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This year CRSP celebrated its 21st anniversary. Since its establishment in 1983 by Professor Sir Adrian Webb CRSP has been a thriving self-funding research centre whose work has had a significant impact upon public policy. To mark the Centre’s many achievements a conference on the relationship between research and policy was held in September 2004. The conference was attended by leading social policy analysts including current and former members of staff, and keynote speeches were given by the Rt. Hon. Dawn Primarolo, Professor Ruth Lister and Sue Duncan. Further details about the event are included on pages 10-11.

The Centre took the opportunity provided by our 21st anniversary to revisit both how we disseminate our research and how we organise our research under themes. As an applied social policy centre, how we disseminate our research is critical and we have established a working group to examine how we can improve the ways in which we inform policy, lay and academic audiences of research findings. During the year work also began on improving our website (www.crsp.ac.uk), and the new CRSP logo was launched at the 21st conference.

The research and evaluation studies covered in this report are grouped under the four new themes:

- Welfare and Life Transitions
- Comparative Welfare
- Towards Social Inclusion
- Poverty and Social Exclusion

Looking ahead to 2005, Sue Middleton will be spending the year working outside of the Centre on a number of projects, including acting as advisor to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation’s Poverty and Disadvantage committee. Accordingly, Bruce Stafford will be leading the Centre next year.

CRSP staff are all looking forward to 2005 and would like to thank all our colleagues and friends who helped make the celebration of our first 21 years such a wonderful occasion.
A Short History of CRSP

It is impossible to do justice to the rich and varied history of CRSP; our developing research interests, patterns of funding, staff comings and goings, and individual and institutional successes, in such a short space. All we can do is highlight some of the main milestones in our development.

Professor Sir Adrian Webb, then Head of the Department of Social Sciences, founded the Centre in 1983. In the early years, most of the Centre’s funding came from the Department of Health through one of the UK’s first major national policy evaluations, of the Opportunities for Volunteering Programme. Following Professor Robert Walker’s appointment as Director in 1990, CRSP expanded both its research interests and funding base, particularly in the fields of social security research and, more generally, the interaction between people’s living standards and lifestyles. Also during this period, the Unit for the Arts and Offenders was established within CRSP under the direction of the late Anne Peaker and Dr Jill Vincent, formerly Assistant Director. The Unit left CRSP in 1996 to establish itself as a separate charity.

1996 also saw the establishment of the Department of Social Security’s core funded research unit within CRSP, under Robert’s direction and with Bruce Stafford as Assistant Director. The Unit sat within a new programme of research on Welfare Institutions. At the same time, Sue Middleton was charged with further developing CRSP’s other research interests under the banner of the Lifestyles and Living Standards Programme. The Centre expanded rapidly during the next few years, taking its funding base from only two funders and 14 members of staff in 1995 to nine funders and 27 members of staff in 2000.

In April 2000 Robert left to become Professor of Social Policy at Nottingham University, and Bruce and Sue took over as Directors. The two research programmes were merged and CRSP’s work was re-organised around themes that are reflected in the descriptions of our current research programme elsewhere in this report. The Centre has continued to develop in the ensuing four years, maintaining and developing our reputation for leading large-scale national policy evaluations for government, particularly the Departments for Work and Pensions and Education and Skills, as well as more strategic research funded by bodies such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Economic and Social Research Council.

It is difficult to choose just one achievement from the many over the years of which we are proud:

- public acknowledgements by Ministers and senior civil servants of the role that some of our research has played in changing policy;
- the respect of our colleagues in the research community; and
- the individual successes of members of CRSP as they have developed their careers.

CRSP has always had a fundamental belief in research as a career that merits security of employment for staff. Despite our continued dependence on ‘soft’ money, one of CRSP’s major achievements has been that virtually all staff are employed on open ended contracts. We believe that this has been crucial in securing CRSP’s ongoing success and is a model to which others in the sector might aspire.
This year's annual report celebrates CRSP's 21st birthday, with an extended edition covering 18 months in the life of the Centre. During this time, in addition to organising the CRSP conference (see pages 10-11), staff have been collaborating with colleagues both here and abroad and sharing research findings and expert knowledge with policy makers, researchers, academics and the media. CRSP warmly welcomed visits from Professor Sir David Wallace, Vice-Chancellor of Loughborough University, and representatives from the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, the Nuffield Community Care Studies Unit at the University of Leicester, HM Treasury's Poverty and Welfare to Work Team and members of the Social Exclusion Unit Impacts and Trends team. External contributors to the Centre's seminar series have included Professor Ruth Hancock, from the University of Essex and John Jensen, from the New Zealand Ministry of Social Development.

Sue Middleton was invited to give evidence to the House of Commons Department for Work and Pensions Select Committee Enquiry into Child Poverty. Nigel Bilsbrough was asked to contribute to the Social Research Association initiative on Research Commissioning, which is led by Dr Janet Lewis. He was also instrumental in facilitating the negotiation of a national agreement with the Inland Revenue on one-off payments to research respondents. Noel Smith gave a presentation on developing budget standards for disabled people at a Labour Party Conference fringe meeting, and was a member of the discussion panel, which also included Maria Eagle MP, the Department for Work and Pensions Minister for disabilities, Dr Roger Berry MP, secretary for the All Party Parliamentary Disability Group and Lorna Reith, Chief Executive of the Disability Alliance.

In 2004 Sue Middleton was invited to act as an adviser to the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's Poverty and Disadvantage Committee, to help develop the future direction of their work on poverty and social exclusion. Sue will spend 2005 working on this, as well as writing on issues relating to childhood poverty and social exclusion but will maintain links with CRSP. She will return to her role as Director of the Centre in January 2006. We would like to take this opportunity to wish Sue well.

CRSP and the wider research arena
CRSP staff contributed to various national and international summer schools, research networks and research centre forums. Since 2003, Centre Director Bruce Stafford has been Director of the Department for Work and Pensions Summer School, which takes place annually. The Summer School, held at King's College, Cambridge, is attended by over 100 supervisory and managerial staff from the Department for Work and Pensions. Students attend sessions by the Secretary of State, the Permanent Secretary, and other senior officials from the Department, as well as lectures by established experts and academics in social policy. Besides Bruce, both Karen Kellard and Simon Roberts have also been tutors at the Summer School.

Simon Roberts is a member of the European Commission's Working Group looking at the impact of globalisation on European social security systems. The working group was part of the COST programme, the main objective of which was to increase knowledge and a common European understanding of the reforms and the transformation of social protection.
systems in Europe in the context of globalisation and European construction. Simon is also a founder member of the Socrates Summer School on European Social Security, which was held for the first time in August 2004 in Ghent. CRSP student researcher Kate Ashton-Brooks was one of the two Loughborough University students to attend.

Nigel Bilsbrough serves on the committee of RAGnet (Research Administrators’ Group Network), which is the professional organisation for research managers and administrators in the UK. Nigel is also a trustee and treasurer of the Unit for the Arts and Offenders, which is the national umbrella organisation that supports the development of the arts within criminal justice settings. Both Bruce Stafford and Nigel are members of the Executive Committee of ARCISS, the Association of Research Centres in Social Sciences, which is a membership organisation for research centres in the UK committed to promoting rigorous social science research.

**CRSP around the world**

Congratulations are due to Monica Magadi on the award of a EuroPanel Users Network (EPUNet) Grant for Short Research Visits, which will see her visiting the Centre for the Study of Populations, Poverty and Socio-economic Policy in Luxembourg in February 2005.

Line Nyhagen Predelli has been continuing work with colleagues overseas on a project exploring political participation and organisation in multicultural Norway. Funded by the Research Council of Norway, it examines the involvement of Norwegian immigrant organisations in political processes and decision-making, and includes a survey of immigrant organisations and in-depth interviews with representatives from immigrant organisations and immigrant councils.

