Mark Winterbotham

Institute for Employment Research,
University of Warwick
Michael Orton

Institute for Employment Studies, Brighton
Nigel Meager

Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS)
Carl Emmerson, Emla Fitzsimons
Erich Battistin

Jobcentre Plus Adviser Learning, Sheffield
Pam Hirlam and Helen Toon

Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Anne Harrop

London School of Economics (LSE)
Tania Burchardt

National Centre for Social Research
Steven Finch and Jane Lewis

National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling
(NICEC)
Malcolm Maguire

Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB)
Mark Baker

Social Policy Research Unit, University of York
Roy Sainsbury

University of Bath
Jane Millar

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand
Simon Campbell – Dept of Sociology and Anthropology

University of Maryland Baltimore County
David Greenberg

University of Newcastle
Simon Alvey

*Sir Richard Tilt and Ann Greenshields (Independent Review
Service for the Social Fund) visit to CRSP in June 2003.
From left to right: Sir Richard Tilt (IRS), Sue Middleton (CRSP),
Bruce Stafford (CRSP) and Ann Greenshields (IRS).*



Books

Adelman, L., Middleton, S. and Ashworth, K. *Britain's Poorest Children: Severe and Persistent Poverty and Social Exclusion*, Save the Children, 2003, ISBN 1 84187 081 1.

Allen, T., Dobson, B., Hardman, J., Maguire, S., Middleton, S., Graham, J., Woodfield, K. and Maguire, M. *Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots for Vulnerable Young People and Childcare Pilots: Implementation and Reported Impacts in the First Year*, DfES Research Report 396, 2003, ISBN 1 84185 934 6.

Finch, S., Humphrey, A., **Hardman, J., Rennison, J., Maguire, S. and Middleton, S.** *ESF Leavers' Survey 2001*, DWP In House Report 112, 2003, ISBN 1 84388 148 9.

Kellard, K., Legge, K. and Ashworth, K. *Self Employment as a route off benefit*, DWP Research Report No 177, 2002, ISBN 1 84123 509 1.

Maguire, S. and Maguire, M. *Implementation of the Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots: The Third Year, 2001/2002*, DfES Research Report 395, 2003, ISBN 1 84185 919 2.

Stafford, B., Greenberg, D. and Davis, A. (2002) *A Literature Review of the Use of Random Assignment Methodology in Evaluations of US Social Policy Programmes*, DWP In-house Report No. 94, London: DWP.

Conference Contributions

Allen, T. "Appraising Inclusion Policy: The Evaluation of Education Maintenance Allowances for Vulnerable Students", *BERA Conference*, Exeter, September 2002.

Middleton, S. "Taking the Child Out of the Family: What We Learn from Child Focused Research", Paper presented to the *International Conference of the Children's Panel 'Methods and Techniques in Children's Research in International Comparison'*, Munich, April 2003 (Confidential – Not for Quotation).

Middleton, S. "Session Four: Comparative Analysis", *Cross-National Qualitative Methods*, Papers from a Workshop held in Brussels on 30-31 January 2003, (ed) Claire Cameron, Brussels, April 2003.

Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K. "Gaps in Coverage for Old Age Pensions & Healthcare in 15 Countries", *ISSA Initiative Conference*, Vancouver, September 2002.

Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K. "ISSA Initiative, Findings & Opinions No. 4, Assessing the coverage gap: A summary of early findings from an ISSA Initiative study", *ISSA Initiative Conference*, Vancouver, September 2002.

Roberts, S. "Migration and old age pensions: the contributory principle and the concept of discrimination", Paper presented to the Fourth *International research conference on social security, 'Social security in a long life society'*, Antwerp, May 2003.

Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K. "Evaluer l'exclusion." Synthèse des conclusions préliminaires d'une étude de l'initiative de l'AISS. Initiative de l'AISS Recherches et points de vue, No. 4. AISS, Genève, Août 2002.

Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K. "Evaluación de la falta de cobertura". Resumen de los primeros resultados de un estudio de la Iniciativa de la AISS. Iniciativa de la AISS Investigaciones y Puntos de Vista N_m. 4. AISS, Ginebra, August 2002.

Roberts, S., Stafford, B. and Ashworth, K.

