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## Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>BCT</th>
<th>Brownlow Community Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Central and Eastern European countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>Council of Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>DGVE</td>
<td>Directorate General Five (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>EAPN</td>
<td>European Anti-Poverty Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECHP</td>
<td>European Community Household Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU-SILC</td>
<td>European Union Survey of Income and Living Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>GTCP</td>
<td>Granby-Toxteth Community Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>HDSE</td>
<td>Human Dignity Social Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>International Standard Book Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>JRF</td>
<td>Joseph Rowntree Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>LSE</td>
<td>London School of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>OMC</td>
<td>Open Method of Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>Participatory Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Pilton Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Rural Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDU</td>
<td>Research and Development Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part 1 Introduction to the submission

1.1 Methodology for the choice of included works

The criteria were:

1. Topic: focus on risks of poverty and social exclusion
2. Quality
   a. “RAE-able”: seven of the nine works were entered in the RAEs of 2001 and 2008
   b. Citations
   c. Mode of publication: three are in peer reviewed journals; four are chapters in books
      one of which I edited and the other co-edited; two are linked funded research
      reports
3. Conceptual and methodological trajectory in analysing poverty and social exclusion

Submitted works are referred to in bold type. Others of my works are referenced where they add to
the evidence for claims made.

1.2 Overview of the body of work

There are four phases each of four-five years. The empirical reports began with local authority and
later inter-governmental clients: the European Commission (EC) and the Council of Europe (CoE) and
a European Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) the European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN)).

The first two phases, for convenience called “Roman Road” and “Poverty 3” focused on the local
level. The Roman Road study was the last of a four year period of my investigating the characteristics
of disadvantaged groups in the labour market, at the level of a city, town or estate. In the second
phase, Poverty 3, the UK work was based on my evaluating over more than four years an
intervention strategy for combating poverty and social exclusion in deprived areas of three cities and
towns. The latter two phases, “HDSE” (Human Dignity and Social Exclusion) and “EAPN”, focused on
the national level in cross-national context. My HDSE work developed the concept of social exclusion
in cross-national context and took a cross-national snapshot of risks of social exclusion. My EAPN
work was based on my evaluation over five years, of the implementation and effectiveness of
intervention strategy, mainly the social Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC), to coordinate and
share learning on national strategies to combat poverty and social exclusion.

1.3 The submitted works

Duffy 1992 is a chapter in a book I co-edited (Campbell and Duffy 1992). It was substantially based
on the Roman Road study (Duffy and Geddes 1991). Other evidence in the chapter came from
secondary data on one of the Poverty 3 projects for which I was a national evaluator. The conceptual
and empirical approach was the culmination of four earlier labour market survey research reports
conducted at local level for municipal funders and in three of which I was either principal
investigator or one of the principals. These surveys investigated labour market disadvantage for
women and ethnic minorities and access to training. They were: Britton, Duffy and Hasluck (1988);
Britton, Cook, Duffy and Hasluck (1989); Duffy and Lincoln (1990) and Duffy and Geddes (1990). The
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Harlow study was then one of the largest ever local surveys of women and paid work. The earning and ethnicity research was then a unique study at city level. I came to Roman Road with already a strong critique of human capital theory both as an explanation of labour market disadvantage (especially differences between groups) and as an explanation of low income. Roman Road launched a direct research focus on poverty as well as labour market disadvantage and the beginnings of a more participatory research methodology.

There are three submitted works from my Poverty 3 research on area based intervention models to combat poverty and social exclusion: Duffy (1994b); Duffy (1996a) and Duffy and Hutchinson (1997). These contributed to: knowledge about the strategy of “entrepreneurial social agencies”; a critique of the relatively unexamined assumptions about “community” in local area based urban and social programmes of the early 1990s and conclusions about the conceptual and methodological difficulties of evaluating cross-national social programmes.

My HDSE research includes four submitted works. Collectively, they include a literature review on poverty and social exclusion concepts and data sources and conclusions on the nature of the distinction between the concepts and the feasibility of cross-national investigation; a methodology for stakeholder consensus on a working definition of social exclusion for cross-national investigation; a methodology to investigate cross-nationally the risks of exclusion in national social policy trends; findings and analysis of results on risks of exclusion arising from policy trends in Central and Eastern European countries (CEE) and benchmarking principles for assessing the inclusivity of public policies. These contributed to methodology for cross-national research of trends in social exclusion and cross-national evidence about trends. Centrally, they contributed to knowledge about the concept of social exclusion.

The key conceptual and empirical works in HDSE are Duffy 1995 and Duffy 1998a. Corden and Duffy (1998) is an overview of the research context and the methodology for achieving an agreed operational definition of social exclusion amongst a variety of stakeholders from many European states. Duffy (2001) discussed in summary the HDSE methodology, the concept of social exclusion, the thematic findings and the link to social rights. It adds value because it elaborated risk, added a fourth benchmarking criterion (accountability) and discussed the role of NGOs in “sub-politics”.

Duffy and Kiernan (2007) introduced the European social agenda and summarised evidence for the strengths and weaknesses of the OMC as a strategy for cross-national policy co-ordination and exchange of practice. It contributed to knowledge about European strategy to combat poverty and social exclusion and the role of participation in realising formal rights. It was based on my research for EAPN’s reports to the European Commission, using findings from questionnaire surveys to national member networks and our European expert meetings.

Appendix A states my contribution to the three jointly authored publications; Appendix D is a full list of my publications.
Part 2 Methodology in the publications

2.1 An overview of methodological approaches

During the fifteen years covered by this submission, I used a number of methodologies. My unit of analysis for empirical research varied from the person (gathering micro data on characteristics or attitudes) to the incident (based on field notes of a variety of qualitative data) to policy (based on data provided by expert respondents). These reflect differing investigative questions; the emphasis in the study on personal data-gathering, theory development or policy evaluation; the contemporary context of theoretical and empirical knowledge (sometimes very limited) and the practicalities of cross-national investigation. Appendix B is a table of methodology and tools.

2.2 Secondary literature search

Duffy (1992) was informed by substantial literature reviews in relevant academic journals, books and grey literature conducted for my labour market research.

But the standard literature review according to key words and quality criteria was more difficult for the three cross-national European research studies for two reasons: standard search strategies then worked best for publications in English and published work was difficult to find. For official documents of the EU, what is now the Europa website was difficult to navigate; and many inter-governmental organisations did not provide ISBNs or otherwise make their publications accessible. Presentation and referencing style varied greatly between member states; in many there was a less clear boundary than in the UK between consultancy in expert institutes and “pure” research, and nor were there always peer reviewed academic journals.

For my Poverty 3 UK comparative case study on which Duffy (1994b) is based, I negotiated access to a range of mainly qualitative sources of grey literature (and interviews). These included baseline studies; project directors’ and evaluators’ reports and accounts to their boards and national and European funders; board minutes, seminar and conference reports and other project materials in various media.

For my Poverty 3 case study of social programme evaluation, academic evaluation literature was accessible in English but as Duffy (1996a:169) indicated there were then very few empirical studies of methodology for cross-national social action programmes.

For HDSE studies, I searched for theoretical and empirical academic, inter-governmental and NGO publications on poverty and social exclusion for the literature review and feasibility study (Duffy 1995). This included a thorough search in contemporary academic sources and data bases; direct enquiry to units of intergovernmental organisations (including CoE; the EC directorate for employment and social affairs; Eurostat and the International Labor Organisation (ILO)) and hand searching of academic journals with a European focus.

Duffy and Kiernan (2007) focused on dissemination. I conducted a thorough search of EC documents. There was little academic output especially on the OMC on social inclusion, and none from a civil society perspective.
For HDSE and EAPN policy and strategy surveys which underpinned Duffy (1998a, 2001) and Duffy and Kiernan (2007), the secondary document searches were conducted by the national correspondents in their own language and their responses translated into English or French for me.

2.3 Introduction: primary data collection and analysis

The main methodology underpinning Duffy (1992) was household surveys; the overarching methodological approach in the three cross-national European research phases were comparative case study in a grounded theory framework (Poverty 3) and forms of policy Delphi (HDSE and EAPN).

Reliability of findings

As part of the research process, qualitative research credibility was supported in my Roman Road, Poverty 3 and HDSE studies through member check, interviewer corroboration, peer debriefing and prolonged engagement (Lincoln and Guba 1985 in Flick 2002:228-230).