Laura Adelman spent a year in Australia at the Social Policy Research Centre working on CRSP projects and presenting the Centre's work at seminars and conferences. Laura was invited to attend the meetings of a working party consisting of poverty researchers and members of charitable organisations, which was attempting to draw up poverty definitions and measures for Australia, and was able to present Britain's latest thinking on this issue, as well as CRSP's perspective. During this time she worked closely with Professor Peter Saunders and with him provided written and oral evidence to the Australian Senate’s Inquiry into Poverty and Financial Hardship.

Kim Perren presented a paper on the impact of social and political change on the social position of older people in Britain, West Germany and Hungary, at the 6th Annual Conference of the European Sociological Association, which was held at the University of Murcia, Spain. Simon Roberts presented the 2003 UK report for the European Observatory on Social Security for Migrant Workers to the European Commission in Brussels. Simon also attended the European Commission’s conference on the Co-ordination of Social Security in an Enlarged Europe: Now and Tomorrow, in Hungary. Karen Kellard gave a presentation at a seminar on Individual Approaches in Activation to the Active Social Policies European Network in Sweden.
CRSP at home
In addition to working with colleagues in the Department of Social Sciences, CRSP staff are involved in several inter-departmental research consortia, and in December 2004 co-ordinated and hosted a meeting of representatives from other Loughborough University research centres in order to facilitate collaboration and to share knowledge and experiences. Sue Middleton is a member of the Social Sciences and Humanities Faculty Board. Karen Kellard is a member of the Human Resources Committee and she and Abigail Davis have been union and staff representatives on the campus’ Nursery Consultative Committee.

Training and development
Each year CRSP recruits an undergraduate in the second year of study from the Department of Social Sciences to work within the Centre for a year in order to gain experience of ‘real world’ research. Kate Ashton-Brooks was the CRSP Scholar from October 2003-September 2004. Kate said ‘One of the main ways that I benefited from my time at CRSP was through making a real contribution to the working life of the Centre. I learnt a great deal through being given the responsibility of doing work that really mattered both to the projects and to CRSP’. The CRSP Scholar for 2004-05 is Sarah Gonzalez.

Staff have participated in a wide range of external training courses and workshops including: approaches to sampling, conducting research with children and young people, reporting, presenting and analysing qualitative data, conducting survey research, dealing with the media, survey data analysis, and using focus groups in qualitative research. In addition to this, staff also attend and contribute to ‘in-house’ training and the weekly CRSP seminar series. Recent sessions covered data protection and attitudinal questionnaire data. Invitations are extended to external speakers both from within Loughborough University and other institutions and research organisations.

Simon Roberts, Karen Kellard, Noel Smith, Nigel Blisbrough, Bruce Stafford and Sue Maguire were involved in delivering seminars on aspects of effective management of research within the Department of Social Science’s MSc in Social Research. Karen Kellard and Liz Sutton gave a workshop for Social Science and Humanities research students on qualitative interviewing techniques, and Liz Sutton was a guest lecturer at De Montfort University on the use of focus groups in media related research. Bruce Stafford was an external examiner for the first year of a taught PhD in Social Policy at Nottingham University.
Joiners and leavers

Over the past eighteen months we have been pleased to welcome Elspeth Pound, Line Nyhagen Predelli, Clare Lawson, Antonia Ivaldi, Amanda Crompton, Jacqueline Beckhelling, Viet-Hai Phung, and Sarah Gonzalez. We were sorry to say goodbye to Andreas Cebulla (now a Research Director at National Centre for Social Research) and Laura Adelman (now a Senior Research Officer within the Department for Work and Pensions). Sue Maguire and Joanne Rennison joined the Centre for Education and Industry at Warwick University as a Principal Research Fellow and Research Fellow, respectively. Rita Khatri took up a post as a Personal Assistant at the Alliance and Leicester’s head office and Emma Gregory joined United Biscuits as a Customer Care Manager. Barbara Dobson emigrated with her family to Canada, Champa Mistry left to take up a position as a Reiki Healer, and Sandra Reyes de Beaman successfully applied to train as a Specialist Registrar in Public Health Medicine. Kate Ashton-Brooks returned to complete the final year of her degree. We wish them all well in their careers and were glad to see so many were able to attend the CRSP 21st anniversary celebrations. At the time of going to print we were also pleased to welcome Chris Dearden who joined CRSP as a Research Fellow in January 2005.

CRSP out and about

During 2003 and 2004 CRSP staff enjoyed a variety of social and cultural pursuits including greyhound racing, bowling, skittles, performances by the Royal Ballet and visiting Loughborough’s annual street fair. One of the highlights of the social calendar was a well-attended day trip to London to see the West End production of Chicago.

Staff have also been involved in a number of charity events, including entering a team in the ‘Race for Life’ held at Loughborough University this year, to raise money for Cancer Research UK. Yvette Hartfree took part in a sponsored 10 km run, raising £80 for Rainbows, a local hospice for terminally ill children, which staff also support each year by making donations to Rainbows instead of exchanging Christmas cards.

Congratulations to...

... Sharon Walker and Steven Whiles on the birth of baby Ethan James Whiles on 24 April, 2004.
... Simon Roberts on his appointment as Assistant Director.
... Kim Perren, Line Nyhagen Predelli and Noel Smith on their Research Fellowships.
... Antonia Ivaldi on the award of her PhD from the University of Keele.
... Liz Sutton and Abigail Davis on attaining passes with distinction in the University’s MSc in Social Research.
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In 2004 CRSP marked its 21st birthday. The highlight of the celebrations was a special conference, held at Loughborough University on 17 September. More than 80 colleagues in the social policy research and academic communities, as well as those involved in policy making, were brought together to consider and debate the role of research in shaping social policy.

The conference was based around four themes:

- Welfare and Life Transitions;
- Comparative Welfare;
- Towards Social Inclusion; and
- Poverty and Social Exclusion.

Keynote speakers were: the Rt Hon Dawn Primarolo MP (Paymaster General); Sue Duncan (Chief Government Social Researcher); and Professor Ruth Lister (Professor of Social Policy at Loughborough University). CRSP was also very pleased to welcome back its founder, Professor Sir Adrian Webb (now Vice-Chancellor at the University of Glamorgan), and its former Director, Professor Robert Walker (now at the University of Nottingham).

In the morning plenary session, the Rt Hon Dawn Primarolo discussed the vital contribution that research makes to effective government and recognised that ‘in constructing evidence-based policies, the Government owes a great deal to social researchers and academics around the country’. She emphasised the Government’s determination to ensure that policy makers’ decisions are rooted in a ‘bedrock’ of sound evidence. The Minister also highlighted the importance of longitudinal evidence, particularly in helping to understand the causes of child poverty and its effects on people’s life chances.

Sue Duncan focused on the challenge of getting the policy-research relationship right. This includes demystifying the policy process for those working outside of government, as well as recognising within government the complexities of the research process. Without
good research information, ‘policies can be poorly targeted, can have unintended consequences or they can simply not work’. Current approaches to policy making prioritise inclusiveness, performance measurement and delivery, joined-up government, strategic thinking and identifying ‘what works’. In each of these key areas, Ms Duncan emphasised the important role that research plays in providing evidence to those working in government, whilst recognising that there remain inherent frustrations and challenges in the research/policy relationship.

Professor Lister reflected on the relevance and value of social policy research both for government and non-government actors. She considered the influence and limits of research on social policy makers, mediating factors and who decides what is relevant. She emphasised the need to give more thought to how we can make research accessible to its ‘beneficiaries’. In conclusion, she argued that we cannot allow government to be the sole arbiter of research relevance, for we also have wider responsibilities, in particular to those whose voices are least heard in policy-making debates.

In the afternoon parallel sessions, participants discussed the role of research in shaping social policy around CRSP’s four research themes: poverty and social exclusion; welfare and life transitions; comparative welfare; and progress towards social inclusion. The panels included speakers from CRSP and other UK and international academics and researchers, as well as representatives from government and the research funding community.

