

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
<b>1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PRESENT STUDY</b> _____	<b>2</b>
1.1. Institutional context and work programme _____	<b>2</b>
1.2. From monetary to non-monetary indicators: understanding the problem _____	<b>4</b>
2.1. Previous studies _____	<b>6</b>
2.2. The Bath Seminar _____	<b>10</b>
2.3. The enquiries _____	<b>13</b>
<b>3. THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION</b> _____	<b>17</b>
3.1. Introductory remarks _____	<b>17</b>
3.2. Towards a definition of social exclusion _____	<b>20</b>
<b>4. NON-MONETARY INDICATORS OF POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION</b> ____	<b>27</b>
4.1. Information covered _____	<b>27</b>
4.2. Overview of the domains concerning the list of new indicators _____	<b>27</b>
4.2. Indicators _____	<b>34</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> _____	<b>71</b>
<b>ANNEX</b> _____	<b>73</b>

## 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

### *1.1. Institutional context and work programme*

In the framework of SUP.COM 1995, Eurostat contracted CESIS - Centro de Estudos para a Intervenção Social - to carry out a research project on the identification of “**Non-monetary indicators of poverty and social exclusion**”, as part of its statistical programme. The contract (nr. 57410001/1) was signed by both parties on 2 February 1996 and the study should have the duration of 12 months<sup>1</sup>.

Following several attempts to define monetary indicators of poverty from Household Budget Surveys, Eurostat’s efforts are now concentrating on covering the phenomenon of social exclusion in its multidimensional nature, namely in the characterisation of aspects that cannot be translated into monetary terms.

The present project established the following goals:

- definition and delimitation of the concept of social exclusion;
- identification of the main types of social exclusion that exist in the EU member-States;
- analysis of each type;
- selection and definition of indicators necessary to describe the various forms of exclusion;
- operationalisation of the indicators in terms that may allow the collection of the correspondent information and data;
- current data and filling the gaps.

These different stages would allow to contribute to:

- a) a better understanding of the concept of social exclusion and its relation with the concept of poverty;

---

<sup>1</sup> The project has been extended for a total period of 17 months.

- b) a common understanding among EU member-States – mainly by the involvement of the representatives of the National Institutes of Statistics – concerning the existence of situations of social exclusion, the origins of which are closely associated with different factors, that can be identified throughout the EU;
- c) a list of non-monetary indicators that, for the first time, in these kind of studies, do not depend – in terms of their starting point – on existing statistical data; these indicators will be identified in order to provide information that will allow an analysis of social exclusion from three perspectives: 1) how can social exclusion situations be identified? 2) what are the basic causes of social exclusion? 3) what are people excluded from?
- d) the identification of statistical sources from where these data can be obtained or, the type of statistical sources that could include the information that at present is not provided by the existing statistical sources.

In this final report it is important to point out some of the steps previously undertaken, in order to fulfil the above mentioned goals:

- the launching of an enquiry addressed to all EU Member-States National Statistical Institutes aiming at having a common understanding on what we defined as the main types of social exclusion, based on specific criteria **(March 1996)**;
- the presentation of a progress report containing the main conceptual and theoretical framework of the present study and an identification of the areas on which the indicators should be able to provide useful and comprehensive information conducive to a better understanding of the phenomena of poverty and social exclusion **(November 1996)**;
- the organisation of a European Seminar on “Social Exclusion: Non-monetary issues”, for which the team prepared a Working Paper containing a brief overview of conceptual issues for discussion and a first comprehensive list of non-monetary indicators and respective sources (available and possible ones) **(March 1997)**;

- the presentation of the present report in which account was taken of the most relevant outcomes of the Lisbon Seminar. The initial comprehensive list of indicators has now been broken down into two reduced sets: one containing all the **new indicators** and the other consisting of a list of first priority choices within the set of new indicators. With regard to the new indicators suggestions are made concerning their operationalisation, and a brief description of the purposes of each group of these indicators is also included (**July 1997**).

It should be noted that this list of non-monetary indicators should be understood as complementary, and not as alternative, to the existing statistical data, “qualifying” the latter or covering new aspects relevant to a non-monetary approach to poverty and social exclusion.

### ***1.2. From monetary to non-monetary indicators: understanding the problem***

The notion of social exclusion, developed mainly by the French intellectual tradition, was recently adopted by the discourse of the European Union. Previous concerns and studies, mainly influenced by the Anglo-Saxon intellectual tradition, focused mostly on poverty, which is one of the forms of social exclusion, and still particularly relevant in most of the EU member-States<sup>2</sup>.

Poverty is understood as a situation characterised by **multiple deprivation**. However, since deprivation is understood as basically caused by **lack of resources**, mainly monetary resources, most studies use **monetary indicators** to measure and analyse it. The use of monetary indicators is also due to other relevant practical reasons: on the one hand, the limited number of countries, if any, with adequate and sufficient non-monetary data for

---

<sup>2</sup> The results of the enquiries sent to the National Statistical Institutes of all EU Member States were particularly clear in respect to the prevalence of social exclusion situations deriving from multiple deprivation due to lack of resources (poverty). See Chapter 3. Methodology, 3.3. The enquiries.

studying poverty; on the other, the fact that monetary indicators (mainly income and consumption), besides being good proxies of living conditions, are easily workable.

The relevance of those monetary indicators should not be underestimated. In societies based on market economies, except for the areas partially or totally protected from the market (such as education or health), most of the basic goods and services have to be bought in the market. Therefore, measures that reflect the possibilities or the actual access to the market – such as those that are reflected by the monetary indicators – do give a fair idea of the actual living conditions of persons and households. Hence, it would be improper to consider monetary indicators as “unidimensional”. For example, the total consumption of a person or household translates its living conditions in a large set of aspects. Neither is the analysis of poverty and deprivation in monetary terms necessarily “static”. Panel surveys that include those variables allow the analysis of the dynamics of poverty, even in terms of monetary indicators.

Having said this, it has to be recognised that monetary indicators are insufficient, mainly for two various reasons. Firstly, in spite of their positive properties as indicators of some relevant aspects of living conditions and deprivation, they are no more than proxies. Beyond the practical problems that some of the indicators may present, most of which accept technical solutions – e.g. quantification or self-consumption or self-production, dwelling in owned house, imputation of the cost of durables –, there remain a certain number of deeper imperfections. Sufficient income, for example, measures the “capability” to buy goods and services (avoiding deprivation), but does not assure that the person or household actually uses the resources in buying them. On the other hand, low consumption may indicate deprivation, but may also coincide with positive savings.

Secondly, both poverty and social exclusion are characterised by aspects that cannot be translated into monetary terms. Features that belong to psychological, social or cultural aspects (such as social identity, loneliness, self-esteem, aspirations, social and political participation, just to mention some examples).

Here, it is not a question of improving monetary indicators but of taking account of aspects that, by their very nature, cannot be expressed in monetary terms.

The present study does not recommend a shift from monetary to non-monetary indicators. The latter are not an alternative to the former. The identification and analysis of non-monetary indicators of poverty and social exclusion has to be understood as a **complementary** step in the effort towards understanding – and translating in statistical terms – the complexity of these phenomena and it is our objective that these non-monetary indicators should give a positive contribution to “qualify” the monetary approach of poverty and social exclusion, as well as to cover those forms of exclusion that are not necessarily related to lack of resources.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

It is an explicit objective of EUROSTAT that the present project should go a step forward in relation to the previous studies commissioned by the mentioned Office with the view of improving statistical information on poverty and social exclusion. It is, therefore, useful to summarise the scope and contents of the main studies more directly related with our subject.

### *2.1. Previous studies*

Following the **Nordwijk Conference** (October 1989), the European Commission (EUROSTAT/DGV) launched a set of studies on poverty, aimed at improving poverty statistics. Below, we will mention those that are more directly related to the present study.

Two of the mentioned studies – one on **objective poverty**, by the *Erasmus University (Rotterdam)*, and the other on **subjective poverty**, by the *Research Institute for Population Economics (RIPE)* – focused on poverty as defined by poverty lines based on monetary

indicators. The main sources of information for these studies were the Household Budget Surveys (HBS) of the member-States. As may be seen from the types of indicators and the sources of information, these studies were not intended to produce any progress with respect to the indicators themselves.

A third study – by the *Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI)*, Dublin – focused on **non-monetary indicators of poverty**. The study comprised three tasks: i) research of useful data sources on non-monetary indicators available in each country; ii) studying the national HBS, designing a set of calculable deprivation indicators and calculating them; and iii) suggesting sets of items to be used in the European Community Household Panel (ECHP)<sup>3</sup>. The study has two basic *a priori* limitations. The first is that it should investigate the possibilities offered by the **existing** data sources, namely the HBS. Secondly, its scope was defined by the notion of **poverty** and was not concerned with the broader implications of the concept of **social exclusion** (discussed below)<sup>4</sup>.

It can be easily seen that the results of ESRI's study constitute an important input for our study.

Another study, by the *Centre d'Étude des Revenues et des Coûts (CERC)* in co-operation with the *Observatoire Sociologique du Changement (OSC - CNRS/FNSP)*, consisted of a comparative research on poverty from the point of view of **social de-qualification**. It deals with poverty as a process of exclusion and, therefore, adopts the concept of social exclusion. The project consists less in “describing who is poor” than in “replying the question of how people become poor”<sup>5</sup>. Insofar as the processes of social exclusion are also considered in our study, the indicators selected by the study by CERC/OSC are particularly relevant for us.

Another study, undertaken by *CBS (Netherlands)*, was entitled *European Social Indicators - A Review of the Extended Short Eurostat List of Social Indicators*. The study covers the

---

<sup>3</sup> EUROSTAT (undated), *Eurostat's Statistical Research on Poverty - Descriptive Synthesis*, pp. 14-15, working paper.

<sup>4</sup> This study constructed four indices for those Member-States that had the relevant information: i) housing facilities hardship index; ii) housing density; iii) consumption hardship index; and iv) expenditure on culture and leisure as a percentage of total consumer expenditure.

<sup>5</sup> EUROSTAT (undated), *Eurostat's Statistical Research on Poverty - Descriptive Synthesis*, pp. 14-15, working paper.

following 16 domains: demography, participation, health, income, consumption, employment, earnings and labour costs, housing, justice and security, geographical isolation, social relations, leisure, education, social protection, working conditions and the Maastricht criteria. Although the study was not specifically concerned with poverty and social exclusion, a considerable number of selected indicators are directly or indirectly related with those phenomena, and, therefore, were included in our list.

The study commissioned by the European Commission to *DPS/CESIS – Analyse des Impacts de la Politique Macro-Économique sur l’Exclusion Sociale* (final report dated July 1993) – had a wider perspective. It focused on “la création d’un tableau théorique de référence qui permette l’explicitation des inter-relations entre les processus qui engendrent l’exclusion sociale et les politiques économiques et sociales, à partir duquel on peut constituer un système de indicateurs d’extension et d’intensité de l’exclusion sociale et des impacts qui découlent des dites politiques sur ce phénomène. On propose aussi les lignes générales pour l’élaboration d’un système intégré de ces indicateurs” (p.4).

In Chapter 8 – “*Lignes Générales pour l’Élaboration d’un Système d’Indicateurs d’Impact de la Politique sur l’Exclusion Sociale*” –, the study defines three groups of social indicators – **situation indicators**; **results indicators**; and **action indicators** – and exemplifies with a set of indicators which are useful to the present study, particularly in what concerns spatial exclusion.

Finally, another *Étude sur les Indicateurs d’Exclusion Sociale*, by *CE.R.FE.* (final report dated May 1993), identifies **18 areas** for indicators on **de-qualification** that **exist** either at the level of the European Union or in the Italian national sources of statistics. The study then groups the mentioned indicators in **three main categories** according to the unit to which they concern: **individual**, **social groups** and **territorial area** (space). The areas and the categories that correspond to each indicator are shown in the table that follows.



AREAS	Individuals	Groups	Territory
	x		
1) difficulties in the access to work	x		
2) poverty	x		
3) family “precarisation” (précarisation familiale)	x		
4) primary de-qualification			
5) clandestine migratory movements		x	
6) political discrimination		x	
7) ethno-linguistic discrimination		x	
8) religious and/or racial discrimination	x	x	
9) violation of standards concerning equality of opportunities for women	x	x	
10) social abandonment			
11) unmet needs in the domestic environment (or related to housing)	x		
12) violation of standards concerning the access to health services	x		x
13) environmental crises			x
14) violation of standards concerning the access to social security and social services			
15) distortions concerning educational and occupational training activities			
16) violation of standards concerning the access to information and culture			x
17) limitations to geographical mobility			x
18) geographic and urban marginalisation			x

The shift from **de-qualification** to **social exclusion** is based on the following two assumptions:

- certain particularly acute processes of de-qualification are at the origin of situations of direct exclusion;
- the convergence of multiple processes of de-qualification, on individuals or social groups, is at the origin of situations of social exclusion that are called “indirect”.

The study then goes on to establish the following three indices:

- index for each phenomenon of direct social exclusion;
- index for each phenomenon of predominant indirect social exclusion identified in the set of situations; and
- a synthetic index of the risk of residual social exclusion.

The model is finally applied to a set of regions in Italy, and the study ends by calculating a **general index of social exclusion**. The authors stress that such an index is only relevant for comparative (synchronic or diachronic) studies.

The final set of indicators refer to each of the 18 areas mentioned above. These areas are again grouped into the following five “**domains of human development**”:

- a) Income generation
- b) Education and training
- c) Health and social services
- d) Environment and territory
- e) Human rights and democracy.

It goes without saying that this study is closely related to the present project. However, as mentioned earlier, it focuses only on statistical data that exist at the level of the EU or in Italy. In our case, the existing sources of statistical information are a reference but not an *a priori* limitation.

## ***2.2. The Bath Seminar***

Following a seminar held in Bath (UK), in June 1994, on the *Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, and subsequent discussions between the organiser and statisticians from EUROSTAT (in January 1995), a paper was produced under the title “*Aftermath to the Bath Seminar - Outline of a Possible Statistical Programme*”. The paper notes that the seminar “raised a number of possible implications for the statistical data which should be collected at national and EU levels”<sup>6</sup>, which result from the concerns of researchers and policy-makers that the seminar confirmed.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Aftermath to the Bath Seminar - Outline of a Possible Statistical Programme*, p. 1.

It is not the aim of the present study to implement the above statistical programme, as may be seen from the terms of reference presented below. However, the paper deals with issues that are of interest for our study and is, therefore, taken into consideration.

The first concern refers to the need of complementing '*financial*' (read '*monetary*') *indicators* with more direct (admittedly '*non-monetary*') indicators of **multi-dimensional disadvantage**. Notwithstanding the "key importance of financial resources in triggering and perpetuating social exclusion", it was recognised that "financial indicators such as low income are insufficiently reliable as proxies for general hardship" and that "it is important for policy and for explanatory purposes to disentangle different elements of hardship and to identify their interrelationships"<sup>7</sup>.

