

Measuring the impact of active inclusion and other policies to combat poverty and social exclusion

Discussion Paper

Robert Walker

Department of Social Policy and Social Work, University of Oxford

The coupling of the goal of building a competitive, dynamic, knowledge-based economy with the aspiration for greater social cohesion manifest in the Lisbon Summit of 2000 gave momentum to Member States' efforts to tackle poverty and social exclusion. These efforts are to be reinforced in the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion in 2010 which, among other objectives, seeks to encourage political commitment from every segment of society, to engage with civil society and to inspire European citizens to participate in the fight against poverty and social exclusion.

An important element strengthening social and political engagement is demonstrable evidence that governments can and are making progress in tackling poverty and social exclusion. In this regard, the decision by the French government in 2007 to introduce a target to reduce poverty by a third within five years and the announcement, in May 2009, to launch a 'Scoreboard', or set of indicators, against which to monitor progress marks a significant development with potential lessons for all Member States.

This discussion paper is divided into three sections. The first sets the French initiative in a broader context, mentioning the development of the 'Laeken' indicators proposed to monitor the performance of Member States under the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), the experience of other Member States that have established poverty reduction targets, and certain weaknesses of existing systems of policy monitoring. The second section provides more detail on the proposal of the French government, noting its origins and construction and drawing attention to innovation and aspects that might be of particular interest to Member States. The final part of the discussion paper draws attention to a range of conceptual and practical issues that need to be resolved before one can have full confidence in the mechanisms available for measuring the impact of active inclusion and other policies to combat poverty and social exclusion.

A European approaches to the conceptualisation and measurement of poverty, social exclusion and policy outcomes

Poverty has long been a concern of the European Commission and Member States; the first European Action Programme to combat poverty was launched in 1975 and followed by Poverty 2 in 1985 and Poverty 3 in 1989 (EC, 1989). (A planned Poverty 4 was rejected in 1993 due to opposition from Germany and the UK). These programmes, which included a mix of analysis and the implementation of typically small scale policy interventions, considerably advanced understanding at European level about the nature and measurement of poverty. There were then important developments at Community level in the 1990s which laid foundations for an approach in which common objectives were agreed through cooperation at European level, leaving Member States free individually to determine the most appropriate policy mechanisms to implement nationally. However, it was only after the 2000 Lisbon Strategy that social inclusion and social

protection policies became 'specific policy areas' for European Union cooperation (Marlier et al., 2007, p.18)

A.1 Conceptions of poverty and social exclusion

The legacy of the combat poverty programmes is evident in the uniquely European approach to the conceptualisation of poverty. In European Union discourse, poverty is almost invariably coupled with social exclusion. In part, this reflects a growing appreciation that low income is only one element in the experience of poverty which is seen to be multi-faceted or multi-dimensional (Atkinson et al., 2002). It reflects, too, a response to historic objections from right of centre German and UK governments that true poverty had been eradicated by economic growth which, combined with concerns about the validity of measures of income, mean that the term 'at risk of poverty' has come to be widely adopted in European debates.

The concept of social exclusion has its origins in ideas of Social Catholicism and originally meant exclusion from the moral fabric of society (Room, 1985). In European Union usage, the antonym – social inclusion - reflects the long-standing objective that all citizens should benefit from economic growth and integration. Social exclusion is viewed as more encompassing than poverty, relating both to the mechanisms that exclude individuals and groups 'from taking part in social exchanges, from the component practices and rights of social integration' and to the outcome (EC, 1992, p.8). Therefore, while poverty discourses tend to focus on the individual and, indeed, often on individual responsibility, debates about social exclusion more readily encompass structural factors, not least public policies, as possible causes. In like manner, it is sometimes argued that social exclusion is a more dynamic concept than poverty, focussing on process and change rather than on outcomes and states (Room and Britton, 2006; Walker 1995). However, in the last 20 years, as panel data have revealed the fluid nature of society and the instability that defines many people's lives, both discourses have had to grapple with the differences between transient, recurrent and permanent states of poverty and social exclusion (Callens and Croux, 2009; Apospori and Millar, 2003; Leisering and Walker, 1998).

A final legacy of the combat poverty programmes is that it is now generally accepted that poverty is inherently relative, shaped by the society in which it occurs, and hence that poverty thresholds should change over time and space. Income poverty is therefore generally defined with reference to current median disposable household income after taking account of household size and composition while measures of material deprivation are likewise fixed relative to current living standards. Similarly, to date, poverty has typically been defined with reference to the prevailing standard of living in the Member State in which it occurs although the logic of open markets and greater economic integration means that, in the longer term, demands for a European wide poverty measure are likely to become irresistible (Beblavy and Kalman, 2006; Burkhauser, 2009).

A.2 The Open Method of Coordination and beyond

These shared conceptualisations of poverty and social inclusion have become increasingly important since the 2000 Lisbon Strategy initiated and legitimated closer collaboration between Member States on social protection and social inclusion policy. Particularly important in this has been the role played by the Open Method of Coordination.

The OMC is a device that aids policy learning between Member States while strengthening the facilitation and coordination functions of European institutions in the development of national social protection and inclusion policies (Ania and Wagener, 2009; Trubek and Trubek, 2005). The OMC process entails an iterative process of Peer Review by Member States in which there is initial agreement on a common set of objectives, the connection of these objectives to commonly defined social indicators, the development of 'National Action Plans' to achieve the objectives, Peer Review of the plans and the preparation of joint evaluation reports by the European Commission leading to the identification of 'good practice' and, finally, as appropriate, the specification of possible policy adjustments. The application of OMC to the social inclusion process generated a need for indicators against which policy outcomes could be assessed and these were agreed, in their original form, by the European Council in Laeken in December 2001.

The OMC was applied to social inclusion (the 'EU Social Inclusion Process') first and subsequently extended to pensions, health care and long term care. The 2005 mid-term review of the Lisbon Strategy led to a streamlined version of the OMC with annual reporting being changed to a three yearly cycle. The agreed objectives of the EU Social Inclusion Process (SPCEPC, 2006) were also simplified being reduced to three, namely to promote:

1. Social cohesion, equality between men and women and equal opportunities for all through adequate, accessible, financially sustainable, adaptable and efficient social protection systems and social inclusion policies;
2. Effective and mutual interaction between the Lisbon objectives of greater economic growth, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, and with the European Union's Sustainable Development Strategy;
3. Good governance, transparency and involvement of stakeholders in the design, implementation and monitoring of policy.

The mid-term review was complemented by the Social Agenda 2005-2010 which comprises two elements: one aimed at building the confidence of European citizens; and the second addressing employment and inclusion issues. The latter includes the modernisation of social inclusion, an initiative on minimum income schemes and integrating people excluded from the labour market, and the designation of 2010 as the European year for combating poverty and social exclusion.

A.3 The Laeken indicators

The Laeken indicators were developed by the Indicators Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee to be used by Member States in their National Action Plans on social inclusion with the purpose of facilitating international comparisons of policy performance by focusing on measurable social outcomes. Given that Member States are allowed freedom in the methods used to reach collectively agreed objectives, the indicators do not include measures relating to the means by which the outcomes are achieved. Moreover, the emphasis on international comparison means that the indicators are not as context specific as might be required of measures to determine the outcomes of particular policy packages within a single Member State. Furthermore, the indicators developed were such as to be able to exploit as much as possible the data collected in the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) and its successor EU-SILC (EU Community Statistics on Income and Living Conditions).

