



NATIONAL ETHNIC DISABILITY ALLIANCE

Cultural and Linguistic Inclusion?

Literature Review on Social Inclusion, Cohesion
and Culture



Carrie Hayter

February 2009

Cultural and Linguistic Inclusion? Literature Review on Social Inclusion, Cohesion,
and Culture

February 2009

This project was commissioned by National Ethnic Disability Alliance (NEDA)

Literature Review: Carrie Hayter
Report Preparation: Carrie Hayter
Editing, Layout and Design: NEDA

Carrie Hayter Consulting
PO Box 1137
Leichhardt, NSW 2040
PH (02) 9560 368
M : 0415 348 057
E: carrieh@iprimus.com.au

Disclaimer

This report presents the results of work carried out from July to November 2008
The information presented was the best available to the knowledge of the consultant at
the time of the evaluation. Every effort has been made to present the diverse range of
perspectives in the literature.

National Ethnic Disability Alliance
PO Box 9381
Harris Park NSW 2150
Ph: 02 9687 8933
Fax: 02 9635 5355

Foreword

In July 2008, Carrie Hayter Consulting was contracted by the National Ethnic Disability Alliance to undertake a literature review of public policy social cohesion and wellbeing indicators from Australia, the United Kingdom with a focus on any available research or policy relating to culturally and linguistically diverse people.

The literature review aimed to:

1. Describe and scope the social inclusion indicators developed from the United Kingdom;
2. Describe and scope potential social inclusion indicators in Australia through reviewing the Australian Bureau of Statistics General Social Survey 2006 and the South Australian Social Inclusion Strategy; and
3. Consider how the principles of cultural competence could guide the development of social cohesion indicators to understand the needs and issues of culturally and linguistically diverse communities in Australia; and
4. Identify areas for potential indicators of social cohesion and well being for people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

NEDA acknowledges the support of the Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs in making this report possible.

Contents

	Page
Acronyms	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1 ABOUT NEDA	9
2 DEFINITIONS OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION	10
2.1 What is Social Exclusion?	10
2.2 What is Social Inclusion?	11
2.3 Social Inclusion and Social Cohesion	12
2.4 Culture and Social Inclusion	13
2.5 Cultural Competence	16
2.6 Key Issues	18
3 SOCIAL INCLUSION AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION – INDICATORS AND MEASUREMENT	
3.1 United Kingdom	19
3.2 Australia	23
3.3 South Australia	27
4 CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION	29
4.1 Key Issues and Summary	32
5 CONCLUSION	33
APPENDIX A SOCIAL EXCLUSION INDICATORS	34
APPENDIX B PROJECTS BEING UNDERTAKEN BY THE JOSEPH ROWNTREE FOUNDATION - IMMIGRATION AND INCLUSION PROGRAM	37
APPENDIX C SUMMARY OF CRITERIA USED FOR SELECTING SOCIAL INDICATORS (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH)	39
APPENDIX D GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY MEASURES (2006)	42
APPENDIX E BIBLIOGRAPHY	49

Acronyms

NEDA	National Ethnic Disability Alliance
NESB	Non English Speaking Background
CALD	Culturally and Linguistically Diverse
EU	European Union
SII	Social Inclusion Initiative (South Australia)
UK	United Kingdom

Executive Summary

The Australian Government commitment to building a social inclusion framework for government policies and directions has the potential to provide a positive framework for addressing disadvantage and working toward cohesion and participation for all members of our society, including the 1 million people from non English Speaking Backgrounds with disability in Australia.

However a key concern is ensuring that the connection between cultural and linguistic inclusion is highlighted within the current social inclusion agenda. Taking account of the interaction of culture, language and disability can provide a different dimension to existing elements within the current Australian Government social inclusion agenda.

This research paper explores the definitions and measures of social exclusion, social inclusion and social cohesion through an analysis of literature and indicators from Australia and the United Kingdom. It also explores how measures of cultural diversity can be built into understanding and measuring social inclusion in Australia.

Defining Social Inclusion, Exclusion and Cohesion

The factors that influence whether people and communities are socially included or excluded are multi-faceted and multi-dimensional. There is also a relationship between social inclusion and the development of social capital which focuses on the building of networks, relationships and trust.

Significant conceptual thinking and development work has been undertaken – in particular in the United Kingdom – in defining social exclusion and measuring the effect of changes in government policy and programs on social exclusion. Social exclusion can affect people's social, economic, political and cultural rights.

Recently in Australia, state and territory and federal governments have focused on social inclusion rather than social exclusion, with a focus on how connecting individuals to employment, support and opportunities might enable increased social participation.

Social Inclusion and Culture

Social inclusion should consider how people are included across social, economic, political and cultural spheres. Research in the United Kingdom has identified that social capital may be formed differently in culturally and linguistically diverse communities. Further, outcomes are also prominently

affected by government policy. This means that the concept of social inclusion may vary significantly between different communities and can be influenced by experiences of migration, and economic, social, political and cultural factors. The lessons and experience from the United Kingdom can inform and assist with the development of indicators of social inclusion in Australia, particularly in understanding cultural diversity and social inclusion.

