

WORKING PAPER 11

LONE PARENTS, POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Jonathan Bradshaw, Ruth Levitas and Naomi Finch

S | P | R | U

Poverty and Social Exclusion

Survey of Britain ●●●●

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

**Townsend Centre
for International
Poverty Research**

PREFACE

This Working Paper arose from the *1999 Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain* funded by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation. The *1999 PSE Survey of Britain* is the most comprehensive and scientifically rigorous survey of its kind ever undertaken. It provides unparalleled detail about deprivation and exclusion among the British population at the close of the twentieth century. It uses a particularly powerful scientific approach to measuring poverty which:

- incorporates the views of members of the public, rather than judgments by social scientists, about what are the necessities of life in modern Britain
- calculates the levels of deprivation that constitutes poverty using scientific methods rather than arbitrary decisions.

The *1999 PSE Survey of Britain* is also the first national study to attempt to measure social exclusion, and to introduce a methodology for poverty and social exclusion which is internationally comparable. Three data sets were used:

- The *1998-9 General Household Survey* (GHS) provided data on the socio-economic circumstances of the respondents, including their incomes
- The *June 1999 ONS Omnibus Survey* included questions designed to establish from a sample of the general population what items and activities they consider to be necessities.
- A follow-up survey of a sub-sample of respondents to the 1998-9 GHS were interviewed in late 1999 to establish how many lacked items identified as necessities, and also to collect other information on poverty and social exclusion.

Further details about the *1999 Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain* are available at: <http://www.bris.ac.uk/poverty/pse/>

1. INTRODUCTION

The proportion of families headed by a lone parent has been increasing for the last 30 years. Now nearly a quarter of families with children are headed by a lone parent and between a third and a half of all children will experience an episode in a lone parent family. The majority of lone parents are still ex married – separated or divorced but the fastest growing group are single who become lone parents as a result of a birth outside marriage or a cohabitation breakdown. About 90 per cent of lone parent families are headed by the mother.

The task of bringing up a child in a lone parent family is difficult since the roles of child-carer and financial provider, usually shared between two-parents, become burdened upon one. This inevitably leads to a very high risk of poverty on the part of lone parents. The latest Households Below Average Income statistics (DSS 2000) show that in 1998/9 62 per cent of lone parents compared with only 12 per cent of couples with children were living on an income less than 50 per cent of the contemporary average (after housing costs and including the self employed). The increase in numbers of lone parents has also been associated with increased dependence on social security benefits for the main source of income. In 1971 less than 10 per cent of lone parents were dependent on Supplementary Benefits. By the mid 1990s that proportion had risen to over two-thirds - though there is evidence that since then it has been falling. Nevertheless the comparative evidence suggests that the UK has one of the lowest lone parent labour market participation in the OECD and one of the biggest gaps between the participation rates of married/cohabiting mothers and lone mothers (Bradshaw et al 1996, OECD 1998). The Labour Government have sought to break the link between lone parenthood and poverty. Among the measures that they have introduced have been the New Deal for Lone Parents which requires all lone parents on Income Support with a child over aged five to have an interview with an advisor about the

possibility of taking paid work. The minimum Wage, Working Families Tax Credits, Childcare Tax Credits, Child Tax Credits have been introduced to increase work incentives. A Childcare Strategy is being implemented to help lone parents find good quality and affordable childcare. The Government also passed an Act in 2000 with the objective of making the Child Support regime more effective. The early measures introduced by the Labour Government were mainly reliant on labour market solutions to lone parent poverty. However in the last budget increases were made in the scale rates of Income Support, providing a welcome boost (and compensation for the abolition of the lone parent premium in Income Support and One Parent Benefit in 1997) for those unable to obtain access to the labour market. earnings disregards in Income Support were also increased.

A number of previous studies have been carried out on the living standards of lone parents. The first major sample survey of lone parents in the UK was commissioned by the Department of Social Security and carried out in 1989 (Bradshaw and Millar 1991). It explored the dynamics of lone parenthood and included material on their living standards, employment status and incomes. Millar (1989) undertook secondary analysis of data from the Family Finances Survey and Family Resources Survey. The main aim of the study was to analyse the living standards of lone parent families, and in light of this to evaluate income support policy towards such families. Millar stressed both the differences and similarities of lone parent families. The differences included different family types as well as different levels of income. However, lone parents were very likely to experience poverty and there was a high risk that they would stay poor – only finding an escape by forming a two-parent family or seeking full time employment. A main conclusion of the study was that the high risk of poverty among lone mothers can be seen as ‘a fairly direct consequence of gender roles and consequent inequalities in marriage and access to employment’ (Millar, 1989:189).

More recently, lone parents and other low income families have been studied through a series of surveys undertaken on behalf of the Department of Social Security at the Policy Studies Institute (Marsh and McKay 1993, Ford et al 1998, 1995). The main purpose of these studies was to investigate the factors, including Family Credit, impacting on the work and well being among families with dependent children. In this paper, the focus of the analysis is a comparison of the poverty and social exclusion of lone mothers compared with mothers in two-parent families. Although we realize that two-parent families are not the only relevant comparator, we have decided to use them as the sole comparator. On the one hand, this will allow a comparison with another disadvantaged group (households with children are often worse off than the rest of the population). Indeed, according to Marsh and McKay, the factors that discourage or encourage lone parents becoming low income, one-earner families in work are the same things that discourage or encourage couples from becoming higher income two-earner families. On the other hand, poor two-parent and poor lone parent families possess differences in their disadvantage. One overall conclusion of Marsh and McKay's study is that low-income families are not all the same. Even if they do have similar incomes, there is a difference between low income and social disadvantage, although most low-income families face material disadvantage of one kind or another (Marsh et al, 1993: 196). Comparing lone parents with two-parent families will therefore demonstrate the double disadvantages that lone parents suffer. It will also allow us to investigate the differences and similarities in the types of poverty and social disadvantages that each family type are facing.

We have undertaken secondary data analysis of two surveys. The first is The Office for National Statistics Omnibus Survey undertaken in June 1999. This asked about people's views on what constitutes the necessities of life in present-day Britain. This survey was weighted to the population as a whole for a consensual measure of poverty. The second, more recent survey, the

Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain (PSE), used the necessities of life identified in the Omnibus Survey as a measure against which the respondents can be seen as having or not having the 'necessities of life'. The PSE survey also asked questions covering the views of poverty, participation in social networks and views of their neighbourhood. It was therefore important that the sample included people with both high and low income levels but was weighted towards lower income groups in order to obtain a large enough sample size and therefore make it possible to measure different concepts of poverty. The PSE survey represents an opportunity to investigate the living standards of lone parents using a wider range of data on poverty and social exclusion than that employed in these previous studies.

We have taken the definition of lone parents to be single, separated or divorced parents who have not formed another cohabiting or marital relationship, i.e are not part of a couple, but who have dependent children living with them (ie. children under the age of 16 or those over that age and in full time education). We realise that lone parents do not always live alone with their child(ren) but in the omnibus survey, due to the nature of the questions asked, it was not possible to account for this. Households could only be counted as lone parent households if the head of household her/himself was a lone parent. For two-parent families, we have included only the family units that include a couple and child(ren). A household with more than two adults (including a couple) with children makes it impossible to identify who the child belongs to – the couple or another adult in the household. These were therefore *not* included in our study.

In our analysis of the PSE survey, we have been able to take into account that lone parents do not necessarily live alone with their child(ren). In our sample, we have included not only those households in which a lone mother is living alone but also those with two or more adults and child(ren), but where there are no couples in the household. The additional adults could be non-

dependent, adult children but, even if this is not the case, the structure of this household indicates the presence of a lone parent. It must be noted, however, that the method used to identify lone parents will inevitably exclude those lone mothers living with their parents (a couple).

Despite identifying lone parents within household units, we have used a sample of *individuals*. Moreover, we have intended for it to be a sample of *mothers*. This will enable us to compare like with like – lone mothers with mothers from two-parent families. Both surveys sampled a population of people aged 16 and above. This inevitably has meant children in the household being interviewed. In this study, since we are interested in lone *mothers* and *mothers* from two-parent families, it is vital that we sample not only those respondents who are female but also those who are parents. The inclusion of non-parent respondents could obviously skew the results. For example, there would be an unrepresentative number of never married respondents or there would be a large proportion of non-workers. In the omnibus survey, due to the nature of the questions asked, it was not possible to identify the individual respondents who were parents themselves. Instead, we *excluded*, all respondents reporting to be the (son) or daughter to the head of household. In other words, we have sampled those female respondents who were *not* daughters within the household, regardless of age. In the sample of mothers obtained from the PSE survey, we have only included the individual female respondents who report to have children themselves. Only those answering the question relating to the possession of child necessities were included in our sample, since only those with children were asked this question.

In addition to filtering to include mothers only, we have also weighted the data to create a representative sample. For the Omnibus survey, the unweighted samples sizes are 102 (lone mothersmothers) and 188 (mothers from two-parent families) but after the sample is weighted, the sample sizes

are 62 (lone mothers) and 214 (two-parent families). For the PSE survey, the unweighted sample of lone mothers is 143 and the weighted sample is 64. The unweighted sample of mothers from two-parent families was 120 and the weighted sample of individual respondents from two-parent households is 171.

In the analysis below when the unweighted number of cases corresponding to a percentage is 10 or below, the figures are in brackets to alert the reader that the percentage is based on a low absolute number. We have presented significance levels (mainly based on chi squared analysis) but where there are small numbers in cells these significance levels may not be reliable. The reader should constantly bear in mind that we are using a sample of only 143 lone mothers to represent a population of over 1.6 million.

Table 1: The sample sizes both unweighted and weighted

	Omnibus		PSE	
	Unweighted	Weighted	Unweighted	Weighted
Lone mothers	102	62	143	64
Mothers in two-parent families	188	214	120	171
Other	1565	1579	1271	1299
Total	1855	1855	1534	1534

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Table 2 shows the characteristics of the respondents. Lone mothers were significantly more likely to have only one child than were mothers in couples. The vast majority of respondents from both family types were white and the difference in the proportions between white and non white were not significant (in this sample). As with mothers from two parent families, the highest proportion of lone mothers were aged between 35 and 44 but a higher proportion of lone mothers compared to mothers in two parent families were aged 16-24 and 45+. Half of the lone mothers were not in paid work

compared to 24% of mothers in two-parent families, 58% of whom were working part time.

An anomaly can be observed with marital status. Of the mothers in two-parent families, 11 reported that they are either divorced or separated. However, although it is likely that they are divorced, all of these mothers are currently living as a couple. . The majority of lone mothers were divorced or separated (64%) but a significant proportion were never married (32%).

Tenure patterns differed between the family types. Mothers in two-parent families were twice as likely to be an owner with a mortgage than the lone mothers. 56% who were renting from a housing association or local authority, five times the proportion of two-parent families.

More than half (55%) of lone mother families are receiving Income Support compared to only 4% of the two-parent households. This alone demonstrates lone mothers precarious position vis a vis mothers in two parent families.

Table 2: The characteristics of Lone parent families compared to two-parent families

Characteristics	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families		Significance (Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two-parent families)
	number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	
All	143	100	120	100	
Number of children in the household					
1	66	50	29	23	***
2+	77	50	91	77	
Ethnicity					
White	130	92	113	95	NS
Black	[8]	[5]	[2]	[1]	
Indian	[2]	[2]	[2]	[1]	
Other	[3]	[2]	[3]	[2]	
Age of respondent					
16-24	20	13	[9]	[6]	**
25-34	49	28	48	40	
35-44	54	36	54	46	
45+	20	23	[9]	[8]	
Employment Status of the respondent					
Working full time	21	25	22	18	***
Working part time	46	25	56	58	
Not working	76	50	42	24	
Marital status					
Never married	54	32	12	7	NS
Married	0	0	97	87	
Seperated	25	19	[1]	[0]	
Divorced	60	45	10	7	
Widowed	[4]	[5]	0	0	
Tenure					
Owner	39	36	88	87	NS
HA/LA tenant	91	56	27	11	
Private tenant/other	13	8	[5]	[2]	
Receiving income support					
No	53	45	109	97	***
Yes	90	55	11	4	

[] = unweighted number less than 10

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

2.1 POVERTY

Income Poverty

Income poverty can be measured in several different ways. In this paper we have used the percentage of respondents with an equivalent income below an arbitrary percentage of the average (below the 40, 50 and 60% of the PSE

equivalence). We have also explored the quintile of the PSE equivalent income. The table below shows the proportion of lone mothers compared to mothers in couples in poverty using these measures.

We can see that a significantly higher proportion of lone mothers than mothers in couples with children are poor whether using the definition of an income (PSE equivalence) below 40, 50 or 60% of the average. 66% of lone mothers are poor if one takes the threshold to be 50% below the average income, compared to 8% of mothers in two-parent families.

The table also shows the proportion of respondents falling in each quintile. 82% of lone mothers are in the bottom two quintiles. 60% fall in the lowest quintile compared to 10% of mothers from two-parents families.

The findings clearly demonstrate the disadvantages in income that lone mothers face compared to a population also recognised as deprived vis a vis the whole of the population: mothers in couples. This reflects the relatively high proportion of lone mothers who receive income support but also suggest that mothers in couples are more likely to be in paid work, or are members of households in which someone is in some kind of paid work.