Despite their specific nature reflecting the very particular purpose of the Laeken indicators, the criteria developed to inform the design of indicators have more general applicability in considering the Scoreboard introduced by France. The Indicators Sub-Group (EC, 2006) suggested the following seven¹ criteria that might be used to assess the utility of an indicator: it should:

1. Capture the essence of the problem and have a clear and accepted normative interpretation;
2. Be robust and statistically validated;
3. Be responsive to policy interventions but not subject to manipulation;
4. Be built on available underlying data and be timely and susceptible to revision;
5. Taken together with other indicators, be comprehensive and cover all the key policy objectives;
6. Contribute to the balance across the different policy objectives;
7. Enable, taken with the other indicators, an accurate synthetic assessment of the country's position vis-a-vis the policy objectives.

The Laeken indicators themselves necessarily reflect the broad objectives of the EU Social Inclusion Process (or, at least, the first two objectives since that relating to governance has yet to be included in the indicators). They are divided into three kinds: primary, secondary and contextual. Primary indicators are intended to provide a 'synthetic set of lead indicators' covering 'all key dimensions' of the agreed 'objectives and/or highlighting the social situation of key sub-populations' (Marlier, 2007, p. 43). The primary indicators are supported by the secondary ones, which provide greater detail on the nature of the problem or cover different aspects of it, and by contextual ones that are intended to assist in the interpretation of the primary and secondary indicators.

The 2008 version of the Laeken indicators is listed at Annex B. This refers to modifications introduced in 2008 to the indicators agreed in 2006 for use under the new streamlined OMC system. Not surprisingly, the French Scoreboard shares a number of indicators with those employed in the EU-Social Inclusion Process which is one example of the policy learning triggered by the Open Method of Coordination.

A.4 Poverty reduction targets

Canada was possibly the first country in the world to introduce a quantifiable target to eradicate poverty when, in 1989, Parliament pledged to eradicate child poverty by the turn of the Millennium. While the federal government failed to meet its target – poverty was 18.1 per cent in 2000, reducing to 11.7 per cent by 2007, Canadian provinces have persisted in the use of targets with Quebec intending to have 'one of the lowest poverty rates' among industrialized countries by 2013 and Newfoundland and Labrador seeking to have the lowest provincial poverty rate in Canada by 2016.

¹ The Indicators Sub-Committee actually proposed eight criteria but one of which was devoted to the goal of facilitating cross-country comparability. The criteria were restated in slightly modified form in September 2009 (EC, 2009b)

Ireland was early among European Countries in setting reduction targets when, in 1997, it announced the intention to reduce the proportion of people who were 'consistently poor' from 9-15 per cent (depending on demographic group) in 1994 to under 5-10 per cent by 2007 (Colin, 2007). Spain, Portugal and Greece have also since established quantitative targets to reduce general poverty under the rubric of the EU Social Inclusion Process.

The Irish government had established the Combat Poverty Agency (CPA) as early as 1986 as a quasi independent agency to offer policy advice, project support and innovation, research and public education on reducing poverty. It played an integral role in the National Anti-Poverty Strategy that led to the introduction of targets although the Office for Social Inclusion in the Department of Social and Family Affairs, created in 2003, now has oversight of the social inclusion agenda. Although Ireland initially expressed its target with respect to a single indicator, the indicator 'being consistently poor' was, in effect, two dimensional since it counted as poor only those people who had incomes below 60 per cent of median household income and lacked two or more items from a list of eight (later increased to 11) that were considered essential for 'a basic standard of living'. Initial success encouraged the Irish government to revise the target downwards, in 2002, to two per cent by 2007 and 'if possible, to eliminate consistent poverty' as then defined. However, the introduction of EU-SILC and its adoption as the means of monitoring the target produced an upwards discontinuity in the monitoring data (OSI, 2009). Using EU-SILC data, Ireland has committed itself to reducing the proportion of persons consistently poor to between 2 per cent and 4 per cent by 2012, with the intent to eliminate consistent poverty by 2016.

In March 1999, the United Kingdom prime minister, Tony Blair, announced the goal of eradicating child poverty 'within a generation', later clarified to be within 20 years (Walker, 1999). Poverty was to be reduced by 25 per cent by 2005 and by 50 per cent by 2010 en route to the goal of elimination. Ownership of the target was initially vested in the Department for Work and Pensions but after several administrative iterations, the Child Poverty Unit was created in 2007 to coordinate strategy across government and a Child Poverty Bill was introduced to the House of Commons on 11 June 2009, is to give a legislative basis to the child poverty targets and create an independent child poverty commission to report on progress.

Tony Blair made no mention of the definition of child poverty in his statement in 1999 but later that year the government published the first of a series of reports 'Opportunity for all'² (DWP, 1999) containing a set of over 30³ indicators that monitored progress on tackling poverty and social exclusion. The government subsequently undertook a consultation exercise on the definition of child poverty (DWP, 2002) and determined on 'a three tiered measure' (DWP, 2003):

1. 'Absolute' poverty: the percentage of children living in households with income below 60 per cent of median equivalised disposable income⁴ in 1998/9 held constant in real terms (i.e. anchored in time)

² Eight annual 'Opportunity for All' reports were published, the last in 2007. The indicators are now appended to the annual

³ There are now 41 main indicators, which with sub-indicators makes 59 in total.

⁴ Income is measured before Housing Costs, i.e it does not take account of imputed rent income attributable to owner occupation or housing specific benefits received from government.

2. Relative poverty: the percentage of children living in households with income below 60 per cent of contemporary equivalised median disposable income
3. Poverty and material deprivation combined: the percentage of children living in households with income below 70 per cent of contemporary equivalised median disposable income and being materially deprived on a prevalence weighted⁵ score of 10 child related indices.

The Child Poverty Bill adds a further 'tier' to capture persistent poverty, the percentage of children in relative poverty for three years out of the last four, and clarifies, after a period of much obscurity, the meaning of 'eradication'. The 'eradication' targets are, by 2020, to reduce relative poverty to 10 percent and both 'absolute' poverty and the combined measure to five per cent⁶. Between 1998/9 and 2006/7 relative child poverty fell from 26 to 23 per cent and 'absolute' poverty from 26 to 13 per cent but the 2005 targets were missed (DWP, 2009).

Child poverty has emerged as a key priority for Member States in the EU Social Inclusion Process and 20 have set quantified targets, 16 using one or more EU-agreed indicators (at-risk-of-poverty rate of children, children in jobless households, low reading performance of pupils). A few Member States have also set intermediate targets in relation to their specific challenges: jobless households, families most at risk, intensity of poverty, and childcare provision (EC, 2009a).⁷

With the 2007 commitment to reduce poverty by a third, France joined Ireland, Greece and Spain in setting a target to reduce general poverty and therefore can be considered in the vanguard of European countries. It follows the European model in accepting that poverty is multidimensional while the introduction of a 'Scorecard' is similar in some respects to the 'Opportunities for all' publication in the UK and seemingly influenced by the Laeken indicators.