There appears to be a significant gap in current policy debates on social inclusion in Australia in terms of building an understanding of how cultural and linguistic diversity can effect social inclusion or social exclusion. The impact of a person's experience of migration can have a significant impact on whether particular communities and individuals feel socially included or excluded. The impact of government policy, particularly immigration and refugee policy, may also effect whether people from specific cultural and linguistically diverse communities feel included or excluded. The research work undertaken through the Scanlon Foundation clearly highlighted that one in two people from Non English Speaking Backgrounds are likely to be subject to discrimination during their lifetime (Markus, & Dharmalingam, 2007).

The diversity of the Australian population provides opportunities to research and consider how cultural and linguistic diversity influences social inclusion. Cultural and linguistic diversity, combined with a person or communities' experience of migration and their migration history can significantly affect whether people describe themselves as socially included or excluded. There can also be significant variation both between and across communities at the local, state and national level.

Indicators of Inclusion

Research from the United Kingdom has highlighted the need to use reliable data sources to measure social exclusion and social inclusion. Measures or indicators of social cohesion must be derived from a robust data source, and include indicators of cultural and linguistic diversity.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics General Social Services Survey is an immensely rich source of data on the Australian population, and includes measures of social capital. Some of these measures of social capital and participation in voluntary associations could be used in conjunction with cultural and linguistic diversity (for example, language spoken at home, country of birth, visa status). However, it is also important to include both local and regional data as well as state and national data as there may be significant variation between and across communities.

This literature review is designed to scope and consider further issues that may need to be considered in the development of social indicators and their measurement that encompass and embrace cultural, linguistic and social diversity. Further conceptualization and research work is necessary for developing indicators and measures of inclusion.

There is an opportunity in Australia to develop a sophisticated understanding of social inclusion, which incorporates a robust reflection upon cultural, linguistic and faith factors. Taking cultural difference seriously within the national social inclusion agenda would go some way towards promoting a rich, inclusive and cosmopolitan Australian society.

1 About NEDA

The National Ethnic Disability Alliance (NEDA) is the national peak organisation representing the rights and interests of people from non-English speaking background (NESB) with disability, their families and carers throughout Australia.

NEDA is funded by the Commonwealth Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) to provide policy advice to the Australian Government and other agencies on national issues affecting people from NESB with disability, their families and carers.

NEDA actively promotes the equal participation of people from NESB with disability in all aspects of Australian society. It manages a range of projects relating to NESB and disability communities and works closely with its state and territory members to ensure that its policy advice reflects the lived experiences of people from NESB with disability. In states and territories where no NESB-disability advocacy agency exists NEDA undertakes development work to establish a structure that can support people from NESB with disability, their families and carers.

NEDA estimates that one in every four people with disability is a person of either first or second generation NESB, representing approximately 1 million people across Australia.

2 Definitions of Social Exclusion and Social Inclusion

2.1 What is Social Exclusion?

The definition of social exclusion is subject to significant debate. The concepts of social inclusion and social exclusion are closely related and it is difficult to discuss one without considering the other (Hayes, Gray & Edwards, 2008). We might view the two concepts on a continuum with social exclusion at one end and social inclusion at the other, with a range of points and perspectives in between.

Social exclusion has been described as a process that leads to a breakdown of the relationship between society and the individual (Barnes, 2005). The product of social exclusion emphasizes the non-realization of civil, political and social rights, and the failure of the various social systems that underpin modern life (Berghman, 1995). Social exclusion is therefore heavily influenced by the political, economic and social environment.

Atkinson (2008:13) argues there are three major areas that need to be discussed when considering social exclusion which include:

- social exclusion is relative to the norms and expectations of society at a particular point in time (referred to as relativity);
- social exclusion is caused by an act of some individual, group or institution. A person may exclude themselves by choice or they may be excluded by the decisions of other people, organisations or institutions (referred to as agency); and
- social exclusion is not simply a result of current circumstances but also requires that the person's future prospects are limited.

Social exclusion can therefore be a byproduct of a wide range of influences. There has been a focus on poverty as one of the contributors to social exclusion. Poverty can be considered a part of social exclusion, but the causes of social exclusion are often much broader than poverty (Room 1998, cited in Barnes, 2005:13). Social exclusion refers to

“the multi-dimensional and dynamic process of being shut out, fully or partial, from the economic, social and cultural systems that determine the social integration of a person in society” (Room 1998, cited in Barnes, 2005:13).

Social exclusion can therefore cover many dimensions including economic, social, cultural and political arenas. It is also multi-layered in that it can affect

individuals, groups and communities which can vary over time and between different geographic locations.

2.2 *What is Social Inclusion?*

The concept of social inclusion can include providing opportunities for people to maximise their social, political, cultural and economic rights. Katz (2008) argues that social inclusion can be used as:

- A political philosophy – way of thinking about what kind of society government should be creating;
- A way of organising government around social issues; and
- A mechanism to address particular social issues.

A by-product of social inclusion is to build relationships, networks and connections between individuals and particular communities within society.

These processes could also be described as building social capital through community cohesion and building community strength. In this sense social inclusion is closely linked to social capital as concepts. Putnam (1996:56) argues that social capital is the crucial element in social organisation which is defined as the ‘features of social life – networks, norms and trust – that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives’. Putnam describes how social groups invest in and share social capital within and between themselves through organisational processes including bonding, bridging and linking (Putnam, 1993).