2.4 Participatory action research (PAR)

All my empirical work underpinning the submitted works included an element of PAR as it was then broadly understood: supplying data that was valid but also an input for action; making participation possible; providing opportunities for reflection and training for other than the researcher (Whyte, Greenwood and Lazes:20 and Karlsen:149-150, 155 in Whyte (ed.) 1991). This was especially the case for Roman Road and Poverty 3 where I had both research and development roles. My later methodology was also influenced by my experience of PAR, especially Karlsen’s “spiral design” of action and research as a corroboratory processes integrated through common methods and reflection (ibid.155).

2.5 Grounded theory: conceptual and theoretical development in a comparative case study of UK Poverty 3 projects

Duffy (1994b, 1996a) and Duffy and Hutchinson (1997) drew on Poverty 3 research. To answer the research question of what was the added value of the programme model action principles for combating poverty and exclusion in localities, I took a comparative case study approach to researching the UK projects within a grounded theory method. This was appropriate because the innovative nature of the initiatives made it important not to close off any explanatory theory early in the process (Flick 2002:41).

As “all is data” this approach need not be qualitative but in practice it was so. My aim was to build concepts and explanatory theory by asking repeatedly and comparatively, what were the projects doing, how and why (Glaser 1992)?

My unit of analysis was an “incident”. Over four years I generated a large number in substantial field notes. I used a range of mainly qualitative documentary sources (see earlier). I conducted repeated problem and expert centred site interviews (Flick 2002:89) with project directors, evaluators, policy and some administrative staff, community and non-community board members. I initiated regular cross-project meetings and thematic seminars both to enhance comparative data-gathering and
support sharing of practice between projects. To understand better what might be distinctive about the anti-poverty projects, I interviewed some board members from other urban projects (Duffy 1994c:83). My preparation of quarterly and annual reports, feedback from interviewees and exchange of views in cross-UK project and cross-national RDU meetings meant I was able to substantively and conceptually code data and generate, sort and compare a large number of informal “memos” to identify my core concept of network agencies and develop my theoretical critique of community.

2.6 Policy Delphi in HDSE and EAPN

The overarching approach to HDSE and EAPN were forms of policy Delphi, which, through iteration, seek to identify issues in areas of incomplete knowledge and make the best use of available information utilising expert judgement (Turoff 2002). Heterogeneity in sample selection was designed in for the HDSE seminars and was ensured for the population of EAPN networks by the country variation in network size and composition. Reliability was enhanced for HDSE by different “panels” for each seminar and in EAPN because the total population of networks was surveyed. In HDSE credibility (Keeney 2001:197) was supported by following up the seminar and questionnaire findings with five thematic seminars of academics, civil servants and NGOs to test the output. Credibility was supported in EAPN by two-day meetings of the European working group including participation by other NGO stakeholders and EC policy staff and content analysis in comparison with National (government) Action Plans on Social Inclusion.

There were three departures from classical forecasting Delphi that are acceptable in policy Delphi. Anonymity: although experts were not often personally known to one another, their responses were not anonymous; some authors suggest this is not possible in certain policy environments and may introduce more possibility of bias in non-response (Gupta and Clarke 1996:187; Keeney et al 2006:209). HDSE seminars included “tour de table” and break out groups to ensure input from all present and country questionnaire responses were 100%. EAPN network response rates were close to 100% in the years to 2007.

Feedback: rather than a mechanical breakdown of range and distribution of responses HDSE seminar feedback was qualitative (Duffield 1993: 228; Keeney et al 2006: 207; Powell 2002: 377-378). But this was acceptable given that there were not more than thirty respondents in each HDSE seminar and for HDSE and EAPNquestionnaires (one expert per country).

Consensus: as in classical Delphi the HDSE seminars sought consensus, but the EAPN surveys sought only identification of common issues, a feature of policy Delphi that has emerged more recently (Landeta 2006:477).

2.7 Qualitative tools

Consensus conferencing in HDSE

The objective of HDSE empirical research (Duffy 1998a) was to gather data on the impact of social policy trends on social exclusion. Given my concern about construct validity for an impact evaluation of the Poverty 3 programme (Duffy 1996a:166) I wanted to conduct the HDSE research (Duffy}
with a common concept of social exclusion that would support a common tool for appropriate data collection (on trends in social policy) to test the hypothesis that diminution of social rights raises the risk of social exclusion (Duffy 1998a:11).

I aimed to achieve agreement on a cross-national working definition of social exclusion and the main lines of investigation that took account of NGO and policy-maker expertise in the field as well as academic knowledge. In some countries there was less tradition of openly challenging authority. I chose what has become known as consensus conferencing, but then was a deliberating approach used in some faith-based and social NGOs. Consensus conferencing seeks agreement of most participants and mitigation of minority objections. It claims to be collaborative, cooperative, egalitarian, inclusive and participatory and is meant to lead to better decisions and implementation as well as better group relationships (Elster 1998:3). Today, forms of deliberative democracy are widely known and in systematic review have been found to “work” (Ryfe 2005:62). But the limitations of majoritarian democracy using formal blocking mechanisms has been criticised (e.g. Blattberg 2003) in ways I recognised from the power relations in Poverty 3 partnerships and therefore I did not use them.

But following sequential Delphi principles, three seminars took place in 1995 (Duffy 1998a:6) with feedback in each two-day event. To establish better the key issues where the social exclusion concept was already in use and then to ensure that the voice of CEE participants was first heard without western contradiction, the seminars brought together consecutively, people from western Europe, eastern Europe, and then both together. I designed the seminars and wrote the first two seminar reports; an external rapporteur, Ann Corden, wrote the third report.

A claimed advantage of both Delphi and deliberative democracy is that they more easily incorporate scientific opinion than conventional PAR as time is given for participants to engage with the science and make competing arguments. In my role as facilitator I made academic input based on Duffy (1995) and organised input from other participants. I used topical and limited dynamic steering including synthesising the discussions and feeding back (Dreher and Dreher 1982 in Flick 2002:116). The final definition of social exclusion I proposed was accepted with one small change, although there were some tensions in the process (Corden and Duffy 1997:116-117).

Commissioning qualitative data: HDSE “hearings”

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) funded UK Commission on Poverty, Participation and Power was described by its evaluators as without precedent (Del Tufo and Gaster 2002) but the model and its objectives were quite similar to the HDSE Phase 2 “Hearings” I designed. These formed part of the overall policy Delphi, drawing on expert knowledge of very disadvantaged people and NGOs who worked with them. Within the framework of the welfare triangle they explored the role of civil society in promoting inclusion and helped inform Duffy (2001).

The CoE civil servants assigned to HDSE advertised the opportunity to submit documentary evidence. In consultation with me and with the HDSE Steering Committee a “snowball” sample from across Europe was recruited. Oral evidence was taken over several days, mainly from disadvantaged and excluded people and NGOs. There were four thematic panels whose chairs produced rapporteur reports (Duffy 1998a:9). Based on the conclusions of Duffy (1995) the themes I chose were: implementation of legal rights of the vulnerable; interventions to support the family and personal
networks of the least advantaged; the roles and responsibilities of voluntary and business sectors and the role of local communities and local partnerships.

2.8 Quantitative tools: questionnaire surveys

Questionnaire survey of personal characteristics and opinions on an English housing estate

Duffy (1992) was based substantially on the Roman Road surveys. The methodology is summarised in Duffy and Geddes (1991, Appendix G). I was responsible for all research design, fieldwork and report. The main data gathering tools were two questionnaire surveys.

Key stakeholder interviews are often used as part of “rapid assessment” (Bowling 2009:445-6). In Roman Road I conducted such interviews with individuals in local organisations including the school, library, housing office, family centre (parents and staff), residents’ association, football club and community groups. My colleague Mike Geddes conducted initial interviews with the local authority funders and with major local employers.

My previous experience of survey design and fieldwork informed the skills’ and social surveys. There was intense resident anger about housing policy and local services. My ten years in Telford of community activism with a background in the work of both Freire (1968) and Alinsky (1971) proved useful in engaging with residents. Adam Brown worked with the football club on the social survey. I worked with residents’ groups and the housing agency in the design and piloting of both surveys which influenced income bands, occupational categories, social survey simplification and delivery methods.