B France's poverty target and Scoreboard of indicators

B 1. Background

The French poverty target, to reduce poverty by a third within five years and the associated scoreboard are the products of considerable development. Following requests by the NGO sector for fuller information of the extent and nature of poverty articulated in the 1990s, considerations by the Conseil Économique et Social (Economic and Social Council) and the Conseil National de l'Information (National Council for Statistical Information) led the latter to propose, in 1998, the establishment of a unit to collect information and promote knowledge about poverty and social

⁵ 'For each question a score of 1 indicates where an item is lacked because it cannot be afforded. If the family has the item, the item is not needed/wanted or the question does not apply then a score of 0 is given. This score is multiplied by the relevant prevalence weight. The scores on each item are summed and then divided by the total maximum score; this results in a continuous distribution of scores ranging from 0 to 1. The scores are multiplied by 100 to make them easier to interpret. The final scores, therefore, range from 0 to 100, with those families lacking all items which other families had access to potentially scoring 100. A child is considered materially deprived if they live in a family that has a final score of 25 or more and a household income below 70 per cent contemporary median income, Before Housing Costs.' P.185

⁶ The target for the measure of persistent poverty is to be set in 2014.

⁷ Member States that have set intermediate targets include for Jobless households: BE, BG, HU, UK; families most at risk: BG, EE, CY, LT, SK, UK; intensity of poverty: NL; childcare provision: DE, IE, FR, IT, LT, LU, HU, AT, PL, PT, SK, UK, MT (EC, 2009)

exclusion. The resultant *Observatoire National de la Pauvreté et de l'Exclusion Sociale* (ONPES, The National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion) is, itself, a novel and forward looking policy mechanism. Announced in July 1998 and launched in June 1999, it reports to the Prime Minister and includes representatives of major government departments, social policy and statistics agencies, academics and researchers and experts from the voluntary sector. In its fourth report in 2006, it recommended the adoption of an integrated approach to tackling poverty and a unified set of indicators.

The analysis provided in the 2006 ONPES report focused on the decline of employment in France between 2001 and 2005 which had resulted in increased poverty rates but indicated, also, the complex relationship between employment status and poverty in which unemployment increased the risk of poverty but employment provided only an imperfect defence against it. On the basis of this analysis, the report pointed to the need to integrate policy responses recognising, for example, that facilitating a person returning to work might be best achieved through a combination of education, training, health, housing and transport programmes.

The report correspondingly argued that the number of indicators used to measure poverty should be increased both to reflect the complexity of poverty and to counterbalance media attention that was concentrated primarily on income poverty. In the French context, it concluded, income measures excluded many of the most poor, such as persons who were homeless or living in institutions, and neglected important income received in kind or derived from assets. The report also observed that existing measures failed to take adequate account of poverty dynamics, the movement of people in and out of poverty, and the non-monetary aspects of poverty which were nevertheless important.

The proposition by the ONPES that France should adopt a common framework of indicators to be used to measure poverty was widely welcomed among interested parties and the Government announced its intention to do so in 2007 in support of a number of policy initiatives premised on the idea of active inclusion. The momentum for initiatives was provided by the presidential announcement, made on the occasion of the World Day against Poverty (17th October 2007), to reduce poverty by at least one-third over the five-year period starting in October 2007. Active inclusion, the principal mechanism through which it is envisaged this objective will be achieved is, in turn, based on 'three complementary and inseparable principles: a guaranteed adequate minimum income, policies promoting labour-market integration, and access to quality social services. Among the most important of the 2007 reforms were the introduction of the "*revenu de Solidarité active*" (rSa) which was piloted in 34 *départements* prior to full implementation in 2009, the *Grenelle de l'insertion* (round-table on Inclusion) which sought to gather ideas from stakeholders and produced a set of shared guidelines and priority projects in 2008, and a call for innovative policy ideas to be tested by social experiment. The framework of indicators, *le tableau de bord* or scoreboard, provides the mechanism by which progress towards the poverty reduction goal is to be monitored.

B 2. The Scoreboard of poverty indicators

A working group to determine the framework of indicators was established in early 2007 and took evidence from a wide range of sources. The scoreboard, comprising 11 thematic objectives, supported by 15 core indicators and 17 other indicators, was given a legal basis in the Decree No. 2009-554 on 20 May 2009.

Responsibility for execution of the decree is vested in the hands of the Minister for Housing and the High Commissioner for Active Solidarity with the Directorate of Research, Studies, Evaluation and Statistics (*La direction de la recherche, des études, de l'évaluation et des statistiques*) being required to construct the scorecard which is to be published annually. The information for the scoreboard is drawn largely from official statistics sourced from, among other organisations, the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (*l'Institut national de la statistique et des études économiques, INSEE*), the Directorate of Research, Studies and Statistics (*la direction de l'animation de la recherche, des études et des statistiques, DARES*), the Directorate General of Planning, Housing and Nature (*la direction générale de l'aménagement, du logement et de la nature*), the Directorate of Evaluation, Planning and Performance (*la direction de l'évaluation de la prospective et de la performance, (DEPP)*), the National Family Allowances Fund (*la Caisse nationale des allocations familiales, CNAF*) and the Bank of France.

The 11 thematic objectives are as follows:

To fight:

1. Poverty and inequality;
2. The accumulation of difficulties in living conditions;
3. Child poverty;
4. Youth poverty;
5. Poverty in old age;
6. Poverty of people who have a job;

To promote access to:

7. Employment;
8. Housing and maintaining housing;
9. Education and training;

To support access to

10. Care;

To fight

11. Financial (banking) exclusion.

A number of specific indices are associated with each thematic objective ranging from seven relating to tackling poverty and inequality to two in the case of youth poverty, with a single index used to measure cumulative difficulty which is itself a composite measure derived from 27 different types of financial problem (Annex).

Within the 11 thematic objectives priority is generally given to the first, the fight against poverty and inequality, and, within the set of associated indicators, the lead indicator is the measure of income poverty with the threshold of 60 per cent of median household income (after adjusting for household size) set constant in real terms. This 'central', anchored in time, indicator is the one chosen to assess progress towards the government's goal of reducing poverty by a third within five years. It reflects living standards at the beginning of the monitoring period, maintains the value of the threshold in terms of what could be purchased but is not adjusted to take account of rises (or falls) in general French living standards. As a consequence, poverty as measured by this

index could be reduced simply by growth in the economy but could equally rise during a recession (a period in which negative growth occurs).

The other objectives and associated indices are included on the scoreboard in order to compensate for the limitations of a single measure of poverty, to reflect better the multi-dimensional nature of poverty and to recognise the contribution required from the whole of government for the poverty reduction target to be met. The inclusion of relative poverty rates, the thresholds set at 40, 50 and 60 per cent of median household income after adjustment for household size, are included specifically to ensure that the reduction in poverty achieved is not associated with increased inequality and social cohesion.