However, the above definitions only inform us about one kind of poverty – income poverty. Whilst useful for international comparison, these definitions are not scientifically based – they are not based on independent criteria of deprivation. Indeed, deprivation and disadvantage can take many forms other than simply low income. The remainder of the paper strives not only to use independent measures of deprivation but also to investigate the different forms that disadvantage can take.

Table 3: Income poverty of respondents

	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families		Significance (Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two-parent families)
	Weighted % of all lone mothers	unweighted number	Weighted % of all mothers from two-parent families	unweighted number	
Household income					
Below 60% PSE equivalent income	73	117	17	42	***
Below 50% PSE equivalent income	66	105	11	29	***
Below 40% PSE equivalent income	56	92	8	25	***
Quntile of PSE equivalent income					
5 (highest)	6	2	16	15	***
4	4	2	27	22	
3	9	9	35	28	
2	22	25	12	20	
1 (lowest)	60	96	10	28	

[] = if unweighted number less than 10

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

Lack of Socially Perceived Necessities

The PSE survey approach to measuring poverty produces a measure of poverty based on socially perceived necessities and a scientific definition of deprivation. This was achieved in three steps. First, the Office for National Statistics Omnibus Survey asked a representative sample of people aged 16 and over to identify the items and activities all adults should have/do and be able to afford, in order to achieve the living standards that everyone in Britain ought to be able to reach. This was essentially an extension of the methodology used in the 1983 and 1990 Breadline Britain surveys. The 1999 survey was adjusted to reflect changes in social conditions, consumer behaviour and household interaction identified in research –additional question were asked relating to social activities (and children) (Gordon et al, 2000). This poverty line represents a relative definition of poverty in which people are entitled to a standard of living that reflects the place and time in which they live (Gordon et al, 1997). Items are considered necessities if more than 50% of the population perceive them to be.

Table 4 compares the items identified as necessities by lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families. Lone mothers identified a total of 28 items as necessities, the respondents from two-parent households identified 31. Although the ranking was different, many of the same items and activities were considered to be necessities by both groups. . However, some differences are apparent. Whilst more than 50% of mothers from two-parent families identified a roast joint/vegetarian equivalent weekly; a dictionary; two pairs of all weather shoes; presents for friends/family yearly and a holiday away from home as necessities, these items were not thought to be necessities by lone mothers. On the other hand, a television and replacing worn out furniture were considered to be necessities by lone mothers but not by mothers from two-parent families. Generally, despite these differences, there appears to be consensus between the two groups about what items and activities constitute the necessities of life in contemporary Britain.

It is clear that both groups do not restrict necessities to the basic items necessary for physical survival: shelter, warmth, food and fuel. The necessities identified include social customs, obligations and activities in addition to physical necessities. Over 80% of both groups, for example, identify 'visits to school, e.g. sports day' and 'visiting friends or family in hospital' and 'collecting children from school' as necessities. Indeed, both groups identified the same activities to be necessities.

Over 90% of lone mothers perceive seven items to be necessities compared to nine identified by two-parent families. Both ranked 'beds and bedding for everyone', 'heating to warm living areas' and a 'damp-free home' among the first five rankings. Lone mothers identified 'all medicines prescribed by the doctor' and 'a refrigerator' in the fourth and fifth rankings and mothers from two-parent families identified 'visiting friends or family in hospital' and 'visits to school, i.e. sports day' as the other two items making up the five most common necessities. It is perhaps revealing that mothers in two- parent

families placed two social obligations in the top five (one in second place), whilst lone mothers included only items necessary for physical survival.

Table 4: A comparison of necessities identified by lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families

	Lone Parents		Two-Parent families		
	Unweighted number	Weighted %	Unweighted number	Weighted %	
Beds & bedding for everyone	99	98	Damp-free home	177	96
Heating to warm living areas	98	98	Visiting friends or family in hospital	175	95
Damp-free home	97	97	Beds & bedding for everyone	175	94
All medicines prescribed by doctor	93	93	Heating to warm living areas	172	93
Refrigerator	93	93	Visits to school, i.e. sports day	152	93
Two meals a day	92	92	Two meals a day	168	91
Visits to school, i.e. sports day	86	92	Refrigerator	168	90
Fresh fruit & vegetables daily	88	89	All medicines prescribed by doctor	167	90
Replace or repair broken electrical goods	88	89	Fresh fruit & vegetables daily	167	90
Visiting friends or family in hospital	88	88	A warm waterproof coat	163	89
Collect children from school	86	87	Replace/repair broken electrical goods	154	83
A warm waterproof coat	82	82	Meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day	152	83
Money to keep home decorated	82	82	Collect children from school	152	82
A washing machine	79	80	Attending weddings, funerals	151	82
Meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day	75	77	Celebrations on special occasions	148	81
Celebrations on special occasions	76	75	Visits to friends or family	147	79
Visits to friends or family	76	75	Money to keep home decorated	146	79
Deep freezer/Fridge freezer	75	75	Insurance of contents of dwelling	146	79
Attending weddings, funerals	73	74	A washing machine	142	76
Carpets in living rooms and bedrooms	72	73	A hobby or leisure activity	130	70
Insurance of contents of dwelling	70	72	Deep freezer/Fridge freezer	129	69
Appropriate clothes for job interviews	65	63	Appropriate clothes for job interviews	122	66
Friends or family round for a meal	62	61	Carpets in living rooms and bedrooms	123	66
A hobby or leisure activity	60	61	Friends or family round for a meal	121	66
Telephone	58	60	Regular savings for rainy days	116	63
A television	54	56	Two pairs of all weather shoes	117	63
Regular savings for rainy days	52	52	Telephone	114	61
Replace any worn out furniture	51	52	A roast joint/vegetarian equivalent weekly	95	52
A roast joint/vegetarian equivalent weekly	47	49	Presents for friends/family yearly	96	52
A dictionary	47	48	A dictionary	93	50
Two pairs of all weather shoes	48	48	A holiday away from home	92	50
Presents for friends/family yearly	45	47	A television	88	48
A holiday away from home	47	46	Replace any worn out furniture	88	47
A evening out once a fortnight	38	36	Attending place of worship	78	42
Money to spend on self weekly	37	34	Outfit to wear on social occasions	75	40
New, not second hand, clothes	31	33	Money to spend on self weekly	70	38
Outfit to wear on social occasions	30	31	A car	71	38
Coach or train fares to visit family or friends	29	30	New, not second hand, clothes	69	37
Attending place of worship	27	26	A evening out once a fortnight	54	30
Having a daily newspaper	20	25	Coach/train fares to visit family/friends	53	29
A meal in a restaurant or pub once a month	22	23	A dressing gown	50	27
A dressing gown	21	23	Having a daily newspaper	40	21
A car	19	23	A meal in a restaurant/pub once a month	38	21
Tumble dryer	18	20	Holidays abroad once a year	34	19
Holidays abroad once a year	17	20	Tumble dryer	29	17
A video cassette recorder	20	18	A video cassette recorder	31	16
Microwave oven	15	16	Microwave oven	28	15
Going to the pub once a fortnight	17	15	A home computer	24	14
CD player	14	13	Going to the pub once a fortnight	19	10
A home computer	6	7	A dishwasher	13	8
Access to the Internet	3	3	CD player	10	6
Satellite TV	3	3	Access to the Internet	9	5
A dishwasher	3	3	Mobile phone	8	5
Mobile phone	2	2	Satellite TV	6	3

The main PSE survey carried out later in 1999, undertook the next step in measuring poverty. It established which sections of the population have the necessities selected in the omnibus survey, and who cannot afford them. Table 5 compares the items that lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families do not have because they cannot afford them. Those items/activities above the line are items/activities, which *lone mothers* identified as necessities and those not considered necessities by lone mothers are placed below the

line. Those items considered to be necessities by more than 50% of lone mothers but are not recognised as necessities by more than 50% of mothers in couples are placed above the 50% cut off mark, but are in italics to highlight this. Likewise, those items considered to be necessities by more than 50% of mothers in two-parent families but by less than 50% of lone mothers are placed below the line and are in italics to highlight this.

Of all items considered to be necessities, over half of the sample of lone mothers cannot afford to have 'regular savings for rainy days' or 'to replace worn out furniture'. On the other hand, all lone mothers can afford visits to school, to own a refrigerator and to own a television. The two-parent families, in comparison, appear to be significantly better off as a group. The highest proportion of mothers in couples reporting that they could not afford a particular item was 32%, the item being 'to replace worn out furniture'. This was followed by 'regular savings for rainy days (25%)'. All could afford beds and bedding for everyone, celebrations of special occasions a refrigerator, a deep freezer/ fridge freezer, a washing machine, visits to school (ie sports days). Also, all could afford a television, despite less than 50% of mothers in two-parent families considering this item to be a necessity.

Indeed, we might expect that the items less likely to be identified as necessities are more likely to be items that cannot be afforded. However, seven items could each be afforded by 90% or more of lone mothers, even though they were not considered to be necessities; a CD player; attending a place of worship; a daily newspaper; a microwave; a dressing gown, a video and a dictionary. In other words, even though they are not considered necessities, most people wanted them and could afford to possess them.

Compared to two-parent families, however, lone mothers are less likely to be able to afford items that are considered to be non-necessities. 90% or more of mothers in two-parent families could afford twelve of the items not

considered to be necessities by the majority of the mothers from two-parent families. These included a television, a car;; new not second hand clothes; a tumble drier; a mobile phone; an outfit to wear on special occasion; a CD player; a daily newspaper; a microwave oven; a dressing gown; a video-cassette recorder and attending a place of worship.

Table 5: The proportion who are lacking the socially defined necessities identified by lone mothers because they cannot afford them

	Lone Mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Number (unweighted)	Weighted %	Number (unweighted)	Weighted %
Regular savings for rainy days	93	58	40	25
<i>Replace any worn out furniture</i>	87	55	41	32
Replace or repair broken electrical goods	72	41	19	11
Insurance of contents of dwelling	58	37	15	5
Money to keep home decorated	60	37	28	18
A hobby or leisure activity	35	21	16	10
Appropriate clothes for job interviews	31	18	12	6
A warm waterproof coat	24	18	14	9
Damp-free home	21	13	6	4
Friends or family round for a meal	23	11	12	10
Fresh fruit & vegetables daily	17	9	6	4
Visits to friends or family	7	8	3	1
Deep freezer/Fridge freezer	9	8	0	0
Telephone	14	8	4	3
Celebrations on special occasions	8	6	1	0
Attending weddings, funerals	13	6	2	1
Collect children from school	6	6	2	2
Heating to warm living areas	10	5	3	1
Visiting friends or family in hospital	8	5	3	2
A washing machine	4	5	0	0
Meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day	8	3	4	1
Carpets in living rooms and bedrooms	5	3	3	2
Two meals a day	4	2	1	1
All medicines prescribed by doctor	3	2	3	1
Beds & bedding for everyone	3	2	2	0
Refrigerator	2	0	0	0
Visits to school, i.e. sports day	0	0	1	0
<i>A television</i>	0	0	0	0
Holidays abroad once a year	101	63	55	39
Money to spend on self weekly	76	48	40	24
<i>A holiday away from home</i>	77	46	37	22
A meal in a restaurant or pub once a month	79	45	43	31
Coach or train fares to visit family or friends	69	45	31	22
A car	54	36	12	5
A evening out once a fortnight	59	33	41	30
A dishwasher	45	32	21	15
Access to the Internet	50	32	31	27
A home computer	45	30	35	28
Going to the pub once a fortnight	50	29	24	18
Satellite TV	35	21	26	16
<i>Two pairs of all weather shoes</i>	27	19	13	10
New, not second hand, clothes	35	19	11	8
Tumble dryer	26	19	10	8
Mobile phone	23	17	8	4
<i>Presents for friends/family yearly</i>	24	16	3	1
Outfit to wear on social occasions	27	16	13	7
<i>A roast joint/vegetarian equivalent weekly</i>	18	11	5	3
CD player	11	10	8	4
Microwave oven	14	8	3	1
Attending place of worship	8	7	0	0
Having a daily newspaper	12	7	7	5
A dressing gown	3	5	2	1
A video cassette recorder	7	3	1	1
<i>A dictionary</i>	5	3	3	2

italics above the line = those items not considered to be necessities by mothers in two-parent families
italics below the line = those items considered to be necessities by mothers in two-parent families

The third step established a threshold that discriminated between those who were 'poor' and 'not poor'. To do this, we have used two methods. The first is a relatively simple one that takes into account the number of necessities respondents reported lacking because they cannot afford them. For lone mothers, the items counted as necessities are those items identified as necessities by members of that group. Likewise, for mothers from two-parent families, the items counted as necessities are those items identified as necessities by mothers in two parent families. Table 6 shows the number of necessities lacking by both lone mothers and mothers from two-parent households. A significantly higher proportion of lone mothers reported lacking at least one necessity because they could not afford them compared to respondents from two-parent families. Whereas 27% of lone mothers reported lacking none of the necessities, 68% of two-parent respondents reported this. In addition, lone mothers as a group lack more necessities than do two-parent families - 63% of lone mothers compared to (only) 21% of two-parent families lacked two or more items. The highest number of necessities lacking by one lone mother respondent was 17, compared to 14 necessities lacking by one mother from a two-parent family. Lone mothers therefore are more likely to be necessities-poor by their own definition of what items constitute necessities than are mothers in couples.