The skills survey was hand-delivered (completion by one working-age adult per household) by members of the Residents’ Association with sample checks by me. As it was one estate with a high level of housing voids and apparently some “giro-drop” addresses, I chose a census rather than a sample. The response rate was 33% of the 750 addresses. For the social survey we conducted a convenience sample of 183 interviews with residents aged fourteen-plus, at home and in estate facilities (Duffy 1992:99). Although some of my earlier labour market studies included inferential statistics (Duffy 1985 and Duffy and Lincoln 1990) I chose not to here, primarily in the skills survey because the qualifications and earnings data on this very disadvantaged estate were so compressed.

A further round of interviews and estate based events helped interpret the findings and draw out regeneration spending priorities.

Cross-national surveys

As part of overall methodologies, each across several years, the surveys were designed to be completed by academic or NGO subject or practice experts.

Survey of project economic integration activities

A questionnaire to the 41 Poverty 3 projects (Duffy 1994a) was a further source of empirical findings to inform Duffy 1994b on “revalorisation of local resources” and Duffy and Hutchinson (1997) on the idea of community in the sense of a common bond through shared work. The chapter drew upon my questionnaire to the population of project directors/ economic policy officers (response rate
73%) about their activities in this field. I designed the questionnaire and wrote the synthesis report; my colleague Mike Morrissey provided descriptive statistics.

It was important to develop terminology that would “travel” cross-nationally (Duffy and Morrissey 1994:35-38). I encountered definitional problems even of a shared language that were identified by Rainbird (1996:17 in Hantrais and Mangan (eds.)). These may arise from different historical traditions attached to terms e.g. “minimum income”. I benefited from consultation with colleagues in cross-national RDU meetings before final issue of the post/ email questionnaire to the projects. I drew upon this experience in Duffy (1996a) and in designing the HDSE methodology Duffy (1995, 1998a).

Cross-national survey of national social policy trends

HDSE was my first experience as a cross-national research director. I designed the research programme, outlined in Duffy (1995, 1998a). The questionnaires, completed by 16 academics, drew on my literature review and the consensus conference output to include questions on the legal and policy environment, trends, risk groups and major actors. The questionnaires were drafted by five European thematic experts who each prepared a questionnaire on their area of expertise: employment; health; education; housing and social protection, for distribution to the eleven country correspondents from CEE. But a lack of funding meant that the second of my two design meetings with the thematic experts did not take place to the detriment mainly of style. The questionnaires were completed by email/ post by country correspondents (11 correspondents X 5 policy areas = 55 completed questionnaires plus 5 thematic overviews). I was able to clarify some questionnaire responses with country correspondents by telephone and email (e.g. Duffy 1998a:57, footnote 3) and we met to discuss the results before resubmission of final responses.

In the Appendix of Duffy (1998a) are the questionnaires with the frequency tables of results I compiled. The approach was to describe the policies in each country, using one expert per country to provide the information. I identified patterns in target groups and issues, by comparing each question response for each of the eleven questionnaires per policy area. For the open questions, taking the social protection questionnaire as an example, I coded correspondent references to a matrix of target groups and issues: for example, Roma, or people with a disability, and user charges or other restrictions on eligibility. I produced a table of results which I analysed in terms of risk of marginalisation or exclusion from one or more dimensions of the Evers welfare triangle that I adapted (Abrahamson 1994 in Duffy 1995: 12). To support reliability a university colleague extracted data for a sample of questions. I made modifications for fact and clarity following comments from national correspondents and national governments. I produced a synthesised matrix of key issues and themes which became the basis for a CoE policy agenda (Duffy 1998a:147).

Cross-national survey of implementation of a European strategy

Duffy and Kiernan (2007) was based on literature review plus findings from several of EAPN’s annual reports for which I was either the sole or principal author (e.g. Duffy 2002,2003(a-c),2004, 2006(a,b), Duffy and Jeliazcova 2005 and Duffy and Kiernan 2006b). The research process reflected the open stage that launches policy Delphi and the participatory working principles of EAPN. As social inclusion group chair, together with my policy officer, Sian Jones, I drafted the questionnaires based on priorities and information drawn from our annual General Assembly and documentary sources and elaborated in two day cross-national network meetings. The draft questionnaires were
circulated by email to 26 national network officers for comments on comprehension and cross-national relevance; amended and resent for completion. Responses required expert opinion on policy and governance at national level and requests for vignettes. Questionnaires included open and closed questions and results were fed back to all correspondents through several iterations to identify common themes and national specificities. Drawing on quality benchmarks for inclusive social policy from Duffy (1998a, 2001) I then analysed the questionnaire results and wrote most of the synthesis report, except the political conclusions.
Part 3 Analysis and reflection on the content of the body of work

3.1 Introduction: An overview of themes and contribution

The major themes of my work concern capacities, community, resources and rights in the context of explaining and combating disadvantage, poverty and social exclusion. My core theoretical contribution clarifies the distinction between concepts of poverty and social exclusion and defines social exclusion in a way that identifies the centrality of work to integration and of social rights to social participation. A subsidiary contribution is a critique of idealised and contested concepts of community in area-based anti-poverty strategies.

3.2 Human capital: a critique of low productivity as an explanation of poverty

Roman Road residents’ view was that the main reason for their unemployment was “not enough jobs”. But the policy offer was training which many did not want (Duffy 1992:102) given a local context of recession and restructuring of a once strong manufacturing base now in severe decline and an under-representation of high-skill and public sector job opportunities. The same difference in perceptions and priorities between the poor and the not-poor is evident across the European Union (Eurobarometer 2010:64-76).

In my MA dissertation (Duffy 1985) I found evidence of occupational segregation of men and women and admitted discrimination by managers in hiring in the hosiery industry. I found similar results in hosiery and banking in Stage II employer interviews of the survey of Leicester women (Britton, Duffy and Hasluck 1988). In the Leicester survey of earnings and ethnicity (Duffy and Lincoln 1990) we found evidence of lower returns to education in the flatter slope of the earnings functions for women compared to men and direct discrimination in the differing intercepts of the earnings function for white and Asian workers. Using the Strober Index I found evidence of occupational segregation. In Duffy and Geddes (1991: Appendix 5) I demonstrated the likelihood of a “corner solution” (zero hours of paid work) given the findings for mothers suggested relatively flat budget lines and steep indifference curves of the labour-leisure trade-off. Differing travel-to-work areas and occupational segregation of men and women suggested differing supply elasticities were leading to monopsony (sole buyers of labour) for women and therefore downward pressure on wages. There was then little interest and evidence for monopsony (except for nurses) but it was my view that the geographical areas in the mainly USA studies were too large to model travel-to-work areas for UK women.

My evidence of spatially concentrated group disadvantage could not be explained within orthodox microeconomics based in Benthamite utilitarianism. It is predictive rather than explanatory and evidence cannot challenge assumptions. I found this scientifically unsatisfactory. My findings led me to reject the core theoretical assumptions of orthodox economics: disutility of work and individual utility maximisation (Duffy 2000a; Duffy and Jones 2009; Duffy in Ben-Galim and Sachrajda (eds.) 2009).
3.3  Combating spatial concentration of disadvantage: network agencies as producers of social capital

Spatial deprivation

Duffy (1992:99) discussed the causes of “spatial concentration of the severely labour market excluded”; 78% of Roman Road respondents of working age were unemployed or “inactive”. The chapter referred to a “double poverty trap” arising from labour market exclusion and spatial isolation (Duffy 1992:111; 113) and to the likelihood of persistent spatial poverty even if individual residents escaped poverty (ibid.113).

In the UK Poverty 3 areas, baseline studies indicated low household income, relatively high deprivation scores and demographics differing from less deprived areas. Residents were divided by ethnicity and religion as well as health and housing status. The peripheral areas lacked identity (Duffy 1994c:147). All project areas were physically isolated and almost deserted by private capital (especially employers) and public services such as secondary schools and parks and leisure facilities. I suggested a link between “desertified” space, and social and economic stigma and exclusion (Duffy in Duffy and Morrissey 1994:136). My findings suggested that “as long as an area is poor, poor people will sink in to it” (Duffy 1993:12). Simon and Burns (1997) concluded that there is an independent effect of area in worsening poverty. Alan Townsend (1993:9,26) suggested the most evident reason is fewer and different economic resources than other areas including the spatial relationships to jobs and services.