A recent study by the Benevolent Society in urban, fringe and rural and regional areas of NSW highlights that people’s perceptions of social inclusion are strongly linked to “family, friendship and community participation” (Healy et al, 2007:8) Social inclusion is about belonging. Participants in the research study said they felt included when they:

- Had regular contact with friends living nearby;
- Were members of local organisations, cultural, sporting or civic Groups;
- Undertook volunteer work in their community;
- Either exchanged goods and services with friends and other community members or participated in bartering within their community; and
- Believed there were lots of things to do in their community (Healy et al, 2007:8)

2.3 Social Inclusion and Social Cohesion

Perhaps an outcome of social inclusion is improving the level of social cohesion within a local community or at the state or national level. Maxwell 1996 (cited in Markus, & Dharmalingam, 2007:13) states that social inclusion:

Involves building shared values and communities of interpretation, reducing disparities in wealth and income, and generally enabling people to have a sense that they are engaged in a common enterprise, facing shared challenges and that they are members of the same community

Research on the definitions of social cohesion has identified a range of dimensions which include:

1. Belonging;
2. Inclusion;
3. Participation;
4. Recognition;
5. Legitimacy; and
6. Equality (Jenson, 1998:15 & Bernard, 1999)

Bernard (1999) has expanded this typology to distinguish the formal and substantial aspects of social cohesion in three spheres of human activity including: economic, political and socio-cultural. Work undertaken by Forrest and Kearns (2001:212) which built on Bernard's work (1999) provides a description of the key domains of social cohesion described in Table 1.

Table 1 – Key Domains of Social Cohesion

Common values and a civic culture	Common aims and objectives, moral principles and codes of behaviour, support for political institutions and participation in politics
Social order and social control	Absence of general conflict and threats to the existing order, absence of incivility; effective informal social control tolerance; respect for difference, intergroup co-operation
Social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities	Harmonious economic and social development and common standards; redistribution of public finances and of opportunities; equal access to services and welfare benefits; ready acknowledgement of social obligations and willingness to assist others
Social networks and social capital	High degree of social interaction within communities and families; civic engagement and associational activity; easy resolution of collective action problems

Place attachment and identity	Strong attachment of place and intertwining of personal and place identity
-------------------------------	--

Work undertaken in the UK has attempted to define social cohesion in the context of culture and linguistic diversity, describing “cohesion based on identifiable communities defined by faith or ethnicity, rather than social class or economic status” (Markus, & Dharmalingam, 2007:23). In this guise, the key elements of social cohesion therefore include:

- Shared vision – social cohesion requires values, mutual respect and common aspirations or identity shared by their members;
- A property of a group or a community – social cohesion tends to describe a well functioning core group or community in which there are shared goals and responsibilities and a readiness to co-operate with the other members;
- A process - social cohesion is generally viewed not simply as an outcome but as a continuous and seemingly never ending process of achieving social harmony (Markus, & Dharmalingam, 2007:25)

The differences in definition of social cohesion concern the identification of factors that seek to enhance (and erode) the process of communal harmony, and the relative weight to be attached to the operation of the specific factors. Markus & Dharmalingam (2007:25) argue that the following economic, political and socio-cultural factors may be important including:

- **Economic** – levels of unemployment and poverty, income distribution, population mobility, health, life satisfaction and sense of security and government responsiveness to issues of poverty and disadvantage;
- **Political** – levels of political participation and social involvement, including the extent of voluntarism, the development of social capital – understood in terms of networks, norms and social trust that can facilitate co-ordination and co-operation for mutual benefit; and
- **Socio –cultural** – levels of consensus and divergence (homogeneity and heterogeneity) on issues of local and national significance.

2.4 *Culture and Social Inclusion*

The role of culture and cultural diversity is a critical factor in whether people are socially included or excluded. Research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in the UK explored the relationship between immigration, social capital and social inclusion (Zetter et al, 2006). They highlight that in some communities

“... Notions of cohesion and consensualism within and between groups, dominant features of Putnam’s conception of social capital, are not universally present among migrant communities. Conflict and consensus may coexist within groups and between ethnic and religious minority groups and dominant social groups” (Zetter et al, 2006: 22)

A number of issues in the development of social capital among immigrant groups were highlighted including:

- Combating and adjusting to social exclusion, for example, the difficulties in accessing welfare entitlements;
- the need to celebrate and reinforce different cultural identities;
- the need to mediate a response to social needs, but where the notions of ethnicity and being immigrants may be less evident than the needs themselves;
- the need to organise to participate in wider social activities;
- Establishing an identity and presence in order to define a negotiating position as opposed to other groups or institutions and agencies that may control public resources;
- Expressing solidarity against threats to cultural norms (Zetter et al, 2006: 14)

The study identified there are different ways in which people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities build networks and relationships and this can be heavily influenced by the design of government policy. Government policy can therefore heavily influence both social exclusion and social inclusion. They argue that:

“In the present climate of immigration policy, there are good reasons why minorities may wish to remain invisible to outsiders and resist forming themselves into explicit organisational structures. This context may generate social capital as the currency of exclusion and a resource that reinforces marginality not cohesion. In these circumstances, bonding capital may constitute an end state, rather than a stage in a dynamic process of bridging and linking out to other communities and institutions” (Zetter et al, 2006: 18),

The structure and the origins of culturally and linguistically diverse communities in Britain via their immigration status may also critically effect how they perceive and value cohesion (Zetter et al, 2006: 19). Issues raised by immigrant groups in this study highlighted the need for funding of specific organisations in communities. There also needs to be recognition that

migrant groups form their identities in diverse and unique ways and the formation of social capital is “contextual and multi-leveled” (Zetter et al, 2006: 19)

Zetter et al (2006: 20) conclude by stating that:

“.. Immigration is set to become an increasingly significant driver of social capital formation in the context of: the relentless process of restrictionism, the proliferation of categories of immigrant; and the growing numbers of economic immigrants from diverse ethnicities and nationalities competing for entry to a country of managed migration. In these circumstances we can envisage the social capital of exclusion becoming a dominant force not a cohesive commodity. Against this it serves to emphasise how the competing national policy agendas may produce contradictory outcomes...”