Secondly, there appeared as yet to be "no unique, formal definitions of social exclusion which would command general assent"<sup>8</sup>. This issue was addressed in the previous section of the present report.

With respect to the strategy for filling the information gaps, the paper emphasises that the "*data availability* criterion would not be satisfied unless the statistics on each indicator were such as to allow thresholds or norms (e.g. overcrowded accommodation, chronic ill-health) to be distinguished (even if the determination of norms had to be based on subjective, arbitrary value-judgements)<sup>9</sup>. The indicators should allow thresholds to be established.

However, it should be stressed that **it is beyond the scope of the present study to establish such thresholds**.

The scope of this project is limited to the **establishment** (only) of a set of non-monetary indicators on social exclusion. Thus, the outcome of the project is a set of non-monetary indicators that may help to identify and understand social exclusion. The three well-known approaches used to establish monetary poverty lines – normative, behavioural and subjective –, with the various variants that each admits, apply to the non-monetary indicators as well.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibidem, p. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>9</sup> Ibidem.

The establishment of the thresholds is, therefore, subject to further debate, foreseeably as complex as (if not more complex than) the debate on the definition of monetary poverty lines.

One of the related studies commissioned by EUROSTAT is focused on **social indicators**<sup>10</sup>. **Social indicators** do not necessarily coincide with **indicators on social exclusion**, although there is a considerable overlapping between the two sets. The present study picks up from the mentioned study all the indicators that seem useful to analyse social exclusion.

The **dynamics** of social exclusion is another aspect that the present study is expected to cover explicitly. This was one of the issues addressed during the Bath Seminar. Occasionally, one comes across the idea that there has been – or should be – a **shift** from a *static* notion of poverty to a *dynamic* one. It therefore seems useful to stress that it is not a question of a shift but, rather a matter of **emphasis**. The dynamics of poverty is not a new concern. What is new is the increased relevance that is presently being attached to this aspect of poverty, and the new developments of the statistical tools aimed at collecting data for the analysis of the changes of the patterns of poverty over time.

The best known device for studying the dynamics of poverty and social exclusion is the **panel survey**. The European Community Household Panel (ECHP) is the most important Union-wide statistical tool for longitudinal studies. The purpose of the ECHP is wider than the collection of information on poverty and social exclusion. During the Bath Seminar, it was recognised that it covers an insufficient range of indicators of social exclusion. Besides enlarging the information collected by the ECHP, it was suggested that longitudinal administrative files could provide complementary, and particularly useful, information.

The other aspect that the Bath Seminar stressed was “the shift of emphasis from the individual and household to the local community in its **spatial dimension**”<sup>11</sup>. Here too, the “shift” to the spatial dimension should not be understood as an alternative, but rather as complementary to the individual and the household. Indeed, certain forms of exclusion

---

<sup>10</sup> Oudhof, J & Everaers, P. (1996) *European Social Indicators - A review of the extended short Eurostat list of social indicators*, Statistics Netherlands.

<sup>11</sup> *Aftermath to the Bath Seminar - Outline of a Possible Statistical Programme*, p. 4. Our bold.

(individual and household) are closely related to the exclusion of the whole space (e.g., some rural areas or degraded urban quarters).

### ***2.3. The enquiries***

One of the first concerns in developing the present study was to ensure that it covered all the **types** of social exclusion that exist in the EU member-States. With this aim in view, questionnaires<sup>12</sup> were sent to the National Institutes of Statistics of all member-States. The questionnaire presented a list of the most common types of social exclusion and inquired whether those types existed in the respective country and whether there was any other form of exclusion not mentioned in the questionnaire. The types of social exclusion were established basically according to the **main origin of the situation**.

Seven sources of social exclusion were identified: economic factors, social factors, cultural factors, psychological factors, pathological factors, “deviant” behaviours and spatial factors. This typology was briefly presented and explained in the questionnaire, and the Institutes were asked to inform whether these situations existed, or not, in their home countries, point out the existence of other situations, and make any Observations considered useful.

The enquiries were addressed to EUROSTAT’s national correspondants – the National Statistical Institutes of all Member-States – who were asked either to answer the questionnaires themselves or to request the opinion of an external expert.

From the replies received – Italy, Ireland and the Netherlands did not react –, we can withdraw **two main conclusions**: one concerning the reaction of the Institutes to the form of the questionnaire; and the other, concerning the contents of the answers themselves.

As far as the first item is concerned, it was obvious that many NSI were reluctant to confirm the existence of the types of social exclusion presented by the questionnaire, since they “do not collect data from which we can draw the types of social exclusion you mention (...)”. However, the lack of statistical data, and the impossibility to “measure” most of those types

– the only exception being the type that was named «poverty» – did not prevent most countries from answering the questionnaire and even to make some interesting Observations on the types of social exclusion defined by us. Portugal, Greece and Spain were the only three countries that replied but did not answer the questionnaire (“measurement variables needed”).

At the same time, some of the answers received considered that it should be almost certain that most countries would answer “yes” to most types, since “depending on how one measures or defines each type of social exclusion, we would expect that each type occurs in all countries, that is, some individuals out of the population could be deemed to fall into each of these categories at different times in their lives and for varying durations.” In fact, the choice of this typology was of course based on the team’s knowledge of the reality of social exclusion situations in Europe. Nevertheless, the rapidly changing nature of these phenomena in recent years seemed to suggest the convenience of having a quick **portrait of the types of social exclusion** that can be identified across the EU countries. The contents of the answers received showed subtle differences between countries and provided some interesting leads for the establishment of non-monetary indicators in some areas.

The table below summarises the results of the questionnaires sent to all EU National Statistical Institutes:

---

<sup>12</sup> See copy of the questionnaire at the end of this report.

**TABLE 1**

Types of Social Exclusion that occur in EU Member-States, considering the criterion - <b>main origin</b> - for the existence of these situations									
	<b>Economic</b>	<b>Social</b>	<b>Cultural</b>	<b>Psychological</b>	<b>Pathological</b>	<b>“Deviant”</b>	<b>Spatial</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Observations</b>
Austria	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES/NO	YES*	
Belgium	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Denmark	YES	YES	YES	⊗	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Finland	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	
France	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Germany	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
Greece									Impossible to draw types from existing statistics
Ireland									No reply
Italy									No reply
Luxembourg	YES	YES	No answ.	YES	YES	YES	∅	NO	
Netherlands									No reply
Portugal									Statistics on poverty only
Spain									Measurement variables needed
Sweden	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
UK	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	

\* The Austrian Institute stresses the existence of social exclusion deriving from national and international migration “mainly related to ethnicity but, at least, in some aspects to citizenship”.

⊗ The existence of this type of social exclusion - defined by us as “shame-faced poverty”, i.e. a form of poverty that is not fully assumed by the poor, who are reluctant to recognise their own poverty and often leading to self-exclusion due to shame, was not identified by the Danish representative.

∅ Spatial exclusion - types of exclusion in which the situation of the persons and groups is closely linked to the overall conditions of the local space - was not recognised by Statec as one of the types of exclusion to be found in Luxembourg.

The conclusion of the exercise was that most of the *types of social exclusion* defined in this project clearly **correspond to social realities** of EU member-States, and that there do not seem to exist other forms of social exclusion in those countries besides those mentioned in the questionnaire.

Both Finland and Denmark present some common features in the type of situations they identified and on which they also made some additional Observations. The following are the most relevant:

- the recent growth of social exclusion situations resulting from the reduction of the number of patients in hospitals (mainly in mental hospitals), who in most cases end up as homeless people ;
- the importance of long-term unemployment;
- the effects of unemployment on regions or “small townships” where the population depended almost exclusively on one employer only (e.g. a single factory);
- no recognition of the existence of social exclusion situations due to psychological reasons (“shame-faced poverty”).

On the whole, it became clear that of the types of social exclusion that exist in all the countries inquired, *poverty* is the **only type that can be effectively measured**, although most of the other types can also be **identified**.

Poverty and other types of social exclusion, although inter-connected phenomena, were clearly recognised as different social realities, empirically identifiable throughout the EU.

Considering the ultimate aim of the present project – the establishment of a set of non-monetary indicators of social exclusion that may help to identify and understand this phenomenon – using the enquiries as a methodological step proved to be particularly important in providing a consensual basis on one of the aspects on which the indicators should provide information: the sources of exclusion.



### 3. THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

#### 3.1. *Introductory remarks*

It is pretended that the present study should take account of the developments mentioned in the previous section and contain some progress in this field. The intended progress implies the clarification of conceptual issues as well as the more pragmatic task of defining relevant indicators. In order to avoid excessive emphasis on either extreme perspective – theoretical or pragmatic – the solution adopted is based on what seems to be a satisfactory compromise. On the one hand, the objective of the study was to establish a set of indicators. On the other, however, it seemed essential to place the indicators in the context of a conceptual frame.

Much has been said about the concept of *social exclusion*, focusing on what it means and implies and, equally important, on what it differs from, or adds to, the notion of *poverty*. In contrast with the generalised use of the expression «social exclusion» in the political discourse, the scientific debate seems far from conclusive<sup>13</sup> and it is foreseeable that it will continue for still a long period of time. It is beyond the scope of this study to participate in that debate. Nevertheless, the choice of any set of indicators must stem from a given understanding of the social problems that they are intended to translate, and, therefore, some form of definition has to precede the description of the indicators.

In the present study, *poverty* and *social exclusion* are taken not as **alternative** but as **complementary** concepts. Accordingly, the notion of social exclusion used here tries to take account of the main contributions of both those concepts for the definition of the social problem that the indicators are expected to characterise. In what follows, we try to highlight the main aspects of those concepts.

- a) The ideas of **deprivation** (as human condition) and of **lack of resources** are the basic components of the concept of *poverty* that underlies this study. In this perspective, poverty may be defined as **deprivation due to lack of resources**. It

---

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., the review, by Vic George, of the book edited by Graham Room, following the Bath Seminar on the *Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, June 1994, *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 25, Part 3, July 1996, pp. 429-430.

should be noted that **resources** may take the form of i) **cash income** (needed to have access to the market of goods and services), ii) **income in kind** (to meet certain needs directly), or iii) **public services** (in areas such as health and education, that are partially or totally protected from the market)<sup>14</sup>.

b) The concept of social exclusion used in this study **includes** the notion of poverty. This implies namely two conditions that both those concepts must satisfy. Firstly, the concept of poverty must be capable of answering the question “exclusion from what?”, since the notion of exclusion implies the idea of being in/out of some context. This condition may be met by understanding poverty as exclusion from the **basic social systems**: market of goods and services, labour market, health system, social security system, educational system, etc..

Secondly, the concept of social exclusion implies weak or broken **social links**, but cannot be seen exclusively in this perspective. Indeed, there are forms of poverty that do not necessarily lead to relational exclusion<sup>15</sup> and, therefore, could not be considered as social exclusion. The above reference to exclusion from the basic social systems (of which the social networks are an example) enlarges the scope of the concept<sup>16</sup>.

c) The “**value added**” of the concept of social exclusion in relation to that of poverty is that the former allows the consideration of types of exclusion that do not result from lack of resources (and, therefore, cannot be considered as poverty). Such is, for example, the case of exclusion of the elderly in the European societies, which is not always due to lack of resources. Of course, poverty and other forms of exclusion may, and often do, overlap.

---

<sup>14</sup> It goes without saying that we have in mind the European context, characterised by market economies provided with some form of the welfare state institutions.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., Castel, Robert (1991), “De l’indigence à l’exclusion: la désaffiliation”, in Donzelot, J. (dir.) *Face à l’exclusion: le modèle français*, Paris, Editions Esprit.

<sup>16</sup> This clarification is important in order to avoid possible misunderstandings about the concept of social exclusion adopted in this study, as seemed to have appeared during the discussions in the Lisbon Seminar on “Social Exclusion: Non-monetary issues”.

d) In the process of analysis, social exclusion is first empirically identified as a **situation**, which is later understood as **dynamic**. Hence, the idea of social exclusion as a **process**. It is generally assumed that the process leads to progressively deeper stages of exclusion. On the other hand, the analysis of this process leads to the identification of **mechanisms of exclusion**, some of which may be related to the attributes of the excluded individual (or group) and others to the characteristics of the society (dynamisms within the society).

e) The **spatial** dimension can be considered as a *perspective* for analysing society and identifying the mechanisms of social exclusion, as complementary to other more common perspectives of analysis. However, it may also be taken in a narrower sense, concerned with spaces that present a *generalised state of deprivation* due to the fact that, for one reason or another, they are, as such, excluded from the development process that takes place in the wider (say, national) territory. To put the latter notion in systemic terms, spatial exclusion may be considered as a form of exclusion of smaller social systems (e.g., degraded urban quarters) from the wider social system (overall society).

In the present study, the spatial dimension is taken in the latter (narrow) sense.

The above approach to the concept of social exclusion (better developed below) has the advantage of permitting that, for scientific or political reasons, **the concept of poverty may continue to be utilised and developed autonomously**. Indeed, it does not look for the “value added” of the concept of social exclusion by comparing it with a narrow concept of poverty (static, exclusively monetary, or unidimensional), and can, therefore, learn from the studies that deal with the concept of poverty.

### 3.2. Towards a definition of social exclusion

As stated earlier, it is not the purpose of this section to participate in the on-going debate on the concept of social exclusion, but only to provide a conceptual background to the selection of a set of non-monetary indicators.

As also mentioned, in the light of the concept adopted in this study, poverty is considered as one of the types of social exclusion. Indeed, the lack of resources felt by some individuals and/or groups prevents them from acceding to many of the **social systems** through which integration is accomplished and maintained.

One of the perspectives adopted by the present study – for the purpose of identifying indicators relevant for the understanding of the processes of poverty and social exclusion – was the analysis of what we call **«areas of exclusion/integration»**.

Approaching the phenomenon of social exclusion from this perspective means that both the excluded and the society are under analysis. The notion of exclusion necessarily implies the idea of integration, the idea of patterns, of references according to which people are considered (and consider themselves) excluded from: “(..) it is important to underline the importance of avoiding interpreting the term integration one-dimensionally - i.e. to see it as only a reintegration into some normal condition, but as a topic with a multidimensional and pluralistic nature which involves the acceptance of the so-called different or even competing ways of life”<sup>17</sup>.

There are well-defined areas of integration in our societies which people are expected to accept and be able to participate (successfully). The failure to accept or to fulfill society's expectations concerning these vital areas necessarily leads to social exclusion situations. “Il existe toute une série de normes ou de niveaux à atteindre, en deçà desquels les individus ne semblent pas habilités à participer au modèle normatif, c'est-à-dire à ce qui est «bien», «beau», «convenable» ou «performant». Pratiquement toutes les sphères de la société moderne semblent soumises à ces niveaux ou ces limites de la normalité qui définissent en

---

<sup>17</sup> Mortensen, Nils (ed.) (1995), *Social Integration and Marginalisation*, Frederiksberg, Samfundslitteratur, pp. 221.

retour, un échec à la norme. Or cet échec à la normalité semble constitutif des processus d'exclusion".<sup>18</sup>

What are then people **excluded from**? As mentioned above, the approach adopted in this study assumes that the contexts of reference from which the person or group is excluded are **social systems**.