Comparison of Scoreboard with the Laeken indicators is instructive, revealing important differences and developments (Annex A). First, the Scoreboard gives much greater prominence to 'anchored in time measures of income poverty than do the Laeken indicators where such measures only appear as contextual ones.

Second, this emphasis is counterbalanced by the omission of two Laeken primary indicators: the difference between the employment rates of immigrants and non-immigrants, (possibly a reflection of the nature of French assimilation policies) and the rate of long-term unemployment.

Third, the Scoreboard includes some poverty dimensions that were, not at the time of implementation agreed for inclusion in the Laeken indicators and which are at some variance from them and yet others that are still not on the Laeken list and which, therefore, may be of particular interest to other Member States. Measures in the first group include material deprivation and housing, while additional unmet care needs and financial exclusion feature in the second.

Fourth, the Scoreboard adds measures of financial, or banking, exclusion, a dimension of poverty not yet considered for inclusion in the Laeken indicators but one shown to be a considerable problem for people living on low incomes (Carbo et al., 2007; Collard et al., 2001).

Finally, while the Scoreboard employs measures of relative poverty to capture inequality, omitting direct indices of income inequality such as the Gini coefficient and the 80/20 income quintile ratio, it includes substantive indicators that nevertheless also reflect inequality. There are two indicators that both directly measure class-based aspects of inequality, namely in dental treatment received by young people and in terms of access to continuing education, and two measures that indirectly reference inequality. The latter, relative health expenditures by persons in the lowest income decile, and the rate of non-negotiable (*Préengagées*) expenditure among persons in the lowest income quintile, refer indirectly to inequality through focusing on one section of the income distribution and thereby calling into question the relative circumstances of persons with different levels of income.

B 3. Achievements and future developments

Considerable progress has clearly been made since the ONPES first suggested the adoption of a common framework of indicators to measure poverty and social exclusion in 2006. Indicators have been selected and the Scoreboard is operational with a secure legislative basis. However, it

is too early to determine the technical effectiveness and policy utility of an instrument that was implemented only in May 2009.

The President of France made it clear in his announcement of the goal to reduce poverty that this had to be an across government priority:

'I have charged the government to reduce poverty in this country by at least one-third over five years. I want to see this long neglected social issue become a political issue. I set this target to force us to deliver. It will force us to unearth the mechanisms that spawn poverty and to set up the ones that will eradicate it. I have asked Martin Hirsch to meet this goal.

But it is a goal for the government as a whole.

So it is a goal for every minister regardless of his or her field of action.'

Nicolas Sarkozy, President of France, 17 October 2007 (UEF, 2008)

The scoreboard is therefore one element in an across government initiative and, as such, the policy effectiveness of the instrument will depend not only on its technical strengths, in terms of sensitivity and robustness, but also on the commitment of various parts of government to use it and to put in place policies consistent with reducing poverty. In this regard, the Scoreboard is viewed as an instrument of observation, evaluation and partnership: it will record trends, suggest whether policy changes are having the desired effect and stimulate interaction within government and beyond in developing sensitive indicators and in implementing policies likely to be effective given the multi-faceted nature of poverty. Currently further work is underway to complete, refine and adjust the chosen indicators.

The President of France envisaged that establishing targets would provide an engine of reform 'forcing' government to deliver. An inter-ministerial group is currently engaged in determining a target associated with each of the main indicators based on past trends and policies to be implemented. It is understood that work is also underway on developing regional and local level indices which can be seen as a means of building a partnership beyond central government to embrace local communities and associations.

Finally, the President of France recognised the need better to understand the causal processes that perpetuate poverty if successful policies are to be devised to tackle poverty and to develop appropriate theories of change, or implementation logics, that specify in sufficient detail the mechanisms through which policy measures are anticipated to reduce poverty. The scorecard arguably has a role to play in this process. It currently contains indicators that directly measure poverty (income measured in relation to the poverty thresholds) and others that are manifestations of poverty (poor living conditions) associated with poverty and yet others (limited educational attainment) that are precursors or predictors of poverty. To the extent that the last type of indicator moves, with appropriate lags, in the same fashion as direct measures of poverty, this will provide support for the contention that they are causes of poverty.

By way of summary, from the perspective the host country (France), the Scoreboard of Poverty Indicators demonstrates three elements of good practice relevant to other Member States:

- The establishment of a national partnership between administrative authorities, including local communities and associations, collectively to tackle poverty.

- The specific design of the monitoring instrument linked to quantified poverty reduction targets.
- Engagement with a better understanding of the phenomenon of poverty in order to implement or refine adapt the related measures or systems.

C Issues for debate

The French Scoreboard of Poverty Indicators is the latest addition to the set of target driven approaches adopted by national governments to tackle poverty and social inclusion. Leaving to one side the merits of particular indicators, which are in part determined by their match to specific cultural and institutional circumstances, the Scoreboard can be used to highlight a number of generic issues relating to this style of governance that warrant discussion. The issues are grouped into two kinds, for convenience labelled as scientific and political. Conceptually the scientific come first: unless understanding of the problem is correct no amount of politics can solve it. However, the political issues are raised first because the Scoreboard is explicitly an attempt to move poverty up the political agenda and to stimulate change and because, however good the science, politics is needed to mobilise an appropriate policy response.

C 1. The politics of poverty indicators

Visibility and accountability

By creating the Scoreboard and annually publishing a scorecard of results the intention is to stimulate interest in poverty and social exclusion, to build support for reform and to pressurise government to deliver reform and policy outcomes.

Issues, therefore, that warrant discussion concern whether this political logic is correct and whether, if it is, the Scoreboard is sufficient in itself and, if not, what else is required.

The premises underlying the strategy are that there is currently insufficient support to do more to tackle poverty, that targets, publication and discussion build support and that public interest in the achievement of targets further motivates and increases pressure for reform. In addition, using targets against which to measure performance contributes to evidence-informed policy making and increases the accountability of government, hence strengthening democracy.

The likely success of the French strategy depends on the validity of the premises as they apply in France. In Canada, Ireland and the UK there is evidence that targets did build political support. The Irish Anti-Poverty Strategy was sustained for over 12 years, while in Canada provinces have taken over the mantle from national government and in the UK, the Conservative Party is committed to pursue the poverty targets if elected to power (CP, 2008). Moreover, the political risks of failing to meet targets have, in the case of anti-poverty programmes proved less than, say health, possibly because targets are recognised to be ambitious and comparatively few people perceive themselves to be personally affected by the outcome (CPAG, 2008).

Equally, there is less evidence that targets stimulate popular support, rather they empower non government organisations (NGOs) and pressure groups to lobby and engage with government (Bamfield, 2005). Indeed, in British government explicitly encouraged civil society organisations to lobby to keep child poverty on the agenda and funded it to do so. In Ireland, the Combat Poverty Agency fulfilled a similar pressurising function until its absorption by the Office for Social Inclusion, a move some commentators feared would remove a powerful irritant for change. The evidence is that public support divides on ideological lines (Kelly, 2008; Castell and Thompson, 2007).

Motivation

It is unlikely that targets in themselves will stimulate effective governance, cross departmental working and the reduction of poverty.

The key issue in this regard is to determine how best to capitalise on the anti-poverty target to change working practices and stimulate inter agency collaboration.