Table 6: Number of necessities lacking by respondents

Number of Necessities	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)
0	24	27	70	68
1	14	9	13	11
2	13	9	4	3
3	17	11	6	5
4	12	6	6	3
5	13	6	4	2
6	13	6	5	3
7	11	6	3	2
8	5	3	1	0
9	8	6	4	1
10	2	5	1	0
11	6	3	2	2
12	2	2	0	0
13	1	0	0	0
14	1	0	1	0
17	1	0	0	0

The second method uses a poverty threshold was established for the whole sample using a combination of lacking two or more necessities and also having a low income (see Gordon et al 2000).

Table 7 identifies the proportion of both lone mothers and mothers in two-parent households who are 'poor'; those who 'have recently risen out of poverty', those who are 'vulnerable to poverty' and those who are 'not poor'. It shows that lone mothers are much more likely to be poor than mothers who are in a couples - 65% compared to 31%. Lone mothers are much less likely not to be poor - 25% compared with 62% of mothers in couples. Taking into account both necessities and low income, lone mothers are twice as likely than mothers in couples to be poor.

Table 7: Proportions of lone mothers and mothers in two-parents families in poverty

	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)
Poor	110	65	48	31
Rising	[2]	[2]	[4]	[3]
Vulnerable	17	9	10	4
Not poor	14	25	58	62

[] = if weighted number less than 10

Respondents were also asked what items they had personally gone without in the last year because of shortage of money. We can see from table 8 that a higher proportion of mothers from two-parent families than lone mothers reported that they never go without, although this difference is not statistically significant. In addition, a higher proportion of lone mothers than mothers in couples reported personally going without each of the items. For six out of the nine items, this difference was statistically significant.

Table 8: Items which mothers have personally gone without in the last year because of shortage of money

		Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families		Significance
		number (unweighted)	% all (weighted)	number (unweighted)	% all (weighted)	(Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two- parent families)
CLOTHES	YES	74	48	39	28	**
	NO	69	52	81	72	
SHOES	YES	89	36	23	17	**
	NO	54	64	97	83	
FOOD	YES	18	11	[5]	[5]	NS
	NO	125	89	115	95	
HEATING	YES	23	16	[3]	[3]	NS
	NO	120	84	117	97	
TELEPHONING FAMILY OR FRIENDS	YES	44	25	18	14	*
	NO	99	75	102	87	
GOING OUT	YES	86	50	31	45	NS
	NO	57	50	89	55	
VISITS TO THE PUB	YES	77	44	34	24	**
	NO	66	56	88	76	
HOBBY OR SPORT	YES	47	31	17	13	**
	NO	96	69	103	87	
HOLIDAY	YES	92	55	44	32	**
	NO	51	45	76	68	
NEVER GO WITHOUT	YES	14	20	33	30	NS
	NO	129	80	87	70	
MONEY NEVER TIGHT	YES	[5]	[5]	[9]	[9]	NS
	NO	138	95	111	91	

[] = unweighted number less than 10

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

The PSE survey also contained some questions on health perceptions so that the association between poverty, lone motherhood and well-being can be analysed. General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) scores are a subjective measure of well being – the higher the score, the worse the well-being.

The results are shown in table 9. The mean score for lone mothers is higher than that compared to mothers from two-parent households. This difference in means, however, is not significant at the 95% level. It is also evident that the results for lone mothers do not follow the general rule of an association between poverty and health. Whilst the mean GHQ score for poor mothers in two-parent households is clearly higher than those who are not poor, the mean score for poor lone mothers is virtually the same as those lone mothers who are not poor. This suggests that the slightly higher average GHQ score for lone mothers is connected to their being a lone mother rather than poverty per se, at least poverty in terms of inadequate resources.

Table 9: Mean GHQ score of Lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families

	POOR		NOT POOR		ALL	
	Mean GHQ Score	Significance (difference between poor lone mothers and mothers from two-parent families)	Mean GHQ Score	Significance (difference between non-poor lone mothers and non-poor mothers from two-parent families)	Mean GHQ Score	Significance (difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two-parent families)
Lone mothers	25.1		25.3		25.2	
Mothers in two-parent families	27.1	NS	22.2	*	23.7	NS

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

3. WHO ARE THE POOR?

This section concentrates upon exploring the characteristics of the poor lone mother and two-parent families sampled in the PSE survey. Only those respondents who have been identified as poor using the second method will be analysed (65% of lone mothers and 32% of mothers from two-parent families). The weighted base for the proportions in this section is therefore 42 lone mothers and 53 mothers in two-parent families, whilst in table 10 we given the unweighted base for the whole sample - 143 lone mothers and 120mothers from two-parent families.

Table 10 presents the poverty rates (the percentage who are poor) for lone mothers and two-parent families. It can be seen from the table that the poverty rate varies according to the characteristics of the respondent and also the family type they are living in. The table also shows the poverty proportions – the proportion of all poor lone mothers/ mothers in two-parent families made up of a respondent/household with a given characteristic.

Lone mothers have a higher poverty rate:

- If they have a child under school age (ns)
- If they are younger (ns)
- If they left school at 16 or younger

- If some one in the household has a longstanding illness (ns)
- If they are not in full time paid work (though 35% of lone mothers who are in full time paid work are still poor).
- If they are never married (ns)
- If they are a tenant (ns)
- If they are receiving Income Support

With the exception of being in a household in which someone has a long term illness, mothers in couples in the above circumstances are also more likely to be poor. However, the poverty rate for lone mothers in these circumstances is considerably higher than for couples, who are themselves a recognised disadvantaged group compared to the whole population This highlights the *double* disadvantage that lone mothers face vis a vis the whole population.

In addition couple families are more likely to be poor:

- If they are cohabiting (never married)

Table 10: Who are the poor lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families?

Characteristics	Lone mothers			Mothers in two parent families			Significance (Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two parent families)		
	% poor (weighted)	Significance (Difference between poor and not poor)	% of all poor lone mothers (weighthed)	number (unweighted)	% poor (weighted)	Significance (Difference between poor and not poor)		% of all poor mothers from two parent families (weighted)	number (unweighted)
All mothers	65		100	144	31		100	122	***
Number of adults in the household									
1	69		79	126	0		0	0	***
2+	56	NS	21	18	31		100	122	
Number of children in the household									
1	63		49	66	25	NS	19	29	***
2+	66	NS	51	77	33		81	91	
Age of the youngest child									
0-4	77		41	52	37		64	60	
5-11	63	NS	36	60	31	*	35	44	*
12+	56		24	31	4		2	16	
Age of respondent									
16-24	75		14	20	[46]		[9]	[9]	
25-34	78		33	49	51	***	64	48	**
35-44	65	NS	36	54	15		23	54	
45+	47		17	20	[15]		[4]	[8]	
Age respondent completed education									
16 and below	76	.	80	97	52	***	48	44	***
17+	42		21	40	23		52	73	
Longstanding illness in the household									
No	60	NS	69	103	32		89	99	NS
Yes	77		31	40	22	NS	12	21	
Ethnicity									
White	63	NS	88	130	29	NS	91	113	NS
Not White	100		12	13	[63]		[9]	[7]	
Employment Status of the respondent									
In full time paid work	35		14	21	16		10	22	
In part time paid work	69	**	26	46	33	NS	62	56	***
Not in paid work	81		60	76	37		29	42	
Household Employment Status									
At least 1 ft paid worker	32		14	19	17		19	43	
At least 1 pt paid worker	67		23	45	[83]		[9]	[10]	
At least 1 ft + 1 pt paid worker	[100]	NS	[2]	[1]	32	NS	57	49	NS
No paid workers - retired or student	[100]		[9]	[8]	[0]		[0]	[0]	
No paid workers -other	85		51	70	73		15	18	
Marital status									
Never married	75		36	54	67		15	12	
Married	[0]		[0]	[0]	28		77	97	
Seperated	69	NS	21	25	[0]	NS	[0]	[1]	NS
Divorced	59		41	60	33		8	10	
Widowed	[33]		[2]	[4]	[0]		[0]	[0]	
Tenure									
Owner	48		26	39	25		70	90	
HA/LA tenant	75	NS	64	91	70	NS	26	27	NS
Private tenant/other	80		10	13	[50]		[4]	[5]	
Receiving income support									
No	45	**	32	53	30	NS	93	109	***
Yes	80		68	90	67		8	11	

[] = number less than 10

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

4. SUBJECTIVE POVERTY

This section analyses the perceived poverty of lone mothers compared to mothers in two-parent households using subjective measures. The results are shown in Table 11. 21% of lone mothers compared with only four per cent of couple families say that they are poor all the time. Only 38% of lone mothers compared with 76% of mothers in couples say that they are never poor. Of those answering that they are poor all the time, the vast majority in both

household types are likely be currently poor, according to the measure applied in the previous section.

There appears to be some relationship between both family types experiences of poverty in the present and their experience of lifetime poverty, especially for lone mothers . A significant majority of those claiming to be poor most of the time in the past are currently poor by our measure. 93% of those lone mothers reporting to be poor occasionally in the past are currently poor. In general, however, for both family types, the more often they claim to have been poor in the past, the more likely they are to be poor at present. This either suggests that people who are poor now tend to have been either persistently poor in the past or those who are currently poor admit to or remember previous spells of poverty more readily than those who are not poor. If the former is the case, then these findings are important in highlighting the difficulty for lone mothers, but also for mothers in couples, in lifting themselves out of poverty once finding themselves in such a situation.

30% of mothers from two-parent households reported that their standard of living had improved in the last two years, but only 17% of lone mothers reported this to be the case. In addition, only 20% of lone mothers have experienced an increase in income recently compared to 35% of mothers in two-parent households. Perhaps encouragingly (but not necessarily surprisingly), 26% of lone mothers and 22% of mothers in couples expect an improvement in their standard of living. Interestingly, whilst 71% of lone mothers answering this way were poor, 51% of mothers from two parent families with this expectation were poor. Also, whilst 33% of lone mothers expected an increase in income, 38% of mothers in two-parent families expected this. Again, the poverty rate for mothers in couples answering this way was lower than for lone mothers, indeed it did not differ to greatly from the average poverty rate for two parent families

Table 11: Subjective personal experience and expectations of poverty

	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families			Significance (Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two-parent families)	
	Poor (weighted %)	Significance (Difference between the poor and non-poor lone mothers)	All (weighted %)	All (unweighted number)	Poor (weighted %)	Significance (Difference between the poor and non-poor mothers from two-parent families)		All (weighted %)
<i>Do you think that you could genuinely say you are poor?</i>								
All the time?	92	NS	21	34	[100]	NS	[4]	[8]
Sometimes?	78		41	67	70		20	33
Never?	36		38	41	17		76	77
<i>Looking back on your life, how often have there been times in your life when you think you have lived in poverty by the standards of that time?</i>								
Never/ rarely	47	**	57	72	21	***	75	81
Occasionally	93		22	39	52		14	23
Often/ most of the time	79		21	29	70		12	16
<i>Has anything happened recently (in the last two years) in your life which has</i>								
Improved your standard of living?	40		17	23	21		30	37
Reduced your standard of living?	88		14	22	65		11	13
Increased your income?	58		20	31	23		35	41
Reduced your income?	77		18	23	54		16	23
None of these?	69		49	71	31		34	43
<i>Note: multiple responses allowed</i>								
<i>Is there anything that you expect to happen in the near future (in the next two years) in your life which will</i>								
Improve your standard of living?	71		26	40	51		22	28
Reduce your standard of living?	[100]		[2]	[3]	[53]		[5]	[5]
Increase your income?	77		33	45	33		38	40
Reduce your income?	[87]		[3]	[5]	[30]		[6]	[7]
None of these?	57		53	74	23		46	59
<i>Note: multiple responses allowed</i>								

[] = if unweighted number less than 5 errors due to rounding

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

Next, we will analyse subjective poverty using several concepts - absolute, overall and general poverty. An international agreement at the Copenhagen World summit on Social Development in 1995, recommended that a two-tier measure of absolute and overall poverty would be applied to every country. Absolute poverty is defined as “a condition characterised by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information. It depends not only on income but also on access to services” (UN, 1995 quoted in Gordon et al, 2000: 9). Overall poverty is a wider measure of poverty that, in addition to lack of access to basics, includes lack of participation in decision making, civil, social and cultural life. The PSE survey adapted these measures to conditions in Britain. Absolute poverty was taken as needing enough money to cover an adequate diet, housing costs/rent, heating costs, clothing, water rates and prescription costs. In addition to these basics, overall poverty was defined as needing enough money to live in a safe environment; have a social life in your local area; feel part of the community; carry out your duties/activities in the family and neighbourhoods, and at work; and meet essential costs of transport. In the PSE survey, households were asked to estimate the income

needed to keep a household out of absolute and overall poverty and how far above or below this threshold they perceived their household to be. In addition, the survey also asked about general poverty. Respondents were asked to determine the income needed to keep a household such as theirs out of poverty and were then asked how far above or below the level of income perceived their household to be. Table 12 compares the results for lone mothers and mothers from two-parent families.

For lone mothers, the mean income estimated as necessary for all concepts of poverty was below the mean estimated by two-parent families. This is not surprising since two-parent families typically have more adults in the household, although 19 lone mother households had two or more adults. Also, the mothers in two-parent households were more likely to have 2 or more children compared to lone mothers, who are more likely only to have one child.