“The tension between a somewhat monolithic or unilinear national discourse and diverse local practice ... confirms the crucial need to develop a much more nuanced vocabulary of social cohesion as a policy instruments that can accommodate different constituencies and localities” (Zetter et al, 2006:23)

The importance of understanding how social capital is created in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CALD) communities is therefore critical, particularly taking Putnam’s work further to understand the how social capital is developed and created. Putnam’s conception of social capital has been criticised for the tendency “towards the consensualism of voluntary association and thus the idealisation of community solidarity” (Zetter et al 2006: 10).

Putnam’s research involved voluntary associations that incorporate residents and citizens who are already ‘integrated’ into a wider society policy and context. The relevance of these findings for migrant and CALD communities have therefore been questioned because many communities are not integrated into existing networks.

In particular, Putnam’s work has been criticised for ignoring the complexities of the development of social capital with CALD communities. Studies in the UK, for example, have highlighted the conflictual environment affecting refugee associations and communities can negatively impact of social cohesion (Griffiths et al, 2005, Griffiths, 2006).

Putnam is not alone in drawing a link between community heterogeneity and reduced social capital: other research in the United States has also highlighted the relationship between community attributes and the level of civic engagement with some research highlighting that “more homogenous communities foster greater levels of social capital production” (Costa & Kahn, 2002:2). The research raises a number of questions as highlighted by Costa and Kahn (2002):

“ This paper has documented an empirical regularity – civic engagement is lower in more - heterogeneous communities...Ideally, we would want to study how civic engagement changes as we move people into different types of communities. But what is an individual’s community? Because of data limitations, researchers are using the metropolitan area as the measure of community, not the nearest neighbours or co-workers... Future research which draws on the insights of many disciplines may reveal the mechanisms through which heterogeneity lowers social capital” (Costa & Kahn, 2002:11-10).

Harris & Williams (2003) argue there is a connection between social inclusion and national identity and government policy and highlight that “evolving ideas about national identity have strongly influenced official counts of social inclusion, because these ideas set out the attributes the person must have in order to be considered a true citizen” (Harris and Williams, 2003: 206).

Harris & Williams (2003) argue that policy developments in Australia in both welfare reform and migration and refugee policy reflect fears about the safety and wellbeing of Australians. These “concerns are seen to justify, even require, the exclusion of those outside of the Australian way and the re-education of those who display such propensities” (Harris and Williams, 2003: 271). They argue for social inclusion to be located firmly within a human rights framework.

2.5 Cultural Competence

In understanding how to put diversity at the centre of social inclusion debates and measures, it may be useful to consider how perspectives on cultural competence can assist the measurement of social inclusion. Cross et al (1989) define cultural competence

“as a set of congruent behaviours, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals and enable that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations”.

They argue that cultural competence requires organisations and their personnel to have the capacity to:

- value diversity;
- conduct self-assessment;
- manage the dynamics of difference;
- acquire and institutionalize cultural knowledge; and

- adapt to the diversity and cultural contexts of the individuals and communities served.

Cultural competence means working effectively with individuals while discovering, recognising and understanding the influence of culture on practice. Understanding and working from a framework of cultural competence has been described as a journey. It is not a one off event but rather an ongoing journey for both individuals and organisations to strive to be culturally competent in practice. Cultural competence exists at different levels including the individual, the program, the organisation, the state and even the nation. Goode (2002) argues that key values and principles guiding cultural competence which could be relevant for the social inclusion debate are included in Table 2.

Table 2 – Key Values and Guiding Principles of Cultural Competence

Key Area	Guiding Principle
Organisational	Systems and organisations must sanction and in some cases mandate the inclusion of cultural knowledge into policy making, infrastructure and practice
	Cultural competence embraces the principles of equal access and on discriminatory practices in service delivery
Community Engagement	Cultural competence extends the concept of self determination to the community
	Cultural competence involves working in conjunction with natural, informal and self help networks within diverse communities (eg neighbourhood groups, self help groups, religious organisations and spiritual leaders etc)
	Communities determine their own needs
	Community members are full partners in their decision making
	Communities should economically benefit from collaboration

	Community engagement should result in reciprocal transfer of knowledge among all collaborators and partners
--	---

Source: Goode (2002)

The principles of cultural competence, particularly in community engagement, need to be at the core of policy considerations when considering social inclusion.

2.6 *Key Issues*

There are a number of definitions of social inclusion and social exclusion. These definitions can be seen to be on a continuum of social exclusion at one end and social inclusion at another. Definitions of social exclusion and social inclusion focus on social, political, cultural and economic factors. The causes of social inclusion and social exclusion can be multi-layered and multi factorial.

The notion of social inclusion is also closely linked to the concept of social capital which has been used to describe the formation of networks, bonds and trust across society. Putnam's research on social capital has been criticised because it does not acknowledge the complexity of how social capital may be formed in culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

Research from the UK and America has highlighted how the formation of social capital can be different in culturally and linguistically diverse communities. The development of social capital and whether specific communities feel socially included or socially excluded may vary significantly both between communities and within communities. This is also heavily influenced by government policy decisions (for example immigration or refugee policy) which can impact on the development of social inclusion in local communities.