Practice to date suggests the need for a change agent and administration systems in support. A High Commissioner for Active Inclusion against poverty has been appointed in France to drive the change agenda working with 'all relevant ministries and public-sector agencies (employment, in particular)' and with 'other players, the State's key partners—territorial authorities, *départements*, trade unions, firms, NGOs and the people concerned' (UEF, 2008, p. 1). Whether as a junior minister the High Commissioner, will wield enough power to be successful might be questioned. In Britain, formal responsibility changed hands between senior ministers but with the positive influence of HM Treasury and the former Chancellor of the Exchequer (now Prime Minister) being crucial. Public Sector Agreements (PSAs) between HM Treasury and Departments, underpinned by the possibility of financial sanction, have been used in support of the poverty targets. Currently the Chancellor himself is the lead minister on the child poverty PSA which is shared with the Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families and the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions with the senior official being located in HM Treasury (HMT, 2007).

Despite such high level stewardship there had to be many other attempts in Britain to foster a collective vision on the poverty target both within central government and at regional and local level. Research suggests that, the Welsh government excepted, the focus on and, engagement with poverty and social exclusion is highly variable as it is elsewhere across Europe (O'Kelly, 2007; Walker et al., 2008). The agenda of mainstreaming social inclusion generally has a long way to go but may well be essential if poverty targets are to be met.

Distortion and priorities

A longstanding criticism of targets used in public policy is that their very success in directing energies leads to distortion, causing the bigger picture to be lost with administrations focusing on meeting targets rather delivering their full range of services most cost effectively.

The central issue hence becomes the criteria used for the choice and prioritisation of targets.

France's Scoreboard has 11 thematic objectives (with priority given to the first) and 15 core and 17 other indicators. Only the first objective has a quantified target but work is in hand to develop targets for at least some of the others. The criteria for the choice of targets are understood to be past trends and policies to be implemented. Targets should stretch organisations but be attainable; however judgements about what is attainable require a sophisticated understanding of the implementation logic of policies and ability to model outcomes. Moreover, rational policy making would require the modelling to take account of the cumulative and substitution effects of different policies and hence prioritise combinations of policies in setting targets.

Currently, with a generic poverty target in place, the policy incentive is to focus on those social groups that are most easy to lift above the poverty threshold at the expense of others that are more difficult to help. The latter are likely, during their lifetimes, to contribute most poverty-years to the poverty rate thereby contributing to high poverty rates in the longer term and adding disproportionately to the severity and persistence of poverty. The choice of 'anchored in time' poverty measures creates a different incentive, namely to focus on economic growth rather than income redistribution as the principal policy driver, thereby probably stimulating inequality and, possibly, reducing social cohesion. The French government is sensitive to this latter possibility, including measures of relative poverty to capture this effect. However, relative poverty measures necessarily focus on low incomes and will miss the global changes in income distribution and attenuation resulting from increased higher incomes that direct measures of income inequality would detect.

The criteria for inclusion of indicators suggested by the Indicator Sub-Group of the Social Protection Committee stress the importance of ensuring a comprehensive coverage of all the different policy objectives while maintaining a balance across them. The Scoreboard indicators are wide-ranging but, as already noted, there are omissions from the Laeken list and, more generally, the indicators tend to focus on poverty rather than social exclusion. Priority is given to income poverty and to 'anchored in time' measures but the logic for doing so is not transparent. Moreover, precisely how the balance between core and other indicators will be negotiated in the presentation of the Scorecard remains to be seen.

Multiple indicators and presentation

The Scoreboard includes multiple indicators to reflect the multidimensionality of poverty and to counterbalance media attention that focuses on income poverty. This rationale confounds science and politics, understanding with presentation.

The issue that arises, therefore, is whether multiple indicators confuse or clarify the problem of poverty and frustrate or hinder policy development.

Poverty is a multifaceted phenomenon but lists of individual indicators, varying in number and based on different sources of data and relating to different groups of the population, cannot adequately capture its multidimensional, interconnected nature. Poverty is experienced by individuals and households as the simultaneous expression of scores on each dimension of poverty, scores not all of which would, on their own, define the individual or household as being poor. Multiple indicators convey some of the complexity of poverty, but over-simplify measurement and divert attention away from causality in ways that constrain and distort the

development of policy. Phenomena that appear simply to be dimensions of poverty on a scorecard at one point in time may be causes or consequences of poverty at another.

So what is the presentational value of multiple indicators? If the various indicators are highly correlated, they are likely to move together in response to particular policy levers; presumably in such a scenario, any measure would suffice to track poverty trends. If the measures are not highly correlated, they are arguably not measuring the same phenomenon and debate and policy should focus on those phenomena that are personally and socially most damaging. To anticipate that, given a large number of measures, some at least will move in a positive direction that can be exploited politically, does not appear to be a good basis for policy making.

C 2. The science behind poverty indicators

Multidimensionality and multiple indicators

One justification given for the use of multiple indicators in the Scoreboard is to reflect the multidimensionality of poverty. Another is that a single measure is inherently partial while a composite indicator is technically difficult to construct and likely to prove unstable.

The issue is whether poverty is multidimensional and whether, if so, multidimensionality can be adequately captured and measured. A supplementary issue questions whether science and policy are distorted by a reliance on multiple indices.

Poverty is arguably a political not a sociological phenomenon; it carries the imperative to act in a way that a term like hardship may not. (A politician is unlikely to be elected by promising to increase poverty but the UK Conservative Party judges that it may win power by warning of austerity and hardship ahead.) If poverty exists, people in poverty are the experts on what poverty means and research with them confirms that poverty is multi-dimensional: they talk of personal failure, worthlessness, alienation, powerlessness, lack of choice and 'lives which are mundane, limited, constrained, full of drudgery or struggle' (Walker et al., 2010, Castell and Thompson, 2007, p.11).

While multiple indicators fail to capture the synchronous and simultaneity nature of multidimensional poverty, composite indicators present other difficulties and challenges. The first is how to decide the weight that should be attached to component indicators; this problem is not avoided by using multiple indicators, responsibility for the decision is simply passed to the policy maker as discussed above. A second problem is that quantitative analytic techniques, such as factor analysis, produce unstable results that prevent composite measures being used to measure change. A third difficulty is that with composite measures one loses track of trends in the component indicators while a further complication is that indicators are based on different data and cannot be combined.

However, recent developments mean that structural equation modelling (SEM) can be used to produce a stable composite measure, one that can be decomposed into its component parts allowing constituent trends to be plotted and movements in the composite measure to be readily interpreted, and where weighting reflects the reality of actual associations between the various dimensions that define the experience of poverty (Tomlinson and Walker, 2009; Haase and Pratschke.(2005) The technique does require data appertaining to the same individuals but EU-

SILC is increasingly being developed to cover most dimensions of poverty. In summary, SEM facilitates the creation of composite measures that directly capture the multi-dimensionality of poverty and which meet the Laeken criteria of being robust and statistically validated and providing, in one measure, an accurate synthetic assessment of a country's position vis-a-vis its policy objectives.