The relevant systems were grouped under the following five **areas**:

- 1) social (social links);
- 2) economic;
- 3) institutional;
- 4) territorial; and
- 5) references.

Each of these areas comprises a set of **basic systems**, as exemplified below.

- 1) **Social**: e.g. family, labour market, neighbourhood, society (global participation).
- 2) **Economic**: e.g. resources (wages, social security, savings, assets, etc.), market of goods and services.
- 3) **Institutional**: e.g. justice, education, health, political rights, bureaucracy.
- 4) **Territorial**: e.g. demographic (migration), accessibility (transport, communications, etc.), society in general (deprived areas).
- 5) **Symbolic references**: e.g. identity, social visibility, self-esteem, basic abilities, interests and motivations, future prospects.

Being poor, for instance, means that one is unable to participate in the consumption market; one is deprived from the access to goods and services, in a society that considers the possibility to accede to the **market** as an important economic benefit, inherent to its own way of functioning.

---

<sup>18</sup> Xiberras, Martine (1993), *Les Théories de l'Exclusion*, Paris, Méridiens Klincksieck, pp.26.

Integration/exclusion from the **labour market** is not only translated into unemployment. Exclusion can have several stages. Working conditions can be an indicator of different degrees of integration in the labour market. Situations of exclusion can easily hide behind these subtleties. Non-monetary indicators of social exclusion in this area will necessarily have to take these realities into consideration.

Those five areas of integration correspond to five different types of *links that tie the individual to society*<sup>19</sup>. Exclusion may occur in one or several of those areas whenever there is a breakdown of the corresponding links. The individual or group is then rejected from participating (partially or fully) in those fields.

Those breakdown situations have severe consequences, not only on the effective participation of those involved but also on the systems of reference to which they belong. Hence, the inclusion of the fifth area in our typology - **symbolic references**. Apart from being excluded from concrete social activities, the individual, group or territory affected by social exclusion is often faced with a breakdown of the images and representations attached to those activities and which were an important element of social identification and integration. Non-monetary indicators will necessarily – although not easily – have to deal also with this component.

Originally, the concept of social exclusion has been primarily – if not exclusively – concerned with **social relationships**. The focus on **social ties** is, indeed, the specific contribution of the concept for the understanding of problems related with multiple deprivation. This fundamental dimension of social integration, which implies, *inter alia*, the *sense of belonging* (to the family, group, community or society) and the fulfilment of *citizenship*, is fully embraced by the approach adopted in this study – mostly in the **social** area and partly in other areas, such as the **economic**, the **political** and of **symbolic references**. In principle, it seems, all the **basic social systems** relevant for the assessment of social integration/exclusion should belong to one (or more) of the five areas mentioned above. It should be stressed here that some relevant aspects of social integration belong to

---

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., Xiberras, Martine, *ibidem*; Walsh, J. et al (1993) *Combatting Exclusion in Ireland*, The European Community Programme to Foster the Social and Economic Integration of the least privileged groups.

more than one area (the **labour market** being a good example). In such cases, though, they are mentioned in only one area (desirably the most important).

**AREAS OF EXCLUSION / INTEGRATION**

**I. SOCIAL LINKS**

Family  
 Close environment  
 Sociability  
 Interpersonal relations  
 Labour market

**II. ECONOMIC**

Generation of resources  
 Market (goods and services)  
 Savings

**III. INSTITUTIONAL**

Justice  
 Education  
 Health  
 Social security  
 Social welfare (care)  
 Political rights (citizenship)  
 Bureaucracy

**IV. TERRITORIAL**

Immigration  
 Mobilities  
 Deprived areas:  
     Urban  
     Suburban  
     Rural

**V. REFERENCES**

Identity  
 Self-esteem  
 Future prospects  
 Basic abilities  
 Interests and motivations  
 Emotional stability



From the point of view of the **proximate causes**<sup>20</sup> of social exclusion, it seems useful to distinguish the following types of factors:

- i) **Economic factors**: in this case, as noted above, exclusion is defined basically as multiple deprivation **due to lack of resources**, and means poverty.
- ii) **Social factors**: mainly related with the weakening or rupture of social links, as the **cause** of social exclusion.
- iii) **Cultural factors**, such as prejudices, racism, xenophobia, etc..
- iv) **Subjective factors**, leading mainly to situations of “shame-faced” poverty, a form of poverty that is not fully assumed by the poor, that leads to self-exclusion due to shame. These poor are sometimes reluctant to recognise their own poverty.
- v) **Pathological factors**. This type of exclusion is associated basically to mental or psychological problems disorder.
- vi) **“Self-destructive” behaviours**. This group comprises a set of conditions that society usually classifies as “deviant”, the most frequent examples being the situations related with drug addiction, alcoholism and prostitution, which may ultimately lead to **homelessness**.
- vii) **Spatial factors**. In this case, the “object” of exclusion are not only individuals and groups, but the whole *territorial unit* where they live. Examples of this type of exclusion are degraded quarters, shanty towns or historical centres, in urban centres pressed by demographic drainage from other zones or from other countries; underdeveloped rural areas excluded from the overall economic development of the country; or depressed industrial zones that could not survive the processes of restructuring or cope with the effects of globalisation. In such cases, the situation of persons and groups is closely linked to the overall conditions of the local space. One of the relevant implications is that, in this case, the situation is characterised by poor individuals and groups living in a **poor setting**.

The above items highlight the fact that social exclusion is a **heterogeneous** and **complex** phenomenon. There are different types and causes of social exclusion. Correspondingly, the indicators that are presented in this study do not necessarily apply to all the types and stages

---

<sup>20</sup> The reference to the «proximate» causes aims at safeguarding the different levels of causes, namely the proximate, the intermediate and the structural.

of exclusion. While some cover the phenomenon in general, others refer only to some particular form(s) of exclusion and others still only concern extreme situations. Since all these types and stages do occur in practice, none of them seems dispensable.

### 3.3. Territorial area

In this case, the “object” of exclusion are not only individuals and groups, but the whole *territorial unit* where they live. Examples of this type of exclusion are degraded quarters, shanty towns or historical centres, in urban centres pressed by demographic drainage from other zones or from other countries; underdeveloped rural areas excluded from the overall economic development of the country; or depressed industrial zones that could not survive the processes of restructuring or cope with the effects of globalisation. In such cases, the situation of persons and groups is closely linked to the overall conditions of the local space. One of the relevant implications is that, in this case, the situation is characterised by poor individuals and groups living in a **poor setting**.

In what regards individuals, households and groups, the social exclusion does not differ from the general pattern that applies to other contexts. The effective difference consists in the fact that in a “normal” context the excluded are a part (usually a minority) of the population, while the other part (usually the majority) is not socially excluded. In the spatial form of exclusion, however, the large majority (if not the totality) of the population is deprived due to the fact that the **spatial context** in which they live lacks, namely, suppliers of basic goods and services. It is not only a question of **access** to the existing supply, but the non-existence of providers. Accordingly, the relevant indicators, in this case, refer not to individuals or households but to the territory itself<sup>21</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> What follows draws on the study by CE.R.FE., in section 2.1 - Previous studies.

## 4. NON-MONETARY INDICATORS OF POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION

### *4.1. Information covered*

The set of indicators should cover all the relevant information necessary to characterise, understand and explain poverty and social exclusion. Accordingly, they have been organised in two sections: the first includes indicators that are primarily used for characterising social exclusion, and are intended to provide the information that may allow the **identification** of social exclusion. This item deals with the way(s) in which social exclusion is identifiable. It assumes the existence of a certain number of features that allow the observer to distinguish the excluded from the non-excluded.<sup>22</sup> The second section covers the indicators needed to assess the integration/exclusion of the individual or family from the basic social systems in the five fundamental areas considered above. The latter should provide the answer to the question «**exclusion from what?**».

Some of the indicators are useful for the purposes of both the sections. However, in order to avoid repetitions, they are mentioned only once.

### *4.2. Overview of the domains concerning the list of new indicators*

The introduction of new indicators (or whole new domains) in the list below demands an explanation of the choices made, with respect to their objectives within the area in which they have been included and the availability (or not) of statistical data in the field. In some cases, the “innovation” consists in the mere inclusion of new dimensions into already existing indicators, whereas in other cases we are proposing new indicators or even new areas for which data should be collected so that the existing statistical data may be complemented with non-monetary aspects of poverty and social exclusion.

---

<sup>22</sup> As stated above, it is not our task to establish thresholds for each of the features that seem relevant, but only to define the indicators that are needed to identify and describe the non-monetary aspects of social exclusion.

### ***Attributes of each member of household***

The inclusion of three new indicators in this field is justified by the fact that very often the corresponding attributes play a decisive role in the process of impoverishment / marginalisation. Early marriages, for instance, frequently translate one of the (few) ways of increasing one's social status, in the absence of other socially recognised attributes, which means that, very often, this "event" is closely linked to socially excluded individuals, families or groups.

### ***Relation of each member of household with the economy, the labour market and the social security system***

The new emphasis on independent workers within this area can basically be explained by the recent precarisation of the working conditions, which affects many of the so-called independent workers whose situation is sometimes "imposed" on them and in many cases means low wages, low (or lack of) social protection, and professional descent.

### ***Economic situation of the household***

The indicators included here are intended to add a qualitative and complementary approach to the existing data on the economic situation of the household. The experience of large income falls and the existence of debts and the way in which they are dealt with by the households can provide an important insight into the hardships and strategies of the poor and the socially excluded.

### ***Family of origin***

The dynamic aspects of poverty and social exclusion must be regarded in a double perspective: along the life cycle of individuals and families, and between generations. The inclusion of this area tries to throw some light on the latter aspect of the dynamics of social exclusion. Vulnerability in terms of educational "histories", professional "careers" and housing situations, and traumatic experiences in the early ages are some of the aspects through which it is possible to identify processes that lead to social exclusion.

### ***Consumption patterns and living conditions of the household***

This is one of the domains which has been thoroughly covered by the existing statistical data. Therefore, the suggestions mainly concern the introduction of time dimension in some indicators and a better specification of the reasons for not consuming a certain number of items. The former will reflect whether certain situations of serious deprivation (e.g., need to miss out on meals **due to lack of money**) are episodic or represent a persistent feature along the life cycle of the family; the latter suggestion makes it possible to distinguish between lack of consumption due to need or lack or due to taste, two quite different situations with respect to social exclusion.

### ***Housing and the neighbourhood***

Although precarious housing has also been one of the privileged areas for the collection of statistical data, it seems important to cover some aspects which may qualitatively improve the available data. Hence the focus on the living conditions of the neighbourhood (in terms of transport facilities, safety, infrastructure and equipment) and on the existence (or not) of a positive evaluation of the environment, through which feelings of belonging and identification can emerge (see 7.7.). The reference to the “absence of family members at the moment of enquiry” is intended to enhance the possibility of identifying situations of absence due to problems with justice, drug addiction, children’s institutional placement or other equally meaningful reasons, thus leading to a better understanding how the processes of social exclusion affect the lives of individuals and groups.

### ***Citizenship and participation in society***

Exclusion is often translated into the difficulty (or impossibility) of participating in society. Apart from the well-known indicators concerning political or associative participation, inability to communicate in the official language is a factor of exclusion from the overall society, although the person concerned may be integrated in smaller-scale groups (e.g. ethnic). Nevertheless, the fulfillment of citizenship is endangered. The difficulty in (and the avoidance of) contacting public services is also, very often, one of the markers of this

participation deficit and a mechanism that produces further disadvantages. Finally, the non-recognition of citizenship increases the possibility of being exposed to threats or even crime.

### ***Social representations***

The inclusion of a whole set of indicators concerning social representations is basically linked to the idea that social exclusion can be identified not only through objective aspects of peoples' lives, but also by images related with their social positioning and their ability to make choices and to act. Hence the introduction of indicators concerning the image of the family's history, the identification of conditions needed, and initiatives taken, to improve life, the existence (or not) of feelings of belonging at different levels, and the identification of negative expectations concerning some key vulnerability factors (racism, precarious housing, unemployment, isolation, health problems, family breakdown, social isolation and others).

### ***Health and welfare***

Indicators included in this area cover different aspects that seem to deserve being added to the already existing statistical information in this field. Hence, the inclusion of items of specific risk behaviour (alcoholism, drug addiction); the identification of particularly vulnerable health situations which may lead to vulnerability (need for special care such as in the case of bed-ridden persons); the conditions under which care is available; the assessment of perceived state of health, through which it may be possible to identify relevant group or regional differences; and, finally, the identification of early motherhood which – as in the case early marriage – may represent the (almost) only possibility to gain social recognition in the absence of other social achievements (educational, professional, financial, etc.).

### ***Social Links***

Exclusion from social activities involving family, friends, neighbours or other social actors, as one of the most significant and disturbing forms of exclusion, has been one of the privileged topics of scientific interest. However, statistical sources have just started to include some indicators in this specific area (e.g. ECHP). Hence our proposal to collect further information on this vital domain. Family links deserve a deeper understanding in terms of the intensity and the extension of family networks, as well as with respect to the motivation(s) underlying those interchanges. The inexistence of those contacts also demands a deeper understanding, at least in terms of the time dimension (episodic situation *versus* long-term family isolation). The latter also applies to contacts with friends and neighbours. Finally, the two indicators concerning children are important, since their absence often means total inexistence of the economic or housing conditions necessary to fulfil this type of “social obligations”. Time dimension can also explain whether this is linked to recent precarisation of the family’s life or to the family’s life-long precarious conditions.

### ***Economic Area***

Only two indicators are proposed in this area. One concerns **access to bank credit**, which, in the context of our societies, can clearly be considered as an exclusion marker, and, to a certain extent, a source of a vicious circle: higher the resources, better the access to credit. The other indicator refers to the possibilities of adapting the respective occupational background to permanent **technological changes**, in order to prevent the obsolescence of the professional qualifications. The well-known employment vulnerability of occupational profiles subject to obsolescence is one of the major concerns of the European societies.

### ***Institutional***

The lack of access to society’s institutions, even when legally guaranteed, can represent one of the most relevant areas of exclusion for entire groups (namely, minorities).

Therefore, some indicators have been included that aim at assessing the **real** access of people to some basic institutional services, such as justice, education, health, social security and social welfare. In the first case, formal citizenship may have objective consequences

regarding the access to judicial institutions, that must be identified. Similarly, indicators on the other institutional systems can provide information on whether people **really** have access to them (have the right and can exercise it), and whether the services rendered are considered satisfactory, or not.

### ***Territorial***

Exclusion of entire territorial units from mainstream society can be illustrated by a whole range of indicators concerning different domains (see global list of indicators, item 16). Four new indicators have been added in this respect: the perception shared by inhabitants of their poor (or non-poor) situation, which can (re)inforce feelings (and objective conditions) of social exclusion; an indicator on individual bankruptcies, which is a situation linked to the ongoing processes of modernisation and restructuring, that affects entire families; and the evaluation of the effective access to health care, from the territorial perspective.