It is important to reflect on the lessons from the UK and South Australia in developing indicators and measures of social inclusion that include an understanding of cultural diversity.

3 Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion – Indicators and Measurement

3.1 United Kingdom

Social exclusion attracted attention in the UK during the 1980 and early 1990's. It became prominent following the election of the Blair Labour Government in 1997 and its establishment of the Social Exclusion Unit. The UK Social Exclusion Unit (1997) defined social exclusion as:

a shorthand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown (cited in Hayes et al, 2008:7)

Buchardt et al (2002) cited in Hayes et al (2008:10) identified four dimension of exclusion in Britain including:

- Consumption - the capacity to purchase goods or services;
- Production – the participation in economically or socially valuable activities;
- Political engagement – involvement in local or national decision making; and
- Social interaction- integration with family, friends and community.

The Millennium Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain (cited in Saunders 2007) included the following dimensions as part of social inclusion:

- *Impoverishment or exclusion from adequate resources* – defined as being poor in terms of both low income and deprivation;
- *Labour market exclusion* – identified using a range of labour market indicators, including living in a jobless household but recognising that these are only valid indicators of exclusion when they correlate with exclusion from social relations;
- *Service exclusion* – where services encompass public transport, play facilities and youth clubs and basic services inside the home (gas, electricity, water, telephone); and
- *Exclusion from social relations* – which covers five dimensions;
 - Non participation in common activities;
 - The extent and quality of social networks;

- Support available in normal times and in times of crisis;
- Disengagement from political and civic activity; and
- Confinement, resulting from fear of crime, disability or other factors.

In the United Kingdom there has been some development work in understanding the nature of community cohesion within the context of cultural and linguistic diversity. A cohesive community has been described as one where:

- *There is a common vision and sense of belonging for all communities;*
- *The diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances is appreciated and positively valued;*
- *Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities; and*
- *Strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods (Cantle, 2004 cited in Markus & Dharmalingam 2007:24)*

Canter (cited in Markus & Dharmalingam 2007:24) developed the conceptual division between 'social cohesion' and 'community cohesion' along the following lines:

- Social cohesion reflects divisions based on social class and economic factors and is complemented by social capital theories relating to the 'bonding' between people and the presence of mutual trust. It is seen to be undermined by the social exclusion experienced by individuals or groups, generally by their social class and economic position.
- Community cohesion reflects the divisions based upon identifiable communities, generally on the basis of faith or ethnic distinctions. It is also complemented by the disadvantage, discrimination and disaffection experienced by the identifiable community as a whole.

Social exclusion indicators have been developed in the United Kingdom with different approaches and measures included at Appendix A. Lessons from the social inclusion work undertaken in the United Kingdom highlights "that interventions have to be developed to respond to the needs of particular groups" (Hayes, et al 2008:20). Indicators need to be robust enough to ensure that they can include the needs of diverse groups.

Social exclusion is more than just poverty and needs to include a diverse range of indicators that are measured over time. Barnes (2005:28) provides a framework for essential functional, theoretical and methodological features of social exclusion which are listed in Figure 1.

Figure 1- Suggested Key Criteria for Selection of Social Exclusion Indicators

<p>Functional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The indicators must be able to be utilized to identify the prevalence of social exclusion;• The indicators should allow for analysis to aid an understanding of the complexities of social exclusion, in particular its multi- dimensional and longitudinal aspects;• The indicators should be relevant for policy as well as intellectual process; <p>Theoretical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each indicator must be able to contribute to a theoretical, rather, than political notion of social exclusion;• Each indicator must represent a distinct and separate domain of social exclusion;• The indicators should focus on outcomes of social exclusion rather than risk factors; <p>Methodological</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A range of separate indicators should be constructed to be used on their own or to allow the design of a composite index or indices, of social inclusion;• The indicators must come from a common data source to allow multi-dimensional and longitudinal analysis to take place;• The indicators must be valid proxies of the dimensions of social exclusion they intend to represent;• Each indicator must be unambiguous in interpretation;• The indicators must be produced regularly, at least annually;• The indicators must be based on national data;• The indicators must be able to be broken down by other economic and socio-demographic characteristics to allow for investigation of 'risk factors'.• Ideally, the indicators should allow for cross country comparisons.

Source, Barnes (2005: 29)

In the UK, the *Opportunity for All* indicators were developed to specifically monitor the progress of government strategies to tackle poverty and social exclusion. These are outlined below in Table 3 and are grouped in life cycle stages and area based clusters.