Poverty, social exclusion, inequality and fairness

The policy context for Peer Review is the focus on evaluating policies to combat poverty and social exclusion but, depending on the definitions applied, the French Scoreboard is related largely to poverty rather than to social exclusion.

Issues for consideration, therefore, include: whether poverty and social exclusion are the same, discrete or overlapping; how, if at all, they relate to inequality; and whether they are amenable to the same policy solutions.

The European convention of coupling poverty and social exclusion avoids debate about the meaning of the two concepts. This has proved both politically convenient, in terms of ensuring that policy discussion continues to advance, and practical since the terms are heavily contested in the academic literature without consensus being in sight. However, the fact that the terms are contested should post warnings that discussion of policy can easily become confused because participants are using similar labels for different concepts. Taking the French Scoreboard as literally providing a comprehensive measure of both poverty and social exclusion could provoke criticism that it omits indicators of social capital, political, cultural and ethnic exclusion, victimisation, exploitation, discrimination, substance abuse, crime, isolation, poor infrastructure, pollution, shame, stigma and more.

Likewise, the Scoreboard contains few direct measures of inequality, relying instead largely on measures of relative poverty. Relative poverty is allied to inequality in that, when poverty is defined in relative terms, it is difficult to eradicate without a positive redistribution of resources. However, relative poverty and inequality are not synonymous. Like poverty, inequality has multiple dimensions. The various dimensions of inequality pertaining to income, wealth, influence, power, etc. act in concert to create and exacerbate both absolute and relative poverty. Poverty, in turn, constraining as it often does the benefits of individual agency, can reinforce the structure of inequality. To misconstrue poverty as being the same as inequality is to miss the point that inequality causes poverty (and vice-versa) and, with it, the truth that tackling inequality is an essential tool in combating poverty and, probably, also, social exclusion.

Theories of change and impact evaluation

The Scoreboard is a monitoring tool to be used in the context of implementing a strategy of active inclusion. It should reveal whether the French government is on track to meet its poverty target and, some time later when the data is available, whether the target has been met. It is less clear whether the Scoreboard will help policymakers determine whether the change in poverty was the result of implementing a policy of active inclusion.

It follows that two issues that warrant consideration are first: whether active inclusion policies are likely to reduce poverty and if so by what mechanisms; and secondly, whether the Scoreboard will assist in determining whether or not the policies work.

To take the second issue first, to determine whether change is the result of the implementation of policy requires the specification of a counterfactual, that is, the situation that would have obtained had the policy not been implemented. Comparing the degree of change that is actually observed with that which would in any case have been expected provides a measure of the impact of a policy. There is no discussion of the counterfactual accompanying the official description of the Scoreboard which suggests that is designed primarily as a monitoring tool rather than as a means of measuring policy impact. Counterfactuals that could be used, for example, the experience of France in the period before the implementation of active inclusion policies or developments in other Member States, are all very weak because they differ so much in character from the situation applying in France today, post the 'Great Recession'.

It follows that it will be impossible to provide categorical evidence that the French active inclusion policies work or precisely how effective they are. However, circumstantial evidence might be made available provided that the implementation logic, or the theory of change, underpinning the policies is clearly articulated. This would entail first, specifying the causal steps through which activation policies are anticipated to bring about reduced poverty and secondly, introducing intermediate indicators to monitor that the necessary predicted changes had occurred. The President of the French Republic (UEF, 2008, p.1) has publicly spelt out part of the logic arguing the welfare system (*minimasociaux*) had to be reformed:

'in order to consistently reward work as opposed to government benefits, and to ensure that work invariably provides a door out of, and protection from, poverty'.

Moreover, a flagship policy, the rSa '*revenu de Solidarité active*' (or) was 'tested' in a limited number of *départements* before national implementation during which process the implementation logic may have been specified and policy impact measured.

The Scoreboard includes certain intermediate indicators, such as in work poverty, jobless households and access to training, that are consistent with the important role assigned to employment as a defence against poverty. A priori, these would seem to fulfil the Laeken criterion of being responsive to policy interventions but not readily subject to manipulation. However, other important measures are omitted including, for example, unemployment rates, unemployment duration, benefit replacement rates, wage rates and wage dispersion, security of employment and job quality, employment retention and progression, labour market discrimination and childcare availability. It follows that the Scoreboard is likely to provide a good assessment of trends in the level and nature of poverty across the dimensions covered but may not, on its own, provide a measure of the effectiveness of active inclusion policies.

Annex A: The Scoreboard of Poverty Indicators

	Thematic objective and code number	Indicator	Definition	Included as Laeken indicator
1	Poverty and inequality			
1	1	Poverty rate anchored in time (initial threshold at 60% of equivalent median income)	Share of people living in households with income below 60 percent of equivalised median disposable income in the base year, up-rated by the consumer price index. (<i>absolute</i>) <i>relative of poverty</i> .	Context
2	2	Rate of income poverty threshold at 60% of median equivalent income	Share of people living in households with less than 60 percent of current equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	Primary
3	2	Rate of income poverty threshold at 50% of median equivalent income	Share of people living in households with less than 50 percent of current equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	Primary
4	2	Rate of income poverty threshold at 40% of median equivalent income	Share of people living in households with less than 40 percent of current equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	Primary
5	3	Poverty Intensity/Severity	Relative difference between the median income of poor individuals and the poverty threshold (= 60 percent of current equivalised median income), expressed as a percentage of this threshold. (<i>relative median poverty gap</i>)	Primary
6	4	Poverty Persistence Rate	Share of currently poor individuals (household income below 60 percent of current equivalised median income) who were poor in at least two of the three previous years (<i>poverty persistence</i>)	Primary
7	5	Rate of non-negotiable (<i>Préengagées</i>) expenditure for individuals in the lowest income quintile	Share of before-tax income corresponding to <i>non-negotiable expenditure</i> for persons living in households with net disposable income in the first (lowest) quintile.	No
2	Hardship and material deprivation			
8	6	Rate of financial hardship/material deprivation	Share of persons reporting at least eight out of 27 predefined difficulties (<i>financial hardship</i>)	Different from Primary added in September 2009

DISCUSSION PAPER

	Thematic objective and code number	Indicator	Definition	Included as Laeken indicator
3	Child poverty			
9	7	Poverty rate anchored in time of under-18	Share of individuals aged under 18 living in households with income below 60 percent of equivalised median disposable income in the base year, up-rated by the consumer price index. (<i>absolute</i>) <i>relative of poverty</i>	Context
10	7	Child poverty rate (60% of median equivalent income)	Share of individuals aged under 18 living in households with less than 60 percent of contemporary equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	Context
11	8	Share of youngsters with of untreated tooth decay (class-related)	Class-related shares of year-10 students having at least two untreated decayed teeth.	No
4	Youth poverty			
12	9	Poverty rate anchored in time of 18-24 year olds	Share of individuals aged 18-24 living in households with income below 60 percent of equivalised median disposable income in the base year, up-rated by the consumer price index. (<i>absolute</i>) <i>relative of poverty</i>	No
13	9	Poverty rate of 18-24 year olds at the threshold of 60% of median equivalent income	Share of individuals aged 18-24 living in households with less than 60 percent of current equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	Primary
5	Old age			
14	10	Poverty rate anchored in time of 65+	Share of individuals aged 65 and above living in households with income below 60 per cent of equivalised median disposable income in the base year, up-rated by the consumer price index. (<i>absolute</i>) <i>relative of poverty</i>	Context
15	10	Poverty rate of 65+ at the threshold of 60% of median equivalent income	Share of individuals aged 65 and above living in households with less than 60 percent of current equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	Primary
16	10	Poverty rate of women aged 75+ at the threshold of 60% of median equivalent income	Share of women aged 75 and above living in households with less than 60 percent of current equivalised median income (<i>relative poverty</i>).	No