"Einschätzung der Deckungslücke. Zusammenfassung der ersten Erkenntnisse einer Studie der IVSS-Initiative." IVSS-Initiative Forschungsergebnisse und Standpunkte Nr. 4. IVSS, Genf, 2002.

Stafford, B. "Active Labour Policies in the United Kingdom: The New Deals", *Paper for a meeting to prepare an FP6 Integrated Project proposal on active policies and sustainable inclusion of vulnerable groups in knowledge-based societies*, Brussels, November 2002.

Edited Works: Contributions

Adelman, L. and Cebulla, A. "The Dynamics of Poverty and Deprivation in the UK", in *The Dynamics of Social Exclusion in Europe: Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*, eds. Apospori, E. and Millar, J. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2003, pp139-163, ISBN 1 84064 893 7.

Arber, S., Davidson, K. and **Perren, K.** "Involvement in Social Organisations in later life: Variations by gender and class", in *Cultural Gerontology*, Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, Connecticut, 2003, pp77-93, ISBN 0 86569 327 7.

Cebulla, A. "Zur Privatisierung der Arbeitsmarktpolitik in Grossbritannien und Deutschland. Raum für private Arbeitslosenversicherung?", in *Zeitschrift Für Sozialreform*, 2003, pp134-152, ISSN 0514 2776.

García, C., Thorogood, M., Armstrong, B., Wonderling, D., **Reyes S.**, Duran, C. and Muñoz, O. "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the primary prevention schemes in high blood pressure management among older people (Evaluación de la efectividad de esquemas de prevención primaria en el manejo de la hipertensión en los ancianos)", in *Health Challenges in the Social Security in the XXI Century. Technology Evaluation and Management*, eds. Duran, L. and Muñoz, O, Mexico: IMSS, 2002, pp51-62, ISBN 968 7346 88 4.

Kellard, K. "Wired-up welfare: the impact of information and communication technology on social security", in *Understanding Social Security: Issues for Policy and Practice*, ed. Millar, J. The Policy Press, 2003, pp213-234, ISBN 1 86134 419 8.

Lodemel, I. and **Stafford, B.** "Social integration through obligations to work? Social Trends Social Policy in Denmark", in *A European Perspective*, Danish Council of Social Welfare and Centre for Alternative Social Analysis, Denmark: Socialpolitish Forlag, 2002, pp65-75, ISBN 87 7504 122 7.

Middleton, S. and Adelman, L. "The Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain: implications for the assessment of social security provision for children in Europe", in *Children and Social Security*, ed. Bradshaw, J. International Studies on Social Security, Volume 8, Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2003, pp23-35, ISBN 0 7546 3164 8.

Middleton, S., Barnes, M. and Millar, J. "Introduction: the dynamic analysis of poverty and social exclusion", in *The Dynamics of Social Exclusion in Europe: Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*, eds. Apospori, E. and Millar, J. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2003, pp1-15, ISBN 1 84064 893 7.

Roberts, S. "Migration und soziale Sicherheit: Kirchturnpolitik im globalen Dorf", in *Soziale Sicherheit im globalen Dorf*, eds. Sigg, R. and Behrendt, C. Land, P. Bern, 2003, pp321-344, ISBN 3 906770 12 5.

Roberts, S. "Migration and social security: parochialism in the global village", in *Social security in the global village*, eds. Sigg, R. and Behrendt, C. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 2002, pp211-226, ISBN 0 7658 0930 3.

PUBLICATIONS AND WORKING PAPERS AUGUST 2002 – JULY 2003

Stafford, B. "Service Delivery and the User", in *Understanding Social Security: Issues for Policy and Practice*, ed. Millar, J. The Policy Press, 2003, pp213-234, ISBN 1 86134 419 8.

Stafford, B. "Beyond lone parents: extending welfare-to-work to disabled people and the young unemployed", in *The Welfare We Want? The British Challenge for American Reform*, eds. Walker, R. and Wiseman, M. The Policy Press, 2003, pp143-174, ISBN 1 86134 407 4.

Journal Papers

Beaman, P., **Reyes, S.** and García, C. "Validation of the HPQ in a Mexican elderly population", *Psychological Reports* 2003, 92, pp723-34.