The day was a great success and concluded with a round table discussion about the future direction of social policy research. Full conference proceedings will be available via CRSP’s website in 2005. More information about CRSP’s work can be accessed via http://www.crsp.ac.uk or from Clare Lawson at CRSP (e.c.lawson@lboro.ac.uk).

The next CRSP Conference will be held in 2006. Details of themes and booking arrangements will be available on the website from Autumn 2005.
CRSP projects within this theme have examined patterns of movement between benefits, routes off benefit and job retention. This work has informed policy debates about how to secure sustained employment for people of working age. CRSP evaluations of social programmes have been influential in understanding why and how government interventions work. Projects have also explored transitions at various stages of life such as into post-16 education, to adult citizenship for young people, into learning for adults and throughout older age.

Research questions include:

- How transitions in peoples' lives are supported by the welfare state, in particular:
  - movements between work and unemployment; and
  - movements between work and other states such as education, training, caring, sickness, incapacity and retirement.
- Has the UK social security system kept pace with changes in demographics, family structures, labour markets, employment patterns and peoples' retirement decisions?

### Projects within this theme are:
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CRSP leads a consortium to evaluate the national extension of the New Deal for Disabled People, which is a voluntary programme designed to assist people with disabilities and health conditions enter sustained employment. It is a key part of the Government’s welfare to work strategy. A network of around 60 Job Brokers (a mix of not-for-profit, private and public sector organisations who bid to cover specific geographical areas) has been established to deliver the programme to people on incapacity related benefits.

The evaluation is large scale and involves a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods. Most of the fieldwork for the evaluation incorporates a longitudinal dimension. The evaluation also includes an impact assessment and a cost benefit study. Principal early findings are:

- over half of the eligible population had heard of NDDP and/or a Job Broker operating in their local area;
- between July 2001 and November 2003, 67,983 people or 1.9 per cent of the eligible population had registered with the programme;
- the programme was designed to give potential participants a choice of Job Broker. However, there is little evidence of participants actively choosing a Job Broker. Of those who made a choice the main influencing factor was the location of a Job Broker’s office;
- there is some evidence from the qualitative research that Job Brokers sought to register the most job ready and to prioritise them once registered. Where a registration did not take place the Job Brokers directed the customers towards more appropriate services;
- participants were more likely to be male, younger, on Incapacity Benefit for a shorter duration, and to have musculo-skeletal problems than the Incapacity Benefit population as a whole; they were less likely to have a mental health condition;
- in general, Job Brokers said they viewed the impact of NDDP on their respective organisations as positive;
- Job Brokers did not provide a set menu of services rather, different Job Brokers provided a package of services, which could include basic skills assessments, help with job search, training, work placements, financial advice, etc. Overall, a wide range of services was provided in-house and/or by other/partner organisations. Most provided job search related services;
- Job Brokers’ relations with one another were mixed – sometimes seen as collaborative and at other times as competitive. Relations with Jobcentre Plus were seen as central to the success of the programme, and as having improved over time;
- participants’ experiences of, and views on, how Job Brokers could help them gain employment varied. For some participants the Job Brokers’ links with employers were not always as close as they had anticipated; and
- participants tended to have positive views about the service they had received from Job Brokers. Of those people registering with NDDP up to November 2003, 32 per cent had gained paid work and of these participants 39 per cent had achieved sustained employment.
The other members of the consortium are: Abt Associates in Cambridge, Massachusetts; the Institute for Employment Studies; the National Centre for Social Research; the Social Policy Research Unit at the University of York; and the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. The consortium is also supported by an Advisory Group of academics and representatives of the voluntary sector chaired by Professor Robert Walker, Nottingham University.

Publications


This has been the largest single evaluation ever funded by the Department for Education and Skills and has been undertaken by a consortium of organisations, led by CRSP. Commissioned in 1999, the evaluation aimed to assess the effect of providing young people from poorer homes with a weekly allowance to encourage them to remain in full-time education post-16 years, in terms of improvements in participation, retention and achievement.

**The Policy Problem**

Despite very large increases in the proportions of young people remaining in post-16 education during the early 1990s, there was concern that levels had peaked at around 70 per cent, below those in other similar countries. Participation in post-17 education was particularly low among young men and those from lower socio-economic groups:

- in 1997 only 66.2 per cent of 16 year old men remained in post-16 education compared with 72.8 per cent of young women; and
- by 1998 only 48 per cent of young people from unskilled manual backgrounds remained in full-time education after the end of compulsory schooling compared with 85 per cent of those from professional/managerial backgrounds.

Lack of money was thought to be one of the main reasons why young people from these backgrounds were not staying on.

There have, in fact, been a number of EMA Evaluations. In addition to the main evaluation in ten of the original 15 pilot areas and 11 control areas, separate evaluations have taken place:

- in the remaining five pilot areas (Leeds and four London Boroughs);
- in four of the original 15 pilot areas where extensions to the main EMA scheme were introduced to encourage ‘vulnerable’ young people to remain in education; and
- in a further five pilot areas where a variant of EMA to assist young people with the costs of transport was tested.

**The EMA Pilots**

- for young people in full-time education post-16;
- annual family incomes of £30,000 or less;
- a maximum of £40 per week in term time;
- termly retention bonuses;
- achievement bonuses; and
- receipt conditional on compliance with a Learning Agreement.
The Evaluation of the Piloting of Education Maintenance Allowances

Methods
The evaluation involved a range of qualitative and quantitative methods, all of which included a longitudinal element. Methods employed for the main EMA evaluation were:

- large longitudinal surveys of an initial random sample of 22,500 young people (and their parents at first interview) in ten pilot areas and 11 control areas. Young people from two cohorts, those who finished compulsory education in 1999 and 2000, were interviewed four times at annual intervals to track their post-16 activities and progress. Data from these surveys provided impact measures of gains in participation, retention and achievement arising from the availability of EMA, using Propensity Score Matching techniques. They also provided a wealth of descriptive data to contextualise and extend the impact analysis;
- studies of how EMA was implemented in the pilot areas involving annual interviews with the main stakeholders in the evaluation at local level;
- area studies to collect contextual socio-economic and demographic data in the pilot and control areas; and
- qualitative interviews with young people and parents over the first twelve months of the pilot to explore the processes underlying young people’s decisions to remain in education and to claim EMA.

Findings
The evaluation produced a wealth of findings about young people as they made the transition from compulsory education to higher education and the labour market. Full reports and research summaries are available on the DfES website.

In terms of the main evaluation, our best estimate of the impact of EMA was that it had increased participation in full-time education in Year 12 among eligible young people in the pilot areas by 5.9 percentage points. These gains were even larger among young men in urban areas, the group that had been a particular focus of policy concern. There was also evidence that EMA had improved retention among eligible young people beyond initial participation at the start of Year 12 and into Year 13 by some 3.2 percentage points. Analysis of the achievement data is currently ongoing and results will be available in 2005.

The evaluation consortium comprised researchers from CRSP, the Institute for Fiscal Studies, National Centre for Social Research, National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling and the Centre for Education and Industry.

2 DfES Youth Cohort Study, Statistical Bulletin, 02/2000
The Evaluation of the Adult Learning Grant

In July 2003 the Government announced in its Skills Strategy the piloting of the Adult Learning Grant (ALG) (21st Century Skills – Realising our Potential, 2003). The ALG is a means-tested grant for adults and provides financial support (up to £30 per week during term time) to adults studying full-time for their first level 2 qualification, and young adults studying full-time for their first full level 3 qualification. The ALG contributes to the government’s 2010 target to achieve a 40 per cent reduction in the number of adults in the workforce lacking any qualifications up to level 2.

In September 2003, the ALG was launched in ten pilot sites across England. Payments of grants are subject to strict attendance requirements, which are monitored by learning providers. Although take-up of the ALG has been slow, 4,864 learners have now been awarded ALG and payments worth £2,187,980 have been issued (as at 8 December 2004).

The ALG evaluation, commissioned by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES), is being conducted by a consortium of organisations. The consortium is led by CRSP and includes the National Centre for Social Research (NatCen), the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) and the National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling (NICEC).