It may be seen from the indicators selected that the information regarding spatial poverty and exclusion is, basically, from **administrative sources**. Thus, **the inclusion of this area does not overburden the statistical sources currently used for the study of poverty and social exclusion (namely, HBS and ECHP)**.

### ***Symbolic references***

Exclusion from society often has subjective effects, many of which behave simultaneously as cause and consequence of processes of exclusion, and often further re-inforce each other generating vicious circles. Apart from being excluded from concrete social activities, the individual, the group or territory affected by social exclusion is often faced with a breakdown of the images and representations attached to those activities and that are an important element of identification and integration.



The introduction of this area is thus essential for better understanding the complexity and the multidimensional character of the phenomenon. However, its translation into statistical data raises specific problems, both technical as well as ethic<sup>23</sup>.

From a scientific point of view, the selection of non-monetary indicators would be incomplete without this area. The short list of indicators included is followed by an annex that helps operationalising the proposed indicators.

A clear feeling of identity is closely linked to the sense of belonging to society and to the possibility of recognising and being recognised by others. The lack of such feelings not only occurs in severe and extreme stages of exclusion, but can also be identified during the process itself, namely in terms of the weakening of one's self-concept, that often characterises, *inter alia*, persons with low qualification, the unemployed, and families living in degraded urban areas.

The identification of “significant losses along life” – namely, the loss of key persons (with regard to financial or emotional support), the impact of unemployment or migration, etc. – can give an important qualitative perspective to the processes of “precarisation” and marginalisation that lead to social exclusion.

Cognitive and behavioural attitudes can help us understand the ways in which people deal with different situations and some of the subjective (but rather effective) obstacles or potentials of individuals concerning their social integration.

The last group of indicators concerning mental health relates to severe types of social exclusion but also to the effects (particularly if long-term) of poverty, marginalisation and social exclusion processes on the individual as such.

---

<sup>23</sup> Possible ethical problems concerning the implementation of some of the proposed indicators was one of the questions raised during the Lisbon Seminar, mainly by the representative of INSEE.

## 4.2. Indicators

The following tables present the indicators that have been selected as the result of the study. Most of the indicators were drawn from the previous studies sponsored by the European Commission, as well as from the following studies:

- MACK, Joanna; LANSLEY, Stewart (1985), *Poor Britain*, London, George Allen & Unwin.
- TOWNSEND, Peter (1979), *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.
- VOGEL, Joachim et al (1988), *Inequality in Sweden - Trends and Current Situation*, Stockholm, Statistics Sweden.

Table 1 presents a full set of indicators, **old and new**, that are of interest for studying poverty and social exclusion. The **new indicators** carry the respective indication in the last column of the table. It should be noted that some of these indicators are “new” only insofar as the time dimension has been introduced. The second column indicates the statistical sources where the **old indicators** are found and the **new indicators** could be included.

It should be realised that the attachment of the new indicators mainly to HBS and ECHP - certainly the most adequate sources - raises relevant problems of feasibility. However, the resort to other alternative sources implies the resolution of equally difficult problems of data matching.

Finally, assuming that the inclusion of new indicators may need the establishment of priorities, the table highlights in **bold** the new indicators that seem to deserve the classification of **1<sup>st</sup> priority**.

**Table 1. Complete List of Indicators**

<b>a) Characteristics of social exclusion (How is it identified? Translates into what?)</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
<b>1. Attributes of each member of household:</b>		
1.1. Gender	HBS/ECHP	
1.2. Age	HBS/ECHP	
1.3. Marital status	HBS/ECHP	
<b>1.4. Age of first marriage</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
1.5. Nationality	HBS/ECHP	
<b>1.6. Ethnic group</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
1.7. Level of education:	HBS/ECHP	
<b>1.8. When first left full time education (age, qualification and reason)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>2. Relation of each member of household with the economy, the labour market and the social security system</b>		
2.1. Income earners in the household (number, gender, age)	HBS	
2.1.1. Now		
2.1.2. 5/10 years back		
2.2. Occupational status	ECHP	
2.3. Over-qualification for present job (under-employment)	ECHP	
2.4. Would work more hours if available(Yes/No)	ECHP	(*)
2.5. Employed:		
2.5.1. Business sector (which, formal /informal)	ECHP	
2.5.2. Employer/Self-employed:	ECHP	
2.5.2.1. with no employees	HBS	
2.5.2.2. with employees	HBS	
2.5.2.3. family members	HBS	
<b>2.5.3. Independent worker (self-employed):</b>		
<b>2.5.3.1. by choice</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>2.5.3.2. due to need</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>2.5.3.3. since when</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
2.5.4. Employee:		
2.5.4.1. full-time / part-time / seasonal	ECHP/HBS	
2.5.4.2. type of contract (permanent / tempor. / no contract)	ECHP/HBS	
2.5.4.2.1 now	ECHP/HBS	
2.5.4.2.2 5 years back	HBS	New
2.5.4.3. number of weekly hours of work (fixed / shift work)	ECHP	
2.5.4.4. non-monetarised work	ECHP	
2.5.4.5. secondary labour market	LS	
2.5.5. days of work lost due to:		
2.5.5.1. working accidents	LS	
2.5.5.2. occupational disease	LS	
2.5.5.3. illness	LS	
2.6. Unemployed:		
2.6.1. short-term / long-term / very long-term	ECHP	
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>

2.6.2. looking (or not) for work	ECHP	
2.6.3. discouraged	ECHP	
2.6.4. with/without unemployment benefit	ECHP	
2.6.5. reason of unemployment	ECHP	
2.7. Overall work satisfaction (degree)	ECHP	
2.8. working conditions:	ECHP	
2.8.1. humidity	ECHP	
2.8.2. noise	ECHP	
2.8.3. environment	ECHP	
2.8.4. risk / victim of working accidents	ECHP	
2.8.5. risk / victim of occupational disease	ECHP	
2.9. Other occupation(s) besides main job	ECHP	
2.10. Covered by social protection system:		
2.10.1. social security (contributory)	HBS/ECHP	
2.10.1.1. now	HBS/ECHP	
2.10.1.2. 5 years back	HBS	New
2.10.2. non-contributory (specify)	HBS/ECHP	
2.10.2.1. now	HBS/ECHP	
2.10.2.2. 5 years back	HBS	New
2.10.3. none	HBS/ECHP	
2.10.3.1. was ever covered	HBS	New
2.11. Voluntary pension schemes	ECHP	
2.12. Social assistance	ECHP	
<b>3. Income (sources and amounts) of each income earner:</b>		
3.1. sources and respective amounts (regular and occasional)	HBS	
3.2. Benefits from employer (cash and in-kind)	ECHP	
3.3. Benefits and allowances (state welfare benefits, other regular supplements, other occasional supplements in the past 12 months)	ECHP	
3.4. Direct deductions from pay	ECHP	
<b>4. Economic situation of the household</b>		
4.1. Equivalent disposable income	ECHP	
4.2. (Dis)satisfaction HH with financial situation (Degree)	ECHP	
4.2.1. Now	ECHP	
4.2.2. 10 years back ( <i>better off, same, worse</i> )	HBS	New
4.3. Can afford pocket money to children ( <i>Yes/No/With difficulty</i> )	ECHP	
4.4. Ability to "make ends meet" ( <i>Yes/No/With difficulty</i> )	ECHP	
4.5. Manage to save (equivalent savings)	ECHP	
4.6. Household debts (to whom, for what, how much)	ECHP	New
<b>4.7. Experience of large falls in earnings during last 5 years (Yes/No):</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>(*)</b>
4.8. Strategies in case of need:	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.1. borrow	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.2. deprivation	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.3. debts	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.4. sell assets	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>5. Family of origin:</b>		
<b>5.1. Educational level of father and mother</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>5.2. Profession of father and mother</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
5.3. Mobility of the family (region/country where most time was spent)	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4. Housing situation:	HBS/ECHP	New
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
5.4.1. autonomous flat	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4.2. unauthorised housing	HBS/ECHP	New

5.4.3. precarious housing	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4.4. homeless family	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>5.5. Episodes of domestic violence</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
5.6. Occasional / permanent separation from parents (age, reason, solution)	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>6. Consumption patterns and living conditions of the household:</b>		
6.1. Food consumption as percentage of total consumption (monetary)	HBS	
<b>6.2. Self-production (market value)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>in member-States where it is missing</b>
<b>6.3. Self-consumption (market value)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>in member-States where it is missing</b>
<b>6.4. Imputed rent for owned housing (market value)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>in member-States where it is missing</b>
<b>6.5. Need to miss out on meals due to lack of money</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>6.5.1. Now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>6.5.2. During the last 5/10 years (no/seldom/often)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
6.6. Diet:		
6.6.1. cooked breakfast	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.6.2. no cooked meal	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.6.3. fresh meat / fish / milk	ECHP	
6.6.4. 3 meals a day for children	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7. Amenities - would like but cannot afford:	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.1. dish washer	ECHP	
6.7.2. washing machine (clothing)	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
<b>6.7.3. fridge</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New for clarifying the reason</b>
6.7.4. deep freeze	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.5. microwave oven	ECHP	
6.7.6. radio	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.7. colour TV	ECHP	
6.7.8. video	ECHP	
6.7.9. telephone	ECHP	
6.7.10. personal computer	ECHP	
6.7.11. vacuum cleaner	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.12. car	ECHP	
<b>6.7.13. Adequate footwear</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
6.7.14. Cigarettes	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.15. Newspaper	HBS	New for clarifying the reason

	Source	Observations
<b>6.7.16. Toys for children</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New for clarifying the reason(*)</b>
<b>6.8. Second-hand clothing (due to need) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New for clarifying the reason (*)</b>
<b>6.9. Warm clothing (coat in winter,...) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>(*)</b>
6.10. Repayment of debts from hire purchases or loans	ECHP	
6.11. Recreational consumption (by type of activities)	ECHP	
<b>7. Housing and the neighbourhood:</b>		
7.1 General aspects:		
7.1.1. Absence of family members at the moment of enquiry (who/why)	HBS/ECHP	New
7.1.2. Domestic tasks support from the outside (yes: paid /not paid / no)	HBS/ECHP	New
7.1.2.1. Now	HBS/ECHP	New
7.1.2.2. 5 years ago	HBS	New
7.2.2. Tenure status (rented / owned/ unauthorised housing )	ECHP	
7.2. Physical characteristics:		
7.2.1. Autonomous flat / house	ECHP	
7.2.2. Precarious housing (barracks, etc.)	ECHP	
7.2.3. Persons per room (number)	ECHP	
7.2.4. Persons per bed-room (number)	ECHP	
7.2.5. Useful and/or living space per person (m <sup>2</sup> )	HBS/ECHP	New/(*)
7.2.6. Indoors place for children to play (yes/no)	HBS/ECHP	New/(*)
7.2.7. Garden or yard (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.8. Availability of bath / shower in the dwelling (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.9. Flush toilet (inside / outside dwelling) (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.10. Piped water in the dwelling (hot /cold) (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.11. Heating:		
7.2.11.1. central heating (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.11.2. room heating (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.11.3. localised heater (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.11.4. had to go without heating (12 months) due to lack of money (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.12. State of building:		
7.2.12.1. Structural defects (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.2.12.2. Maintenance (very good/satisfactory/unsatisfactory)	ECHP	
7.2.13. Humidity in the dwelling (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.3. Time living in the dwelling (years)	ECHP	
7.4. Financial stress:		
7.4.1. House price to income ratio	ECHP	
7.4.2. Rent to income ratio	ECHP	
7.4.3. Existence of mortgages (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.4.4. Housing costs (mortgage, repairs, taxes,...) considered burden? (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.4.5. Receiving rent allowance (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.5. Neighbourhood:		
7.5.1. External aspect of the dwelling / neighbourhood (very good/good/bad)	ECHP	
7.5.2. Air / water pollution sources nearby (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.5.3. Problems of crime / vandalism in the area (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.5.3.1. Now	ECHP	
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>

7.5.3.2. 5 years ago	HBS	New
7.5.4. Motorways / train tracks crossing or isolating the neighbourhood (yes/no)	ECHP	
7.6. Accessibility:		
<b>7.6.1. Regular public transport facilities within 500 meter (yes/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>7.6.2. Facilities (schools, hospital, sports, chemist, bank, commerce,...) (yes/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
7.6.3. Places for children to play (near and safe) (yes/no) (yes/no)	ECHP	(*)
7.6.4. Time from home to work (and return)(hours)	ECHP	(*)
7.6.5. Time from home to school (and return)(hours)	ECHP	(*)
7.6.6. Kind of transport used (to work and to school)(car/public/ bicycle /walk)	ECHP	(*)
7.6.7. Share of transport consumption in total consumption (%)	ECHP	
7.7. Would like children to live here when adults (yes/no)	ECHP	New
<b>8. Social activities:</b>		
8.1. Museum visits(yes/no)	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.2. Reading books(yes/no)	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.3. Concerts or musical performances	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.4. Sports	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.5. Watching TV / video	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.6. Recreational stays in home country (now/ in the past)		
8.7.1. with whom	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.7.2. length of stay	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.7.3. frequency	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.8. Recreational stays abroad (now / in the past)		
8.8.1. with whom	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.8.2. length of stay	HBS/ECHP	(*)
8.8.3. frequency	HBS/ECHP	(*)
<b>9. Citizenship and participation in society</b>		
<b>9.1. Ability to communicate in official language of domicile (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
9.2. Knowledge of languages foreign to domicile	LIVCDS	
9.3. Knowledge of rights (access to social benefits, political rights, ...)	LIVCDS	
9.4. Voting:		
9.4.1. attitude (want to, able to)	LIVCDS	
9.4.2. frequency	LIVCDS	
9.4.3. in the last elections	LIVCDS	
9.4.4. local / national / European elections	LIVCDS	
9.5. Political affiliation	LIVCDS	
9.6. Membership (now / in the past):	LIVCDS	
9.6.1. of trade union	LIVCDS	
9.6.2. of political party	LIVCDS	
9.6.3. of associations (civic, cultural and voluntary work)	LIVCDS	
9.6.4. of church / religious organisations	LIVCDS	
9.7. Attempt to persuade municipal authorities or local government officials	HBS/ECHP	(*)
<b>9.8. Contact with public services (easy/difficult)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>9.9. Exposure to risk (crime, threat)(often/seldom/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>10. Social representations:</b>		
<b>10.1. Own family situation (well-off /acceptable / bad)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
<b>10.1.1. at present</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>