Network agencies

The Poverty 3 principles for intervention were partnership, participation and multidimensionality. They were to be tested for contribution to the goal of combating poverty and exclusion in local areas of significant disadvantage. It was the first time they had been systematically applied cross-nationally to this goal (Duffy and Hutchinson (1997).

My analysis of project activities is consonant with the “cope” and “grab” of Sik and Wellman (1999, in Mihaylova 2004:49). I concluded that it is necessary “to support both existing social networks and the development of new forms of organising and organisations to support the social fabric of the area” (Duffy 1994b:82). I conceptualised the projects as “network agencies” (Duffy 1994a:132) “rather equivalent to creating ‘neural nets’ in engineering ... which can proceed rapidly to a satisfactory solution... Some of these (barriers) are.... the lack of intermediary organisations to support ‘connectivity’” (Duffy 1994b:86). I described the projects’ as “entrepreneurial social agencies...expanding to fill gaps at the institutional middle level in places with fragmented services and very limited private sector presence” (Duffy and Hutchinson 1997:359). I concluded that the projects engaged in “Active intermediation... entrepreneurially and to capture ‘bits’ of policy and funding and redirect it to the least advantaged” (Duffy 1994a:144). In social network theory the unit of analysis is an entity and its linkages and it is assumed that structures affect substantive outcomes (Wasserman and Faust 1994). The projects’ organisational model enhanced local capacity both for horizontal integration and vertical articulation between national decision makers and local residents – thickening the institutional middle level in favour of residents’ priorities (Duffy 1994b:77).

In interviews project statutory board members stated that they had changed their thinking and
enhanced their focus on the needs of disadvantaged residents; in certain cases their organisation’s policy had changed (Duffy 1994c:96).

**Social capital**

In Roman Road trust in local agencies and other residents was very low. The social survey findings on “the best and worst things about Roman Road” indicated that more than half had no comment or said nothing in response to “best”; 8% said “the people” were the best thing; 11% said they were the worst thing (Duffy 1992: 111). In Poverty 3, a statutory board partner stated that community consultation was more successful where there were more existing community organisations (Duffy in Duffy et al 1994a:137-140). **Duffy and Hutchinson (1997:356)** referred to target groups as “excluded from the forms of connection” and the creation of community infrastructure as investment in collective human resources “rebuilding society in areas where morale has broken down”.

Adam et al’s (2003:174-177) four dimensions of social capital (dissemination; synergy; lubrication and facilitator of intermediary institutions) are evident in my analysis of the projects as network agencies. The concept of social capital may have substantial heuristic value in unifying my area-based findings. The broad version of the concept attributes to collectivities, capacities for trust and civic engagement that contribute to the public good and to the reinforcement of democracy. Concepts of bonding, bridging and linking social capital can be used to define relations internal and external to networks and to address outcomes that are both negative and positive for the productivity of wider society.

I used the term social capital explicitly in referring to evidence of exhausted stock of social capital in some CEE in Duffy (1998a:5, 24, 36) and as an asset in Duffy 2001:21). From witness evidence in the HDSE “Hearings” I suggested an explanation: that groups at risk of exclusion suffered relational vulnerability, “resulting in lack of ‘social’ or ‘network’ capital” (Duffy 1998b:21).

I referred in Duffy (1992:95) to informal job search networks which in social capital studies would be called “neighbourhood collective efficacy” and have been quantified as measures of social capital deployment (e.g. Quillian and Redd, 2006). Lin suggested that “social capital may be defined operationally as resources that are embedded in social networks and accessed and used by actors for actions” (Lin 2001:24-25). Measuring social capital is challenging especially for whole entities or networks (Haynes 2006). As a crude indicator of social capital (there were no better data) I compared numbers of groups and societies in and outside the Rural Development Agency in Lincolnshire. I used a non–parametric test for a skewed sample (Mann-Whitney) but found no significant difference, adjusted for population size, suggesting that the RDA had not measurably enhanced local engagement though this was an objective (Duffy and Worthington 1999: executive summary and 6; 64-66; 79; Appendix 6). However my Roman Road research indicated the importance of informal networks and Batty and Cole (2010) suggested formal groups and societies may be an inadequate indicator of social capital in poor areas. But more nuanced research is needed: friendship/kin networks may support bonding but inhibit bridging and linking capital (Mihaylova 2004:44-50). Further, most research has been cross-sectional so direction of causation is impossible to establish between measures of social capital and outcomes – for example, in poor mental health (De Silva, McKenzie, et al 2005).
My HDSE studies suggested limitations of social capital as a basis for inclusion where civil society and democratic governance is weak (Duffy 1995:28, 31; Duffy 1998a:93-94). From the HDSE “Hearings” (Duffy 1998b:20-25) I argued that civil society groups were not able to take up the burden of the “individualisation” of the social (Beck 1995:13-14). In a world of compulsory individualization social rights are individual rights of participation in the welfare state (ibid.15) - a (partial) response to the lost community of Duffy and Hutchinson (1997).

3.4 Area based anti-poverty strategies

Community and territorial “revalorisation”

Poverty 3 findings indicated projects put significant effort and resources into community engagement, community membership of the project board, support for existing groups and establishment of new groups to increase community resilience to risks of poverty and social exclusion. But combating area based disadvantage engaged the projects also in strategies to maximise the assets and circulating resources in the areas (Duffy 1994b:80-84; Duffy 1994c chapters 4-6).

Revalorising local resources

The economic difficulties are indicated in the Pilton project director and community partners’ fight to have the board remove what they felt was a very unrealistic jobs target (Duffy 1994c:99-100). But to combat poverty, projects aimed to cut resource leakage, build on existing residents’ capacities and generate locally retained income (Duffy 1994b:80-82; Duffy 1994a:134). I categorised many of the activities as ‘revalorising local resources’ (ibid.1994:136). Examples included community enterprise; stimulating social demand and a “third” labour market of volunteer and “social” jobs for the unemployed; training of community activists; drawing on minorities’ local capacity for self-employment and low income trading including repair and refurbishment, recycling and social enterprises.

Policy ‘bending’

Projects had in common a belief that revalorising resources internal to the area – whether embedded in residents, services or physical assets – was inadequate to lift existing residents out of income poverty. Bargaining within the partnerships was essentially about resource redistribution: “Curiously, as bargaining has lost legitimacy in the workplace it has arrived in partnerships and localities” (Duffy and Hutchinson 1997:357).

To better capture mainstream resources (which were being cut nationally), projects’ engaged in “policy bending, in favour of the last advantaged groups” (Duffy 1994b:77). Examples of new money in urban, housing and social facilities are given in Duffy (1994b:87); Duffy (1993:10) and (Duffy 1994c:146). Examples of service bending to better meet residents’ needs are in Duffy (1994c:80-90; 148) and Duffy (1994a:130-1).

3.5 Community, power and legitimacy
I suggested that “bargaining... is a means of communities attempting to regain some collective local control over the quality of their lives” (Duffy 1994b:79). The partnership approach could be a “model of social dialogue” – “a cooperative search for consensus solutions” (Duffy 1994b:67). But my findings indicated that the conceptual framework in which UK projects aimed to achieve their objectives differed. I categorised them as “political” (Granby-Toxteth); “economic” (Pilton) and social “service” (Brownlow) approaches which reflected their area contexts and their exclusion priorities: respectively, black people’s access to decision-making power over large Objective 1 and regeneration resources; access to employment for residents (jobs and childcare) and access to services for discriminated or disadvantaged groups (Duffy 1994c:79).

There were tensions, especially between statutory partners and community partners and project staff. Partnerships struggled over priorities and resources and “representation” of communities of place, interest and target groups in partnership structures (Duffy 1994b introduction:3; Duffy 1994c:55-75; 143; Duffy 1994a).