Lister, R., **Smith, N., Middleton, S. and Cox, L.** "Young People Talk about Citizenship: Empirical Perspectives on Theoretical and Political Debates", *Citizenship Studies*, Vol 7, No.2, 2003, pp235-253, ISSN 1362 1025.

Maguire, S. "Employers' Demands for Youth Labour and their Recruitment Strategies", *Career Research & Development*, No.6, Summer 2002, ISSN 1472 6564.

Perren, K., Arber, S. and Davidson, K. "Men's organisational affiliations in later life: the influence of social class and marital status on informal group membership", *Ageing & Society* 23, 2003, pp69-82.

Reyes, S., Beaman, P., García, C., Córdova, A., Villa, MA., Heres J. and Jagger, C. "Minimal state examination (MMSE): Translation and Validation for a Mexican Elderly Population", *Ageing, Neuropsychology and Cognition in 2003*.

Roberts, S. "Review of Frans Pennings' 'Dutch Social Security Law in International Context'", *European Journal of Social Security*, Volume 5, No. 2, 2003, pp181-184, ISSN 1388-2627.

Stafford, B. "In Search of a Welfare to Work Solution: The New Deal for Disabled People", *Benefits*, Number 38, Volume 11, Issue 3, 2003, pp181-186.

Stafford, B. "Being more certain about Random Assignment in Social Policy Evaluations", *Social Policy and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 2002, pp275-284.

Walker, R., Greenberg, D., **Ashworth, K. and Cebulla, A.** (2003) "Successful welfare-to-work programs: Were Riverside and Portland really that good?", *Focus*, Vol 22, No.3, Summer 2003, pp11-18, ISSN 0195 5705.

Official Reports

Jagger, C., **Reyes, S.,** Clarke, M. and Ballantyne, R. *Population Ageing in the East Midlands*, University of Leicester/Trent Public Health Observatory.

Jagger, C., **Reyes, S.,** Clarke, M. and Ballantyne, R. *Healthy Ageing in the East Midlands*, University of Leicester/Trent Public Health Observatory.

Roberts, S. *European Observatory on Social Security for Migrant Workers: National Report: United Kingdom*, Max Planck Institute for Foreign and International Social Law, Munich 2002.

Working Papers

Adelman, L., Middleton S. and Ashworth, K. *Dimensions of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Childhood*. April 2003, CRSP 476.

Adelman, L., Middleton, S. and Ashworth, K. *Persistence of Severe Child Poverty*. March 2003, CRSP 473.

Ashworth, K., Hartfree, Y., Kazimirski, A., **Legge, K.,** Pires, C., **Reyes de Beaman, S.,** Shaw, A. and **Stafford, B.** *New Deal for Disabled People National Extension: First Wave of the First Cohort of the Survey of Registrants*. May 2003, CRSP 478s.

Cebulla, A. Staat und Selbstverantwortung - Eine Illustration der Einstellungen zum Wohlfahrtsstaat in Deutschland und Grossbritannien am (hypothetischen) Beispiel der privaten Arbeitslosenversicherung. September 2002, CRSP 464.

Cebulla, A., Heaver, C., Smith, N. and Sutton, L. *Drugs and Alcohol Use as Barriers to Employment*. November 2002, CRSP 470s.

Corden, A., Harries, T., **Hill, K., Kellard, K.,** Lewis, J., Sainsbury, R. and Thornton, P. *New Deal for Disabled People National Extension: Findings from the First Wave of Qualitative Research with Clients, Job Brokers and Jobcentre Plus Staff*. June 2003, CRSP 474S.

Dobson, B. *Preliminary Research into the Additional Needs of Disabled People*. September 2002, CRSP 465.

Hartfree, Y., Sutton, L. and Kellard, K. *Jobcentre Plus: Personal Adviser Training*. May 2003, CRSP 477.

Kellard, K., Hartfree, Y. and ECOTEC. Deferrals in Jobcentre Plus: Research into Staff Understanding and Application of Deferral Guidance for Non-Jobseekers Allowance Customers. June 2003, CRSP 485.