<b>10.1.2. in the past (10 years ago)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
10.2. Dissatisfaction with financial situation	ECHP	
10.3. Dissatisfaction with living conditions / life style	ECHP	
10.4. Conditions / things needed to improve one's life	ECHP	New
10.5. Initiatives taken (to be taken) in order to improve one's life if not satisfactory	ECHP	New
10.6. Needs every household should be able to provide for	ECHP	
10.7. Needs that you cannot meet due to lack of resources	ECHP	
10.8. Worries due to:		
10.8.1. lack of money	LIVCDS	(*)
10.8.2. bad conditions of housing (housing stress)	LIVCDS	New
10.8.3. atmosphere of surrounding neighbourhood	LIVCDS	New
10.8.4. possibility of children (3-6 years) mobbed or beaten up	LIVCDS	(*)
<b>10.8.5. possibility of youngsters becoming mixed up in gangs</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>10.8.6. possibility of being victimised due to racist feelings</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>10.8.7. possibility of becoming unemployed</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
10.8.8. possibility of not having a place to sleep	LIVCDS	New
<b>10.8.9. possibility of being abandoned by family and friends</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.8.10. health problems</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.8.11. isolation in old age</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
10.8.12. need of resorting to social services for assistance	LIVCDS	New
<b>10.8.13. fear of not being able to provide for own family</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.9. Feelings about neighbourhood (positive / negative)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
10.10. Transformations desired / to be avoided in the neighbourhood	LIVCDS	New
10.11. Where one really feels at home (room, house, neighbourhood, village, city, ..)	LIVCDS	New
<b>11. Health and welfare:</b>		
<b>11.1. Age of first delivery</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
11.2. Disability:	ECHP	
11.2.1. short-term	ECHP	
11.2.2. long-term	ECHP	
<b>11.3. Assessment of perceived health</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
11.4. Smoking and heavy smoking	ECHP	(*)
<b>11.5. Alcohol consumption (No/Moderate/Excessive)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>11.5.1. Now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.5.2. Since last 5 years</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.6. Drug addiction (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.6.1. Now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.6.2. Since last 5 years</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
11.7. Hospitalisation last 12 months	ECHP	(*)
11.8. Regular visits to / from G. P.	ECHP	(*)
<b>11.9. In need of special cares (bedridden, etc.) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.10. Access to care (satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>12. Cultural and psychological features (See 17.)</b>		



<b>b) EXCLUSION FROM WHAT ? (AREAS OF EXCLUSION)</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
<b>13. SOCIAL</b>		
<b>13.1. Family:</b>		
13.1.1. Household composition ( <i>now/ 5 years ago</i> )	HBS	
13.1.1.1. single parent family	HBS	
13.1.1.2. nuclear family	HBS	
13.1.1.3. extended family	HBS	
13.1.1.4. other (specify)	HBS	
<b>13.1.1.5. lone person, due to</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.1.5.1. single</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.1.5.2. breakdown (death, divorce, separation)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
13.1.2. Size of household	HBS	
13.1.3. Urban/suburban/rural (define)	HBS	
<b>13.1.4. Family contacts:</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.1. No</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.1.1. since when?</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2. Yes:</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.1. with whom (husband/wife, mother, father, etc.)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.2. how often (daily/weekly/monthly/rare)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.3. type (personal, telephone, mail)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4. motivation:</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.1. no special reason</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.2. need</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.3. special occasions</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.4. leisure activities</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2. Close environment:</b>		
13.2.1. contact with neighbours	ECHP	
13.2.1.1. No	ECHP	
13.2.1.1.1. since when?	ECHP	New
13.2.1.2. Yes:	ECHP	
13.2.1.2.1. how often ( <i>daily/weekly/monthly/rare</i> )	ECHP	
13.2.1.3. no contacts	ECHP	
13.2.2. contact with friends	ECHP	
13.2.2.1. No	ECHP	
13.2.2.1.1. since when?	ECHP	New
13.2.2.2. Yes	ECHP	
13.2.2.2.1. how often ( <i>daily/weekly/monthly/rare</i> )	ECHP	
13.2.2.2.2. type (personal, telephone, mail)	ECHP	New
13.2.2.3. no contacts	ECHP	
13.2.3. associations (nature) - ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	ECHP	
13.2.4. political meetings - ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	ECHP	(*)
13.2.5. religious meetings - ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	ECHP	(*)
13.2.6. none	ECHP	
13.2.7. parties/gathering	HBS/ECHP	New
13.2.7.1. No	HBS/ECHP	New
13.2.7.1.1. 5 years ago ( <i>yes/no/ever</i> )	HBS	New
13.2.7.2. Yes	HBS/ECHP	New
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>

13.2.7.2.1. how often	HBS/ECHP	New
13.2.8. attend school meetings ( <i>yes/no</i> )	HBS/ECHP	(*)
<b>13.2.9. inviting children's friends (<i>yes/no</i>)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>13.2.9.1. now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2.9.2. 5 years back</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2.10. giving birthday parties for children (<i>yes/no</i>)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>13.2.10.1. now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2.10.2. 5 years back</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
13.2.11. gifts given / received (regular, occasional)	HBS/ECHP	(*)
<b>14. ECONOMIC</b>		
<b>14.1. Resource generation</b>		
14.1.1. <i>Material:</i>		
14.1.1.1. wages	HBS	
14.1.1.2. capital income from:	HBS	
14.1.1.2.1. property	HBS	
14.1.1.2.2. land	HBS	
14.1.1.2.3. other	HBS	
<b>14.1.1.3. access to credit from bank (<i>Yes/No</i>)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
14.1.2. <i>Cultural / occupational assets:</i>		
14.1.2.1. education / skills	ECHP	
14.1.2.2. information (media, etc.)	ECHP	New
14.1.2.3. technology (prevent qualification obsolescence)	ECHP	New
<b>14.2. Savings (monetary)</b>	<b>ECHP/HBS</b>	
<b>15. INSTITUTIONAL</b>		
<b>15.1. Justice</b>		
<b>15.1.1. if not national</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.1.2. equality before the law (perception)</b> <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</i>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
15.1.3. access to justice (based on past experience) <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</i>	LIVCDS	New
<b>15.2. Education</b>		
<b>15.2.1. access (cost) (<i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory</i>)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.2.2. possibility of success (perception)</b> <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</i>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
15.2.3. level of education	ECHP	
<b>15.3. Health</b>		
<b>15.3.1. access to health services when needed</b> <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory):</i>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.1. primary health care</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.2. hospital care</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.3. rehabilitation</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.4. pharmaceuticals</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>

	Source	Observations
<b>15.4. Social security</b>		
<b>15.4.1. access to social security services</b> <i>satisfactory /unsatisfactory:</i>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.4.1.1.in unemployment (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.4.1.2. in disability (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.4.1.3. in old age (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.4.1.4. in family responsibilities (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.4.1.5. in illness (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.5. Social welfare (care)</b>		
<b>15.5.1. access to social welfare when needed</b> <i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory:</i>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.5.1.1.children (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.5.1.2. elderly (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.5.1.3. disabled (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.5.1.4. chronically ill (bed-ridden) (Yes/No)</b>	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>15.6. Political rights (citizenship)</b>		
15.6.1. participation in the democratic process (See 9.)		
15.6.2. equal opportunities	LIVCDS	
<b>15.7. Bureaucracy (non-take-up due to bureaucracy) (See 9.8)</b>		
<b>16. TERRITORIAL</b>		
<b>16.1. Population</b>		
16.1.1. Population structure by age, gender.	DEMO	(*)
16.1.2. Percentage of migrants	DEMO	(*)
16.1.3. Percentage of clandestine migrants	DEMO	(*)
16.1.4. Percentage of elderly living alone	DEMO	(*)
16.1.5. Percentage of single-parent families	DEMO	(*)
<b>16.2. Income</b>		
16.2.1. GDP (GVA) generated in the territory. Sector structure.	NA	(*)
16.2.2. Income distribution	HBS/NA	(*)
16.2.3. Perception of poverty	HBS	New
16.2.4. Structure of family incomes (sources)	HBS	(*)
<b>16.3 Employment/Unemployment</b>		
16.3.1. Employment:		
16.3.1.1. participation rate (by gender)	LS	(*)
16.3.1.2. structure of active population (employers, self-employed, employees)	LS	(*)
16.3.1.3. structure of employment (by economic sector, occupation)	LS	(*)
16.3.1.4. structure of type of contract (permanent, temporary, no contract), by gender	LS	(*)
16.3.1.5. percentage of employees without social security	SS	(*)
16.3.1.6. percentage of workers not insured against working accidents	LS	(*)
16.3.2. Unemployment:		
16.3.2.1. global rate (by gender and age)	LS	(*)
16.3.2.2. youth unemployment rate	LS	(*)
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>

16.3.2.3. duration	LS	(*)
16.3.2.4. unemployment benefit	LS	(*)
16.3.2.5. characteristics of unemployed and other job seekers (occupation, economic sector)	LS	(*)
16.3.2.6. firm(s) closures or transfers	IND	(*)
<b>16.4. Poverty</b>		
16.4.1. Firm mortality rate	IND	(*)
16.4.2. Percentage of employees under/on minimum wage	LS	(*)
16.4.3. Percentage of pensioners on minimum pensions	SS	(*)
16.4.4. Average household debt	HBS	(*)
16.4.5. Percentage of minimum income beneficiaries	SS	(*)
<b>16.4.6. Number of individual bankruptcies per 100 000 individuals (annual average)</b>	<b>IND</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>16.5. Education and training</b>		
16.5.1. Illiteracy rate	EDUC	(*)
16.5.2. Rate of Primary School drop-outs	EDUC	(*)
16.5.3. Rate of compulsory Secondary School drop-outs	EDUC	(*)
16.5.4. Number of persons on occupational training course per year	LS	(*)
16.5.5. Number of university students per 10 000 individuals between 18 and 29 years of age	EDUC	(*)
<b>16.6. Information, communication and participation</b>		
16.6.1. Number of telephones per 100 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.2. Number of daily newspapers sold per inhabitant and per year	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.3. Number of libraries per 1000 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.4. Number of television sets per 1000 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.5. Number of personal computers per 100 000 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.6. Number of fax machines per 100 000 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.7. Number of cars and motorcycles per 100 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.8. Number of public cars per 100 000 inhabitants	LIVCDS	(*)
16.6.9. Public expenditures in shows, sporting events and culture <i>per capita</i>	LIVCDS	New
16.6.10. Percentage of actual voters:		
16.6.10.1. in local elections	ELECSTS	(*)
16.6.10.2. in national elections	ELECSTS	(*)
16.6.10.3. in European elections	ELECSTS	(*)
<b>16.7. Housing and environment</b>		
16.7.1. Density (persons per room)	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.2. Percentage of houses without:	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.2.1. drinking water	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.2.2. electricity	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.2.3. WC	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.2.4. telephone	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.2.5. heating	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.3. Number of evictions per year	HOUSTS	(*)
16.7.4. Degraded quarters (numbers of families and persons)	HOUSTS	(*)
<b>16.8. Access to health care</b>		
16.8.1. Number of doctors per 1000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.2. Number of nurses per 1000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
16.8.3. Number of pharmacists per 1000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)

16.8.4. Number of other health personnel per 1000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.5. Number of hospital beds per 1000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)
<b>16.8.6. Access to primary health-care centres (distance/waiting time/price)</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>16.8.7. Access to maternal-and-child health care (distance/waiting time/price)</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>New</b>
16.8.8. Number of pharmacies per 100 000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.9. Death rate by:		
16.8.9.1. avoidable diseases	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.9.2. alcoholism	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.9.3. suicide	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.9.4. infant mortality	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.9.5. maternal mortality	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.10. Percentage of sick persons	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.11. Incidence of infectious diseases	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.12. Permanent invalidity rate	HEALTH	(*)
16.8.13. Incidence of mental illness per 100 000 inhabitants	HEALTH	(*)
<b>16.9. Deviant behaviour</b>		
16.9.1. Number of inmates per 100 000 inhabitants	JUSTICE	(*)
16.9.2. Percentage of drug addicts	HEALTH	(*)
16.9.3. Youth delinquency rate	JUSTICE	(*)
16.9.4. Crime rate	JUSTICE	(*)
<b>17. SYMBOLIC REFERENCES</b>		<b>NEW</b>
<b>17.1. Identity</b>		
17.1.1. Self-concept / self-image:		
17.1.1.1. sense of personal value	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.2. self-image	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.3. self confidence	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.4. self acceptance	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.5. autonomy	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.6. responsibility	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
<b>17.1.2. social identity (perception of one's social place):</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.1.3. social isolation</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2. Significant "losses" along life</b>		
<b>17.2.1. persons</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2.2. situations</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2.3. personal attributes</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2.4. global feeling</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.3. Cognitive and behavioural abilities.</b>		
17.3.1. Ability to:		
17.3.1.1. control impulses	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.2. cope with stress	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.3. cope with personal failure and frustration	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.4. anticipate consequences (problem solving)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.5. decentrate (egocentrism)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.6. communicate (express feelings, wishes, opinions)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
	<b>Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
17.3.1.7. socialise	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.8. make projects (short-, medium- and long-term)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex

17.3.1.9. adapt oneself to new situations	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.2. Anti-social and self-destructive behaviours	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
<b>17.4. Mental health</b>		
<b>17.4.1. depression</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.4.2. hostility</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.4.3. anxiety</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.4.4. somatization and psychiatric disorders</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>

(\*) On these indicators see the following studies:

CERFE (1993), *Etude sur les Indicateurs d'Exclusion Sociale*, Bruxelles, CCE.

MACK, Joanna; LANSLEY, Stewart (1985), *Poor Britain*, London, George Allen & Unwin.

LOUDHOF, J. & EVERAERS, P. (1996), *European Social Indicators - A review of the extended short Eurostat list of social indicators*, Statistics Netherlands.

PAUGAM, Serge (1994), *Apprehension de la Pauvreté sous l'angle de la disqualification sociale*, Luxembourg, CNRS/EUROSTAT.

TOWNSEND, Peter (1979), *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

WHELAN, B. (coord.) (1992), *A study of the non-monetary indicators of poverty in the European Community*, Dublin, ESRI.

VOGEL, Joachim et al (1988), *Inequality in Sweden - Trends and Current Situation*, Stockholm, Statistics Sweden.