The evaluation aims to:
1. evaluate the impact of the ALG on retention, attainment and progression of learners;
2. examine the effect of the ALG on the level of qualification, type of learning and working patterns of learners;
3. explore implementation of the ALG at local level; and
4. identify good practice.

The evaluation design has both qualitative and quantitative elements. Quantitative techniques, comprising large-scale longitudinal surveys of learners in pilot and control areas, will be undertaken to address aims 1, 2 and 4. Surveys will take place in 2004, 2005 and 2006. Qualitative techniques are being adopted to address aims 3 and 4.

The findings from the qualitative element were reported to the DfES in October 2004.
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CRSP, in partnership with Ecotec Research and Consulting Ltd, completed a third phase of the qualitative evaluation of Jobcentre Plus. The overall aim of the research was to look at the extent to which the first pathfinder offices (launched in October 2001) had progressed in delivering the Jobcentre Plus vision. A small number of newer offices (rolled out in 2002) were also included in the research for comparison. There were three elements to the data collection: interviews with staff; interviews with customers; and non-participative observations.

Findings

- **First Contact**
  Customers initiate the new claim process by telephoning a Jobcentre Plus Contact Centre. In identifying the appropriate benefit for customers to claim, arranging work-focused meetings and despatching claim forms the First Contact process was largely working well. It appeared, however, that First Contact was less effective in promoting the work-focused element of Jobcentre Plus. For some customers there were limited explanations as to the purpose of the work focused interview. Although discussions about work did occur with some customers claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA), these tended to be brief.

- **Meetings with Financial Assessors**
  Benefit services are delivered through Financial Assessors (FAs), who check customer’s completed claim forms and supporting evidence, and respond to any benefit queries. FAs had progressed from checking benefit claims to delivering a more comprehensive service. There was an increase in FAs’ knowledge and confidence in giving customers information and advice on other entitlements, such as new Tax Credits. However, generally customers were still not being informed about how much benefit they could expect to receive.

- **Meetings with Personal Advisers**
  As a condition of benefit receipt customers are required to attend a work-focused interview with a Personal Adviser (PA). Across all customer groups work was discussed, but the extent to which these discussions were relevant and substantive varied greatly. PAs were more knowledgeable and confident in giving customers information about the help and support available, such as New Deals or training courses. However, the main criticism from customers was that the information they received was insufficient to enable them to determine whether the course of action suggested would be appropriate for them.

Conclusions

Where progress occurred it was largely as a result of increased individual staff knowledge and confidence gained ‘on the job’. A number of barriers appeared to hinder the delivery of the Jobcentre Plus vision including: staff preconceptions as to the job-readiness of some non-JSA customers; a lack of confidence in promoting a work focus to some non-JSA customers; insufficient knowledge across all of the Jobcentre Plus benefits; and constraints on staff time.

Reference

CRSP researchers have been part of a consortium, which also involved the Policy Research Institute (Leeds Metropolitan University) and GHK Consulting, commissioned to evaluate current local and regional strategic partnerships aimed at improving operations of labour markets and economic development. The evaluation reviewed and assessed the effectiveness of partnership working and the contribution it can make to the delivery of labour market policies in eleven Jobcentre Plus districts. The project also identified models of best practice and provided guidance to Jobcentre Plus staff on their roles in developing and strengthening partnerships.

Qualitative interviews with Jobcentre Plus managers and representatives of partner organisations were conducted, producing case study reports from Scotland (Lanarkshire) and England (Tees Valley). These reports have fed into the overall and final report from the project, Delivering Labour Market Policies through Local and Regional Partnerships, prepared for the Department for Work and Pensions.

The research found that Jobcentre Plus is involved in a wide range of strategic partnerships at regional and local levels, and that Jobcentre Plus contributions, in the form of time, experience, and knowledge, are valued by its partner organisations. It was observed that the effectiveness of Jobcentre Plus involvement could be limited by a narrow focus on national, short-term performance targets, limited flexibility to operate at the local level, limited local discretion over spending, recent focus on the Jobcentre Plus roll-out, and an inward-looking organisational culture.

The majority of research participants perceived strategic partnership working as important and as having a positive impact on the local labour market. Nevertheless, respondents found it difficult to describe in detail the relationship between strategic partnerships and labour market impact, or to provide specific examples of how this had worked in practice. Due to the complex relationship between strategic partnerships and labour market outcomes, it was also difficult to obtain quantitative support for the notion that strategic partnership working has a positive impact on the labour market.
The Local Housing Allowance represents a radical reform of the assistance given to people on low incomes with their housing costs. The reform was signalled in April 2000 in the Labour Government’s housing green paper *Quality and Choice: A Decent Home for All*. On 17 October 2002 the Secretary of State announced ‘the biggest reform of Housing Benefit since 1988’, with Local Housing Allowance being tested in Pathfinder local authorities. The Local Housing Allowance was introduced in nine Pathfinder areas from November 2003 onwards.

The Local Housing Allowance, which is part of the Government’s wider strategy for Housing Benefit reform, applies to tenants in the deregulated private rented sector. The amount of the allowance awarded is based upon family size and the property’s location within a ‘broad rental market area’, and is means-tested. The new allowance has been designed to be simple to administer, transparent and fair. In addition Local Housing Allowance will operate in such a way that, where the rent charge is lower than the housing allowance, the tenant can keep the difference. In this way the Local Housing Allowance aims to offer a ‘shopping incentive’ through giving tenants the opportunity to decide how to spend their Local Housing Allowances, by securing properties above, at or below the relevant housing allowance rate.

A further key feature of the reform is the ending of direct payments of benefit to landlords except where the tenant is considered to be financially vulnerable. This change is one of the most controversial aspects of the reform, and means that many tenants who previously had their Housing Benefit paid direct to their landlord will instead receive the housing allowance and be responsible for paying their rent.

CRSP is a member of a consortium evaluating the Local Housing Allowance. The consortium, which is led by the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham also includes the Centre for Housing Studies, University of York and the National Centre for Social Research.

Within the consortium CRSP undertakes fieldwork in three of the pathfinder areas – Coventry, Lewisham and NE Lincolnshire – and, with the National Centre, has responsibility for research focusing on claimants’ experiences and views.

**Publications**

The issue of risk has come to pervade many dimensions of contemporary life, from global terrorism to personal health. There is burgeoning interest in the social sciences and social policy in understanding people’s perceptions of and responses to risk in everyday experiences and life changes, such as decisions about careers. It has been argued that social change has resulted in a society that is increasingly risk-orientated, and that this may result in intergenerational difference in people’s risk perceptions and responses. However, there is a lack of empirical research about these issues.

This project is part of the ESRC-funded research network, Social Contexts and Responses to Risk. The project’s aims are to explore:

- individuals’ and families’ responses to, and perceptions and experiences of risk events, and the consequences of risk events;
- how responses to risk might change at different points in people’s lives and in different generations; and
- the extent to which responses to risk draw on, and are shaped by, personal networks and public institutions.

The research is in two parts. First, a survey has been conducted with 1400 respondents. This catalogues perceptions and experiences of a range of potential risk events, ranging from changing employment and family responsibilities, through becoming seriously ill, to encountering poor customer services. Data has been gathered about individuals and their families, and about the support networks and agencies used to mediate experiences of risk. Preliminary analysis of the survey reveals that two-thirds of the sample experienced at least one risk event in the previous two years, and that respondents with experience of risk events in the past were more likely (than those without experience) to worry about such events in the future.

The second part of the research will be a qualitative study of 30 families, involving an interview with a parent and an adult, independent child in each family. Interviews will investigate participants’ perceptions, and past and present responses to career-associated and other risks. An aim here is to consider the influence and ‘transfer’ of perceptions across family generations. One member from each family will be interviewed again after a year to observe how responses to risk events resolve (or fail to resolve) the challenges posed by risk events over time.