Kellard, K., Cox, L. and Davis, A. *Saffron Sure Start Baseline Satisfaction Report*. July 2003, CRSP 487.

MacDonald, S., Davis, A. and Stafford, B. *Report of the Survey of Job Brokers*. June 2003, CRSP 484s.

Middleton, S., Ashworth, K., Maguire, S., Emmerson, C., Battistin, E. and Fitzsimons, E. *Quantitative Evaluation of Education Maintenance Allowance Pilots: Reflections on Analytic Strategy and Responses to Questions – A Research Note*. March 2003, CRSP 472.

Middleton, S., Maguire, S., Ashworth, K., Legge, K., Allen, T., Perren, K., Battistin, E., Dearden, L., Emmerson, C., Fitzsimons, E. and Meghir, C. *The Evaluation of Education Maintenance Pilots: Three Years Evidence A Quantitative Evaluation*. November 2002, CRSP 471.

Perren, K. and Middleton, S. *Participation in Post-16 Education and Application for EMA Among Young People with Special Needs: A Research Note*. May 2003, CRSP 479.

Perren, K., Middleton, S. and Emmerson, C. *Education Maintenance Allowance Transport Report – Integrated Quantitative Findings from Year 1 and 2*. June 2003, CRSP 480.

Roberts, S., Ashworth, K. and Stafford, B.R. *Assessing the Coverage Gap*. October 2002, CRSP 468.

Roberts, S., Hill, K., Rennison, J., Stafford, B., Heaver, C., Howat, N., Kelly, G., Krishnan, S., Tapp, P. and Thomas, A. *Preparation for 2004 Changes: Employers' and Service Providers' Responses to the DDA in 2003 and Disability in the Workplace*. August 2003, CRSP 488s.

Ward, H., **Smith, N.,** Garnett, L., Booth, A. and Everett, G. *Evaluation of the introduction of Inter-agency Referral Documentation (Children in Need and in Need of Protection Assessment and Consent Form) in North Lincolnshire*. October 2002, CRSP 469.

CONTACT DETAILS

NAME	TITLE	E-MAIL	TELEPHONE
Laura Adelman	Research Associate	L.P.A.Adelman@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3392
Nigel Bilsbrough	Finance & Resources Manager	J.N.Bilsbrough@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3381
Andreas Cebulla	Assistant Director	A.J.Cebulla@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3374
Lynne Cox	Research Assistant	L.A.M.Cox@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3677
Abigail Davis	Research Assistant	A.A.I.Davis@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3369
Sandra Reyes de Beaman	Research Fellow	S.De-Beaman@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3785
Barbara Dobson	Research Fellow	B.M.Dobson@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3785
Emma Gregory	Project Administrator	E.Gregory@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3372
Yvette Hartfree	Research Associate	Y.F.Hartfree@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3377
Katherine Hill	Research Associate	K.R.Hill@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3385
Karen Kellard	Assistant Director	K.V.Kellard@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3389
Rita Khatri	Project Administrator	R.Khatri@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3372
Kate Legge	Research Associate	K.E.Legge@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3373
Siobhan MacDonald	Research Student	S.MacDonald@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3674
Sue Maguire	Research Fellow	S.Maguire@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3673
Sue Middleton	Director	S.Middleton@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 2059
Kim Perren	Research Associate	K.Perren@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3378
Joanne Rennison	Research Associate	J.H.Rennison@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3617
Simon Roberts	Research Fellow	S.Roberts@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3876
Phil Sadler	IT Technician	P.Sadler@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3375
Nicola Selby	Project Administrator	N.A.Selby@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3618
Noel Smith	Research Associate	N.D.Smith@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3786
Bruce Stafford	Director	B.R.Stafford@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3784
Liz Sutton	Research Associate	E.A.Sutton@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3679
Sharon Walker	Office Co-ordinator	S.Walker@lboro.ac.uk	01509 22 3618

Centre for Research in Social Policy
 Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University, Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK.
 Telephone +44 (0)1509 223372 Fax +44 (0)1509 213409
www.crsp.ac.uk



Centre for Research in Social Policy
Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University
Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK.
Telephone +44 (0)1509 223372 Fax +44 (0)1509 213409
www.crsp.ac.uk