DISCUSSION PAPER

	Thematic objective and code number	Indicator	Definition	Included as Laeken indicator
6	Poverty in work			
17	11	In-Work Poverty Rate	Share of individuals who are employed more than half of the year, but living in poor households (i.e. presumed to be less than 60 percent of current equivalised median income)	Context
18	12	Underemployment Rate	Share of individuals working part-time, but with the availability and the desire to work longer, and individuals working involuntarily less time than usual.	No
19	13	Average number of paid weeks per year	Number of paid weeks per year among all individuals working in the year.	No
7	Access to employment			
20	14	Proportion of people living in jobless households	Share of individuals aged under 60 living in households with no working income (students only households excluded).	Primary
21	15	Employment rate of 55-59 year olds	Share of persons aged 55-59 years in employment	Structural (55-64)
22		Employment rate of 60-64 year olds	Share of persons aged 60-64 years in employment	Structural (55-64)
23	16	Youth employment and training rate	Share of persons aged 16-25 in employment or training.	
24	17	Female economic activity rate	Share of working or job-seeking women aged 15-64 years.	Structural
8	Housing access			
25	18	Share of people relocated among all individuals designated as priorities by the "right to housing" mediation committee and having not refused the relocation proposal		Not yet
26	18	Success rate of applications for social housing	Percentage of applications for social housing made by households in the lowest three deciles of disposable income, not been satisfied after one year.	Not yet
27	19	Proportional spending on housing	Share of disposable income spent on housing in households receiving housing benefits.	Secondary from September 2009

DISCUSSION PAPER

	Thematic objective and code number	Indicator	Definition	Included as Laeken indicator
9	Access to education and training			
28	20	Early school leaving rate	Share of persons aged 18-24 with lower secondary attainment levels at the most who are not in education and training.	Secondary
29	21	Early school leaving rate (class-related)	Class-related shares of persons aged 18-24 with lower secondary attainment levels at the most who are not in education and training.	No
30	22	Basic educational attainment rate among year-6 pupils	Share of year-6 students mastering basic skills in French and mathematics (as defined by the Directorate of evaluation, foresight and performance, Ministry of Education).	No
31	23	Rate of limited literacy	Share of 17 year olds with reading difficulties or low reading skills.	Secondary (15 year olds)
32	24	Participation in continuing education	Share of people aged 15-64 having completed their initial education level with lower secondary attainment levels at the most, and having participated in education/training in the last three months.	No
10	Access to care			
33	25	Relative rate of withdrawal from care for financial reasons	Relative shares of Universal Healthcare Coverage receivers and Private Healthcare recipients having withdrawn from care for financial reasons during the last twelve months.	No
34	26	Healthcare expenditure of low-income households	Healthcare spendings borne by households in the first income decile (after health insurance reimbursement), compared to their average income per consumer unit.	No
35	26	Share of Universal Healthcare Coverage receivers among participants in free health check-ups		No
11	Financial (banking) exclusion			
36	27	Number of over-indebted households	The number of households that are in good faith unable to meet all their non-commercial debts in accordance with Article L. 331-1 of the Consumer Code.	No
37	28	Share of repeated filings to Debt Commission	Percentage of re-filings among all filings in a given year to the National Debt Commission at the Bank of France.	No
38	29	Share of bank account holders	Share of the population with access to banking services.	No

Annex B

'Laeken' indicators, social inclusion, April 2008 update (September 2009 in *italics*)

	Indicator	Definition
Primary indicators		
P1	At-risk-of poverty Rate	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below 60% of the national equivalised median income.
P2	Persistent at-risk of poverty rate	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold in the current year and in at least two of the preceding three years.
P3	Relative median poverty risk gap	Difference between the median equivalised income of persons aged 0+ below the at-risk-of poverty threshold and the threshold itself, expressed as a percentage of the at-risk-of poverty threshold.
P4	Long term unemployment rate	Total long-term unemployed population (≥ 12 months' unemployment; ILO definition) as a proportion of total active population aged 15 years or more.
P5	Population living in jobless households	Proportion of people living in jobless households, expressed as a share of all people in the same age group.
P6	Early school leavers not in education or training	Share of persons aged 18 to 24 who have only lower secondary education (their highest level of education or training attained is 0, 1 or 2 according to the 1997 International Standard Classification of Education – ISCED 97) and have not received education or training in the four weeks preceding the survey.
P7	Employment gap of immigrants ¹	Percentage point difference between the employment rate for non-immigrants and that for immigrants. Immigrants are defined on the basis of the variable "born abroad" (and it is up to each Country to decide whether to include nationals born abroad or not, as appropriate)
P8	<i>Material deprivation rate (Added, September 2009)</i>	<i>Share of the population living in households lacking at least three of nine specified items.</i>
P9	<i>Housing</i>	<i>As of September 2009 two secondary indicators and two contextual measures had been adopted but further work was deemed to be required before a primary indicator could be specified</i>
P10	Self reported unmet need for medical Care NAT: Care utilisation	Total self-reported unmet need for medical care for the following three reasons: financial barriers + waiting times + too far to travel
P11	<i>Child well-being</i>	<i>To be developed</i>
Secondary indicators		
S1	At-risk-of poverty rate	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below 60% of the national equivalised median income.
S1a	Poverty risk by household type	
S1b	Poverty risk by the work intensity of households	
S1c	Poverty risk by most frequent activity status	

	Indicator	Definition
S1d	Poverty risk by accommodation tenure status	
S1e	Dispersion around the at-risk-of-poverty threshold	Share of persons aged 0+ with an equivalised disposable income below 40%, 50% and 70% of the national equivalised median income.
S2	Persons with low educational attainment	Share of the adult population (aged 25 years and over) whose highest level of education or training is ISCED 0, 1 or 2.
S3	Low reading literacy performance of pupils	Share of 15 years old pupils who are at level 1 or below of the PISA combined reading literacy scale
S4	<i>Depth of material deprivation (Added, September 2009)</i>	<i>Unweighted mean of the number of items lacked out of nine specified for the total population and for the poor/non-poor (Indicator P1 above) and deprived /non-deprived splits (Indicator P8 above)</i>
S5	<i>Housing costs (Added, September 2009)</i>	<i>Percentage of the population living in households where total housing costs represent more than 40% of total disposable household income (net of housing allowances)</i>
Context information		
C1	Income quintile ratio (S80/S20)	
C2	Gini coefficient	
C3	Regional cohesion: dispersion in regional employment rates	
C4	Healthy Life expectancy and Life expectancy at birth, at 65	
C5	At-risk-of-poverty rate anchored at a moment in time	
C6	At-risk-of-poverty rate before social cash transfers (other than pensions)	
C7	Jobless households by main household types	
C8	In-work poverty risk, breakdown full-time/part time	
C9	Making work pay indicators (unemployment trap, inactivity trap (esp. second earner case), low-wage trap.	
C10	Net income of social assistance recipients as a % of the at-risk of poverty threshold for 3 jobless household types.	
C11	Self reported limitations in daily activities by income quintiles, by sex, by age (0-17, 18-64, 65+)	
C12	<i>Housing deprivation by item: Percentage of the population deprived by each housing deprivation item, and by number of items (Added, September 2009)</i>	
C13	<i>Share of housing costs in total disposable income; median for total population and for at-risk-of-poverty with additional socio-demographic breakdowns (Added, September 2009)</i>	