Website
Social Contexts and Responses to Risk (SCARR). http://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/
The aim of this research is to investigate the ‘needs’ and ‘resources’ of older people, with a particular focus on poverty and hardship in later life, by conducting secondary analysis of data from five nationally representative datasets (see below).

The aims of the project are ambitious, requiring an exploration of many dimensions of needs and resources and their interactions, both at a point in time and over successive cohorts. One of the central challenges for this research is that people’s (changing) needs in later life have not been studied in any systematic rigorous fashion, either for the generality of older people or for particular sub-groups (age, ill-health/disability, gender). The research will also include evidence on older people’s aspirations, focusing on what they have, buy and do as well as what they ‘need’.

The following 5 datasets are being explored:

- **British Household Panel Survey (BHPS).** BHPS has followed the same individuals and households since 1991, and contains a wide range of questions on needs and resources including questions on level of income, sources of income, receipt of benefits and how people are managing financially;
- **The Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS).** A nationally representative sample of all households in the United Kingdom, which brings together the Family Expenditure and National Food Surveys, and contains detailed information on individuals’ and households’ expenditure on a wide range of items and services;
- **General Household Survey (GHS).** The GHS is a repeated cross-sectional survey that has been carried out since 1971 and collects demographic information including individual, household and family information, in addition to a range of information on needs and resources including consumer durables, as well as information on pensions, health and use of health services and income;
- **The Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain (PSE).** The PSE was developed (in 1999) specifically to measure different aspects of poverty and social exclusion, and as such contains a wide range of variables including those relating to access and take-up/usage of key services. Its sample was drawn from the GHS and, although low income households were over-represented in the sample, weights have been devised to ensure that the data are nationally representative; and
- **Health Survey for England (HSE).** The HSE includes ‘core’ modules on, for example, general health and longstanding illnesses, use of health services, drinking, cigarette smoking, psycho-social health (GHQ12) and non-fatal accidents.

The analysis will focus on three areas in order to examine how the needs and resources of individuals in later life interact, identifying triggers of hardship and protective factors:

- a general overview of the needs and resources of individuals in later life;
- changing needs and resources with age; and
- changing needs and resources over time.

The analytical techniques will include both simple descriptive methods and multivariate techniques, which can show the relative importance of different characteristics in ‘explaining’ needs and resources and changes in them. Professor Ruth Hancock (of the University of Essex) is providing expert advice and analysis relating to health data.
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 the interlinked themes of social relationships and social attitudes. These facets of life are viewed as complementary measures of ‘connectedness’. Social relationships reflect social engagement, while holding values that are at odds with those of the majority is viewed as an indicator of social exclusion.

The study investigates the claim that rapid and profound social change increasingly renders the world-views and life-styles of older people obsolete. From this perspective, modern society is individualistic and privatised. These characteristics are manifested in novel family situations (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 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.
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CRSP has used comparative methods to explore workfare in an international context: family structure, labour market participation and the dynamics of social exclusion; workfare, unemployment and the insurance compensation principle; social security coverage in fifteen countries around the world; and minimum income standards within the EU member countries. CRSP is also a member of the European Commission’s Observatory on Social Security.

Research questions include:

- How far have common pressures caused convergence amongst European welfare systems?
- How desirable/practical is it to harmonise and coordinate social policy at the European level?
- What role does the EU have in stimulating convergence?
- What are the implications of the expansion of the EU?

Projects within this theme are:

- Minimum Income as the Social Protection of Last Resort: Safety Net, Trap and/or Springboard 26
- Assessing the Coverage Gap 27
- European Observatory on Social Security for Migrant Workers (4th Year) 28
- Vehicle Safety Standards: Improving Car Crashworthiness 29
- Meta Analysis of United States Welfare-to-Work Programmes 30
Minimum Income as the Social Protection of Last Resort: Safety Net, Trap and/or Springboard

This project, which was undertaken in collaboration with Hoger Instituut voor de Arbeid (HIVA) at the University of Leuven in Belgium, used longitudinal panel data and policy analysis to investigate access to, and exclusion from, social security and employment in thirteen ‘old’ EU member countries. It asked:

- How effective are the existing safety nets of guaranteed minimum income and, more generally, social security systems in the EU?
- What proportion of the active population actually has/has no access to minimum income protection?
- What structural mechanisms determine the probability of exclusion from/inclusion into social protection?

The project built on a previous study ‘Traps and springboards in minimum income standards’ which covered four countries – Belgium, Denmark, Greece and the UK – and which was also carried out by CRSP and HIVA. The framework fits with the current conceptual approach to social inclusion, where structural and dynamic processes are emphasised rather than static individual characteristics. Data were drawn from the European Community Household Panel (ECHP).

The study produced indicators of movements between insufficient protection, minimum income, social security and work and contributes to debates about measuring poverty and social exclusion. It found a serious lack of effective access to minimum protection in almost all countries (Finland seems to be the only exception). On a yearly basis, between two and 13 per cent of the population have at some point lived below the national minimum income level. Between 50 and 80 per cent of the group affected by insufficient protection suffered severe deprivation (i.e. their income was less than three-quarters of the minimum income threshold). Two-thirds of the group were affected in two or more years.

The study identified measures:

- To strengthen the safety net. These include:
  - relaxing legal restrictions on access to Guaranteed Minimum Incomes (GMI);
  - raising benefits of mainstream social security above GMI level;
  - detecting potentially entitled households;
  - encouraging take-up; and
  - avoiding deductions from benefits.

- To remove ‘traps’. These include:
  - strengthening mainstream social security; and
  - relieving sanctions and duration limits on benefits.

- To improve inclusion. These include:
  - removing unemployment and poverty traps in benefit schemes;
  - activation of benefits;
  - provision of in-work benefits; and
  - building bridges between GMI and other rights.
CRSP assembled and led an international team of renowned experts to examine who is excluded from social security coverage, and why, in 15 countries around the world. The case study countries are: Australia; Costa Rica; Czech Republic; Finland; Germany; Hungary; India; Mali; Mexico; Morocco; Tanzania; Thailand; UK; Uruguay; and USA.

The study examined coverage for old age and healthcare in all 15 countries and coverage for unemployment in Australia, Finland, Germany, UK and USA. In addition the study asked which programmes suffer most from lack of universality of coverage, and what policy options are available in the short and medium term to extend coverage.

The study found that exclusion is ‘non-random’. There are, across countries, systematic similarities in who is least likely to be covered by social security. The study identified women, migrants, and agricultural and urban informal sector workers as most likely to be excluded. It was found that these groups are unprotected largely because of the interface between their labour market position and the role and design of contributory schemes, which lie at the heart of most of the case study countries’ social security systems. The problem of an over-concentration on formal sector worker insurance is exacerbated for healthcare in some of the case study countries by an inappropriate focus on providing services that are not relevant to the prevailing sickness profiles and epidemiological patterns, and failure to provide for women’s healthcare needs. These findings have important implications for the design of policies to extend coverage of social security.

The findings suggest a link between funding method and coverage: coverage appears to increase the further the scheme moves away from a direct equivalence between individual contributions and benefits and towards a social security scheme that redistributes resources. The relationship between redistribution and coverage is perhaps not all that surprising. While schemes that are based on equivalence between individual contributions and benefits can provide security in old age and sickness for ‘insiders’ they are closed to those who may need social security the most. In many cases it is not feasible to bring the excluded within the scope of contributory benefits. Providing adequate social protection for these groups will necessitate a complete or partial de-linking of contributions and benefits and a redistribution of resources. The study concluded that 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 so that a commitment can be made to providing and maintaining social security for all, not just a few.

**Publications**


The coordinating regulations

Regulation (EEC) 1408/71 coordinates 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 Regulation achieves 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.

The role of the Observatory

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). Dr. Simon Roberts is the UK expert and member of the project’s Editorial Board.

The role of the Observatory is to provide the European Commission with systematic, information on how the regulations 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 above);
- information on 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.