Table 3 - Summary of UK Opportunity for All Indicators

Grouping	Indicator
Children and Younger People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children in workless households • Low income (Relative, Absolute, Persistent • Key Stage 1 (7year olds) attainment in Sure Start Areas • Key Stage 2 (11 year olds) attainment • 16 year olds with at least one GSCE • 19 year olds with at least a level 2 qualification • Truancies • School exclusions • Educational attainment of children looked after by local authorities • 16-18 year olds in learning • Infant mortality • Smoking rates (for pregnant women and children aged 11-15) • Re-registration on child protection register • Housing that falls below the set standard of decency
People of working age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment rate • Employment rates of disadvantaged groups (egg people from CALD backgrounds, people with disabilities) • Working age people in a workless household • Working age people without a qualification • Long periods on income related benefits • Low income (relative, absolute, persistent) • Smoking rates (all adults and manual socio economic groups) • Death rates from suicide and undetermined injury • Rough sleepers • Use of class A drugs
Older People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low income (relative, absolute, persistent) • People contributing to a non state pension • Amount contributed to non state pensions • People making continuous contributions to a non state pension • Healthy age life expectancy at age 65 years • Being helped at live independently (receiving intensives home care and receiving any community based service)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing that falls below the set standard of decency • Fear of crime
Communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment rates in deprived areas • Rate of domestic burglary • Housing that falls below the set standard of decency • Life expectancy at birth • Attainment gap at Key Stage 2 (11 year olds)

Source: Department of Work and Pensions UK (2002)

Table 3 highlights that some of the indicators in the UK do not include many measures of cultural and linguistic diversity. Some research work is being undertaken by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation through their Immigration and Inclusion Program which aims to contribute to the development of evidence based social and public policy and practice responses to new migration that have the potential to:

- Strengthen social cohesion and civil society in areas affected by new migration, recognising equally the perspectives and interests of long term residents (including established immigrant communities and new migrants);
- Reduce the level of socio-economic disadvantage experienced by some new migrants and their families; and
- Improve the experience of settling and of participating in social, economic and civic life for current and future migrants (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2007)

A list of projects being undertaken by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation is included at Appendix B.

3.2 *Australia*

The Federal Government has adopted a social inclusion approach with the establishment of the Australian Social Inclusion Board and a Social Inclusion Unit in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Rather than focusing on people who are socially excluded, the federal government is explicitly focusing on how people are included. At the recent 2020 summit, delegates advocated that social inclusion should be considered as a national priority and that a National Action Plan for Social Inclusion should be developed and implemented (Hayes et al, 2008:6).

In recent speeches, Julia Gillard, the Deputy Prime Minister has outlined the Australian Government’s approach to social inclusion which should include:

“securing a job, accessing services, connecting with others in life through family, friends, work, personal interests and local community,

dealing with personal crises, such as ill health bereavement or the loss of a job; and being heard (Gilliard, 2008a).

The Australian Institute of Family Studies have undertaken research on social capital in Australia as part of the Families, Social Capital and Citizenship Project (Stone, 2001). The research aimed to:

- Establish a theoretically informed measurement framework for empirical investigation of social capital; and
- Review existing measures of social capital (Stone,2001:viii).

The findings of the research highlight the following:

- *The need for empirical recognition that social capital is a multidimensional concept comprising networks of relations characterised by norms of trust and reciprocity;*
- *An understanding that each of these dimensions must be measured in a comprehensive and valid investigation of social capital;*
- *A conceptual and empirical distinction between social capital and its outcomes, facilitating unambiguous research design which may properly inform upon the relationship between social capital and other factors;*
- *Avoidance, therefore of the common practice of mistaking a range of factors/ outcomes which may be related to social capital for measures of social capital itself;*
- *Research which is, overall, therefore, able to measure with precision the key elements of social capital, understand how these outcomes relate to one another, as well as how they relate to key predictors and outcomes (Stone, 2001:35).*

An Australian Government discussion paper advocates “that in order to reduce social exclusion, both active and preventative policies are needed” (Hayes et al 2008:32). The paper suggests that approaches to social inclusion should have a number of features which may include:

- Enhancing the ability of services to address the multiple disadvantages that many of the socially excluded experience (“joined up services for joined up problems”)
- Recognising that the most socially disadvantaged and excluded often do not access conventional services, so services should target transition points;

- Centralised co-ordination, which can be useful in setting targets and monitoring whether they are being achieved, in terms of services reaching the socially excluded;
- Local co-ordination across government and non government organisations to achieve an integrated approach to social inclusion;
- The re-examination of the evidence base to identify new solutions; and
- Data performance measures and robust evaluation (Hayes et al, 2008).

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006) has undertaken work on both defining and measuring social capital and has adopted the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) definition of social capital which is "networks, together with shared norms, values and understandings which facilitate cooperation within or among groups" (ABS, 2006).

These definitions and measures were used and tested in the ABS General Social Survey (GSS) . The survey provides information on:

- health and disability;
- housing and mobility;
- education;
- employment;
- income;
- financial stress;
- assets and liabilities;
- information technology;
- transport;
- family and community involvement
- attendance at culture and leisure centres (ABS, 2006:6)

In 2006, the GSS included more detailed indicators of family and community involvement and includes measures of social capital. The ABS has adopted the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) definition of social capital and highlights that:

“Social capital resources are presented as attributes of networks organised as network qualities, structure, transactions and broad types (bonding, bridging and linking). Potential network participants (such as families, friends and organisations/ groups) are indicated by network compositions. Network qualities include norms, such as trust,

reciprocity and inclusiveness and common purposes, for networks or groups such as social, civic and economic participation. Structure refers to size, frequency of interaction, density and openness, power relationships and transience/mobility. "(ABS, 2006: 6-7)

The data available on social capital from the 2006 ABS GSS include:

- support for children and other relatives in other households;
- support in time of crisis;
- levels of trust in people and institutions;
- whether a person feels able to have a say on important issues;
- diversity of people's social networks;
- active involvement in groups;
- contact with family and friend;
- close friendships;
- provision of unpaid assistance;
- civic and community activities; and
- linking relationships to people in organisations of influence.