Trust, legitimacy and decision power were key problems. A statutory partner referred to community power as “the tail wagging the dog” (Duffy 1994b introduction: 4). Statutory partners supported community development as a means to improve absorptive capacity of existing resources but were more challenged when residents were included in structures that allocated resources, rather than as service users, which could be understood in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, rather than equity (Duffy 1994b:78; Duffy 1994c:99-106). For example GTCP community partners and staff saw the project as a route to direct access for community groups to negotiate with statutory partners. Statutory partners saw community partners as a “bridge” for them to the wider community (Duffy 1994c:144-145) but believed that community partners had chosen an ‘outsider’ status antithetical to information exchange and cooperation. Community partners believed there was institutional racism (Duffy 1994c: 79,100,105). BCT was created by statutory partners to broaden the successful bidder, a community organisation (Duffy 1994b:75) for reasons that could be interpreted in terms of bridging and linking, rather than bonding.

Non-community partners saw themselves as accountable to the local electorate, taxpayers or shareholders; they questioned community partners’ “representativeness” and mandate (Duffy 1994c:159). I identified the problem of distinguishing representative from participatory democracy and the consequence of groups reinventing themselves as “aboriginal” to claim the “community franchise” (Duffy and Hutchinson 1997:353-356). I concluded that “Participatory democracy within the partnerships was difficult to square with wider representative democracy and ultimately this means that statutory partners do not see themselves as accountable to the local community at which point the community participation may be seen as no more than consultation” (Duffy 1994c:65).

Discussing UK urban programmes, which also had a principle of community engagement and focus on poverty, I concluded that “the turn to community is itself a deficiency of the urban programmes and does not address the problem of social exclusion” (Duffy and Hutchinson 1997:348). My research revealed a fundamental conceptual problem for a community-based strategy. There was no “unified representative group” of the kind that partners expected and preferred (Duffy 1994b:76) and community (and statutory) partners were exclusionary of other groups of very disadvantaged residents deliberately not included as target groups for action or board participation. I discussed also
the differing engagement of men and women based on their differing relations to the kinship of work and family in contemporary society. I argued that conditions set by Tönnies for the classical sociological organic and exchange communities were not extant (Duffy and Hutchinson 1997:335-357).

3.6 Social capital, work, welfare and social inclusion

Percy-Smith discussed the potential of a lack of social capital to define social exclusion and individual or community acquisition of social capital as a means to “create the conditions in which it is easier to address other aspects of social exclusion”. She noted that social capital is more difficult to develop in communities with little tradition of trust or reciprocity (Percy-Smith 2000:6-7). This point is congruent with my conclusions from Duffy (1992) and Duffy and Hutchinson (1997). But I suggested that any future Poverty programme “should address the question of the limits of individual responsibility and the economic consequences of changes in family structure and societal norms and values” (Duffy 1994c:170). I drew on Keating (1995) Adamson (1995), Joye (1995), Crouch (1995) Frazer (1995) Maffessoli (1996) Join-Lambert (1995) and HDSE witness evidence to challenge Etzioni’s (Duffy 1998b:21) necessary conditions for communities to “reclaim” more responsibility for integration. I argued that the integration powers of family and personal networks had declined, differentially affecting men and women. I suggested that risk was bleeding from the labour market into other areas of social life and that the nature of welfare reform was perverse in this climate, when there was greater risk of “no route back” (ibid., 22).

Drawing on Tönnies (1955) view of the centrality of work to social relations there is a possibility of reverse causation in the relationship between social capital and social exclusion. For “workless” communities (more accurately “employee-less” communities) exclusion is a potential cause of diminished social capital, rather than a consequence of it. I suggested also that “in a Marxian sense, exclusion from work affects social being” (Corden and Duffy 1998:107-108).

Tönnies’ conceptualisation of the state as expression of the will in contemporary “mechanical” (instrumental, exchange) societies resonated with my area based findings and influenced the development of my concept of social exclusion. I suggested that in the absence of the organic communities of gemeinschaft, welfare systems are an “expression of the principle of inclusion of the society of strangers which is the mechanical organisation of geselschaft” (Corden and Duffy 1998:107, 108).

Roman Road (Duffy 1992) showed how dependent were the most deprived communities on circulating income supplied by redistributive benefits and services from central government. Local community-based bargaining cannot tackle wages or cash benefits (Duffy 1994b:79-80). I suggested that area-based projects were “bending the new agenda of welfare restructuring in favour of the least advantaged” (Duffy 1994b:70). Room (in Gordon et al 2000:416) referred to Holman’s evidence that community self organisation without the external resources of the state is not sustainable.

Implications for “Big Society” and “New Localism”

My findings suggested that partnerships were an “arena of struggle” and an “arena for replaying conflicts from other levels” and “not so much a received structure as a debate about the new welfare agenda” Duffy (1994b: 73;82). I argued that the middle level could not substitute for the
I have the same concerns about the “Big Society” and the “new localism” (Blond 2010; Norman 2010), especially community “right to challenge”.

I referred to projects’ capacity for “360 degrees” of flexibility but I argued that flexibility was required not only by the complexity of presenting problems of poverty and exclusion in a period of rapid change but by the fragmentation of powers and responsibilities of the intervention actors including the welfare regime and especially the local state (Duffy 1994b:67-68). I noted that UK municipalities did not have significant local flexibility on tax and spend to implement a local social policy, though on spending this will change with the new localism (Duffy 1994c:160). But I argued also that if local authority legal powers were diminished there was less scope for policy influence (Duffy 1994b:78).

Duffy (1994c:28) referred to the impact of local fragmentation. Duffy and Hutchinson (1997:355) discussed the problems of society conferring access to bargaining rights and resources when the communities on which such rights are conferred exist only as idealised forms. I discussed accountability in Duffy (2001: 37). In Duffy (2001:39) I noted Putnam’s view that some countries did not have the capacity to generate a “dense networks of civil society organisations rather than vertical forms of clientalism” but that in others “a rich seam of civil society organisations......may equally denote underdeveloped collective national provision” of some of the five ‘assets’ (the policy areas of HDSE phase 1”). Further, social NGOs may not be independent of the state which creates conditions for their operation (Duffy 1998a:93-94; Mihaylova 2004:86). HDSE “Hearings” indicated that NGOs were not capable of taking on a greater burden of integration given a changing role of the state in integration and the pressure on family and personal networks of unmediated demands of markets (Duffy 2001:37). Witness evidence from the National Employment Foundation in Hungary also identified NGO ambiguity about state social provision “because in establishing democratic rights we have to destroy the power of the state, but at the same time in maintaining our social rights we have to fight against efforts of the state to withdraw from welfare areas” (quoted in Duffy 1998b:22).

But overall, my research supported Sen’s (1981) argument of poverty as a denial of rights “problems cannot be solved at the local level alone...social rights have been inhibited by exclusionary practices and laws” (Duffy 1993:12). I supported a national policy dimension to a potential Poverty 4 programme (Duffy 1994c:170) which came into effect in 2000 in the OMC process in the social field following strong NGO lobbying. However, Duffy (2007:76-77) indicated how far neoliberalism has permeated European social policy and how little political traction there is for social rights.

### 3.7 The distinction between poverty and social exclusion

I wanted to understand whether there was a clear conceptual distinction between poverty and social exclusion, if so what it was and what were the implications for policy. Duffy (1995) aimed to distinguish between poverty and social exclusion and get an operational definition of social exclusion prior to cross-national data gathering in HDSE (Duffy 1998a).

### 3.8 Poverty

**Concept and definitions**
Discussion of concepts and measures of poverty including absolute, relative, subjective, objective, income and expenditure based, headcounts and gaps (which measure intensity) appropriate weightings and equivalence scales (indicating the impact on who and how many are poor of using different weightings), assets, persistence, etc., and data sources, quality and data gaps can be found in Duffy (1995:8-30) and in summary in Corden and Duffy (1998a).

Peter Townsend argued that even physical subsistence measures have a social component and are not constant over time and therefore operationally are indistinguishable from relative concepts of poverty (Gordon in Gordon et al 2000:50-53). I agree that there is no constant physical subsistence concept since even calorific definitions have a cultural dimension (Duffy 1995:20) but I believe the Townsend/ Gordon perspective is unhelpful conceptually. Core definitions of absolute and relative poverty are distinguishable by whether or not they refer to a measure of central tendency in the distribution of income – or expenditure (ibid:20). These best operationalise two distinct concepts of poverty: resource insufficiency - inability to “make ends meet” and degree of income inequality which raises distributional questions about sharing of wealth.