Publications


---

1 On 29 April 2004, the Council and the European Parliament adopted Regulation No 883/2004 on the co-ordination of social security systems. This regulation reforms and simplifies the rules for co-ordination of social security. However, it will not be applicable until the end of 2006.
This study, which is being carried out with Ergonomics and Safety Research Ltd (ESRI), at Loughborough University, evaluates improvements in car crashworthiness in the context of the UK government’s commitment to reduce the number of killed or seriously injured road users by 40 per cent, with an equivalent figure for children of 50 per cent, by 2010 when compared with the average for 1994-1998.

The study assesses the effectiveness of the Department for Transport (DfT) research programme between January 1990 and December 2002 in contributing to these policy aims and objectives. Specifically, the study evaluates the contribution that Department for Transport initiatives have made to the development and implementation of EU front and side impact regulations and the EuroNCAP consumer test.

The evaluation framework includes:

- a review of policies and DfT actions, including consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme in terms of both content and delivery. Where appropriate, recommendations for improvements will be made;

- quantification of casualty reduction and improvements in occupant protection. The analysis will draw upon the National Road Accident Database (STATS 19) and the UK in-depth accident data base (CCIS). It will also be necessary to consider some exposure data and this will be drawn from the National Travel Survey and the Vehicle Licensing Statistics;

- identification of stakeholder/public attitudes and behaviour to car safety including the policy making and research communities, car industry, and consumer representatives. This part of the evaluation uses a conceptual model that is based on theories of change and realistic evaluation, which seeks to trace adaptation in the thinking and behaviour of people and/or institutions over time. Relating changes in thinking and behaviour to legal/regulatory changes will allow real policy effects to be mapped; and

- synthesis of qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate impact, effectiveness and value for money of the Programme.

Dr Judith Unell has been assisting the CRSP team with the qualitative fieldwork for this project.
Meta Analysis Of United States Welfare-To-Work Programmes

Background

Welfare-to-work programmes in the United States 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, programmes vary in content, and are set within different social and economic environments. Between 2000 and 2002, with support from the Economic and Social Research Council and the Rockefeller Foundation, Andreas Cebulla and Abigail Davis at CRSP, with David Greenberg from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC), aggregated the evaluation evidence of mandatory programmes. A first meta-analysis of their impacts was conducted together with Karl Ashworth (see Annual Report 2001/02). Robert Walker, Professor of Social Policy at the University of Nottingham, complemented the research team.

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.

Recent work

Abigail Davis, Andreas Cebulla (now at the National Centre for Social Research) and David Greenberg worked 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 in 2003 and 2004. Existing information about the use of financial incentives and sanctions was refined to add further detail and allow greater differentiation between programmes. The database was 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. Analyses of the data were undertaken in late 2004, with results expected by early 2005.
CRSP research in this area has included the household dynamics of participation in the e-society (internet, mobile telephones and computers), the impact of legislative changes, for example through the Disability Discrimination Act, research examining the experiences of disadvantaged groups such as people with disabilities and health problems, and experiences and impacts of local Sure Start programmes.

Research questions include:

- What progress has been made towards a socially inclusive society?
- How have well-being and living standards improved?
- What is the impact of new information and communication technologies?
- How can children get a better start in life?
- What are the multi-dimensional processes of social inclusion?
- How are difference and diversity recognised?

Projects within this theme are:

- Sure Start Loughborough East: a Baseline Study of Parents’ Views 32
- Saffron Sure Start Local Evaluation 33
- Evaluation of the New Opportunities for PE and Sport Initiative (NOPES) 34
- School Sports Partnership Impact Study 35
- Navigating the E-Society: Dynamics of Participation and Exclusion 36
- Employers’ Pension Provision Survey 2003 37
- Disability in the Workplace: Employers’ and Service Providers’ Responses to the Disability Discrimination Act in 2003 and Preparation for 2004 Changes 38
- The Public Sector Response to the Provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act 40
CRSP was commissioned to undertake a ‘baseline’ survey by Sure Start Loughborough East. Sure Start is the cornerstone of the Government’s drive to tackle child poverty and social exclusion. It is targeted at children under four and their families, and aims to give children a better start in life through delivering coordinated community-based services that aim to:

- improve social and emotional development;
- improve health;
- improve learning;
- strengthen families and communities; and
- improve the availability, accessibility, affordability and quality of childcare.

There are over 520 local Sure Start programmes, concentrated in areas of relative deprivation. Each programme is run by a Partnership, which in the case of Loughborough East is headed by NCH Action for Children.

Each local programme is required to carry out (or commission) a local evaluation. Part of this evaluation includes conducting a ‘baseline’ survey of the views of local parents of young children about the services that are currently available to them. CRSP has been carrying out this survey for Sure Start Loughborough East using a variety of methods to suit the needs of the diverse community, which includes many different minority ethnic groups. Methods used include a postal survey, face-to-face surveys, and discussions with parents and staff. The results of the research are informing the development of the programme (for example, by identifying which services are most important to parents) and will provide a benchmark against which to assess future satisfaction with, and usage of, local provision for families with pre-school children.

The baseline survey was completed in October 2004. The research team then worked with the local Sure Start team to disseminate the results of the study to the community members, parents and professionals working in the area, to enable the findings to feed into the development of the Sure Start programme over the next three years.
The government's Sure Start programme began in 1999 with the intention of tackling poverty and social exclusion among children by giving them a better start in life. The programme is targeted towards deprived areas; bringing together core health, welfare and education services and delivering them through a community approach, better to meet the needs of local families.

Although the programme is national, each of the local programmes (currently approximately 520) is different, tailored according to the needs of the community in which it is based. Saffron Sure Start is a third wave programme, which began in 2001. The programme is based at a local community centre, where staff from different professions and agencies work together to provide co-ordinated services in a way that best meets the needs of families living in the community.

In late 2002 CRSP began working with Saffron Sure Start to help them to create an evaluation framework within which to explore and assess the progress of the programme. The end of evaluation report is now completed, which provides an overview of the first years of the project. In particular, the report includes both staff and parents’ experiences of using the services provided under the Saffron Sure Start umbrella, including views of how the programme was set up and developed during the early years, and perspectives on how the programme has benefited those involved in it.

The report also includes an in-depth focus on two specifically selected elements of the programme:

- The Food and Health Project was designed to promote healthy eating, nutrition and food safety for those living on a low income, and used many innovative approaches to working with local community members; and

- The Born to Read project focused particularly on working with parents to encourage them to use books in play to encourage their child’s development and to help parents to overcome practical and financial obstacles to accessing age-appropriate books.

As with all of the Sure Start services, the project aimed to deliver services and support in an informal and non-stigmatising way.

Part of the report provides an overview of parental satisfaction with the services provided under the Sure Start umbrella, and identifies clear increases in satisfaction with core services between the first and the second surveys of parents.
Evaluation of the New Opportunities for PE and Sport Initiative (NOPES)

The Big Lottery Fund has allocated £750.75 million for the New Opportunities for PE and Sport (NOPES) initiative throughout the UK. The initiative has six key outcomes that projects are expected to achieve:

- improved physical education and sport in schools;
- higher standards across the whole school through PE, sport and other forms of structured activity;
- better opportunities to increase the levels of physical activity among the school age population and, more generally, local communities;
- improved collaboration, co-operation and partnership between schools and their communities;
- promotion of social inclusion through access to, and use of, sports and outdoor adventure facilities by all groups in society; and
- innovation and best practice in the design and management of facilities.

As part of the Loughborough Partnership led by the Institute of Youth Sport, CRSP staff have been working with the British Heart Foundation National Centre and the Institute for Sport and Leisure Policy (all based at Loughborough University) and the Centre for Developing and Evaluating Lifelong Learning (Nottingham University) on a six year evaluation of the initiative, using both quantitative and qualitative methods.

The evaluation includes:

Eleven core case study local authorities:
- five Local Education Authorities in England;
- two Local Authorities in Scotland;
- two Local Authorities in Wales; and
- two Education and Library Board areas in Northern Ireland.