**Annex 1 to Table 1**

**17. SYMBOLIC REFERENCES**

**17.1. Identity**

**17.1.1. SELF CONCEPT / SELF ESTEEM**

1. I feel like I am no one	
2. I feel I am as capable as others	
3. People usually like me	
4. I feel I am competent in what I do	
5. When I have a good idea I try to realize it	
6. When I have a problem I can't solve it without help	Always
7. I like myself	Often
8. I make too many mistakes	Some times
9. I don't deserve other people's affection	Occasionally
10. I feel I am different	Never
11. I feel something is wrong on my head	
12. I feel I am a failure	
13. I'm intelligent	
14. My family loves me	
15. I feel I don't like my body	
16. I'm not responsible for my situation	
17. I feel enough energy to solve my difficulties	
18. I need a lot of support	

**17.1.2 SOCIAL IDENTITY**

1. I feel that my place in society is	inside society /outside society
2.	winner/ loser (defeated)
3.	inferior/superior
4.	identical /different
5.	strong/weak
6.	desired /undesired
7.	protected/vulnerable
8.	valuable/unvaluable

## 17.2. Significant losses (by death or otherwise) along life

1. In my life, I miss:

1.1. Persons:

a) Close family

Mother

Father

Brothers/Sisters (n)

Partners (n)

Sons/Daughters (n)

b) Other family

c) Friends

d) Neighbours

Yes (Very much, much)

No

1.2. Situations

a) House

b) Work

c) Profession

d) Native Land

e) Place of origin

f) Social background

g) Interests

1.3. Personal attributes

a) Health

b) Intellectual Capacities

c) Personality (no longer what I was)

d) Beauty

2. I lost in my life

everything

most important things and persons

many things

some things and persons

nothing special



### 17.3. COGNITIVE AND BEHAVIOURAL ABILITIES

#### 17.3.1. Ability to

##### 17.3.1.1. Control impulses:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. I have a problem with controlling my impulses |   |
| 2. When I loose control                          | Always - often -<br>sometimes - never           |
| a) I am physically violent                       |   |
| b) I am verbally violent                         |   |
| c) I loose control over my emotions              |   |
| d) I brake things                                |   |
| e) I injure myself                               |   |
| f) I feel I deserve punishment                   |   |
| 3. When I have an idea                           | I act imediately - I think over it - I leave it |

##### 17.3.1.2. Cope with stress

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. I feel stressed    | Very often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never           |
| 2. When I am stressed | I loose control - I feel fragile - I cope with it |

##### 17.3.1.3. Cope with personal failure and frustration

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. When I fail          | I give up everything - I get discouraged - I try to find a solution                                |
| 2. When things go wrong | a) I give up<br>b) I feel discouraged<br>c) I don't get discouraged<br>d) I try to find a solution |

##### 17.3.1.4. Anticipate consequences (problem solving)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. When I must take a decision,<br>or do something, usually | a) I act without thinking<br>b) I think about everything but cannot take a decision<br>c) I decide after assessing the pros and cons<br>d) I get paralised |
|---|--|

##### 17.3.1.5. Descentrate

- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| 1. There are many good people very different from me               | Yes / No |
| 2. There is only one right solution for each problem               |          |
| 3. If someone harms me I tend to think that she/he is a bad person |          |
| 4. I think I can't like people different from me                   |          |

##### 17.3.1.6. Communicate

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1. I express my feelings and my thoughts with</p> | <p>a) no one<br/>b) 1/2 persons<br/>c) some persons<br/>d) a lot of people</p>  | <p>Always /Often /<br/>Rarely / Never</p> |
| <p>2. When I express myself usually I feel</p>       | <p>a) anxious<br/>b) ridiculous<br/>c) afraid of critics<br/>d) comfortable</p> |   |

**17.3.1.7 Socialize**

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <p>1. I don't like most people<br/>2. I don't know any one worthwhile<br/>3. I have no one<br/>4. We can't believe in anyone<br/>5. I never opened my heart with anybody<br/>6. I've never been loved<br/>7. I am alone<br/>8. I feel I've never loved anyone<br/>9. I feel I'm not understood<br/>10. I like to work together</p> | <p>Yes /No</p> |
|--|----------------|

**17.3.1.8. Cope with loneliness**

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <p>1. I feel lonely</p>      | <p>Always - Often - Rarely -Never</p>   |
| <p>2. When I feel lonely</p> | <p>a) I get depressed<br/>b) I try to amuse myself<br/>c) I try to find someone<br/>d) There is someone in special I can always contact</p> |

**17.3.1.9. Make projects, to invest with**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. I have projects for</p> <p>a) myself<br/>b) family<br/>c) profession<br/>d) others</p> | <p>short-term/medium-term/long-term</p> |
| <p>2. When I have projects:</p>  |   |

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) I never accomplish them</li> <li>b) I recognise that they were unrealistic</li> <li>c) I keep post poning it</li> <li>d) They realize</li> <li>e) They never realize</li> <li>f) They usually fail because I'm not lucky</li> </ul>	Yes/No
---	--------

**17.3.1.10. Adapt**

1. In face of new situations I feel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) uncomfortable</li> <li>b) stressed</li> <li>c) confiding</li> <li>d) desiring to run away</li> <li>e) taking up the glove</li> </ul>
-------------------------------------	--

2. In face of new situations I deal well Always - often - rarely - never

**17.3.2. ANTISOCIAL AND SELF DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOURS**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Problems with Law</li> <li>2. Murder</li> <li>3. Phisic Agressions</li> <li>4. Theft</li> <li>5. Prostitution</li> <li>6. Drugs Addiction</li> <li>7. Alcoolism</li> </ul>	Always    Often    Rarely    Never
--	------------------------------------

**17.4. MENTAL HEALTH**

**17.4.1. Depression**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Crying</li> <li>2. Fatigue</li> <li>3. Irritability</li> <li>4. Sadness</li> <li>5. Insomnia</li> <li>6. Pessimism about myself</li> <li>7. Pessimism about others</li> <li>8. Pessimism about future</li> <li>9. Anguish</li> <li>10. Desmotivation</li> <li>11. Lack of pleasure</li> <li>12. Suicide Thought</li> <li>13. Suicide attempts</li> </ul>	Always /Often / Rarely /Never
--	-------------------------------

**17.4.2. Hostility**

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Anger</li><li>2. Desire of revenge</li><li>3. Hate</li></ol> | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|---------------------------------|

#### **17.4.3. Anxiety**

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Heart-throbs</li><li>2. Fear without reason</li><li>3. Feeling distress</li><li>4. Inquietation</li><li>5. Lack of concentration</li></ol> | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|---------------------------------|

#### **17.4.4. Somatization and psychiatric disorders**

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Head aches</li><li>2. Earing strange things ( voices )</li><li>3. Seeing strange things</li><li>4. Tremblings</li><li>5. Fainting / Dizziness</li><li>6. Sexual problems</li></ol> | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|---------------------------------|

**Table 2. List of NEW indicators**

a) CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION (HOW IS IT IDENTIFIED? TRANSLATES INTO WHAT?)	Possible Source	Observations
<b>1. Attributes of each member of household:</b>		
1.4. Age of first marriage	HBS/ECHP	New
1.6. Ethnic group	HBS/ECHP	New
1.8. When first left full time education ( <i>age, qualification and reason</i> )	HBS/ECHP	(*)
<b>2. Relation of each member of household with the economy, the labour market and the social security system</b>		
<b>2.5.3. Independent worker (self-employed):</b>		
2.5.3.1. by choice	HBS/ECHP	New
2.5.3.2. due to need	HBS/ECHP	New
2.5.3.3. since when	HBS/ECHP	New
2.5.4. Employee		
2.5.4.2. Type of contract		
2.5.4.2.2. 5 years back	HBS	New
2.10. Covered by social protection system:		
2.10.1. social security (contributory)		
2.10.1.2. 5 years back	HBS	New
2.10.2. non-contributory (specify)		
2.10.2.2. 5 years back	HBS	New
2.10.3. none		
2.10.3.1. was ever covered	HBS	New
<b>4. Economic situation of the household</b>		
4.2.. (Dis)satisfaction HH with financial situation (Degree)		
4.2.2. 10 years back ( <i>better off, same, worse</i> )	HBS	New
4.6. Household debts (to whom, for what, how much)	ECHP	New
4.7. Experience of large falls in earnings during last 5 years ( <i>Yes/No</i> ):	HBS	(*)
4.8. Strategies in case of need:	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.1.. borrow	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.2. deprivation	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.3. debts	HBS/ECHP	New
4.8.4. sell assets	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>5. Family of origin:</b>		
5.1. Educational level of father and mother	HBS/ECHP	New
5.2. Profession of father and mother	HBS/ECHP	New
5.3. Mobility of the family (region/country where most time was spent)	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4. Housing situation:	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4.1. autonomous flat	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4.2. unauthorised housing	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4.3. precarious housing	HBS/ECHP	New
5.4.4. homeless family	HBS/ECHP	New
	<b>Possible Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>
5.5. Episodes of domestic violence	HBS/ECHP	New

5.6. Occasional / permanent separation from parents (age, reason, solution)	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>6. Consumption patterns and living conditions of the household:</b>		
<b>6.2. Self-production (market value)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>in member-States where it is missing</b>
<b>6.3. Self-consumption (market value)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>in member-States where it is missing</b>
<b>6.4. Imputed rent for owned housing (market value)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>in member-States where it is missing</b>
<b>6.5. Need to miss out on meals due to lack of money</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>6.5.1. Now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>6.5.2. During the last 5/10 years (no/seldom/often)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
6.6. Diet:		
6.6.1. cooked breakfast	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.6.2. no cooked meal	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.6.4. 3 meals a day for children	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7. Amenities - would like but cannot afford:	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.2. washing machine (clothing)	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
<b>6.7.3. fridge</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New for clarifying the reason</b>
6.7.4. deep freeze	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.6. radio	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.11. vacuum cleaner	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
<b>6.7.13. Adequate footwear</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
6.7.14. Cigarettes	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
6.7.15. Newspaper	HBS	New for clarifying the reason
<b>6.7.16. Toys for children</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New for clarifying the reason(*)</b>
<b>6.8. Second-hand clothing (due to need) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New for clarifying the reason (*)</b>
<b>6.9. Warm clothing (coat in winter,...) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>7. Housing and the neighbourhood:</b>		
7.1 General aspects:		
7.1.1. Absence of family members at the moment of enquiry (who/why)	HBS/ECHP	New
7.1.2. Domestic tasks support from the outside (yes: paid /not paid / no)	HBS/ECHP	New
7.1.2.1. Now	HBS/ECHP	New
7.1.2.2. 5 years ago	HBS	New

	Possible Source	Observations
7.5.3. Problems of crime / vandalism in the area (yes/no)		
7.5.3.2. 5 years ago	HBS	New
<b>7.6.1. Regular public transport facilities within 500 meter (yes/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>7.6.2. Facilities (schools, hospital, sports, chemist, bank, commerce,...) (yes/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
7.7. Would like children to live here when adults (yes/no)	ECHP	New
<b>9. Citizenship and participation in society</b>		
<b>9.1. Ability to communicate in official language of domicile (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>9.11. Contact with public services (easy/difficult)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>9.12. Exposure to risk (crime, threat)(often/seldom/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>10. Social representations:</b>		
<b>10.1. Own family situation (well-off /acceptable / bad)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.1.1. at present</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.1.2. in the past (10 years ago)</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
10.4. Conditions / things needed to improve one's life	ECHP	New
10.5. Initiatives taken (to be taken) in order to improve one's life if not satisfactory	ECHP	New
10.8. Worries due to:		
10.8.2. bad conditions of housing (housing stress)	LIVCDS	New
10.8.3. atmosphere of surrounding neighbourhood	LIVCDS	New
<b>10.8.5. possibility of youngsters becoming mixed up in gangs</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>10.8.6. possibility of being victimised due to racist feelings</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>10.8.7. possibility of becoming unemployed</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
10.8.8. possibility of not having a place to sleep	LIVCDS	New
<b>10.8.9. possibility of being abandoned by family and friends</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.8.10. health problems</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.8.11. isolation in old age</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
10.8.12. need of resorting to social services for assistance	LIVCDS	New
<b>10.8.13. fear of not being able to provide for own family</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>10.9. Feelings about neighbourhood (positive / negative)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
10.10. Transformations desired / to be avoided in the neighbourhood	LIVCDS	New
10.11. Where one really feels at home (room, house, neighbourhood, village, city, ..)	LIVCDS	New
<b>11. Health and welfare:</b>		
<b>11.1. Age of first delivery</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.3. Assessment of perceived health</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>11.5. Alcohol consumption (No/Moderate/Excessive)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>11.5.1. Now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.5.2. Since last 5 years</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.6. Drug addiction (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.6.1. Now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.6.2. Since last 5 years</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.9. In need of special cares (bedridden, etc.) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>11.10. Access to care (satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>

<b>b) EXCLUSION FROM WHAT ? (AREAS OF</b>		
---	--	--

EXCLUSION)	Possible Source	Observations
<b>13. SOCIAL LINKS</b>		
<b>13.1. Family:</b>		
<b>13.1.1.5. lone person, due to</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.1.5.1. single</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.1.5.2. breakdown (death, divorce, separation)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4. Family contacts:</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	
<b>13.1.4.1. No</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	
<b>13.1.4.1.1. since when?</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2. Yes:</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	
<b>13.1.4.2.1. with whom (husband/wife, mother, father, etc.)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.2. how often (daily/weekly/monthly/rare)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.3. type (personal, telephone, mail)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4. motivation:</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.1. no special reason</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.2. need</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.3. special occasions</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.1.4.2.4.4. leisure activities</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2. Close environment:</b>		
13.2.1. contact with neighbours	ECHP	
13.1.4.1. No	ECHP	
13.1.4.1.1. since when?	ECHP	New
13.2.2. contact with friends	ECHP	
13.2.2.1. No	ECHP	
13.2.2.1.1. since when?	ECHP	New
13.2.2.2. Yes	ECHP	
13.2.2.2.2. type (personal, telephone, mail)	ECHP	New
13.2.7. parties/gathering	HBS/ECHP	New
13.2.7.1. No	HBS/ECHP	New
13.2.7.1.1. 5 years ago (yes/no/ever)	HBS	New
13.2.7.2. Yes	HBS/ECHP	New
13.2.7.2.1. how often	HBS/ECHP	New
<b>13.2.9. inviting children's friends (yes/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>13.2.9.1. now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2.9.2. 5 years back</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2.10. giving birthday parties for children (yes/no)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>(*)</b>
<b>13.2.10.1. now</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>13.2.10.2. 5 years back</b>	<b>HBS</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>14. ECONOMIC</b>		
<b>14.1. Resource generation</b>		
14.1.1. <i>Material:</i>		
<b>14.1.1.3. access to credit from bank (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
14.1.2. <i>Cultural / occupational assets:</i>		
14.1.2.2. information (media, etc.)	ECHP	New
14.1.2.3. technology (prevent qualification obsolescence)	ECHP	New
<b>15. INSTITUTIONAL</b>	<b>Possible Source</b>	<b>Observations</b>



<b>15.1. Justice</b>		
<b>15.1.1. if not national</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.1.2. equality before the law (perception)</b> <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</i>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
15.1.3. access to justice (based on past experience) <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</i>	LIVCDS	New
<b>15.2. Education</b>		
<b>15.2.1. access (cost) (satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.2.2. possibility of success (perception)</b> <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory)</i>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3. Health</b>		
<b>15.3.1. access to health services when needed</b> <i>(satisfactory/unsatisfactory):</i>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.1. primary health care</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.2. hospital care</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.3. rehabilitation</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.3.1.4. pharmaceuticals</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.4. Social security</b>		
<b>15.4.1. access to social security services</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.4.1.1. in unemployment (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.4.1.2. in disability (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.4.1.3. in old age (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.4.1.4. in family responsibilities (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.4.1.5. in illness (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.5. Social welfare (care)</b>		
<b>15.5.1. access to social welfare when needed</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.5.1.1. children (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.5.1.2. elderly (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.5.1.3. disabled (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>15.5.1.4. chronically ill (bed-ridden) (Yes/No)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>16. TERRITORIAL</b>		
<b>16.1. Population</b>		
16.2.3. Perception of poverty	HBS	New
<b>16.4.6. Number of individual bankruptcies per 100 000 individuals (annual average)</b>	<b>IND</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>16.8. Access to health care</b>		
<b>16.8.6. Access to primary health-care centres (distance/waiting time/price)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>
<b>16.8.7. Access to maternal-and-child health care (distance/waiting time/price)</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>New</b>

	Possible Source	Observations
<b>17. SYMBOLIC REFERENCES</b>		
		<b>NEW</b>
<b>17.1. Identity</b>		
17.1.1. Self-concept / self-image:		
17.1.1.1. sense of personal value	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.2. self-image	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.3. self confidence	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.4. self acceptance	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.5. autonomy	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.1.1.6. responsibility	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
<b>17.1.2. social identity (perception of one's social place):</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.1.3. social isolation</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2. Significant "losses" along life</b>		
<b>17.2.1. persons</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2.2. situations</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2.3. personal attributes</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.2.4. global feeling</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.3. Cognitive and behavioural abilities.</b>		
17.3.1. Ability to:		
17.3.1.1. control impulses	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.2. cope with stress	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.3. cope with personal failure and frustration	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.4. anticipate consequences (problem solving)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.5. descentre (egocentrism)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.6. communicate (express feelings, wishes, opinions)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.7. socialise	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.8. make projects (short-, medium- and long-term)	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.1.9. adapt oneself to new situations	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
17.3.2. Anti-social and self-destructive behaviours	HBS/ECHP	see Annex
<b>17.4. Mental health</b>		
<b>17.4.1. depression</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.4.2. hostility</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.4.3. anxiety</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>
<b>17.4.4. somatization and psychiatric disorders</b>	<b>HBS/ECHP</b>	<b>see Annex</b>

(\*) On these indicators see the following studies:

CERFE (1993), *Etude sur les Indicateurs d'Exclusion Sociale*, Bruxelles, CCE.