I concluded that the core concept of poverty was economic, focused on possession of material resources and living conditions (Duffy 1995:8).

Income and expenditure measures and thresholds

I discussed conceptual and practical problems in cross-national measures including concepts of current and “permanent” income (Duffy 1995:12,16) and distortions due to variations in home ownership, monetisation of resources and the size of the hidden economy and the importance of variations in the “social wage”, (Duffy 1995:12,16; 2001:22).

Expenditure is often considered to better capture achieved living standards. But I referred to problems in the content and updating of a basket of goods and to issues of purchasing power parity. Price data in CEE were unreliable, or government controlled, or changing very rapidly, (Duffy 1998a: 19-20).

I concluded that existing micro data were not robust enough for accurate cross-national measurement of poverty.

At the time of HDSE there were (and are) few national poverty lines, but more commonly social minima and minimum wages – “the poor defined administratively” (Duffy 1995:9). While “needs are defined in a social context” (Ferge in Gordon et al 2000:267) the support may not meet minimal actual needs of disadvantaged people, for example, in CEE post-transition (Duffy 1995:25-26). As Dziewiecka-Bokun (one of my HDSE country correspondents) said “What we witness in CEE countries is not so much a crisis in resources to deal with poverty as a crisis of distributional social policies” (Dziewiecka-Bokun in Gordon et al 2000: 262).

3.9 Social exclusion

When preparing Duffy (1995) social exclusion was a concept little known or used in the UK. Levitas (in Gordon et al 2000:357) said “it is less than two years since it became prominent in public
political discourse in Britain”. Percy-Smith referred to an explosion of interest post 2000 (Percy-Smith in Percy-Smith (ed.) 2000:9: Table 1.1).

It was better known especially politically, in a European context (Rogers 1994, Yepez De Castillo 1994 in Duffy 1995:33) with important origins in the French welfare regime. Article 1 of the French constitution protected the total population of workers and their families against all insecurity that could affect capacity to work and support families (Lamarque 1995:11). But by the 1970s, social protection gaps in an underdeveloped insurance based system (for example for disabled people) led Lenoir, a civil servant, to coin the term “Les Exclus” (1974). High long-term unemployment in the 1980s raised political concerns about loss of entitlement to unemployment insurance, leading to the quasi-official definition of social exclusion of the Delors’ Green and White Papers, based on the concept of a dual society arising from an increasingly dualised labour market (Duffy:1994b: 63; 1995:39).

Concept of social exclusion

I concluded that there is a conceptual distinction between poverty and social exclusion even if there are narrower and broader versions of both and even if it is difficult to operationalise them empirically. Drawing on Touraine (1992 in Duffy 1995:40) I noted that a distinction with the relative concept of poverty was that disparity was not only between the top and the bottom of an income/resource distribution, but (in a sociological framework) about having a “place” in society or being excluded from it, in which extreme vulnerability is defined in relationship terms (Pieretti 1994 in Duffy 1995:35) and there is decay of the “social tie” (Castel 1995 in Duffy 1995:39, 40).

Relative and absolute social exclusion

I distinguished relative risk as social distance from mainstream society but the core of absolute or extreme social exclusion as the “rupture of the social tie” (Duffy 1995:40). I referred to Pieretti’s (1994) “biographical break-off” from which there is no route back (Duffy 1995:34-36). Both absolute/extreme and relative versions are extant in UK discourse and policy (Levitas in Gordon et al 2000:373; Burchardt in Gordon et al 2000:388; Abrams et al 2007:xiv).

Definition of social exclusion

There is no single accepted definition of social exclusion (Department for International Development 2005; United Nations 2007; Morgan et al 2007). Duffy (1995:33) defined social exclusion at the micro level as “inability to participate effectively in economic, social, political and cultural life... alienation and distance from the mainstream society”. The concept expressed in my definition is multidimensionally relational and encapsulates absolute as well as relative exclusion, but is not explanatory of causes and micro analysis of relational concepts have had a restricted approximation of participation (see below).

Human dignity and social rights

There is an important but contested strand in continental conceptualisation of social exclusion as a threat to human dignity that has also influenced ILO/UNDP leading Rogers to conclude that “exclusion from basic rights underlies other exclusions” (Rogers 1994 in Duffy 1995:42).
The principle of human dignity draws on Kantian moral philosophy and implies an absolutist approach to human rights and the non-instrumentation of humans no matter how beneficial for others. The categorical principle is evident in the German (and other) post-1945 constitutional Basic Law whose highest point is human dignity. The CoE was established in 1948 to promote democracy, the rule of law, human and later, social, rights. Human dignity is central to the moral philosophy of many NGOs including faith organisations which have official status at the CoE (Duffy 2001:24). The HDSE initiative was launched when the CoE was seeking to develop its set of social rights and control procedures to include the right to protection from poverty and social exclusion and a collective complaints procedure open to NGOs (Duffy 1998a:148).

Duffy (1995) discussed causes of social exclusion and the role of social rights for all - and their enforcement (ibid.43-53) in combating social exclusion. Room (1995) and Percy-Smith (2000:4) have also taken this perspective. To identify the nature of the threat to social rights, I discussed Silver on the influence of social structure on social exclusion (in Duffy 1995:40-41;95) and Rodgers on the relation between globalisation and social policy (in Duffy 1995:41). I drew on Rosanvallon, Castel and Lenoir (all 1995) to focus on weakening and destabilisation of the centre (Duffy 1998a:50). Drawing on Xibberras (Duffy 2001:20) on exclusion from a place where you stood before, I put emphasis on seeking an explanation of social exclusion in whom or what is doing the pushing.

Thus my HDSE definition for investigating the phenomenon of social exclusion understood it in terms of macro processes of co-production and power “A process of interaction of the dynamics of the family and personal networks, the labour market and the welfare state that results in a chronic and structured inability by individuals and groups to participate in social life” (Duffy 1996b:13 quoted in Corden and Duffy 1998:117).

HDSE Phase I investigated trends in law and policy; HDSE Phase 2, the role of civil society in promoting inclusion. I adapted Ever’s (1987 in Abrahamson 1994) “welfare triangle” to analyse mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion (in Duffy 1998a:12). Rather than describe social exclusion as multifaceted, I conceptualised inclusion as co-produced (Brudney and England 1983; Pestoff 2006). My findings indicated there was little scope for the dimensions of the welfare triangle (labour market, state and family and personal networks) to be substituted one for another. However, a weak relationship to one dimension of the welfare triangle would multiply risk of exclusion in others (Duffy 1998a:ch7; Duffy 2001:21). Abrams (in Abrams et al 2007:215-216; 225), Hutchinson (ibid. 2007:37) made similar arguments but in terms of the effectiveness of welfare states in preventing exclusion from social capital and supporting social participation.

3.10 Measuring social exclusion

Cross-national data sources

There were no European income or expenditure data designed on a comparative basis and certainly no longitudinal data, until Eurostat’s European Community Household Panel (ECHP) the first full survey of which was in 1995 (Duffy 1995:11). It has been superseded by EU-SILC (Survey of Income and Living Conditions). But given the small sample sizes and household address data collection, the severely disadvantaged are unlikely to be visible. There were no cross-national data sets explicitly designed to address social exclusion. Even had HDSE much more substantial resources and there was
not a structural break in the CEE data pre-and-post transition, there was no possibility of using then existing micro data to measure social exclusion of individuals pan-Europe Duffy (1995:37-39).

**Social exclusion in micro data**

In the late 1990s sufficient comparable panel data became available for micro investigation, albeit only in EU countries and therefore not suitable for HDSE even had it arrived sooner. Peter Townsend was influential in broadening poverty to define it as simultaneous and multiple deprivation including lack of social participation (Walker et al 2010). Levitas argued that because poverty includes participation it includes social exclusion (Levitas in Pantazis et al 2006:154) and is not distinguishable from multiple deprivation (Levitas in Gordon et al 2000:369-371). From my Duffy (1995) analysis (see earlier) I contend this approach drains poverty of its key economic content and fogs policy.

Further, investigators have struggled to proxy social exclusion as social participation in a way that draws on the continental theoretical framework and the operational definition in many studies has been shaped by the available micro data.