Surveys are used to collect quantitative data nationally on the impact of the NOPES initiative. Baseline and subsequent annual surveys will mainly be used to measure changes in participation over time.

Seven fast track projects have been selected to provide examples of effective practice and demonstrate innovative approaches or designs. The emphasis of this aspect of the evaluation will be on assessing the scope for fast track projects to offer examples of effective practice for later, main track projects.

In addition to the main case studies, a number of telephone case studies will be conducted. These will enable the evaluation team to monitor the implementation practices in a more diverse range of local settings.

Publications


Website

http://www.nopesevaluation.org.uk/
CRSP is part of a consortium, led by the Institute of Youth Sport, which is evaluating the effectiveness of the School Sports Partnership Programme (SSP Programme) in delivering its policy objectives.

The SSP Programme is a joint initiative of the Department for Education and Skills and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, involving Sport England and the Youth Sport Trust, launched in September 2000. The programme’s aims are to:

- increase the participation of school age children in sports;
- improve the standards of performance;
- improve motivation and attitudes of pupils; and
- increase the number of qualified and active coaches.

The programme has so far put into post more than 8,000 key personnel, whose task it is to co-ordinate sport and sport teaching activities by creating local networks of schools linked to specialist sports colleges.

The impact study commenced in 2003 and will be completed by 2008. It has both quantitative and qualitative components. The evaluation team will gather part of the information through a series of questionnaires distributed to all Partnership Development Managers and to a sample of School Sport Coordinators and Primary Link Teachers. Further, more detailed information will be gathered through a series of case studies focused on individual partnerships. Twenty in-depth case studies will be compiled in each of the five years of the study. Of these, five will be longitudinal studies.

The consortium includes the Institute for Sport and Leisure Policy, the Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy Research Group, the British Heart Foundation National Centre (all based at Loughborough University), and the Centre for Developing and Evaluating Lifelong Learning (University of Nottingham). The project is being conducted in association with the Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
Navigating the E society: Dynamics of Participation and Exclusion

Over the next few years there will be significant developments in the information and communication opportunities available to people. These changes are driven by the Government’s commitment to bring Internet access to everyone who wants it, the continuing expansion of broadband connections, the predicted growth of digital interactive technologies and the increasing ownership and use of mobile phone technologies.

A research team comprising Professor Ruth Lister and Graham Murdock from the Department of Social Sciences, and Karen Kellard, Liz Sutton and Dr Antonia Ivaldi from CRSP, has been working on an ESRC-funded longitudinal project which looks at how families and individuals interact with these different technologies, and how such interactions vary over time. The central focus of the research is to explore variations in access and usage, and how these might be shaped by different social, economic and cultural resources.

Ninety three households were purposively selected to represent a range of different household sizes and compositions, including families with and without children, older people, ethnic minority families as well as those living in rural and urban areas. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected through:

- in-depth interviews with all household members age six and above;
- week long activity diaries;
- household ICT inventories; and
- computer activity checklists.

Two waves of interviews were conducted during 2003 and 2004. The second wave of interviews concentrated particularly on any changes since the first wave, for example, in Internet access and usage, digital television and mobile phone ownership and activities. Both waves of data will be analysed during Winter 2004/Spring 2005.

Some early findings have already been disseminated; Antonia Ivaldi presented a paper exploring young people’s mobile phone usage at the Digital Generations: Children, Young People and New Media Conference. Liz Sutton presented findings at the Association of Internet Researchers Conference looking specifically at patterns of Internet access and use within and between households, and the economic, cultural and social resources families draw on to facilitate such usage. Conference presentations are also planned for the MeCCSA conference in January 2005 in Lincoln and the British Sociological Association in York in March 2005.

The project has its own website, which includes further details of the innovative techniques adopted, including the use of visual techniques and children’s drawings. The website also contains more information about the research, the research team, the methodology used and its early findings.

Website
http://www.newtechnologyandyou.net

Project Team: Graham Murdock and Professor Ruth Lister (Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough University), Karen Kellard, Dr Antonia Ivaldi, Liz Sutton
Dates: May 2003-Apr 2005
Funder: ESRC
The Centre for Research in Social Policy together with the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) undertook the 2003 Employers’ Pension Provision Survey. The survey was 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 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 had 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 was undertaken by CRSP.

The survey is 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 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. This survey will produce estimates of the proportion of employees who have joined stakeholder pension schemes, and provides 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 explores 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.

**Publications**

This study, which was carried out in conjunction with the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) explores how employers and service providers were responding to both existing and forthcoming provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA). Specifically, it examines awareness of the Act, current policy and practices, actions taken to conform to existing legislation, and preparation for the October 2004 changes in legislation.

The Disability Discrimination Act
The Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) introduced new legislation 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 with the final phase becoming effective in October 2004. Under Part II of the Act the exemption from provisions concerning the recruitment and employment for employers with less than 15 employees was removed. Under Part III of the Act the final stages of access duties came into force which require service providers to remove, alter or avoid physical barriers or provide alternative means of using the service, where physical features of their services make access for disabled people unreasonably difficult or impossible.

The study comprised around 2,000 telephone interviews and in-depth face-to-face interviews with 38 employers and service providers in public, private and voluntary sector organisations across the United Kingdom.

Key Findings

- There is a lack of knowledge about disability on the part of employers, in particular by small employers and/or those who have not employed a disabled person. Employers do not have as broad a perception of disability as is set out by the DDA. Disability still carries connotations of physical and visible impairments and there are misunderstandings and prejudices around mental illness.

- Knowledge of the employment provisions of the DDA was higher among larger organisations, and in public and voluntary sector organisations, as well as among employers at workplaces where there had been disabled employees. Smaller employers in particular (those with fewer than 15 employees) were unsure of the implications of the Act for their organisation. Knowledge of the October 2004 changes concerning the provision of services was usually higher in organisations within the public and voluntary sector.
Nearly all employers (94 per cent) stated that their workplace always sought to recruit the best person for the job, regardless of any disability, yet many felt that taking on a disabled person is a major risk for the employer (33 per cent), and that their workplace would find it difficult to retain an employee who became disabled (47 per cent). Workplaces that had employed people with disabilities were more likely to report that it is easy to employ a disabled person.

Over four-fifths of employers that have had disabled employees (83 per cent) said that adjustments at the workplace or to working practices had been made or were planned specifically to help disabled employees. Overall, nearly three-quarters of service providers said that they had adjustments in place, or planned, to assist disabled customers. However, changes and adjustments by service providers tended to be for customers with physical impairments.

The cost of making adjustments was of concern to some employers, especially small ones, in the case studies. However, 72 per cent of employers in the survey who had made changes said that it had been easy to make the adjustments while only 14 per cent said that it had been difficult.

The case studies indicated that the DDA had acted as a driver and ‘road map’ for organisations where a commitment to disabled people was already a core value.

Publication
The Public Sector Response to the Provisions of the Disability Discrimination Act

The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995 introduced 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 trade organisations.

The Disability Discrimination Bill proposes substantial amendments to the Act, building on amendments already made by other legislation since 1999. Amongst other things the proposals in the Bill would make it unlawful for public authorities to discriminate in carrying out any of their 'functions' that are not already within the scope of the DDA. Public authorities would be placed under a duty to make reasonable adjustments if the outcome to a disabled person would be 'very much less favourable' than to a non-disabled person. In addition the Bill proposes to place a positive and proactive general duty on organisations that come within the definition of a public authority to put disability equality in the mainstream of their activities.

During 2003 CRSP, along with the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) conducted an evaluation of how employers and service providers were responding to both the existing and forthcoming provisions of the Act. The study explored awareness of the Act, current policy and practices, and actions taken to conform to existing legislation, as well as preparation for the changes in legislation, which were due to come into force the following year (Roberts et al., 2004).

The new study is evaluating the performance of public authorities specifically and has a dual purpose:

- to examine public authorities’ performance in relation to the new provisions introduced on 1 October 2004; and
- to provide a baseline against which to assess the extent to which the duties in the Disability Discrimination Bill make a positive impact on disability equality.