MACK, Joanna; LANSLEY, Stewart (1985), *Poor Britain*, London, George Allen & Unwin.

LOUDHOF, J. & EVERAERS, P. (1996), *European Social Indicators - A review of the extended short Eurostat list of social indicators*, Statistics Netherlands.

PAUGAM, Serge (1994), *Apprehension de la Pauvreté sous l'angle de la disqualification sociale*, Luxembourg, CNRS/EUROSTAT.

TOWNSEND, Peter (1979), *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books.

WHELAN, B. (coord.) (1992), *A study of the non-monetary indicators of poverty in the European Community*, Dublin, ESRI.

VOGEL, Joachim et al (1988), *Inequality in Sweden - Trends and Current Situation*, Stockholm, Statistics Sweden.

## Annex 1 to Table 2

### 17. SYMBOLIC REFERENCES

#### 17.1. Identity

##### 17.1.1. SELF CONCEPT / SELF ESTEEM

1. I feel like I am no one
2. I feel I am as capable as others
3. People usually like me
4. I feel I am competent in what I do
5. When I have a good idea I try to realize it
6. When I have a problem I can't solve it without help
7. I like myself
8. I make too many mistakes
9. I don't deserve other people's affection
10. I feel I am different
11. I feel something is wrong on my head
12. I feel I am a failure
13. I'm intelligent
14. My family loves me
15. I feel I don't like my body
16. I'm not responsible for my situation
17. I feel enough energy to solve my difficulties
18. I need a lot of support

Always  
Often  
Some times  
Occasionally  
Never

### 17.1.2 SOCIAL IDENTITY

1. I feel that my place in society is	inside society /outside society
2.	winner/ loser (defeated)
3.	inferior/superior
4.	identical /different
5.	strong/weak
6.	desired /undesired
7.	protected/vulnerable
8.	valuable/unvaluable

### 17.2. Relevant losses (by death or otherwise) along life

1. In my life, I miss:

1.1. Persons:

a) Close family

Mother

Father

Brothers/Sisters (n)

Partners (n)

Sons/Daughters (n)

b) Other family

c) Friends

d) Neighbours

Yes (Very much, much)

No

1.2. Situations

a) House

b) Work

c) Profession

d) Native Land

e) Place of origin

f) Social background

g) Interests

1.3. Personal attributes

a) Health

b) Intellectual Capacities

c) Personality (no longer what I was)

d) Beauty

2. I lost in my life

everything

most important things and persons

many things

some things and persons

nothing special

### 17.3. COGNITIVE AND BEHAVIOURAL ABILITIES

### 17.3.1. Ability to

#### 17.3.1.1. Control impulses:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. I have a problem with controlling my impulses |   |
| 2. When I loose control                          | Always - often -<br>sometimes - never           |
| a) I am physically violent                       |   |
| b) I am verbally violent                         |   |
| c) I loose control over my emotions              |   |
| d) I brake things                                |   |
| e) I injure myself                               |   |
| f) I feel I deserve punishment                   |   |
| 3. When I have an idea                           | I act imediately - I think over it - I leave it |

#### 17.3.1.2. Cope with stress

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. I feel stressed    | Very often - Sometimes - Rarely - Never           |
| 2. When I am stressed | I loose control - I feel fragile - I cope with it |

#### 17.3.1.3. Cope with personal failure and frustration

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. When I fail          | I give up everything - I get discouraged - I try to find a solution                                |
| 2. When things go wrong | a) I give up<br>b) I feel discouraged<br>c) I don't get discouraged<br>d) I try to find a solution |

#### 17.3.1.4. Anticipate consequences (problem solving)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. When I must take a decision,<br>or do something, usually | a) I act without thinking<br>b) I think about everything but cannot take a decision<br>c) I decide after assessing the pros and cons<br>d) I get paralised |
|---|--|

#### 17.3.1.5. Descentrate

- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| 1. There are many good people very different from me               | Yes / No |
| 2. There is only one right solution for each problem               |          |
| 3. If someone harms me I tend to think that she/he is a bad person |          |
| 4. I think I can't like people different from me                   |          |

#### 17.3.1.6. Communicate

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <p>1. I express my feelings and my thoughts with</p> | <p>a) no one<br/>b) 1/2 persons<br/>c) some persons<br/>d) a lot of people</p>  | <p>Always /Often /<br/>Rarely / Never</p> |
| <p>2. When I express myself usually I feel</p>       | <p>a) anxious<br/>b) ridiculous<br/>c) afraid of critics<br/>d) comfortable</p> |   |

**17.3.1.7 Socialize**

- |  |                |
|--|----------------|
| <p>1. I don't like most people<br/>2. I don't know any one worthwhile<br/>3. I have no one<br/>4. We can't believe in anyone<br/>5. I never opened my heart with anybody<br/>6. I've never been loved<br/>7. I am alone<br/>8. I feel I've never loved anyone<br/>9. I feel I'm not understood<br/>10. I like to work together</p> | <p>Yes /No</p> |
|--|----------------|

**17.3.1.8. Cope with loneliness**

- |                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <p>1. I feel lonely</p>      | <p>Always - Often - Rarely -Never</p>   |
| <p>2. When I feel lonely</p> | <p>a) I get depressed<br/>b) I try to amuse myself<br/>c) I try to find someone<br/>d) There is someone in special I can always contact</p> |

**17.3.1.9. Make projects, to invest with**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>1. I have projects for</p> <p>a) myself<br/>b) family<br/>c) profession<br/>d) others</p> | <p>short-term/medium-term/long-term</p> |
| <p>2. When I have projects:</p> <p>a) I never accomplish them</p>                            |   |

- b) I recognise that they were unrealistic
  - c) I keep post poning it
  - d) They realize
  - e) They never realize
  - f) They usually fail because I'm not lucky
- Yes/No

**17.3.1.10. Adapt**

- 1. In face of new situations I feel
  - a) uncomfortable
  - b) stressed
  - c) confiding
  - d) desiring to run away
  - e) taking up the glove
  
- 2. In face of new situations I deal well Always - often - rarely - never

**17.3.2. ANTISOCIAL AND SELF DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOURS**

- 1. Problems with Law
  - 2. Murder
  - 3. Phisic Agressions
  - 4. Theft
  - 5. Prostitution
  - 6. Drugs Addiction
  - 7. Alcoolism
- Always    Often    Rarely    Never

**17.4. MENTAL HEALTH**

**17.4.1. Depression**

- 1. Crying
  - 2. Fatigue
  - 3. Irritability
  - 4. Sadness
  - 5. Insomnia
  - 6. Pessimism about myself
  - 7. Pessimism about others
  - 8. Pessimism about future
  - 9. Anguish
  - 10. Desmotivation
  - 11. Lack of pleasure
  - 12. Suicide Thought
  - 13. Suicide attempts
- Always /Often / Rarely /Never

**17.4.2. Hostility**

- |   |  |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Anger</li><li>2. Desire of revenge</li><li>3. Hate</li></ol> |  | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|--|---------------------------------|

#### **17.4.3. Anxiety**

- |   |  |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Heart-throbs</li><li>2. Fear without reason</li><li>3. Feeling distress</li><li>4. Inquietation</li><li>5. Lack of concentration</li></ol> |  | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|--|---------------------------------|

#### **17.4.4. Somatization and psychiatric disorders**

- |   |  |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Head aches</li><li>2. Earing strange things ( voices )</li><li>3. Seeing strange things</li><li>4. Tremblings</li><li>5. Fainting / Dizziness</li><li>6. Sexual problems</li></ol> |  | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|--|---------------------------------|



**Table 3. List of FIRST PRIORITY NEW indicators**

<b>a) CHARACTERISTICS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION (HOW IS IT IDENTIFIED? TRANSLATES INTO WHAT?)</b>	<b>Possible Source /Observations</b>
<b>1. Attributes of each member of household:</b>	
1.4. Age of first marriage	HBS/ECHP
1.6. Ethnic group	HBS/ECHP
1.8. When first left full time education ( <i>age, qualification and reason</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>2. Relation of each member of household with the economy, the labour market and the social security system</b>	
2.5.3. Independent worker (self-employed):	
2.5.3.1. by choice	HBS/ECHP
2.5.3.2. due to need	HBS/ECHP
2.5.3.3. since when	HBS/ECHP
<b>4. Economic situation of the household</b>	
4.7. Experience of large falls in earnings during last 5 years ( <i>Yes/No</i> ):	HBS
<b>5. Family of origin:</b>	
5.1. Educational level of father and mother	HBS/ECHP
5.2. Profession of father and mother	HBS/ECHP
5.5. Episodes of domestic violence	HBS/ECHP
<b>6. Consumption patterns and living conditions of the household:</b>	
6.2. Self-production ( <i>market value</i> )	HBS/ECHP - in member-States where it is missing
6.3. Self-consumption ( <i>market value</i> )	HBS/ECHP - in member-States where it is missing
6.4. Imputed rent for owned housing ( <i>market value</i> )	HBS/ECHP - in member-States where it is missing
6.5. Need to miss out on meals due to lack of money	
6.5.1. Now	HBS/ECHP
6.5.2. During the last 5/10 years ( <i>no/seldom/often</i> )	HBS
6.7.3. fridge	HBS - New for clarifying the reason
6.7.13. Adequate footwear	HBS/ECHP
6.7.16. Toys for children	HBS - New for clarifying the reason
6.8. Second-hand clothing (due to need) ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	HBS - New for clarifying the reason
6.9. Warm clothing (coat in winter,...) ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>7. Housing and the neighbourhood:</b>	
7.6. Accessibilities:	
7.6.1. Regular public transport facilities within 500 meter ( <i>yes/no</i> )	HBS/ECHP
7.6.2. Facilities (schools, hospital, sports, chemist, bank, commerce,...) ( <i>yes/no</i> )	HBS/ECHP

	Possible Source /Observations
<b>9. Citizenship and participation in society</b>	
9.1. Ability to communicate in official language of domicile ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	HBS/ECHP
9.8. Contact with public services ( <i>easy/difficult</i> )	HBS/ECHP
9.9. Exposure to risk (crime, threat)( <i>often/seldom/no</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>10. Social representations:</b>	
10.1. Own family situation ( <i>well-off /acceptable / bad</i> )	HBS/ECHP
10.1.1. at present	HBS/ECHP
10.1.2. in the past (10 years ago)	HBS
10.8. Worries due to:	
10.8.5. possibility of youngsters becoming mixed up in gangs	HBS/ECHP
10.8.6. possibility of being victimised due to racist feelings	HBS/ECHP
10.8.7. possibility of becoming unemployed	HBS/ECHP
10.8.9. possibility of being abandoned by family and friends	HBS/ECHP
10.8.10. health problems	HBS/ECHP
10.8.11. isolation in old age	HBS/ECHP
10.8.13. fear of not being able to provide for own family	HBS/ECHP
10.9. Feelings about neighbourhood ( <i>positive / negative</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>11. Health and welfare:</b>	
11.1. Age of first delivery	HBS/ECHP
11.3. Assessment of perceived health	HBS/ECHP
11.5. Alcohol consumption ( <i>No/Moderate/Excessive</i> )	HBS/ECHP
11.5.1. Now	HBS/ECHP
11.5.2. Since last 5 years	HBS
11.6. Drug addiction ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	HBS/ECHP
11.6.1. Now	HBS/ECHP
11.6.2. Since last 5 years	HBS
11.9. In need of special cares (bedridden, etc.) ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	HBS/ECHP
11.10. Access to care ( <i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory</i> )	HBS/ECHP

**b) EXCLUSION FROM WHAT ? (AREAS OF EXCLUSION)**

	Possible Source / Observations
<b>13. SOCIAL LINKS</b>	
<b>13.1. Family:</b>	
13.1.1. Household composition ( <i>now/ 5 years ago</i> )	
13.1.1.5. lone person, due to	HBS/ECHP
13.1.1.5.1. single	HBS/ECHP
13.1.1.5.2. breakdown (death, divorce, separation)	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4. Family contacts:	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.1. No	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.1.1. since when?	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2. Yes:	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.1. with whom (husband/wife, mother, father, etc.)	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.2. how often (daily/weekly/monthly/rare)	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.3. type (personal, telephone, mail)	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.4. motivation:	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.4.1. no special reason	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.4.2. need	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.4.3. special occasions	HBS/ECHP
13.1.4.2.4.4. leisure activities	HBS/ECHP
<b>13.2. Close environment:</b>	
13.2.9. inviting children's friends ( <i>yes/no</i> )	HBS/ECHP
13.2.9.1. now	HBS/ECHP
13.2.9.2. 5 years back	HBS
13.2.10. giving birthday parties for children ( <i>yes/no</i> )	HBS/ECHP
13.2.10.1. now	HBS/ECHP
13.2.10.2. 5 years back	HBS
<b>14. ECONOMIC</b>	
<b>14.1. Resource generation</b>	
<b>14.1.1. Material:</b>	
14.1.1.3. access to credit from bank ( <i>Yes/No</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>14.1.2. Cultural / occupational assets:</b>	
14.1.2.3. technology (prevent qualification obsolescence)	HBS/ECHP
<b>15. INSTITUTIONAL</b>	
<b>15.1. Justice</b>	
15.1.1. if not national	HBS/ECHP
15.1.2. equality before the law (perception) ( <i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>15.2. Education</b>	
15.2.1. access (cost) ( <i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory</i> )	HBS/ECHP
15.2.2. possibility of success (perception) ( <i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory</i> )	HBS/ECHP