There is also a range of data available on voluntary work in the 2006 ABS GSS survey which includes:

- whether a person did unpaid voluntary work for an organisation in the last 12 months;
- reasons for volunteering;
- length of time since first volunteered;
- number of organisations volunteered for;
- total annual hours of voluntary work;
- sector or type of organisation;
- type of voluntary activity;
- group which organisation aims to assist;
- expenses related to voluntary work;
- financial donations made to organisations.

Data available on visa category includes:

- Whether or not currently the person has Australian citizenship;

- Visa category;
- Whether a temporary resident before becoming a permanent resident;
- Whether main applicant on application form to become permanent resident (ABS, 2006:11)

The list of data used in the General Social Services Survey is included at Appendix D.

3.3 *South Australia*

In 2002, the South Australian government started the Social Inclusion Initiative (SII). The South Australian model has an independent Social Inclusion Board reporting directly to the Head of Government and associated department (Newman et al 2007: 1).

The Social Inclusion Initiative sits within the broader context of the South Australian strategic plan which was developed in 2004 “to drive the State towards becoming a healthy, socially inclusive and economically prosperous society” (Newman et al 2007:1). An explicit policy focus in South Australia was to reframe the focus from social exclusion to social inclusion to focus “more on the solution of what can be done to increase social inclusion” (Newman et al 2007:10). The Social Inclusion Initiative in South Australia aimed to:

- Facilitate joined up implementation of programs across government departments;
- Sponsoring/ employing innovative approaches;
- Developing partnerships and relationships with stakeholders and focusing on outcomes (Newman et al 2007:12).

The South Australian Social Inclusion Initiative has three broad areas that it seeks to change:

- Improvement in the level of social inclusion in the lives of individuals and groups, particularly those who are socially excluded, disadvantaged and unable to gain access to participation in productive life (this can include people from specific population groups as well as people with particular issues) ;
- Encourage systematic change in the way that government agencies and non government agencies address social issues; and
- Bring broader benefits to the community (Newman et al, 2007:20)

The development of key points of reference for the Social Inclusion Initiative is undertaken through collecting evidence and reviewing potential programs and interventions, staff consult broadly across the community and relevant government sectors to gather evidence. The setting of targets and public reporting on outcomes and accountability for meeting these targets are a clear focus on the South Australian Initiatives (Newman et al, 2007:26). The review

of the evaluations undertaken through the South Australian Initiatives identified that

“Evaluation and monitoring processes have highlighted the need to develop interventions which will engage the socially excluded group and which are culturally appropriate” (Newman et al 2007, 58).

A focus of the South Australian Social Inclusion Initiative is the evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of initiatives including both process and outcomes evaluation. Some of the broader principles which overarch the evaluation framework of the SII include:

- SII is an overarching priority of Government;
- Evaluation takes place over the life of SII;
- Evaluation is an ongoing process that provides information to improve what we are doing and change things that are not working;
- Evaluation needs to be considered in the broadest sense; and
- The evaluation findings need to be of interest to different audiences (Department of Premier & Cabinet, 2004:3-4).

Four key evaluation questions provide the starting point for the SII evaluation including:

1. What has the commitment to and investment in the Social Inclusion Initiative achieved?
2. What factors and processes have influenced the outcomes?
3. What impact has the Social Inclusion Initiative had in responding to pressing social problems?
4. What directions and aspirations for the future of the SII arise from the learning made? (Department of Premier & Cabinet, 2004:4)

Further description of the measures and indicators used in South Australia is included at Appendix C.

4 Cultural Diversity and Social Inclusion

Understanding and measuring social inclusion is important in considering strategies and policies to support the participation and engagement of people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds in all aspects of economic, social, political and civic life. This also needs to be considered within the context of current government policies and the context of Australia's migration landscape.

An important question to consider is the connection between social inclusion, social capital and concepts of cultural diversity. This includes how to understand and conceptualise notions of social inclusion for culturally and linguistically diverse communities. For example, how do particular communities describe social inclusion in areas of economic, social, political and civic participation? This could include looking at trends both across communities but also within particular communities. There may also be significant differences in terms of social inclusion based on a person's experience of migration, for example communities that may have settled in Australia for a long period and those communities that may be described as new and emerging.

A recent research study by the Scanlon Foundation attempted to explore the connection between social capital and cultural diversity (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007). It aimed to:

- Establish a benchmark measure of social cohesion in Australia and provide information that will contribute to improving social cohesion in Australia; and
- Identify social or cultural barriers to increasing Australia's population through increased immigration (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007)

The research study is of particular importance in terms of advancing an understanding of the relationship between social cohesion and diverse communities because a concerted attempt was made to both survey NESB / overseas born Australians, and report on differences in responses to survey questions between Australian born and NESB participants. The survey also utilised non English language interviewing for main community language groups (see Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: 12-3). The research findings highlight the following:

- A substantial proportion of people surveyed are actively engaged in the community life and politics with 38% of respondents reporting that they visit on a regular basis (at least several times a month) people of different nationality or ethnicity in their homes (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: x).