Clearly the mothers in both family types could differentiate between the three concepts of poverty since the anticipated threshold varied with each definition. For mothers in both family types, the estimated income was lowest for absolute poverty and highest for overall poverty with the anticipated income needed to keep a household out of general poverty falling somewhere between the two. The differences between the three thresholds were greater for those estimated by mothers in two-parent families.

The majority of mothers in two-parent families (61%) considered themselves above the level of income necessary to keep a household such as the one they live in out of general poverty, but over half of lone mothers (55%) perceived themselves to be a little or a lot below that level. 55% of lone mothers compared to 14% of two-parent families claimed to be in general poverty.

Likewise, the vast majority of mothers in two-parent households described themselves to be above the level of income needed to avoid absolute poverty (72%) compared to 39% of lone mothers. Indeed, 34% of lone mothers compared to only 7% of mothers in couples reported being a lot below that level of income. 45% of lone mothers in total, compared to only 12% of mothers from two-parent respondents ranked themselves in absolute poverty.

Over half the lone mothers (54%) also describe themselves to be in overall poverty, 43% claiming to be a lot below the level of income needed to avoid overall poverty. This is in comparison to only 21% of two-parent households claiming overall poverty.

A general pattern is apparent – the majority of mothers in two-parent families do not claim to be in poverty by all three definitions. Indeed, the highest proportion by all three measures claim that they are a lot above the level of income required to keep them out of poverty. In contrast, the highest proportion of lone mothers reported that they are a lot below the level of income required by all three poverty measures. The majority of lone mothers rank themselves in general and overall poverty and a significant proportion claim absolute poverty. This suggests that many lone parents are aware of their precarious position vis a vis the rest of society.

Table 12: Income needed each week to keep a household of your type out of absolute, overall and general poverty

	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Absolute poverty	Overall poverty	General poverty	Absolute poverty	Overall poverty	General poverty
Mean income needed	£139	£186	£162	£198	£255	£240
Actual income a lot above	16	[11]	[11]	56	38	37
A little above	23	[13]	18	16	24	24
About the same	6	8	10	[4]	[2]	12
A little below	11	11	19	5	10	7
A lot below	34	43	36	7	11	7
Don't know	9	14	[7]	13	16	13

[] = if number less than 10 *errors due to rounding*

5. PERCEPTIONS OF POVERTY

One of the main objectives of the PSE survey was to explore the association between poverty and other experiences. Whilst the section on social exclusion will investigate the proportions of the social disadvantaged lone parents who are poor, this section will analyse respondents' perceptions of poverty in general. Table 13 analyses lone mothers' perceptions of poverty compared to mothers from two-parent households.

Overall, lone mothers' perceptions of poverty do not differ greatly from that of mothers in two-parent households. However, a higher percentage of lone mothers than mothers in couples believe that poverty has decreased over the last 10 years and will decrease over the next 10 years, whilst mothers in couples are more likely to believe that it has increased and will continue to increase.

Interestingly, there is general agreement between the two family types over the reasons people live in need. Respondents from both household types blame injustice in our society as the main reason why people are in need. 75% of lone mothers answering this way are poor. Of the 25% of lone mothers answering that people are in need because of an inevitable part of progress, an above average proportion (75%) are also poor, whilst the poverty rate of mothers in couples answering this way reflects the average

Table 13: Perception of poverty and its causes in Britain in general

	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families			Significance (Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two-parent families)	
	Poor (weighted %)	Significance (Difference between poor and non-poor lone mothers)	All (weighted %)	All (unweighted number)	Poor (weighted %)	Significance (Difference between poor and non-poor mothers from two-parent families)		All (weighted %)
<i>Over the last ten years, do you think poverty has been</i>								
Increasing	81		41	69	35		55	63
Decreasing	31	NS	25	22	11	NS	12	13
Staying about the same	77		27	42	25		28	38
Don't know	60		6	10	[56]		[5]	[6]
<i>Over the next 10 years, do you think poverty will</i>								
Increase	71		44	60	35		50	57
Decrease	57	NS	22	33	23	NS	15	20
Stay about the same	73		23	38	31		30	38
Don't know	43		11	12	[11]		[5]	[5]
<i>Why, in your opinion, are there people who live in need?</i>								
Because they have been unlucky	58		19	25	21		21	20
Because of laziness and lack of willpower	43		22	28	43		16	20
Because there is much injustice in our society	75	NS	31	52	28	NS	37	50
It's an inevitable part of modern progress	75		25	31	30		23	27
None of these	[100]		[5]	[7]	[60]		[3]	[3]

[] = unweighted number less than 10

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

6 SOCIAL EXCLUSION

The PSE survey enables us to look more fully at Social Exclusion. The definition of social exclusion as developed by the PSE survey team includes four dimensions: impoverishment or exclusion from inadequate income or resources (poverty); labour market exclusion; service exclusion; and exclusion from social relations. The poverty dimension has been extensively investigated in the previous section. This section is therefore devoted to the last three dimensions – labour market exclusion, service exclusion and exclusion from social relations. However, poverty plays an important part in a discussion of the questions: how can social exclusion be brought about; and what are the socially excluded lacking: money or work? Whilst some, such as Townsend, have emphasised that poverty and inequality in the distribution of resources can create limited participation in society, others such as Hutton emphasise the importance of paid work (or rather the lack of it) as a contributory factor to social exclusion. Most will not disagree that unemployment is a contributory factor to social exclusion and that paid work is a factor in social integration. However, the main difference between the above discourses is that the latter treats paid work as *synonymous* with social inclusion (Levitas, 1998: 23). Indeed, New Labour is one example of those who emphasise exclusion from paid work rather than a broader view of exclusion

from social participation. They declare that the very act of work, rather than the pay, promotes inclusion. In light of these discourses, in this section we shall pay particular attention to the relationship of both paid work and poverty with social exclusion. We will begin by looking at the proportions excluded from the labour market.

LABOUR MARKET EXCLUSION

The PSE survey data makes it possible to look at individual and household labour market exclusion both, which can be used as indicators of social exclusion. Labour market activity is thought to be important not only for obtaining an income but also for social interaction and contact. Individuals not in paid work may therefore be socially excluded, even if poor and even if they live with workers. The following account uses the term 'labour market inactive' as opposed to 'economically inactive' for the those not in paid work.

Individual labour market exclusion

Table 14 shows the extent of labour market participation for both lone mothers and mothers in two-parent households. Over twice the proportion of mothers in two-parent families than lone mothers are working part time, whilst a slightly smaller proportion are working full time. Although the proportion of females from two-parent families not working is higher than average, twice as many female lone mothers than female two-parent respondents are not working. This suggests that lone mothers are more likely to work full time or not partake in any paid work at all, rather than work part time. Also shown in table 17 is the employment status of the female partners of the male respondents. It can be seen that, although the same proportion as the female respondents are not working, a slightly higher proportion are working full time. This information still supports the findings that mothers in two parent households are more likely to supplement their partners' work by working part time. This highlights the better position of two parent

households in terms of being able to take up paid work compared to those with only one parent.

Investigating the poverty rates, lone mothers are more likely to be poor if they are not working but mothers in two-parent families are just as likely to be poor whether in part time paid work or not participating in any paid work. This suggests that poor lone mothers are differentiated from non-poor lone mothers by labour market attachment, whilst this is not the case for mothers in two-parent families. This likely to be because mothers in couples live in households where their partner is participating in some kind of paid work. We shall now consider household labour market exclusion.

Table 14: Employment status of mothers

Employment Status	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families			Female partners of male respondents in two parent-families	
	% poor (weighted)	% (weighted)	number (unweighted)	% poor (weighted)	% (weighted)	number (unweighted)	number (unweighted)	% (weighted)
In full-time paid work	35	25	21	16	18	22	26	29
In part-time paid work	69	25	46	33	58	56	48	46
Not in paid work	81	50	76	37	24	42	40	25
							6 missing persons	

Household labour market exclusion

New Labour's New Deal for lone parents established in 1997 targeted principally women with school aged children, who were not considered to be legitimately exempt from participation in paid work. Lone parents were deemed to need paid work for self esteem in addition to social inclusion. However, for those mothers not in receipt of income support, notably those in a two-parent family with a working partner, caring for a child full time was still considered acceptable. Social inclusion, in this case is not considered to result from exclusion from the labour market, despite the emphasised importance of paid work as the vehicle for social inclusion of lone mothers. New Labour then is not concerned with individual exclusion but *household* exclusion, when no one of working age is in paid work (Levitas, 1998: 145-

146). Indeed, social exclusion and exclusion from social relationships are perhaps more likely to happen to individuals in households with no adult paid work. It is therefore also important to investigate household labour market exclusion. However, since many of these will be doing large amounts of unpaid care work, they are better described as 'jobless households' rather than 'workless households'.

Whilst the highest proportion of two-parent households live in a household where one person is working full time and the other, part time (49%), the highest proportion of lone mothers are living households with no workers (45%). This supports the conclusion that mothers in two parent families are in a better position to undertake paid work, and it seems that they do so by supplementing their partners earnings through part time work. This, however, also suggests that, in a partnership, it is women who are expected to juggle the conflicting demands of paid and unpaid work. This may lead to negative consequences, especially in terms of lack of time to participate in certain activities considered necessary for social inclusion. This potential contradiction between paid work and social inclusion will be investigated in this section. Nevertheless, if living in a jobless household is a measure of social exclusion, excluding retired and student households, 39% of lone mothers are, by this measure, socially excluded compared to only 6% of mothers in two-parent households.

Regardless of household type, mothers who are poor are more likely to be in jobless households than those who are not poor. 85% of lone mothers in jobless households were poor compared to 51% of those not in jobless households who were poor. 73% of mothers in couples who were in jobless households were poor compared to 28% of those not in jobless households who were poor (see table 37). In other words, poor mothers in both household types are differentiated from non-poor mothers by household labour market attachment. The relationship between household labour market exclusion and

other dimensions of social exclusion will be investigated throughout the section, largely in terms of investigating those who are poor/not poor by each dimension, but will also be more directly discussed in the conclusion. . .

Table 15: Household Employment Status

Employment status	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % who are poor	% (weighted)	number (unweighted)	Weighted % who are poor	% (weighted)	number (unweighted)
At least 1 in ft paid work	32	30	19	17	35	43
At least 1 in pt paid work	67	23	45	83	4	10
At least 1 in ft and at least 1 in pt paid work	[100]	[2]	[1]	32	56	49
None in paid work - retired or student	[100]	[6]	[8]	[0]	[0]	[0]
None in paid work -other	85	39	70	73	6	18

[] = unweighted number is less than 10

Service Exclusion

Social exclusion includes a lack of access to basic services, whether in the home or outside it. In this section, we will discuss utility disconnection, which constitutes exclusion from basic domestic service, which most people would take for granted. We also identify the proportion within lone mothers who are socially excluded from a range of public and private services and compare it to mothers within two-parent households excluded in this way.

The PSE survey asked whether people has experienced disconnection from water, gas, electricity and telephone services and also whether people had restricted their use of these services because they were unable to afford them. Table 16 shows clearly that a higher proportion of lone mothers compared to those in two-parent households had experienced both disconnection from one or more services and restricted their consumption. 20% of lone mothers had experienced disconnection and 40% had restricted their consumption, compared to just 7% of the mothers in two-parent households who had experienced disconnection and 12% who have used less because they were unable to afford the service. Of all those mothers in both household types

who have experienced disconnection or have used less, nearly all are poor by the method used in above. However, for, the difference between the poor and non-poor and disconnection is not statistically significant for both family types. Restricting consumption is significant and it can therefore be concluded that this measure of social exclusion is related to being poor.

Table 16: Utility disconnection and restricted use experienced by respondents

	Lone mothers				Mothers in two-parent families			
	Weighted % who are poor	Significance (Difference between poor and non poor)	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % who are poor	Significance (Difference between poor and non poor)	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
Has experienced disconnection	93	NS	20	35	100	NS	7	10
Has not experienced disconnection	57		80	108	26		93	110
Has restricted consumption	89	**	40	65	91	***	12	22
Has not restricted consumption	49		60	78	23		88	98

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

Respondents were also asked about access to a range of public and private services outside the home. The survey differentiated between those who did not use services because they were unavailable and those who did not use them because they were unable to afford them. This enables us to distinguish between ‘collective exclusion’, where services are simply not available and ‘individual exclusion’, where the services are too expensive for the individual.

We can see from table 18 that lack of affordability rather than lack of availability is the main barrier to use for lone mothers whilst mothers in two-parent households are more likely to suffer from lack of availability. Overall, 45% of lone mothers and 50% of mothers in two-parent households did not use public or private services because they were either not available or not affordable. 23% of lone mothers did not use either services because they were too expensive, compared to 15% of two-parent households. In contrast, 43% of mothers from two-parent families reported that the services were unavailable compared to 34% of lone mothers.

Table 17 shows the proportions not using individual services because they are too expensive or because they are unavailable. For both lone mothers and mothers in couples, lack of affordability was cited as the main deterrent for visits to the pub or cinema, whilst lack of availability was cited as the reason for not using museums or a village hall. Indeed, nearly 19% of respondents from two-parent households reported not using museums due to their unavailability. With the exception of one mother from a two-parent household who could not afford to use the dentist, one lone mother who could not afford to use the opticians and another who could not afford to use the hospital, all respondents in both households types could afford access to health services, including dentists and opticians.