Source: From EC (2008, 2009b)

References

- Ania, A. and Wagener, A. (2009) *The Open Method of Coordination (OMC) as an Evolutionary Learning Process*, Munich: University of Munich, Department of Economics, Discussion paper 2009-03.
- Apospori, E and Millar, J. (2003) The dynamics of social exclusion In Europe: Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK, Edward Elgar.
- Atkinson, T., Cantillon, B., Marlier, E. and Nolan, B., (2002) *Social indicators – the EU and social inclusion*, Oxford, Oxford University Pres.
- Bamfield, L. (2005) Making the public case for tackling poverty and inequality, Poverty, 121: <http://www.cpag.org.uk/info/Povertyarticles/Poverty121/making.htm>.
- Beblavy, M. and Kalman, M. (2006) 'Make spurious poverty statistics history', *Development and Transition*, 4 (July): 4.
- Burkhauser, R. (2009) 'Deconstructing European poverty measures: What relative and absolute scales mean', *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 28(4): 715-25.
- Callens, M. and Croux, C. (2009) Poverty dynamics in Europe: A multilevel recurrent discrete-time hazard analysis, *International Sociology*, 24(3): 368-396.
- Carbo, S., Gardener, E. and Molyneux, P. (2007) Financial Exclusion in Europe, *Public Money & Management*, 27(1): 21 – 27.
- Castell, S. and Thompson, J. (2007) *Understanding attitudes to poverty in the UK*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Colin, C. (2007) *Poverty reduction strategies in the United Kingdom and Ireland*, Ottawa: Library of Parliament PRB 07-28E.
- Collard, S., Kempson, E and Whyley, C. (2001) *Tackling Financial Exclusion*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- CP (2008) *Making British poverty history*, London: The Conservative Party.
- CPAG (2008) *Child poverty: the stats: Analysis of the latest poverty statistics*, London: CPAG policy briefing.
- CWP (2009) *20th Year since Parliament's Pledge to Eradicate Child Poverty by 2000*, Ottawa: Canada Without Poverty, http://www.cwp-csp.ca/Blog/?page_id=140&event_id=9.
- DWP (1999) *Opportunity for all: tackling poverty and social exclusion*, London: Department for Work and Pensions.
- DWP (2002) *Measuring child poverty: A consultation exercise*. London: Department of Work and Pensions.
- DWP (2003) *Measuring child poverty*. London: Department of Work and Pensions.

DWP (2009) *Households below average income (HBAI) 1994/95-2007/08*, London: Department of Work and Pensions.

EC (1989) *Council decision of 18 July 1989 establishing a medium term community action programme concerning the economic and social integration of the economically and socially less privileged groups in society*, Brussels: 89/457/EEC. OJEC, L 224.

EC (1992) *Towards a Europe of solidarity: Intensifying the fight against social exclusion, fostering integration*, Brussels: Communication from the Commission, COM(92)542.

EC (2006) *Portfolio of overarching indicators and streamlined social inclusion, pensions, and health portfolios*, Brussels, European Commission, 7 June 2006, D(2006).

EC (2008) *Portfolio of overarching indicators and streamlined social inclusion, pensions, and health portfolios, April 2008 update*, Brussels, European Commission.

EC (2009a) *Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion, Supporting document*, Brussels: European Commission: Accompanying document to the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic And Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Proposal for the Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2009, {COM(2009) 58 final}.

EC (2009b) *Portfolio of indicators for the monitoring of the European Strategy for Social Protection and Social Inclusion – 2009 update September 2009 update*, Brussels: European Commission.

Haase, T. and Pratschke, J. (2005), *Deprivation and its Spatial Articulation in the Republic of Ireland*, Dublin: NDP.

HM Treasury (2007) *PSA Delivery Agreement 9: Halve the number of children in poverty by 2010-11, on the way to eradicating child poverty by 2020*, London: HM Treasury.

Leisering, L. and Walker, R., (eds.), (1998) *The Dynamics of Modern Society: Poverty, policy and welfare*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp.320, ISBN 1 86134 059 1.

Kelly, M. (2008) *Public attitudes to child poverty*, London: Department for Work and Pensions, Research Summary: <http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/PublicAttitudestoChildPoverty.pdf>.

Marlier, E., Atkinson, A., Cantillon, B., and Nolan, B. (2007) *The EU and social inclusion*, Bristol: Policy Press.

O'Kelly, K. (2007). *The Evaluation of Mainstreaming Social Inclusion in Europe*. Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.

OSI (2009) *What is poverty?* Dublin: Office for Social Inclusion. <http://www.socialinclusion.ie/poverty.html>.

Room, G. (1995) 'Introduction' in G. Room (ed.) *Beyond the threshold: The measurement and analysis of social exclusion*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Room, G. and Britton, N. (2006) 'The dynamics of social exclusion', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 15(4): 280 – 289.

SPCEPC (2006) *Joint opinion of the Social Protection Committee and the Economic Policy Committee on the Commission Communication on 'Working together, working better:: A new framework for the Open Coordination of Social Protection and Inclusion Policies in the European Union'*, Brussels: European Commission: COM(2005)706Final.

Tomlinson, M. and Walker, R. (2009) *Coping with Complexity: Child and adult poverty*, London: CPAG.

Trubek, D. and Trubek, L. (2005) 'Hard and soft law in the construction of Social Europe: The role of the Open Method of Co-ordination', *European Law Journal*, 1(3): 343-364.

UEF (2008) *High Commissioner for active Inclusion against poverty*. http://www.eu2008.fr/webdav/site/PFUE/shared/import/1015_table_ronde_pauvrete/Active_inclusion_against_poverty.pdf.

Walker, R., (1995) 'The Dynamics of poverty and social exclusion'. Pp.102-128 in G. Room (ed.), *Beyond the threshold: The measurement and analysis of social exclusion*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Walker, R. (ed.) (1999) *Ending child poverty: Popular welfare for the 21st Century?*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Walker, R., Park, J. and Thompson, K. (2008) *Mainstreaming Social Inclusion: The United Kingdom experience*, Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.

Walker, R. Tomlinson, M. and Williams, G. (2009) 'The Problem with poverty: Definition, measurement and interpretation' in Walford, G. and Tucker, E. (2010) *The Sage Handbook of Measurement: How social scientists generate, modify, and validate indicators and scales*, London: Sage.