Thus, it will:

- test the extent to which public authorities are already taking steps to avoid discrimination against disabled people in the provision of their services and in the exercise of public functions; and
- assess the extent to which public authorities understand the impact of their activities on disability equality, and build in disability equality concerns in the way they conduct their activities.

Reference


This major theme of CRSP’s work is central to the social policy agendas of both the UK government and the European Union. CRSP projects have been conducted at international, national and local level and have been critical in highlighting the importance of research in this area. Our research findings have had significant implications for the shaping of policy. Using qualitative and quantitative methods our work explores the causes and effects of deprivation throughout the life course.

Research questions include:
- Do poverty and social exclusion exist?
- What do we understand by them?
- How do we measure them?
- Who is at greatest risk from them?
- How can policy help?
- Can the ‘low pay, no pay’ cycle be broken?

Projects within this theme are:
- Developing Budget Standards for Disabled People 42
- The Social Fund: Current Role and Future Direction 43
- A Systematic Review of Poverty Dynamics Research 44
- Developing an Income Support System for Jersey 45
It is well known that disabled people face additional costs to enable them to meet their needs, and that they are more likely to experience poverty than non-disabled people. However, there has been no clear evidence about the true extent of these additional costs and needs. Consequently, there is no way of assessing the extent to which they are met by current benefits and services.

This research, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) and undertaken with the support of Disability Alliance, presents budget standards for groups of disabled people who have different needs arising from physical or sensory impairments. The budget standards represent the amounts disabled people (of working age) require in order to cover the costs of an acceptable and equitable quality of life. They were developed by disabled people themselves, using a needs-based, consensual budget standard methodology consisting of a series of rigorously-conducted focus groups and workshops. The budgets represent the minimum essential resources necessary to meet disabled people’s needs, detailing all costs for disabled people’s households and lifestyles, and were arrived at through debate and negotiation within the focus groups. The research found that:

- Disabled people experience additional costs in most areas of everyday life, from major expenditure on equipment essential for independence, to ongoing higher expenses for items such as food, clothing, utilities and recreation.

- The weekly budget standards required for disabled people are as follows:
  - £1,513 for a person with high–medium mobility and personal support needs;
  - £448 for a person with intermittent or fluctuating needs (i.e. from relatively negligible needs to higher needs);
  - £389 for a person with low–medium needs;
  - £1,336 for a person with needs arising from hearing impairment; and
  - £632 for a person with needs arising from visual impairment.

- Deaf people faced particularly high costs due to their need for interpreter/communicator services.

- The weekly income of disabled people who are solely dependent on benefits is approximately £200 below the amount required for them to ensure an acceptable, equitable quality of life.

- Unmet weekly costs for disabled people who work 20 hours per week at the minimum wage are up to £189 (for those with high–medium needs).

The research was designed and undertaken with the active support of Lorna Reith, Chief Executive, Disability Alliance.

**Publication**


This report is available from [http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop](http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop)
The Centre for Research in Social Policy is undertaking research for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation exploring the current role and future direction of the Social Fund. This project was suggested, and is supported, by Sir Richard Tilt, the Social Fund Commissioner.

The Social Fund was established in 1988 to provide financial support for people on low incomes experiencing exceptional needs. It has two elements: the regulated Social Fund and the discretionary Social Fund. This project focuses on the discretionary Social Fund, which has been a controversial part of the welfare system. Recently, the Select Committee on Social Security (2001) questioned whether it was succeeding in helping the poorest and most vulnerable in society. It concluded that without reform ‘there is a strong possibility that the wider social policy objectives of the Government will be endangered’.

Objectives
This research project has the following objectives:

- to explore what contribution the Social Fund makes to reducing poverty and social exclusion;
- to assess whether proposals for changes to the Social Fund are likely to further Government objectives of combating poverty and social exclusion; and
- to produce policy recommendations for reform based on the experiences, reflections and deliberations of both eligible and non-eligible groups that will contribute to combating poverty and social exclusion.

Kate Legge and Sue Middleton are producing a short review of relevant literature which will feed into the other elements of the project. Monica Magadi, Kate Legge and Jacqueline Beckhelling are undertaking quantitative analysis using the Family Resources Survey and the Expenditure and Food Survey. Analysis will explore the main socio-economic and demographic characteristics of users of the Social Fund and the uses made of Social Fund awards.

Yvette Hartfree is leading the qualitative element of the project, with support from Sue Middleton, Bruce Stafford, Line Nyhagen Predelli and Kate Legge. Focus groups are being conducted in two stages.

- Stage 1 will use vignettes to explore how low income households deal with times of particular financial hardship, including the role of the Social Fund where appropriate.
- Stage 2 comprises four focus groups to discuss various policy options identified from the literature review and the Stage 1 focus groups.

We are grateful to Sir Richard Tilt, Ann Greenshields and Pauline Adey, of the Independent Review Service, for their support throughout the project, providing information and insight into the workings of the Social Fund.
This project, funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, is a major review of research on the dynamic – or life-course – perspective of poverty. Until the 1990s, the study of poverty in the UK was limited largely to point-in-time comparisons of poverty rates using repeat cross-sectional surveys. However, in recent years there has been an expansion in the availability of longitudinal data, leading to a wide range of studies exploring poverty dynamics. This represents a shift away from studying snapshots of poverty to a dynamic perspective, from which it is possible to investigate, for example, why some poor people move out of poverty while others remain persistently poor.

As this crucial approach gathers pace, a comprehensive review of poverty dynamics studies is urgently required. This review has two aims:

- to map existing studies, highlighting gaps in poverty dynamics research and so identifying priorities for future research programmes; and
- to synthesise the findings of existing studies in order to inform policy in relation to the reduction and eradication of poverty and disadvantage.

In achieving these aims, the project builds on the relatively recent – but increasing – use of systematic review methodology in social policy. This innovative methodology involves identifying all potentially pertinent studies from a broad, specified range of sources, using a structured search strategy. This search has generated in excess of 10,000 references. These will be systematically assessed and screened for relevance and quality using predefined criteria, so that the project will be able to catalogue and collate a complete set of best-available evidence. It is this evidence which will be mapped and synthesised.

It is anticipated that the synthesis will provide insight on questions such as:

- What are the factors and transitions in people’s lives that lift them out of or keep them in poverty?
- Which groups experience persistent or cyclical poverty?
- What measures can help combat poverty?
- What effect does child poverty later have on adulthood?
- How does household and individual poverty change over time?

In support of the systematic review, the project will also consult with international experts on poverty research in order to identify techniques for the analysis of poverty dynamics that might be imported for use in the UK.
As part of ongoing work for the States of Jersey, CRSP has been commissioned to assist further in the development of a new income-tested minimum income system. Jersey currently provides a range of benefits funded by Social Security contributions, but does not have provision for unemployment benefit or an island-wide system of support for those in need who do not qualify for contribution-based benefits. As in most systems where financial and other forms of support for individuals and families have developed over time, Jersey has a plethora of means tests with different income limits and allowances.

The research that we have undertaken this year has two main elements:

**Extending and finalising consensual budget standards**

Since 1998, CRSP has employed consensual budget standards methodology to establish the minimum cost of living for all family types on Jersey. In summary, the method involves bringing together groups of people for whom a budget standard is to be constructed to act as their own budget standards committee, discussing, negotiating and reaching a consensus on lists of items considered to be essential\(^1\).

In this phase of the research, additional work has been undertaken to develop further policies for:

- supporting parents in work with the costs and availability of childcare; and
- meeting particular needs of the older section of the retired population who do not have a recognised disability or medical condition but who, nevertheless, might have additional needs\(^2\).

**Policy Review**

This element of the research explored the nature of minimum income systems worldwide in order to identify issues that will need to be considered in designing a new minimum income system for Jersey. The review posed a number of questions for policy makers and has been fed into the development process, which is currently ongoing.

**Publication**


---
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