	Possible Source / Observations
<b>15.3. Health</b>	
15.3.1. access to health services when needed ( <i>satisfactory/unsatisfactory</i> ):	HBS/ECHP
15.3.1.1. primary health care	HBS/ECHP
15.3.1.2. hospital care	HBS/ECHP
15.3.1.3. rehabilitation	HBS/ECHP
15.3.1.4. pharmaceuticals	HBS/ECHP
<b>15.4. Social security</b>	
15.4.1. access to social security services	HBS/ECHP
15.4.1.1. in unemployment (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.4.1.2. in disability (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.4.1.3. in old age (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.4.1.4. in family responsibilities (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.4.1.5. in illness (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
<b>15.5. Social welfare (care)</b>	
15.5.1. access to social welfare when needed	HBS/ECHP
15.5.1.1. children (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.5.1.2. elderly (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.5.1.3. disabled (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
15.5.1.4. chronically ill (bed-ridden) (Yes/No)	HBS/ECHP
<b>16. TERRITORIAL</b>	
<b>16.4. Poverty</b>	
16.4.6. Number of individual bankruptcies per 100 000 individuals ( <i>annual average</i> )	IND
<b>16.8. Access to health care</b>	
16.8.6. Access to primary health-care centres ( <i>distance/waiting time/price</i> )	HBS/ECHP
16.8.7. Access to maternal-and-child health care ( <i>distance/waiting time/price</i> )	HBS/ECHP
<b>17. SYMBOLIC REFERENCES</b>	NEW
<b>17.1. Identity</b>	
17.1.2. social identity (perception of one's social place):	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.1.3. social isolation	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
<b>17.2. Significant "losses" along life</b>	
17.2.1. persons	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.2.2. situations	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.2.3. personal attributes	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.2.4. global feeling	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
<b>17.4. Mental health</b>	
17.4.1. depression	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.4.2. hostility	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.4.3. anxiety	HBS/ECHP - see Annex
17.4.4. somatization and psychiatric disorders	HBS/ECHP - see Annex

**Annex 1 to Table 3**

**17. SYMBOLIC REFERENCES**

**17.1. Identity**

17.1.2 SOCIAL IDENTITY

1. I feel that my place in society is	inside society /outside society
2.	winner/ loser (defeated)
3.	inferior/superior
4.	identical /different
5.	strong/weak
6.	desired /undesired
7.	protected/vulnerable
8.	valuable/unvaluable

**17.2. Significant losses (by death or otherwise) along life**

1. In my life, I miss:

1.1. Persons:

a) Close family

Mother

Father

Brothers/Sisters (n)

Partners (n)

Sons/Daughters (n)

b) Other family

c) Friends

d) Neighbours

Yes (Very much, much)

No

1.2. Situations

a) House

b) Work

c) Profession

d) Native Land

e) Place of origin

f) Social background

g) Interests

1.3. Personal attributes

a) Health

b) Intellectual Capacities

c) Personality (no longer what I was)

d) Beauty

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| 2. I lost in my life | everything<br>most important things and persons<br>many things<br>some things and persons<br>nothing special |
|----------------------|--|

## 17.4. MENTAL HEALTH

### 17.4.1. Depression

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. Crying<br>2. Fatigue<br>3. Irritability<br>4. Sadness<br>5. Insomnia<br>6. Pessimism about myself<br>7. Pessimism about others<br>8. Pessimism about future<br>9. Anguish<br>10. Desmotivation<br>11. Lack of pleasure<br>12. Suicide Thought<br>13. Suicide attempts | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|--|---------------------------------|

### 17.4.2. Hostility

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Anger<br>2. Desire of revenge<br>3. Hate | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|---------------------------------|

### 17.4.3. Anxiety

- |   |                                 |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Heart-throbs<br>2. Fear without reason<br>3. Feeling distress<br>4. Inquietation<br>5. Lack of concentration | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|---|---------------------------------|

### 17.4.4. Somatization and psychiatric disorders

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. Head aches<br>2. Earing strange things ( voices )<br>3. Seeing strange things<br>4. Tremblings<br>5. Fainting / Dizziness<br>6. Sexual problems | Always / Often / Rarely / Never |
|--|---------------------------------|

## REFERENCES:

- Balandier, Georges (undated), "Le Lien Social en Question" in *Actes du XIIIe Colloque de l'AISLF*, Tome I, pp.19-25.
- BREBANT, Brigitte (1984), *La pauvreté, un destin?*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- BRUTO DA COSTA, Alfredo (1995), "Les politiques sociales: des exclusions à l'intégration", *Service Social dans le Monde*, février.
- BRUTO DA COSTA, Alfredo (coord.) (1994), *Définitions de la Pauvreté, de l'Exclusion et de l'Intégration*, Brussels, CCE/Poverty 3.
- CALLAN, Tim (1993), "Resources, deprivation and the measurement of poverty", *Journal of Social Policy*, 22.
- CANNAT, Noel (1990), *Le pouvoir des exclus: pour un nouvel ordre culturel mondial*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- CANTILLON et al.(1994), "Indicateurs sociaux 1985-1992", *Revue Belge de Sécurité Sociale*, n° 2, Juin.
- CARTER, Genevieve et al (1972), *Social Indicators: two perspectives*, Univ. of Southern California/Regional Research Institute in Social Welfare.
- CASTEL, Robert (1991), "De l'indigence à l'exclusion: la désaffiliation" in Donzelot, J. (dir.) *Face à l'exclusion: le modèle français*, Paris, Editions Esprit.
- CCE (1991), *Rapport Final du Second Programme Européen de Lutte contre la Pauvreté 1985-1989*, Brussels, CCE
- CERFE (1993), *Etude sur les Indicateurs d'Exclusion Sociale*, Bruxelles, CCE.
- DAVIDSON, Joan et al (1992), *No time to waste: poverty and the global environment*, Oxford, Oxford Press.
- DHOQUOIS, Régine (1989), *Appartenance et Exclusion*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- DICKES, Paul (1989), *Pauvreté et Conditions d'Existence*, Walferdange, CEPPPSE.
- DUBET, F; LAPEYRONNIE, D. (1992), *Les Quartiers d'Exil*, Paris, Ed. du Seuil.
- HAGENAARS, Aldi et al. (1995), *Statistiques relatives à la Pauvreté à la fin des années 80: recherche s'appuyant sur des microdonnées*, Luxembourg, Université Erasmus/EUROSTAT.
- MARTIN, G.; JOBERT, B. (1971), *Etude Préliminaire à une intégration des indicateurs sociaux dans les modèles de changement social*, Grenoble, IREP/USSG.
- MERRIEN, François-Xavier (1994), *Face à la pauvreté*, Paris, Les Editions de l'Atelier.
- MILANO, Serge (1982), *La pauvreté en France*, Paris, Le Sycomore.
- NASSE, Philippe et al. (1992), *Exclus et exclusions - connaître les populations, comprendre les processus*, Paris, Commissariat Général du Plan.
- LOUDHOFF, J. & EVERAERS, P. (1996), *European Social Indicators - A review of the extended short Eurostat list of social indicators*, Statistics Netherlands.
- PAUGAM, Serge (1991), *La disqualification Sociale*, Paris, PUF.
- PAUGAM, Serge (1993), *La disqualification sociale: essai sur la nouvelle pauvreté*, Paris, PUF.
- PAUGAM, Serge (1994), *Apprehension de la Pauvreté sous l'angle de la disqualification sociale*, Luxembourg, CNRS/EUROSTAT.
- PEREIRINHA, José (1995), *Pobreza e Exclusão Social: fronteiras conceptuais, relevância para a política social e implicações na sua medida*, Lisboa, ISEG.
- PEREIRINHA, José (1996), *Welfare States and patterns of anti-poverty regimes: elements for a comparative analysis with focus on southern european countries. The specific case of Portugal*, Lisboa, ISEG.

- PEREIRINHA, José (coord.) (1992), *European Community Observatory on National Policies to Combat Social Exclusion - Portugal*, Brussels, CEC.
- RAO, M. et al (1978), *Indicators of Human and Social Development - Report on the State of the Art*, Tokio, The UN University.
- ROBBINS, Diana (1994), *Observatory on national policies to combat social exclusion - third annual report*, Lille, CEC.
- RODGERS, Gerry et al (1994), *Combattre l'Exclusion Sociale*, Genève, Institut International d'Etudes Sociales / PNUD.
- ROOM, G. (coord.) (1992), *Observatoire des Politiques nationales de lutte contre l'exclusion sociale*, Bruxelles, CCE.
- ROSANVALLON, Pierre (1995), *La nouvelle question sociale: repenser l'Etat-Providence*, Paris, Ed. du Seuil
- SILVER, Hillary (1994), "Exclusion sociale et solidarité sociale: trois paradigmes", *Revue Internationale du Travail*, Juin.
- TOWNSEND, Peter (1993), *The International Analysis of Poverty*, Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- VOS, Klas e ZAIDIR, Ashgar (1995), *Trend analysis of poverty in the European Union*, Luxembourg, Université Erasmus/EUROSTAT
- WALSH, J. et al. (1993), *Combating Exclusion in Ireland*, Dublin, The European Community Programme to Foster the Social and Economic Integration of the least privileged groups.
- WEMANS, Luis et al. (1993), *Analyse des Impacts de la Politique Macro-économique sur l'Exclusion Sociale*, Lisboa, CESIS\CCE.
- WHELAN, B. (coord.) (1992), *A study of the non-monetary indicators of poverty in the European Community*, Dublin, ESRI.
- XIBERRAS, Martine (1993), *Les Théories de L'Exclusion*, Méridiens Klincksieck, Paris.
- YEPEZ DEL CASTILLO, Isabel (1994), "Approche comparative de l'exclusion sociale: les expériences française et belge", *Revue Internationale du Travail*, juin.



## ANNEX 3

### EUROSTAT 'S RESEARCH PROJECT

#### *“NON-MONETARY INDICATORS OF POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION”*

#### **Request for National cooperation through brief questionnaire**

##### 1. The Project

Until recent years, the concept of poverty was broadly used to define the problems affecting underprivileged persons, particular groups of persons or even spatial areas or environments. The monetary dimension of these problems has been particularly emphasised in the many conceptual and empirical approaches aimed at measuring and describing poverty.

Although Eurostat's statistical research on Poverty has been reflecting this concern on the monetary dimension of poverty, a significant effort has been made in order to broaden the scope of the research projects so as to reflect the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon.

More recently, the need for three major perspective **changes** - to be understood in the sense of complementarity - has been recognised and reinforced within Eurostat:

- from the monetary dimension to the multidimensional disadvantage approach;
- from static to dynamic analyses;
- from the individual/household unit to the spatial unit.

The present project - “Non-Monetary Indicators of Poverty and Social Exclusion” - was launched in this context of Eurostat's attempt to widen and deepen the research work on non-monetary aspects of poverty and social exclusion.

The Project's main objectives are “to identify relevant indicators to describe poverty and social exclusion; to conceptualise indicators, considering their relationship to social indicators in general; to specify them so that they can be operationalised; to consider data availability and identify gaps, suggesting how these could be filled”.

##### 2. The role of the NSI's representatives in the project

We expect the NSI's to play an important role along the present project in what we can call a “two-way cooperation line”. The enclosed questionnaire - its objectives are explained below - is the first step of this process. The results of this enquiry as well as the presentation of the conceptual frame adopted by the present project will be presented at a European seminar to be held next September, for which we will count on your participation. Later along the research process - when the first list of indicators is completed - it will be important for us to understand whether those indicators reflect correctly the different situations of poverty and social exclusion that exist in your respective countries. Our effort to have your collaboration all along the research work also has another precise aim: we hope that the results of this study will give the NSI's actual perspectives on the future use of this kind of indicators in their work programme.

##### 3. The Enquiry

The present enquiry - addressed to experts in all EU Member-States - aims at gathering basic information necessary to identify the main types of social exclusion that exist in the European Union and, subsequently, to build up a list of indicators that reflect the whole range of situations covered. The criterion used in this classification - the origins - highlights the existence of certain determinant factors (economic, social, cultural, etc.) underlying the process that leads to the exclusion of individuals, groups or entire spaces. It should be stressed that different origins/factors sometimes (often) lead to similar situations of deprivation and exclusion. Hence the overlapping of some of the mentioned types of exclusion.

#### 4. Your contribution

Considering the present classification of social exclusion (as shown below) it is our objective to know:

- a) which types of social exclusion occur in your country;
- b) whether there are other kinds of exclusion in your country that do not belong to any of the types mentioned, and, if so, identify them;
- c) other Observations considered important.

## TYPES OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION

PLEASE ANSWER YES OR NO, AND USE THE SPACE BELOW TO MAKE OTHER OBSERVATIONS

### I. DO THESE TYPES OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION OCCUR IN YOUR COUNTRY?

#### 1. Economic (poverty)

*Defined basically as a situation of multiple deprivation due to lack of resources.*

YES        NO   

---



---



---

#### 2. Social (elderly, chronically ill, disabled, homeless individuals, etc.)

*Defined as a situation of deprivation, mainly characterised by isolation, loneliness, loose family ties, loss of personal autonomy and of self-sufficiency. It may or not be due to lack of resources.*

YES        NO   

---



---



---

#### 3. Cultural (cultural and ethnic minorities, former inmates)

*This is a type of social exclusion that may or not be associated to poverty, though most frequently it is. The exclusion here is mainly social, and the causes are mainly cultural.*

YES        NO   

---



---



---

**4. Psychological (“shame-faced poverty”)**

*A form of poverty (deprivation due to lack of resources), that is not fully assumed by the poor. This leads to self exclusion due to shame. These poor are sometimes reluctant to recognise their own poverty.*

YES  NO

---



---



---

**5. Pathological (mentally ill, etc.)**

*Caused basically by mental or psychological problems. Often leads to homelessness.*

YES  NO

---



---



---

**6. “Deviant” behaviour (drug addicted, alcoholics)**

*Forms of addiction, often leading to deprivation and, eventually, to homelessness. May or not be due to lack of resources.*

YES  NO

---



---



---

**7. Spatial (urban quarters - shanty towns and historical centres - and under-developed rural areas)**

*Types of exclusion in which the situation of persons and groups is closely linked to the overall conditions of the local space.*

YES

NO

---

---

---

**II. ARE THERE OTHER KINDS OF EXCLUSION IN YOUR COUNTRY THAT DO NOT BELONG TO ANY OF THE TYPES MENTIONED ?****8. If any (please specify)**

---

---

---

PLEASE NOTE  
REPLY UNTIL THE END OF APRIL