For example, using ECHP data Barnes et al did not define social exclusion but described it as multidimensional, dynamic, and relational and also referred to Lee and Murie (1999) on rights and obligations defined with respect to a shared moral order (Barnes et al 2002:5-6). But for purposes of investigation their operational definition was “closer to a notion of multiple disadvantage” (ibid. 2002:8, 13, 17). Similarly, Burchardt looked for social exclusion in the BHPS as persistent multiple deprivation and did not find a structural break in the data (Burchardt in Gordon et al 2000:400).

Room (2008) argued that longitudinal micro-data are a poor tool for analysing social change but in my view his proposed “complexity science” (which builds patterns from local interactions) suffers from the same conceptual limitation as neoclassical economics – that the whole is the sum of the parts.

A feature of these studies is the unexamined assumption about what is inclusion and an interpretation of dynamism restricted to individual life courses. More recently, Millar in Abrams (2007:12) defined the relational social exclusion concept as “social and economic contexts” but the content of this phrase was not expanded.

**Investigating macro processes of social exclusion**

In the context of threats to human dignity HDSE investigated the impact for risks of exclusion of trends in national social policy. The synthesised results are reported in chapters 2-6 of Duffy (1998a). The overarching theme was access for the least advantaged following de-statisation, marketisation, privatisation and localism. Factors that increased risk of poverty and social exclusion included: low cash benefits; inadequate supply of services leading to capping, rationing, trade-off; legal discrimination against ethnic and language minorities; missing “institutional middle level” and turbulence in property rights.

My evidence is consistent with Ferge and also Clarke (in Gordon et al 2000:276 and 316, 336 respectively) and confirmed my view from my labour market research that in society there are no “objective” floors, only social floors.
I drew on Esping-Andersen (1990) in discussing “ideal-type” welfare regimes in Duffy (1995); Corden and Duffy (1998a) and Duffy (1998a:12; 73-80). My findings supported Esping-Andersen’s perspective on variations in poverty and stratification in welfare regimes. I located ideal-type welfare regimes to their orientation on the welfare triangle, interpreted in terms of solidarity and risk (Duffy 1998a:12:Figs 1.1a and 1.1b). I concluded that “social exclusion, which involves ejection and rejection from a place and relationships in society, may rise alongside poverty and persist even where poverty declines” (Duffy 1998a:1).

3.11 Risk

Duffy (1998a) was a historical snapshot from which I concluded that “the liberalisation of markets in a variety of sectors simultaneously may generate complex multidimensional risks of exclusion” (Duffy 1998a:137). I suggested follow-up research to better distinguish the effects of short-term turbulence of transition, constitutional and legal changes arising from independence and “those which are part of a new strategy and logic” (Duffy 1998a:ii, v, 84-88).

The link between poverty and social exclusion may be found in the fact that social rights govern access to and disbursement of resources. In western societies rights to social protection have become the key anti-poverty measure (Duffy 1995:49, 52). An attack on rights and therefore on the underlying moral and political philosophy may be necessary to push down living standards.

My findings suggested a key transmission mechanism of social exclusion through transfer and individualization of risk. Neo-liberalism dismantles the “firewalls” between the values and objectives of the market and civil society and the state, can have prejudicial effects on human dignity (Duffy 1998a:148 and 2001:30).

Individualisation of risk and insurance against it cannot prevent risks of social exclusion but may exacerbate them (Duffy 1998a:143-145; Duffy 2001:31). My analysis was influenced by the Keynesian mathematical distinction between risk and uncertainty. “Forecast-ability” is essential for the validity of actuarial self-interested decision-making that underpins neoclassical economics and neoliberal policies (Duffy 1998a:145; 2001:31). At a meta-theoretical level I was influenced by contemporary authors such as Luhmann (1993) and Beck in Beck et al (1995) (Duffy 2001:20,31; Duffy 1998a:145). Key influences were Luhmann’s discussion of time-binding and distinctions between risk, danger and security, (Luhmann 1993: chapters 2,6) and Beck’s “reflexive modernization” in which societies unthinkingly (reflexively) undercut their structures for order and accommodation and manufacture risk and its insurance, putting a side-effect at the core of defence against uncertainty (Beck in Beck et al 1995:20-21;30-33).

Sub-politics

Duffy and Kiernan (2007:74) evaluated policy coordination in the OMC as a weak process in a difficult climate for social rights. I indicated the dominance of neo-liberalism and was not hopeful of the process other than in keeping open the public space for dialogue on poverty and social exclusion. The high water mark for extensions to rights had passed by the mid-1990s (Duffy 2001:23-25).
Issues of power and democratic legitimacy were as central to the OMC dialogue as to the Poverty 3 partnerships discussed earlier (and indeed Roman Road). Beck described as “sub-politics” in reflexive modernity a situation in which order is less legitimate, experts are doubted, new forms of defensive strategy are attempted by civil society groups and solidaristic outcomes are contested and can be remade (Beck 1995:17-19). I discussed the role of NGOs in sub-politics in Duffy (2001:38-39). Armstrong (2006) discussed my own role in the governance of the OMC. With hindsight, an analysis of governance in the Poverty 3 partnerships and the OMC, in terms of “network agencies” in “arenas of struggle” could have good explanatory power. But I am much less optimistic than is Beck about the possibility of remaking a positive global society.
Part 4 Contribution to knowledge

4.1 Introduction

As a volunteer activist combating poverty and social exclusion, my normative reference is social justice for all. This has directed my sustained research interest in process and policy including a preference for participatory action in the genesis, implementation and evaluation of the research. As a researcher, my methodology has been chosen to suit the investigative question, within the practical constraints of research in which the concept, model or site of investigation was innovative and challenging. As a lecturer in a university business school, my research generally has been conducted for clients, who may put their own interpretation on the data. My interpretation has been subject to challenge as an integral part of my research processes. In taking the learning from my research and applying it in different contexts I have pushed forward understanding of the persistence of social exclusion and the limitations of particular approaches, which has current relevance.

4.2 Contribution to knowledge

Methodology

I made some contribution to knowledge about methodology for doing cross-national research in Duffy (1996a) on problems of evaluating impact of a social programme. Walker (in Hantrais and Mangan 1996:19) stated of my chapter that “her account serves as a definitive case study”. Corden and Duffy (1998a) discussed a consensus process to develop common concepts and tools before proceeding to empirical research.

In my empirical work for CoE (Duffy 1995 and 1998a) and EAPN (Duffy and Kiernan 2007), I have shown it is possible with modest resources, to use a form of policy Delphi cross-nationally. My HDSE matrix of themes and issues was required to be taken into account in new CoE Programmes. HDSE is still on the CoE website thirteen years later and no government has found in it errors sufficient to have it taken down.

Concepts

Duffy and Hutchinson (1997) is my second most cited work (citations are in Appendix C). We are two of many authors who have discussed the problematic reality of “community” but I made some contribution to knowledge in my argument that the idealised notion of community fundamentally undermined the sustainability of contemporary urban programme strategies. Taylor (1998) discussed fractured communities but in proposing building social capital as the “bottom line” to combat social exclusion, did not address the conceptual issues I raised about community, exclusion and rights.

Duffy (1995) is my most cited work. I believe a key contribution to academic knowledge was to distinguish between poverty and social exclusion and to provide a definition of social exclusion drawn from my extensive literature review. In defining the concept of poverty as economic at core, I was insisting on a concept that can, in principle, be monetised for measurement in a way that the
relational definition of social exclusion cannot. Succinctly, perhaps value rather than values. My 1995 definition of social exclusion included the possibility of “absolute” and “relative” exclusion and inability to participate in social life is given multidimensional content.

I believe Duffy (1995) had most influence on UK academia. It was very favourably reviewed by Room ¹ (University of Bath). Duffy (1998a) was favourably reviewed by Le Grand ² (LSE). For the ESRC I wrote a paper on the international dimension of social exclusion (Duffy 1997) and then reviewed university bids for an ESRC centre on social exclusion which LSE won. I spoke at many UK seminars (e.g. LSE 1998 on concepts of social exclusion). I wrote a report on HDSE including Phases 1 and 2 for JRF, a major funder of HDSE (Duffy 1998b). Mine is one of several definitions of social exclusion proffered by Levitas in Gordon et al (2000:365).