Lack of access to a bank account is becoming an increasingly important marker of financial exclusion (Gordon et al, 2000:58) since fewer and fewer transactions can be effected purely in cash and as the provision of post offices and sub post offices declines. Although the numbers who could not afford / did not have access to bank accounts due to both unavailability and affordability was very small, 5% of lone mothers did not use banks or building societies because they did could not afford to.

Table 17: Which public and private services mothers used

	Lone mothers				Mothers in two-parent families			
	Don't use - unavailable		Don't use - can't afford		Don't use - unavailable		Don't use - can't afford	
	Unweighted number	Weighted %	Unweighted number	Weighted %	Unweighted number	Weighted %	Unweighted number	Weighted %
<i>Public services</i>								
libraries	[2]	[2]	[1]	[0]	[2]	[2]	[0]	[0]
Public sports facilities	[9]	[6]	[9]	[3]	[3]	[3]	[7]	[5]
Museums and galleries	19	11	10	5	18	21	[4]	[1]
Evening classes	10	5	13	6	[9]	[7]	[9]	[5]
A public or community village hall	22	13	[4]	[3]	12	13	[2]	[1]
A hospital with accident/emergency unit	[5]	[2]	[1]	[0]	[2]	[1]	[0]	[0]
Doctor	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Dentist	[2]	[2]	[0]	[0]	[2]	[1]	[1]	[0]
Optician	[5]	[3]	[1]	[0]	[1]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Post office	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
<i>Private services</i>								
Places of Worship	[2]	[2]	[0]	[0]	[1]	[1]	[0]	[0]
Bus services	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]	[3]	[2]	[2]	[1]
Train or tube station	14	8	11	6	[4]	[4]	[2]	[1]
Petrol station	[5]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[0]	[0]	[1]	[0]
Chemist	[1]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Corner shop	[8]	[5]	[2]	[2]	[8]	[7]	[0]	[0]
Medium to large supermarket	[2]	[2]	[0]	[0]	[3]	[3]	[0]	[0]
Banks or building societies	[5]	[2]	[5]	[5]	[1]	[1]	[0]	[0]
Pub	[1]	[0]	18	8	[3]	[3]	[8]	[7]
Cinema or theatre	11	8	27	14	10	8	15	11

[] = If unweighted number is less than 10

It was also possible to look at the number of services lacking by each respondent. Table 18 shows that the majority can afford or has access to all the services, 29% of lone mothers were lacking 2 or more public and private services due to either cost or unavailability compared to 28% of mothers from two-parent households. In terms of numbers if services lacking, service exclusion effects both lone mothers and mothers in couples to the same extent. Also, for both types of mothers, the more services lacking, the more likely they are to be poor. This is the case whatever the reason (unaffordable/unavailable or both) and whatever the service (private/public or both). The only exception being the proportion of mothers in two-parent families lacking private services because they are unavailable; the poverty rates did not increase with the more services lacking.

Table 18: Mothers lacking different number of services because unaffordable and/or unavailable

	Lone mothers						Mothers in two-parent families					
	0		1		2+		0		1		2+	
	Weighted % who are poor	weighted % of all	Weighted % who are poor	weighted % of all	Weighted % who are poor	weighted % of all	Weighted % who are poor	weighted % of all	Weighted % who are poor	weighted % of all	Weighted % who are poor	weighted % of all
Public services												
Can't afford	61	89	100	6	[100]	[5]	28	92	[38]	[5]	[100]	[4]
Not available	62	72	75	19	80	9	23	68	35	20	64	12
Can't afford or unavailable	57	66	75	20	90	14	22	63	27	21	71	16
Private services												
Can't afford	59	79	86	11	86	11	24	86	[64]	[8]	[100]	[6]
Not available	64	83	67	9	80	8	31	80	32	15	[22]	[5]
Can't afford or unavailable	58	67	75	13	85	20	23	69	42	19	60	12
Both Public and private services												
Can't afford	57	77	83	9	89	14	22	85	[100]	[5]	71	10
Not available	62	66	67	20	78	14	27	57	24	25	55	18
Can't afford or unavailable	54	55	67	15	84	29	21	50	21	22	59	28

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Errors due to rounding

We must take into consideration factors other than cost that may also result in exclusion from services. In particular, those with limiting long-standing illness or disabilities may find it difficult to access certain services. Table 19 shows, however, that the majority of those with an illness or disability did not have great difficulty doing the activities or using certain services they were asked about. However, whilst the proportion having difficulty accessing services were similar regardless of family type, a larger proportion of mothers in two-parent families (41%) than lone mothers (22%) had difficulty doing certain activities. Having an illness or disability, whilst increasing poverty, does not appear to influence service exclusion to any great extent, although there are some indications that it impacts undertaking certain activities. We must, however, be cautious about drawing any conclusions from this sample due to the small unweighted numbers.

Table 19: Activity/service difficulty due to health problems or disability

	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Unweighted number	weighted %	Unweighted number	weighted %
Activities				
Go to the cinema, theatre or concerts	[6]	[10]	[1]	[6]
Go to the library, art galleries or museums	[2]	[4]	[1]	[6]
Go Shopping	[6]	[13]	[4]	[17]
Eat out in a restaurant or have a drink	[4]	[7]	[3]	[10]
Go to a football match or other sporting	[3]	[5]	[4]	[23]
Other	[3]	[6]	[2]	[20]
Have had no great difficulty in doing these things	28	78	12	59
	base = 40		base = 21	
Services				
Arranging accommodation in a hotel or boarding house	[2]	[4]	[0]	[0]
Arranging insurance	[2]	[5]	[2]	[9]
Using a bank or building society	[1]	[1]	[0]	[0]
Using a public telephone	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Other	[2]	[4]	[0]	[0]
Have had no great difficulty in using these things	35	90	19	91
	base = 40		base = 21	

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Note: Multiple responses allowed

Exclusion from Social Relations

The PSE survey is unique in that it seeks direct information about social relations and social participation. Exclusion from social relations can be looked at in different ways; through non-participation in common social activities; isolation; lack of support; disengagement; and confinement.

Non Participation in common social activities

Table 20 shows the proportion of lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families who do not take part in common social activities either because they do not want to or because they cannot afford to. Those activities above the line are activities which both lone mothers and mothers in couples identified as necessities (both identified the same activities). But since this section is about social exclusion those activities not considered necessities have also been included and are placed below the line. The proportions reporting that they cannot afford to do each activity are generally higher for lone mothers. However, for both lone mothers and mothers in two-parent families, lack of money is most likely to hinder going on holiday (whether abroad or not), obtaining coach fares to visit family and friends and going out. Moreover, money is likely to prevent 21% of lone mothers from having a hobby, whilst only 10% of mothers in two-parent families cannot afford this activity.

Table 20: Participation in common social activities

	Lone mothers				Mothers in two-parent families			
	Don't want		Can't afford		Don't want		Can't afford	
	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)	Number (unweighted)	% (weighted)
A hobby or leisure activity	24	18	35	21	12	10	16	10
Friends or family round for a meal	12	13	23	11	[3]	[3]	12	10
Visits to friends or family	[1]	[0]	[7]	[8]	[1]	[0]	[3]	[1]
Celebrations on special occasions	[5]	[3]	[8]	[6]	[0]	[0]	[1]	[0]
Collect children from school	29	22	[6]	[6]	11	8	[2]	[2]
Attending weddings, funerals	[2]	[2]	13	6	[2]	[2]	[2]	[1]
Visiting friends or family in hospital	10	5	[8]	[5]	[6]	[4]	[3]	[2]
Visits to school, i.e. sports day	[8]	[7]	[0]	[0]	[5]	[4]	[1]	[0]
Holidays abroad once a year	13	13	101	63	23	21	55	39
A holiday away from home	[8]	[8]	77	46	11	9	37	22
A meal in a restaurant/pub once a month	23	19	79	45	16	12	43	31
Coach/train fares to visit family/friends	48	37	69	45	50	51	31	22
A evening out once a fortnight	14	8	59	33	19	19	41	30
Going to the pub once a fortnight	35	22	50	29	58	53	24	18
Attending place of worship	100	68	[8]	[7]	77	63	[0]	[0]

[] = if unweighted number less than 10

We shall take those lacking 3 or more social activities because they cannot afford them as an indicator of social exclusion. It can be seen from table 21 that 19% of lone mothers and 27% of mothers from two-parent households can afford to participate in the whole range of social activities. However, 53% of lone mothers respondents experience this aspect of social exclusion (lack 3 or more social activities) compared to 31% of mothers from two-parent households. For both family types, the higher the number of social activities that the mothers cannot afford, the higher the poverty rate. The poverty rate, however was higher for lone mothers - nearly all those lacking 3 or more activities were also poor. Unsurprisingly, there is therefore a connection between poverty and exclusion from social activities due to cost. However, this correlation between poverty and exclusion from social activities is stronger for lone mothers.

Table 21: Number of social activities that cannot be afforded

	Lone Mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
Lack 0	9	19	21	0	27	28
Lack 1	17	19	16	18	32	35
Lack 2	83	9	18	35	10	13
Lack 3 +	97	53	88	70	31	44

Isolation

Respondents were also asked whether there had been times in the past year when they had felt either isolated and cut off from society, or depressed specifically because of lack of money. Table 22 shows that a higher proportion of lone mothers than respondents from two-parent families have felt isolated and/or depressed in the last year due to lack of money. 46% of lone mothers compared to 79% of mothers in two-parent families reported feeling neither isolated nor depressed. Of those lone mothers and mothers in couples answering that they have been isolated or depressed due to lack of money, the vast majority are poor. Unsurprisingly, this suggests that, regardless of family type, poor mothers are more likely to feel isolated or depressed due to lack of money.

Paid work is thought to improve inclusion and improve self-esteem of the person undertaking the work. However, there is less difference in the mental health (depression) of poor/non poor mothers in couples than for lone mothers. This can partly be explained by the observation that the poor/not poor mothers in two parent families are not differentiated by individual labour market attachment, but they are in the case of lone mothers (see table 37).

This suggests therefore that the data support the theory that individual labour market attachment improves self-esteem and inclusion. If this were the case, we would expect those not in paid work to be more prone to experiencing isolation and depression. Whilst this appears to be the case for lone mothers, mothers in couples experiencing isolation or depression are more likely to be in paid work than not. Nevertheless, we must remember that only 24% of the sampled mothers in couples are not in any paid work at all. Taking this into account, mothers in two parent families who are isolated or depressed are more likely than average not to be in paid work. In addition, whilst isolated or depressed lone mothers are more likely not to be in paid work, lone mothers overall are also more likely than mothers in couples not to be in paid work. Therefore, there is some evidence that those not in paid work are more likely to suffer from poor general well being than those in paid work.

Table 22: Impact of poverty and family type on general well being

	Lone mothers				Mothers in two-Parent families			
	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % answering this way who are not in paid work	Weighted % of all	All (unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % answering this way who are not in paid work	Weighted % of all	All (unweighted number)
Neither of these	38	34	46	58	18	19	79	84
Yes - isolated	94	78	25	36	92	39	8	16
No -not isolated	[62]	[72]	[4]	[4]	[18]	[70]	[4]	[5]
Yes -depressed	93	64	40	68	85	43	13	24
No - Not depressed	[62]	[38]	[4]	[5]	[60]	[36]	[5]	[7]

[] = if unweighted number less than 10

Note: Multiple responses allowed

Isolation from society can be due to reasons other than lack of money. Respondents were asked whether they have felt isolated and cut off from society in the past year for a number of given reasons. A higher proportion of lone mothers (53%) compared to mothers from two-parent families (27%) reported feeling isolated from society. A lack of transport and child-care responsibilities were the two main reasons given by both household types, although higher proportions of lone mothers than mothers from two-parent families gave these reasons. However, childcare responsibilities was more likely to isolate mothers in couples than was lack of own transport. Childcare responsibilities, although more likely to isolate the poor, also has an effect

upon about a quarter of the non-poor mothers in both household types. Although the large majority of lone mothers lacking their own transport were poor (89%), the poverty rate was only 44% for mothers from two-parent families. In section we found that 38% of mothers from two parent families thought that a car was a necessity compared to 23% of lone mothers. Likewise, only 5% of mothers in couples reported that they lacked a car because they could not afford one, compared to 36% of lone mothers who do not have a car due to cost. This accounts for the small proportion of mothers in two parent families, compared to lone mothers reporting lacking their own transport (and also irregular or expensive public transport) as a reason for feeling isolated from society.