**Explanatory theory**

Duffy (1998a) made a strong contribution to knowledge on social policy trends in CEE that increased the risk of poverty and social exclusion. But I made a contribution also in operationalising the normative reference of human dignity as inclusion in social rights as well as family and personal networks and markets.

A micro approach that defines inclusion as social participation investigated in measurement of associative life misses macro social processes and therefore the drivers of exclusion.

For two main reasons my approach is distinct from Sen’s capabilities approach although he highlights the mediation between “commodities” and “functionings” of social structures (“conversion factors”) (Goerne 2010). First, Sen’s unit of analysis for investigation is the individual and second, as Dean (2009) has argued, the capabilities approach is based on a liberal concept of freedom and is silent on capitalism and social change.

In my Poverty 3 and OMC research I have identified governance arrangements as arenas of struggle. My findings from HDSE indicated social exclusion was increasing in a context of system turbulence and neoliberal policies. I sought explanation in Keynes and Beck, who both, in their different fields, distinguished between risk and uncertainty in capitalist (Keynes) or post-industrial (Beck) society, which generate uncertainties at the macro level, falsely modelled as risk. Consequently simply “scaling up” micro data is not explanatory of social processes. My findings therefore drew me to explain social exclusion as essentially a disequilibrium phenomenon which I therefore sought in shifts in the welfare regime and in diminished integrative capacity of family and personal networks and the labour market.

---

¹ Copy available on request
² Copy available on request
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Appendix A: Statement of contribution to jointly authored works in the submission

There are three submitted works that were jointly authored. All three works are based on empirical research that I had carried out and for which I was the sole or principal investigator and in which the co-authors were not involved.

Duffy and Hutchinson 1997

Jo Hutchison and I shared an office at De Montfort University and both of us taught on urban/regeneration modules though my major teaching was in labour market studies and my research, by then, in social policy. We decided to write an article together that addressed the urban programme audience drawing on my labour market and Poverty 3 research; it was published in Town Planning Review. Jo wrote the earlier part of the article on urban programmes and I wrote the theoretical argument about community.

Corden and Duffy 1998

Ann Corden was a researcher at the University of York and was invited to be a rapporteur for the third of the three Friedrich Ebert Foundation funded seminars that I designed and facilitated, to develop consensus on the HDSE concept of social exclusion and the investigatory approach. Ann was interested in my methodology and proposed we write a conference paper which became the chapter in Sykes and Alcock (eds). I wrote the first part of the paper and outlined the methodology, which Ann wrote up in first draft, but we worked on this chapter together.

Duffy and Kiernan 2007

Annabel Kiernan is a politics lecturer at Manchester Metropolitan University. We began to write together in 2006, after I invited her to volunteer for EAPN. I had volunteered for EAPN since the early 1990s and I had prepared the methodology and written the reports on the OMC since it launched in 2000-2001. The article in Benefits was requested of me by Fran Bennett of University of Oxford who managed that part of the journal and who was aware of my role in the OMC process, in which she was also involved. I wrote the majority of the article. Further, the summary evaluation of the contribution of the National Action Plans on Social inclusion and the National Reform Programme are based on a summary of my findings from my surveys for EAPN. Annabel and I are currently working together on some research on the Structural Funds in the UK.
## Appendix B: Methodology Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology type</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Respondent type and population/sample or document source</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Info sought</th>
<th>Output Data type</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Output client</th>
<th>Output academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary research surveys – skills questionnaire</td>
<td>Roman Road Duffy and Geddes</td>
<td>All individuals living on the estate</td>
<td>Household delivery</td>
<td>Personal labour market characteristics</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative descriptive data</td>
<td>Descriptive stats</td>
<td>Research report Duffy and Geddes</td>
<td>Duffy in Campbell and Duffy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research opinion questionnaire</td>
<td>Roman Road Duffy and Geddes</td>
<td>All individuals living on the estate</td>
<td>Household interviews</td>
<td>Personal opinion on local environment</td>
<td>Descriptive stats</td>
<td>Research report Duffy and Geddes</td>
<td>Duffy in Campbell and Duffy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research: questionnaire</td>
<td>HDSE 98 Duffy</td>
<td>Network of Academic experts one each from 17 countries</td>
<td>Email/post</td>
<td>Evidence on social policy trends from secondary data, mainly national governments</td>
<td>Descriptive stats</td>
<td>Research report Duffy</td>
<td>Corden and Duffy in Sykes et al; Duffy in Canadian Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research opinion questionnaire</td>
<td>EAPN</td>
<td>Network of anti-poverty NGOs practitioners in 26 countries</td>
<td>Email/post</td>
<td>Evidence from NGO stakeholders on national implementation trends on European poverty strategy</td>
<td>Qualitative and some quantitative descriptive data</td>
<td>Some descriptive stats;</td>
<td>Research report Duffy; Duffy and Jeliazcov a; Duffy and Kiernan</td>
<td>Duffy and Kiernan Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research</td>
<td>Poverty 3</td>
<td>Project stakeholder</td>
<td>Workforce explanatory and qualitative data</td>
<td>Interview notes</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Duffy in Hantrais</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology type</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Respondent type and population/sample or document source</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Info sought</td>
<td>Output Data type</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Output client</td>
<td>Output academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually interviews</td>
<td>Roman Road</td>
<td>Estate community groups</td>
<td>Face to face in community facilities</td>
<td>Explanatory: Context info and reflection on questionnaire results</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
<td>Discussion notes</td>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Duffy and Mangen; Duffy and Hutchins on, Town Planning Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research: stakeholder group discussions and thematic seminars</td>
<td>Poverty 3</td>
<td>Project directors and evaluators</td>
<td>Warwick University cross – project meetings and events and ditto in project premises</td>
<td>Learning transfer</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
<td>Presentations; discussion notes; seminar reports</td>
<td>Research reports</td>
<td>Duffy in Hantrais and Mangen; Duffy and Hutchinson, Town Planning Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research: Consensus conferencing in stakeholder</td>
<td>HDSE Friedrich Ebert seminars</td>
<td>“Poverty stakeholders”: NGOs, academics and bureaucrats from</td>
<td>Council of Europe seminars</td>
<td>Working definition of social exclusion</td>
<td>Definition of social exclusion and methodology for investigation</td>
<td>Content analysis: Presentations, Discussion notes; reports; Seminar reports 2 out of 3 Duffy) Research report</td>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Corden and Duffy in Sykes et al;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology type</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Respondent type and population/sampling or document source</td>
<td>Delivery method</td>
<td>Info sought</td>
<td>Output Data type</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Output client</td>
<td>Output academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council of Europe Member States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 rounds of reflection and amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary document analysis</td>
<td>Poverty 3</td>
<td>Project reports; seminar reports; programme management and European Commission documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detail on project activities and progress and finance; output of thematic seminars; are context documents; relevant management and policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory of poverty and social exclusion; evidence on trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary document analysis</td>
<td>HDSE 95 AND 98</td>
<td>Academic and public policy and grey literature and empirical data on poverty and social exclusion and on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology type</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Respondent type and population/sample or document source</th>
<th>Delivery method</th>
<th>Info sought</th>
<th>Output Data type</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Output client</th>
<th>Output academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Delphi</td>
<td>HDSE</td>
<td>Document search strategy; Face to face groups and email/post</td>
<td>Definitio n of social exclusio n; data sources; policy trends in social exclusio n</td>
<td>Cross-national trends in social exclusio n in Europe</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>Analysis of causes of and trends in social exclusio n</td>
<td>Researc h reports (4) Duffy and Duffy in Sykes et al; Duffy in Canadia n Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Delphi</td>
<td>EAPN</td>
<td>Email/post questionnaires with iteration s, 2 rounds of group meeting discussion, iteration s of report</td>
<td>Trends in impleme ntation of OMC on exclusio n</td>
<td>Opinion survey results</td>
<td>Descripti ve stats; Content analysis</td>
<td>Seconda ry docume nt analysis</td>
<td>Reports (5 annual plus quarterl y)</td>
<td>Duffy and Kiernan Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Poverty 3</td>
<td>Stakeholders and secondary data</td>
<td>Face to face Docume ntary analysis</td>
<td>Impleme ntation of local area based action</td>
<td>Evaluati on</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Duffy in Hantrais and Mangen; Duffy and Hutchins on, Town Planning Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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