Table 23: Reasons for feeling isolated from society

	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
Lack of own transport	89	25	35	44	8	16
Childcare responsibilities	72	24	39	69	16	22
Irregular or expensive public transport	96	10	17	[32]	[2]	[4]
No family	[100]	[5]	[7]	[64]	[4]	[7]
Other caring responsibilities	[100]	[4]	[7]	[100]	[3]	[4]
Paid Work	[100]	[3]	[6]	[73]	[5]	[5]
No friends	[100]	[2]	[3]	[15]	[4]	[4]
Sexism	[34]	[2]	[2]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Problems with physical access	[100]	[1]	[1]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Discrimination relating to disability	[100]	[1]	[3]	[100]	[1]	[2]
Racism	[100]	[1]	[2]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Discrimination relating to homosexuality	[0]	[0]	[0]	[100]	[2]	[0]
Other	[55]	[10]	[6]	[0]	[2]	[3]
None of these	50	47	67	23	73	76

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Note: Multiple responses allowed

The frequency with which respondents speak to family or friends outside their immediate household, including both face to face and telephone contact, is another measure of isolation. We can see from table 24 that 75% of lone mothers compared to 70% of those mothers in two-parent households are in contact with at-least one non-household family member daily. Turning this on its head, 25% of lone mothers and 30% of those in two-parent households do *not* have contact with a non-household family member daily. Both types of mothers are more likely to have contact with at least one non-household

friend daily than they are a non-household relative - The vast majority of both lone mothers and mothers from a two-parent household see at least one non-household friend or one non-household relative both daily and weekly. We have chosen as the social exclusion threshold those who have no contact with any non-household family or non-household friend daily. By this measure, only 6% of lone mothers and 7% of mothers from two-parent households experience this aspect of social exclusion

Even though mothers in both family types are just as likely to experience this kind of social exclusion, the lone mothers who have no contact with family or friends daily are more likely to be poor compared to mothers in two-parents families. Whereas all lone mothers socially excluded by this measure are poor, 39% of the mothers in two parent households are poor. This indicates that poverty is correlated with this aspect of social exclusion, and more specifically, that it is a barrier to social contact for lone mothers in particular. However, the unweighted numbers are very small and therefore this inference should not be related to the population of lone mothers in society as a whole.

Table 24: Level of respondents social contact with friends and family

Contact with family/friends	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
At least one non-household family member Daily	63	75	114	32	70	85
At least one non-household family member weekly	66	83	114	28	87	99
At least one non-household friend Daily	62	82	122	30	81	94
At least one non-household friend weekly	56	78	111	31	90	101
At least one non-household friend/family member daily	63	94	137	30	93	112
At least one non-household friend/family member weekly	65	97	136	30	98	116

The PSE survey enabled us to investigate what factors prevent mothers from meeting up with friends and family more often. Table 25 shows that a higher proportion of lone mothers (35%) than mothers in couples (26%) report seeing family and friends as often as they would like. The main reasons for *not* seeing family and friends were reported to be a lack of time due to child-care

responsibilities and lack of time due to paid work, with a higher proportion of mothers in couples reporting these reasons.

The unpaid work, caring for children, is given as the main barrier to social relations, especially for mothers in two parent families. This is perhaps surprising because the task of bringing up a child in a lone parent family is deemed to be difficult since the roles of child-carer and financial provider, usually shared between two-parents, become burdened upon one. However, acting as a barrier to both poor and non-poor mothers in a couple alike, it appears to affect the non-poor lone mothers slightly more than those who are poor (since the poverty rate is slightly lower than average). This could be due to the negative correlation between individual paid employment and poverty that is found to be the case for lone mothers, but not for mothers in couples. In other words, non-poor lone mothers (and a high proportion of mothers in couples) are more likely to be in paid work and therefore will need to juggle their childcare responsibilities with paid work.

Indeed, paid work, often vital for a good standard of living, ironically is cited as the second main barrier to forming social relations by both family types, although again it appears to affect a higher proportion of mothers in couples than lone mothers. This partly reflects the higher probability that mothers from two-parent families are in some kind of paid work (76% compared to 50%). Indeed, to obtain an accurate picture, we must take into account that only those mothers who are in some kind of paid work will give this as a reason. Those reporting lack of time due to paid work as a proportion of those reporting to be in some kind of paid work is 36% for lone mothers and 48% for mothers in two parent households. Although a relatively large proportion of both types of mothers in paid work report that lack of time due to paid work is a barrier to social relations, mothers in two-parent families undertaking some kind of paid work are more likely than lone mothers in paid work to report this. This suggests that lack of time due to paid work *is* an

important barrier to forming social relations whatever the family type, but especially for those mothers in two-parent families.

It is no coincidence that mothers in two-parent families are more likely than lone mothers to give both lack of time due to child care responsibilities and lack of time due to paid work as the main factors preventing meeting up with friends and family more often. Whilst lone mothers have both the financial responsibilities and the child care responsibilities, in reality mothers in two parent families are the ones who actually juggle between the two. Lone mothers, less likely to undertake any form of paid work, can concentrate on the unpaid child-care work whilst mothers in couples, more likely to undertake some kind of paid work still have the responsibility of looking after the children. This obviously can have costs, such as lack of time.

Table 25: Factors preventing mothers from meeting up with friends and family more often

Factors	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
I see them as often as I want to	66	35	53	23	26	32
Lack of time due to childcare responsibilities	55	22	30	29	36	39
Lack of time due to paid work	37	20	24	32	39	38
Too far away	79	17	31	18	30	37
No vehicle	91	17	27	34	6	10
Can't afford to	85	16	31	73	9	10
Poor public transport	80	8	15	[21]	[2]	[5]
Lack of time due to other caring responsibilities	[72]	[3]	[6]	[85]	[4]	[6]
Can't go out because of caring responsibilities	[72]	[3]	[6]	[17]	[1]	[2]
Not interested	[86]	[2]	[3]	[71]	[2]	[3]
Fear of burglary or vandalism	[100]	[1]	[3]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Fear of personal attack	[100]	[1]	[2]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Problems with physical access	[100]	[1]	[1]	[0]	[0]	[0]
Too ill, sick or disabled	[0]	[0]	[0]	[100]	[0.3]	[1]
None of these	52	14	11	[37]	[5]	[9]

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Note: Multiple response allowed

Lack of Support

The existence of functional social relationships and networks can also be measured by the extent of practical and emotional support available to individuals when needed. The PSE survey asked respondents about the amount of emotional and practical support they would receive from any source, including those living in the household, in seven situations. Four

items relating to practical support were included. Help around the home when in bed with flu; help with heavy household or gardening jobs; help with caring responsibilities for children or elderly or disabled adults; someone to look after the home or possessions when away. The three other situations related to emotional support. These were: needing advice about an important life change; someone to talk to if depressed; and someone to talk to about problems with a spouse or partner.

A summary of the results is presented in Table 26. In each situation, the majority of both types of mothers expect to have a lot or some support, but, in nearly all of the seven situations, a higher proportion of lone mothers than mothers in couples report that not much or no support is available. The highest proportion of lone mothers lack support when they need help with heavy household jobs or with informal caring, but the highest proportion of mothers from two-parent families lack home help during personal illness. Only 9% of mothers in couples report lacking help in informal caring compared to 19% of lone mothers. This difference reflects the difficult position of lone mothers' due to the fact that the roles of child-carer and financial provider, usually shared between two-parents, become burdened upon one.

In all seven situations, a large majority of mothers in both family types who lack support, are poor, although the poverty rates are higher for lone mothers. This suggests a correlation between poverty and this measure of social exclusion. However, there are two exceptions. The poverty rate for mothers in couples answering that they receive not much or no support with home help during illness is 48%, and 50% for those answering that they receive little or no help in relation to looking after the house or possessions when away. Both poverty rates, however, are still higher than overall rate for the sample.

Table 26: Level of support available in various situations

Type of Support	Lone parents						Mothers in two-parent families					
	A lot/Some			Not Much/None			A lot/Some			Not Much/None		
	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
Home help during illness	59	83	116	91	17	27	28	83	100	48	17	20
Help with household jobs	59	81	116	92	19	27	28	90	105	56	11	15
Advice	61	89	129	100	11	14	28	91	110	60	9	10
Help with relationship	63	82	114	91	18	21	27	90	106	61	11	14
Talk to if depressed	62	91	131	86	9	12	29	92	110	92	8	10
Informal caring	59	81	117	92	19	21	28	91	106	60	9	14
Look after possessions	59	84	120	90	16	21	29	90	109	50	11	11

Table 27 shows the number of situations in which individual respondents reported they received a lot of support or some support. A low number in both households reported lacking support in all 7 situations. A slightly higher proportion of mothers from two-parent households (67%) compared to 59% of lone mothers expect to be able to call on a lot or some support in all 7 areas, which again may reflect the fact that lone mothers do not have a partner with whom to share tasks

Table 27: Number of situations in which individual respondents reported they received a lot of support or some support

No of situations in which potential support available	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Unweighted number	weighted %	Unweighted number	weighted %
7	77	59	79	67
6	27	17	20	17
5	12	8	[6]	[5]
4	[9]	[5]	[4]	[4]
3	[7]	[6]	[3]	[2]
2	[1]	[0]	[1]	[1]
1	[7]	[5]	[5]	[2]
0	[3]	[2]	[2]	[2]

[] = unweighted number less than 10

We divided the data into those with good support (some or a lot of support in all seven situations), reasonable support (lacking good support in one to three situations) and very poor support lacking good support in 4 or more situations). Table 28 shows the results. We used very poor support (those lacking support in 4 or more areas) as the social exclusion indicator. Therefore, 12% of lone mothers and 8% of mothers from two-parent

households are excluded from social relations on this dimension. Despite the differences noted above, lone mothers are no more likely (or only very slightly more likely) than mothers in couples to be socially excluded by this indicator. This is perhaps surprising given that lone mothers do not have support from a partner. It may demonstrate the extent to which friends and family, external to the household, play apart in helping lone mothers, although this is not born out by the data relating to contact with family and friends.

Table 28: Level of overall support

Level	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % answering this way who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
GOOD	50	59	77	26	66	79
REASONABLE	94	29	48	43	26	30
VERY POOR	75	12	18	36	8	11

Disengagement

A lack of civil engagement is sometimes taken as an indicator of social exclusion. Respondents were shown a list of activities and organisations and were asked which activities they had done in the last three years and which organisations they were currently actively involved with. A higher proportion of lone mothers (27%) than mothers in couples (16%) had not taken part in any of the activities listed. In all except 'urging someone to get in touch with a local councillor', a lower proportion of lone mothers than mothers in two-parent households reported having taken action in each of the activities listed. The majority of both types of mothers had voted in the last general election and local election.

Table 29: Participation in civic activities in the past 3 years

Type of activity	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Unweighted number	weighted %	Unweighted number	weighted %
Voted in the last general election	80	54	79	75
Voted in th last local election	76	49	72	70
Helped on fundraising drives	33	24	47	46
Urged someone to get in touch with a local councillor	30	18	18	14
Urged someone outside the family to vote	25	16	24	23
Presented views to local councillor	22	12	23	22
Been an officer of an organisation or club	11	9	12	14
Made a speech before an organised group	10	8	12	12
Written a letter to an editor	[6]	[3]	[3]	[3]
Taken active part in a political campaign	[3]	[2]	[5]	[4]
Stood for civic office	[1]	[1]	[0]	[0]
None of the these	34	27	21	13

[] = unweighted number less than 10

In terms of current participation in various types of civic organisations, less than 10% of lone mothers were involved in any one group, the highest proportion having joined the tenants residents association, which drew 9% of the lone mother population. On the contrary, 29% of mothers in two-parent households compared to only 7% of lone mothers were involved in a parents' association.

Table 30: Current participation in various civic organisations

Type of group	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	Unweighted	weighted %	Unweighted	weighted %
Tenants residents association	16	9	[8]	[7]
Sports club	12	8	17	17
Voluntary service group	[8]	[8]	[8]	[8]
Parents' or school association	12	7	25	29
Religious group or church organisation	[8]	[6]	16	14
Any other group or organisation	[9]	[5]	[9]	10
Trade Union	[5]	[4]	13	14
Other community or civic group	[5]	[4]	[2]	[2]
Social club or working men's club	[2]	[1]	[4]	[3]
Environmental group	[1]	[1]	[4]	[6]
Women's group or organisation	[2]	[1]	[5]	[4]
Political party	[1]	[1]	[3]	[2]
Other pressure group	[0]	[0]	[2]	[2]
Women's Institute or Townswomen's guild	[1]	[0.4]	[0]	[0]
Don't know	[7]	[5]	[1]	[0.1]
None of these	86	62	51	37

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Table 31 summarises the extent to which lone mothers and mothers from two-parent households took part in civic activities, the extent to which they are currently members of organisations and finally, the extent to which they are engaged in civic participation overall. In terms of taking part in civic activities, whilst the highest proportion of lone mothers were only fairly active (45%), the highest proportion of mothers from two-parent households (48%) were active. 66% of lone mothers were not involved in an organisation compared to 36% of mothers from two-parent households.

We used total disengagement from any activities in the past 3 years as well as a total lack of current involvement with any organisation as the measure of social exclusion. It is clear that lone mothers are more likely to be disengaged from any civic participation than those respondents from two-parent households: 20% of lone mothers are socially excluded by this measure, compared to 7% of mothers in two-parent households.

It is difficult to tell from this survey why lone mothers are more likely than mothers from two parent families to be disengaged. Although, for both types of mothers, the lower the civic participation, the higher the poverty rate,

poverty does not seem to be the explanation for disengagement in lone mothers. Although the overall poverty rate for mothers in couples is about half that of lone mothers, disengaged mothers in two-parent households are more likely to be poor compared to lone mothers who are disengaged. This suggests that disengagement for mothers in couples is related to poverty, but civic disengagement experienced by lone mothers is likely to be related to another factor. Perhaps lack of time to take part is an important contributory factor, since for lone mothers financial and caring roles are burdened upon one. If so, this is contrary to the findings above concerning contact with friends and family. These suggest that mothers in couples are less likely than lone mothers to be able to find time to meet up with friends and family due to having to juggle paid work with unpaid care work. Time poverty is discussed in the final part of this section.

Table 31: Extent of civic Engagement

	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families		
	Weighted % who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % who are poor	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)
<i>Activity</i>						
inactive	71	27	34	50	13	22
fairly active	66	45	63	27	37	47
active	58	28	46	28	50	51
<i>Member</i>						
none	63	66	93	46	37	53
1	71	22	31	22	38	42
2+	57	12	19	23	25	25
<i>Overall Engagement</i>						
none	62	20	26	68	7	14
moderate participation	69	57	77	33	52	64
4+participate	53	23	40	23	41	42

Confinement

Participation in social activities and social contact beyond the household depend on being able to get out and about. People who are not able to move freely may be effectively excluded from full social participation. Table 32 shows that ‘can’t afford to’ was given as the main reason by mothers in both family types for not participating in social activities, a larger proportion of lone mothers than two-parent families citing this (86% and 63% respectively). This appears to contradict table 31 which indicates that those disengaged

mothers in two parent families were more likely to be poor compared to lone mothers.

'Lack of time due to child care responsibilities' was cited as the second main reason by both types of mothers, but was cited by a slightly higher proportion of mothers in two-parent families than lone mothers. This reflects the findings above concerning the reasons for being unable to see family and friends more often. Indeed, whilst lone mothers may feel the burden of childcare responsibilities more heavily, mothers in couples are more likely to be undertaking some kind of paid work and therefore will need to juggle childcare responsibilities with paid work. This is borne out by the data: whilst 22% of mothers in couples cited lack of time due to paid work to be a factor preventing participation in social activities, only 4% of lone mothers gave this as a reason.

We excluded those who were 'not interested' as well as those who answered 'none of these' and identified the rest as confined for reasons outside their control. 42% of lone mothers were socially confined in this way (96% of whom were poor) compared to 46% of mothers from two-parent households (of whom 60% were poor). Interestingly, whilst both groups were just as likely to be confined, those lone mothers who were confined were more likely to be in poverty. It is likely that being poor and a lone mother makes it more likely to be confined for reasons outside their control, whilst the two are not so strongly correlated for mothers from two-parent families

Table 32: Factors preventing participation in common social activities

	Lone mothers		Mothers in two-parent families	
	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % of all	All (Unweighted number)	Weighted % of all
Can't afford to	94	86	50	63
Lack of time due to childcare responsibilities	46	45	34	53
Not interested	30	37	12	20
No vehicle poor public transport	13	13	[5]	[3]
Lack of time due to other caring responsibilities	[6]	[8]	[1]	[0]
No one to go out with (social)	[8]	[7]	[1]	[0]
Fear of burglary or vandalism	[4]	[4]	[0]	[0]
Lack of time due to paid work	[5]	[4]	11	22
Feel unwelcome (eg.due to disability, ethnicity, gender, age, etc.)	[2]	[4]	[1]	[0]
Too old, ill, sick or disabled	[4]	[3]	[1]	[1]
Can't go out due to other caring responsibilities	[3]	[3]	[0]	[0]
Fear of personal attack	[2]	[1]	[0]	[0]
Problems with physical access	[0]	[0]	[1]	[1]
None of these	[5]	[6]	[5]	[8]

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Note: Multiple response allowed

Area Deprivation and safety

Personal safety is also one form of confinement. Table 33 shows the results for the security and satisfaction of lone mother and two-parent respondents in the area they live in. 70% of lone mothers and 88% of mothers from two-parent families were satisfied with the area in which they live. 20% of lone mothers, however, reported feeling dissatisfied. For both types of mothers, those reporting dissatisfaction were more likely to be poor than those who reported that they are satisfied with the place they live.

Whilst the majority of mothers in both household types feel safe walking alone after dark, nearly 44% of lone mothers reported feeling unsafe compared to 33% of mothers in couples. The poverty rate of those feeling unsafe was below average for both family types. Those feeling unsafe were no more likely to be poor than those feeling safe.

The vast majority of mothers from both family types feel safe in their homes at night. However, 20% of lone mothers reported feeling unsafe, but these were less likely to be poor compared to those who felt safe. The proportion of mothers from two parent families reporting feeling unsafe was small (12%) and the difference between the poverty rates between those feeling safe and unsafe was very slight. This suggests that being in poverty does not increase the likelihood of being confined in this way, especially for lone mothers. Perhaps being a lone mothers itself makes it more likely that the individual will feel unsafe in their homes at night, since they are more likely to be alone (without other adults), although the difference between family type is not significant.

Table 33: Security and satisfaction with the area in which respondents live

	Lone mothers				Mothers in two-parent families				Significance (Difference between all lone mothers and all mothers from two-parent families)
	Poor % (weighted)	Significance (Difference between poor and non-poor lone mothers)	All % (weighted)	All (unweighted number)	Poor % (weighted)	Significance (Difference between poor and non-poor mothers from two-parent families)	All % (weighted)	All (unweighted number)	
<i>How satisfied are you with this area as a place to live?</i>									
Satisfied	67		70	94	28		88	100	NS
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	[33]	NS	[9]	[9]	[67]	NS	[4]	[6]	
Dissatisfied	71		20	40	47		9	14	
<i>How safe do you feel walking alone in this areas after dark?</i>									
Safe	61		56	78	30	NS	67	78	NS
Unsafe	68	NS	44	65	32		33	42	
<i>How safe do you feel when you are alone in your home at night?</i>									
Safe	69		80	117	31		88	104	NS
Unsafe	46	NS	20	26	35	NS	12	16	

[] = unweighted number less than 10

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

Time Poverty

It is recognised that some people may not be able to do certain things that they wish to due to a lack of time. Indeed, many of the findings above show that lack of time due to paid work or child-care responsibilities are important barriers to participation in certain social arenas. Those experiencing these barriers are considered to be 'time poor'. The 'time poor' may be excluded from certain social activities due to a lack of time to take part in them. The PSE survey allows us to investigate time poverty; respondents were asked

whether they agreed with a variety of statements relating to time poverty. Table 34 presents the results.

A relatively low proportion of both groups reported that they did not agree with any of the statements. 16% of lone mothers reported not agreeing and 13% of mothers in two-parent families. In relation to those who did agree, there are some differences in the type of time poverty felt by lone mothers compared to that felt by mothers in two-parent families. Lone mothers were more likely than mothers in two-parent families to report time poverty in three ways; mothers in two parent families were more likely than lone mothers to experience time poverty in five ways. Lone mothers were more likely than mothers in two parent families to feel trapped in a daily routine; to feel constantly under stress trying to accomplish more than they can handle and to feel that have no time for fun. Mothers in two parent families were more likely than lone mothers to report feeling under stress when they do not have enough time; to cut back on sleep; to consider themselves a workaholic and to plan slow down in the coming year. Under half of the mothers in both household types reported any one kind of time poverty, with the exception of 54% of mothers in couples who reported feeling under stress when there was not enough time. In general, it appears then that mothers in two-parent families as a group can be considered to suffer from time poverty to a slightly greater extent than lone mothers. This is perhaps because mothers in couples are more likely to be undertaking some form of paid work in addition to their child-care responsibilities.

Table 34: Mothers reporting that they feel pressured for time (time poor)

	Lone mothers			Mothers in two-parent families			
	Poor (weighted %)	All (weighted %)	All (unweighted number)	Poor (weighted %)	All (weighted %)	All (unweighted number)	
Trapped in daily routine	68	46	63	50	29	40	
At end of day has not accomplished what has set out to do	71	45	67	51	46	61	
Under stress when not enough time	60	45	66	39	54	62	
Constantly under stress trying to accomplish more than can handle	68	44	60	41	40	45	
No time for fun	67	36	50	47	28	40	
Doesn't spend enough time with family and friends	61	33	44	39	38	43	
Cuts back on sleep	69	32	53	44	38	47	
Would like to spend more time alone	60	29	38	30	30	37	
Consider oneself a workaholic	60	10	16	44	15	15	
Plan to slow down in the coming year	49	8	12	25	15	16	
None of these	63	16	26	15	13	16	

Note: multiple responses allowed

7. CONCLUSION

This section serves to summarise the findings above related to the poverty and social exclusion of lone mothers as compared to mothers in two-parent families. Using several different measures and indicators, we shall summarise the proportion of lone mothers who are poor and the proportion who are socially excluded, compared to those in two-parent households. We shall also attempt to draw some conclusions related to the relationship between lone motherhood, poverty, paid work and social exclusion.

SUMMARY OF POVERTY

Table 35 demonstrates that the proportion of poor in lone mothers and mothers in two-parent households differs depending on the measure and definition of poverty that is used. However, whichever measure is used, at least twice the proportion of lone mothers, compared to respondents from two-parent households, can be identified as poor.

Table 35: Summary of Poverty of lone mothers compared to two-parent households

Measures of Poverty	Lone mothers (weighted %)	Mothers in two-parent families (weighted %)
Income poverty		
<i>below 40% of PSE equivalent income</i>	56	8
<i>below 50% of PSE equivalent income</i>	66	11
<i>below 60% of PSE equivalent income</i>	73	17
Lack of Socially perceived necessities		
<i>Lacking 2 or more items (mothers' definition of necessities)</i>	63	21
<i>Lacking 2 or more items, income accounted for (all samples' definition)</i>	65	31
Subjective poverty		
<i>genuinely poor all the time</i>	21	4
<i>general poverty</i>	55	14
<i>Absolute poverty</i>	45	12
<i>Overall poverty</i>	54	21

SUMMARY OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

It can be seen from table 36 that, in 3 out of the 8 indicators, there is a significant difference between the proportion of lone mothers who were socially excluded and the proportion socially excluded from two-parent families. These are the labour market excluded, the service excluded and participation in activities. However, in all ways except lacking two or more services; confinement and contact with friends/family daily, a higher proportion of lone mothers are socially excluded than mothers in two-parent families.

Table 36: Summary of Social Exclusion of lone mothers and two-parent households

Social Exclusion dimensions	Lone mothers	Mothers in two-parent families	Significance (Difference between lone mothers and mothers from two-parent families)
Labour Market Excluded			
<i>Individual not in paid work</i>	50	24	***
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	50	76	
<i>Jobless households (excluding retired and students)</i>	39	6	***
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	61	94	
Service Excluded			
<i>Lacking 2 or more services</i>	30	28	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	70	73	
Exclusion from Social relations			
<i>Unable to participate in three or more activities</i>	53	31	**
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	47	69	
<i>No contact with family/friends daily</i>	[6]	7	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	94	93	
<i>Lack of Support in four or more areas</i>	[13]	8	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	88	92	
<i>Disengaged from all activities</i>	20	7	**
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	80	93	
<i>Confined</i>	42	46	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	58	54	
<i>Confined because of fear</i>	44	33	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	56	67	

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

[] = unweighted number less than 10

Note: errors due to rounding

In order to design appropriate policy to tackle social exclusion it is important to find out why lone mothers are more likely to be socially excluded than mothers in couples by certain dimensions but not by others. Is lack of money or lack of paid work to blame? We shall first discuss the impact of poverty on social exclusion and then household and individual labour market exclusion in turn.

The above findings indicate that, in many cases, poverty is correlated with social exclusion, regardless of family type. However, lone mothers who are socially excluded by certain dimensions are not always more likely to be poor, as is the case with socially excluded mothers in couples. The table below summarises the relationship between poverty and social exclusion of lone mothers and mothers in couples. Two social exclusion dimensions do not appear to be related to poverty. The first is disengagement in lone mothers: those who are who are *not* disengaged are just as likely to be poor compared to those who are disengaged. The second is confinement because of fear in

mothers in couples: again those who are confined because of fear are just as likely to be poor compared to those who are not confined.

The difference between the poor and non-poor is statistically significant in five of the nine dimensions for lone mothers but in only three for mothers in couples. For both family types, poverty can be significantly correlated with service exclusion; the inability to participate in three or more activities and confinement. It is not particularly surprising, however, that the first two dimensions are related to poverty since the questions involved asking the number of services/ activities that cannot be afforded. For both family types, the poor/non poor mothers are differentiated by household labour market exclusion, but poor/non-poor lone mothers are only differentiated by individual labour market to any great extent. It is particularly interesting that these differences, whilst statistically significant for lone mothers, are *not* significant for mothers in couples. This suggests that the poverty of lone parents is attached to labour market exclusion, whilst for mothers in couples individual labour market exclusion and poverty are not (directly) correlated, although there is some evidence that household labour market exclusion and poverty *are* related. We shall now turn our attention to the relationship between labour market exclusion and social exclusion, beginning with household labour market exclusion.

Table 37: Summary of the relationship between Poverty and the Social Exclusion of lone mothers and two-parent households

Social Exclusion dimensions	Lone mothers % poor	Significance (Difference between poor lone mothers and non-poor lone mothers)	Mothers in two-parent families % poor	Significance (Difference between poor mothers in two parent families and non-poor mothers in two-parent families)
Poor				
Lacking 2 or more items, income accounted for (all samples' definition)	65		31	
Labour Market Excluded				
Individual not in paid work	81	*	37	NS
Not socially excluded by this dimension	50		29	
Jobless households (excluding retired and students)	85	**	73	NS
Not socially excluded by this dimension	51		28	
Service Excluded				
Lacking 2 or more services	84	*	55	***
Not socially excluded by this dimension	57		20	
Exclusion from Social relations				
Unable to participate in three or more activities	97	***	70	***
Not socially excluded by this dimension	28		13	
No contact with family/friends daily	[100]	NS	39	NS
Not socially excluded by this dimension	63		30	
Lack of Support in four or more areas	[75]	NS	36	NS
Not socially excluded by this dimension	64		30	
Disengaged from all activities	62	NS	67	NS
Not socially excluded by this dimension	65		28	
Confined	96	***	60	***
Not socially excluded by this dimension	43		6	
Confined because of fear	68	NS	32	NS
Not socially excluded by this dimension	61		29	

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

[] = unweighted number less than 10

HOUSEHOLD LABOUR MARKET EXCLUSION AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION

New Labour emphasise that the very act of work (rather than the act of being paid) leads to social inclusion. Their concern, however, is not with individual exclusion but *household* exclusion, when no one of working age is in paid work (Levitas, 1998: 145-146). By this definition, compared to lone mothers, mothers in couples are significantly less likely to be considered labour market excluded; if they are not in paid work themselves, it is highly likely that their partner is undertaking some form of paid work. By logic, however, mothers in this situation will experience only *proxy* social inclusion. Nevertheless, if it is the case that household labour market inclusion leads to social inclusion, we would expect high proportions of mothers who are socially excluded by our dimensions to be in households with no paid workers, compared to mothers who are not socially excluded, regardless of family type.

For both types of mothers, those socially excluded by four dimensions (excluding labour market exclusion) were more likely to be in jobless households compared to those not socially excluded by that dimension. These were lacking two or more services, unable to participate in three or more activities, disengagement and confinement. However, this difference was only statistically significant in two out of the seven dimensions for lone mothers and for mothers in couples, the difference between the household labour market excluded/ not labour market excluded was not statistically significant for any of the dimensions. Furthermore, in two of the dimensions, the socially excluded were less likely, or just as likely, to be in jobless households compared to those not socially excluded. This was the case regardless of household type. The dimensions were confined because of fear and no contact with family or friends daily. In the case of the latter, 42% of lone mothers who were *not* socially excluded by this dimension were in jobless households, compared to there being *nobody* in jobless households amongst those who were socially excluded. In addition, lone mothers who lacked support in four or more areas were just as likely to be in jobless households compared to those not socially excluded by this dimension.

The data does not show a correlation between *all* dimensions of social exclusion and household labour market exclusion, regardless of family type. When a correlation is apparent, it is more likely to be for those dimensions that also correlated with poverty. However, New Labour's proclamation is that paid work per se leads to social exclusion. Perhaps then it is direct individual labour market exclusion that is the important factor, rather than household (and therefore, in some cases, proxy) labour market exclusion. The final section will discuss the relationship between lone motherhood, paid work and social exclusion.

Table 38: Summary of the relationship between Household Labour Market Exclusion and Social Exclusion of lone mothers and two-parent households

Social Exclusion dimensions	Lone mothers % in jobless households	Significance (Difference between lone mothers in jobless households and lone mothers not in jobless households)	Mothers in two-parent families % in jobless households	Significance (Difference between mothers from two parent families in jobless households and mothers from two-parent families not in jobless households)
Labour Market Excluded				
<i>Jobless households (excluding retired and students)</i>	39		6	
<i>Individual not in paid work</i>	72	***	24	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	6		0	
Service Excluded				
<i>Lacking 2 or more services</i>	53	NS	10	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	33		4	
Exclusion from Social relations				
<i>Unable to participate in three or more activities</i>	56	**	13	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	20		3	
<i>No contact with family/friends daily</i>	[0]	NS	8	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	42		6	
<i>Lack of Support in four or more areas</i>	[38]	NS	6	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	39		13	
<i>Disengaged from all activities</i>	46	NS	25	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	39		4	
<i>Confined</i>	57	*	9	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	27		3	
<i>Confined because of fear</i>	39	NS	7	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	39		5	

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

[] = unweighted number less than 10

INDIVIDUAL LABOUR MARKET EXCLUSION AND PAID WORK

The data in table 39 shows that lone mothers are less likely to be in paid work, compared to mothers in two-parent families. Although this difference is statistically significant only for one dimension¹, in six out of the seven dimensions (excluding labour market exclusion), socially excluded lone mothers are more likely *not* to be in paid work compared to those who are not socially excluded. These findings, however, do not necessarily infer that it is the very act of working that is itself an important factor. We have seen above that in all dimensions those in poverty are more likely to be socially excluded than those not in poverty and that these differences are significant in five out of the nine dimensions, including both the labour market dimensions. Furthermore, poor lone mothers are differentiated from non-poor lone mothers by labour market attachment. The act of being paid rather than being in work per se therefore appears to a more likely explanation for these findings.

¹ This dimension is 'unable to participate in three or more social activities' (see table 39).

For mother in couples, the socially excluded are more likely than the non-socially excluded *not* to be in paid work in only three of the seven dimensions. Whilst these differences are not statistically significant, there is some evidence to suggest that more often than not, mothers in couples are just as likely to be (or more likely to be by one dimension²) socially excluded if they are in paid work compared to those not in paid work. It therefore appears that, far from being synonymous with social inclusion, the very act of paid work is having a negative effect upon the inclusion of mothers in couples into society.

We would perhaps expect that lone mothers are more likely to suffer the effects of lack of time, since the roles of child-carer and financial provider, usually shared between two-parents, become burdened upon one. Nevertheless, whilst lone mothers are burdened with both financial responsibilities *and* child-care responsibilities, in reality mothers in two parent families are the ones who actually juggle between the two. Lone mothers, less likely to undertake any form of paid work, can concentrate on the unpaid child-care work whilst mothers in couples, more likely to undertake some kind of paid work still have the responsibility of looking after the children. This suggests that either both mothers and fathers should be encouraged to share the role of carer, or that mothers should not be expected to undertake paid work in addition to the unpaid care work that she has to undertake in the home.

² Those mothers in couples who *do not have* contact with at least one non-household friend or family member are less likely not to be in paid work compared to those who have contact.

Table 39: Summary of the relationship between Individual Labour Market exclusion and Social Exclusion of lone mothers and two-parent households

Social Exclusion dimensions	Lone mothers % not in paid work	Significance (Difference between lone mothers not in paid work and lone mothers in paid work)	Mothers in two-parent families % not in paid work	Significance (Difference between mothers from two parent families in paid work and mothers from two-parent families not in paid work)
Labour Market Excluded				
<i>Individual not in paid work</i>	50		24	
<i>Jobless households (excluding retired and students)</i>	92	***	100	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	23		19	
Service Excluded				
<i>Lacking 2 or more services</i>	63	NS	28	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	42		23	
Exclusion from Social relations				
<i>Unable to participate in three or more activities</i>	65	**	26	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	31		23	
<i>No contact with family/friends daily</i>	[80]	NS	8	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	47		25	
<i>Lack of Support in four or more areas</i>	[38]	NS	50	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	52		22	
<i>Disengaged from all activities</i>	67	NS	50	NS
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	45		22	
<i>Confined</i>	57		25	
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	43	NS	24	NS
<i>Confined because of fear</i>	57		35	
<i>Not socially excluded by this dimension</i>	44	NS	24	NS

*=P<0.05; **=P<0.01; ***=P<0.001

[] = unweighted number less than 10

New Labour, then are getting some things right. In terms of social inclusion, lone mothers do appear to benefit from paid work. Nevertheless, this is more likely to be because the act of getting paid alleviates poverty, which in turn leads to social inclusion, rather than because the act of work itself has a direct bearing on social inclusion. Lone mothers are still more likely to be both in poverty and are therefore more likely to be socially excluded compared to mothers in couples. On the contrary, there is some evidence to suggest that mothers in couples are less likely to be in poverty since they are less likely to be in a jobless household. They are therefore less likely to be socially excluded, not because they undertake paid work themselves, but because the household in which they live is less likely to be poor. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest throughout the research that mothers in couples who undertake paid work are just as likely, or more likely, to suffer social exclusion than those not in paid work. The act of paid work, therefore, has a different impact upon the social exclusion of lone mothers compared to mothers in couples. Perhaps this is because there are obvious benefits of being paid for lone mothers (the alleviation of poverty). For mothers in couples, however, the act of participating in paid work themselves does not have such a dramatic

impact upon the alleviation of poverty since their partner is likely to be in paid work. Rather, the negative consequences of juggling paid work and child-care responsibilities become apparent.

Whilst it does depend upon the definition of social exclusion, the PSE data suggests that New Labour's proclamation that the very act of paid work has a direct bearing on social inclusion and their use of this to justify their welfare to work programme for lone parents, is a misnomer. Rather, it is more realistic to argue that poverty (and therefore the act of getting *paid*) is related to social exclusion.

Appendix 1: Overall perception of adult necessities and how many people lack them (All figures show % of adult population)

	Omnibus considered Necessary	Survey: Not necessary	Items that respondents Don't have don't want	Main Stage Survey: Items Don't have can't afford
Beds and bedding for everyone in the household	95	4	0.2	1
Heating to warm living areas if it's cold	94	5	0.4	1
Damp free home	93	6	3	6
Visiting friends or family in hospital or other institutions	92	7	8	3
Two meals a day	91	9	3	1
Medicines prescribed by your doctor	90	9	5	1
Refrigerator	89	11	1	0.1
Fresh fruit and vegetables every day	86	13	7	4
A warm waterproof coat	85	14	2	4
Replace or repair broken electrical goods	85	14	6	12
Visits to friends or family	84	15	3	2
Celebrations on special occasions such as Christmas	83	16	2	2
Enough money to keep home in a decent state of decoration	82	17	2	14
Visits to school e.g. sports day, parents evening	81	17	33	2
Attending weddings, funerals and other such occasions	80	19	3	3
Meat, fish or vegetarian equivalent every other day	79	19	4	3
Insurance of contents of dwelling	79	20	5	8
A hobby or leisure activity	78	20	12	7
A washing machine	76	22	3	1
Collect children from school	75	23	36	2
Telephone	71	28	1	1
Appropriate clothes for job interviews	69	28	13	4
Deep freezer/fridge freezer	68	30	3	2
Carpets in living rooms and bedrooms	67	31	2	3
Regular savings (of £10 per month) for rainy days or retirement	66	32	7	25
Two pairs of all weather shoes	64	34	4	5
Friends or family round for a meal, snack or drink	64	34	10	6
A small amount of money to spend on yourself	59	39	3	13

each week

A television	56	43	1	1
A roast joint/vegetarian equivalent weekly	56	41	11	3
Presents for friends/family yearly	56	42	1	3
A holiday away from home for one week a year	55	43	14	18
Replace any worn out furniture	54	43	6	12
A dictionary	53	44	6	5
An outfit for social or family occasions such as parties and weddings	51	46	4	4

<i>New, not second hand, clothes</i>	48	49	4	5
<i>Attending place of worship</i>	42	55	65	1
<i>A car</i>	38	59	12	10
<i>Coach/train fares to visit friends/family</i>	38	58	49	16
<i>A evening out once a fortnight</i>	37	56	22	15
<i>A dressing gown</i>	34	63	12	6
<i>Having a daily newspaper</i>	30	66	37	4
<i>A meal in a restaurant/pub monthly</i>	26	71	20	18
<i>Microwave oven</i>	23	73	16	3
<i>Tumble dryer</i>	20	75	33	7
<i>Going to the pub once a fortnight</i>	20	76	42	10
<i>A video cassette recorder</i>	19	78	7	2
<i>Holidays abroad once a year</i>	19	77	25	27
<i>CD player</i>	12	84	19	7
<i>A home computer</i>	11	85	42	15
<i>A dishwasher</i>	7	88	57	11
<i>Mobile phone</i>	7	88	48	7
<i>Access to the Internet</i>	6	89	54	16
<i>Satellite television</i>	5	90	56	7

REFERENCES

- Bradshaw J and Millar, J (1991) *Lone Parent Families in the UK*, DSS Research Report no 6, HMSO, London.
- Bradshaw, J. et al (1996) *Policy and the employment of lone parents in 20 countries*, Observatory on National Family Policies, University of York/EU.
- DSS (2000) *Households Below Average Incomes 1994/5-1997/8*, Leeds: Corporate Document Services.
- Ford, R. et al (1998) *What happens to lone parents*, DSS Research Report 77, London: HMSO.
- Ford et al (1995) *Changes in lone parenthood 1989-1993*, London: HMSO.
- Gordon, D. et al (2000) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York:YPS.
- Gordon, D., and Pantazis, C., 'Measuring Poverty: Breadline Britain in the 1990s' in Gordon, D., and Pantazis, C (ed.) (1997) *Breadline Britain in the 1990s* Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company pp5-48.
- Levitas, R (1998) *The inclusive society? Social exclusion and New Labour* Macmillan Press Ltd. London
- Marsh, A and Mckay, S (1993), *Families, Work and Benefits*, Policy Studies Institute, London
- Millar, J (1989) *Poverty and the Lone parent family: the challenge to social policy*, Avebury, Aldershot
- OECD (1998) *Employment Outlook*, June 1998, Paris: OECD.