- 86.7 % of respondents had voted in an election over the previous three years and over the same period, 57.3% of the sample had signed a petition (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: x).
- Slightly more than one in four respondents (25.6%) report experience of discrimination over the course of their lives because of their ethnic background (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: x)
- At least one in two people from Non English Speaking Background reported having experienced some form of discrimination over the course of their lives which compared to two out of ten Australian born people (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: xi)
- The study found that length of residence in Australia leads to closer identification with dominant Australian attitudes (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: xii)

The community level survey also has some significant finding for the social inclusion agenda including:

- The level of disaffection within the communities surveyed is at a low level (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: xiii)
- The comparison across survey groups reveals marked attitudinal divergence in response to some questions. The major divergence are in the levels of participation and acceptance indicating lower levels of social capital in areas of high immigrant concentration reflected in the following:
 - 51.3% of Australia born with both parents born in Australia consider that the level of immigration intake is too high, compared with 22.1% of NESB respondents;
 - 20.5% of Australia born with both parents in Australia support government funding to ethnic minorities for maintenance of customs and traditions compared with 70.1% of NESB respondents.
- Respondents also report greater experience of discrimination with the highest incidence reported by the overseas born highlighted by the following data:
 - Of Australia born with both parents born in Australia, 20% report experience of discrimination over the course of their lives on the basis of nationality or ethnicity, compared with the highest response rate of 53.7% for those who first language is Mandarin, Cantonese or Vietnamese.

- Of respondents of Middle Eastern background, 27.5% reported experience of discrimination on the basis of the basis of religion, compared with less than 10% for other groups (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007: xiii)

The analysis of the data found that:

“Indicators of concern within the domains of participation and acceptance: significant levels of misunderstanding between birthplace groups heightened reporting of discriminatory and hostile behaviour, lower levels of involvement in the political process and voluntary work, lower levels of mixing between Australians of different ethnicity. These findings all point to lower levels of social capital in areas of high immigrant concentration” (Marcus & Dharmalingam, 2007:116).

Patterns of volunteering in culturally and linguistically diverse communities have also been explored in national studies. A national study undertaken by Volunteering Australia and the Australian Multicultural Foundation (2007) explored the patterns of volunteering by people from CALD backgrounds. The national study surveyed volunteers who spoke a range of different languages including: Mandarin, Cantonese, Vietnamese, Croatian, Polish, Macedonian, Somali, Greek, Italian, Spanish and Arabic. The study found that:

- 45% of the survey respondents were aged over 60 years, 49% of respondents reported participating in formal volunteering 1-2 days per week and 31% reported volunteering as informal volunteers (helping families and friends) 1-2 days per week;
- men were more likely to volunteer in sporting organisations and local schools whereas women were more likely to volunteer in nursing, retirement homes, schools and charitable organisations;
- volunteers reported that time restrictions were the main barrier for volunteering followed by travel and distance, issues with the reimbursement of expenses and issues with English language proficiency (however this could be reflective of the sample size in that most of the people in the study were aged 60 years and over);
- the most common reasons why CALD people volunteered was to do something worthwhile, to help their own community and for personal satisfaction; and
- people from CALD communities that have been living in Australia for under 10 years are most likely to volunteer in their first three years of being in Australia (Volunteering Australia, 2007:6-7).

This study highlights that people from CALD communities are often actively engaged in their communities but may not describe it as volunteering. This can work to build social capital and social inclusion in culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

4.1 Key Issues and Summary

The work undertaken in the United Kingdom and South Australia highlights the need to include cultural diversity in measures of social inclusion. Research from the United Kingdom highlights how social capital and social inclusion may be formed differently in culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

It is important that the development of social indicators in Australia consider how social capital may be formed in different cultural and linguistically diverse communities. These measures need to be reliable and be able to be consistently measured within communities as well as across communities with possible aggregation at a state and national level.

The indicators used to measure social capital identified in the General Social Survey could be used if it was compared with other ABS data such as country of birth, language spoken at home. Comparisons with data from the Scanlon Survey could also be used to identify how communities perceive their sense of connectedness and social capital over time.

Other ABS data in terms of labour force participation compared with visa categories and immigration data could also be used to measure and compare levels of social inclusion across communities and at local, state and national levels. However, it should be noted that measures of social inclusion may need to target particular communities and be analysed at a local and regional level.

5 Conclusion

Australia is an immensely diverse nation, in culture, language and faith. These differences strongly shape everyday life: Australian practices, values and lifestyles.

Culture, language and faith also shape social inclusion outcomes. In some cases, cultural difference, migration history, English proficiency and religious difference lead to discrimination and exclusion for people from non English Speaking Backgrounds. However, diverse communities also enjoy diverse forms of inclusion, many of which are difficult to measure or compare.

There is an opportunity in Australia to develop a sophisticated understanding of social inclusion, which incorporates a robust reflection upon cultural, linguistic and faith factors. Taking cultural difference seriously within the national social inclusion agenda would go some way towards promoting a rich, inclusive and cosmopolitan Australian society.

This report has provided an outline of current approaches and measures of social exclusion, inclusion and cohesion, and examined the relationship of cultural and linguistic factors upon social inclusion in Australia and in other jurisdictions.

A key message that flows through this report is the need to develop more sophisticated approaches to understanding the impact of cultural difference on inclusion outcomes, whether through more careful analysis and comparison of existing data sources, or through new research.

Appendix A - Social Exclusion Indicators

Table 4 – United Kingdom

Key Area	Key Measure	Key Area	Key Measure
Income	Numbers in Low Income	Young Adults	Without basic qualifications
	Low income and Housing Cost		School Leavers
	Low income by age group		With a criminal record
	Income inequalities		Unemployment
	Lacking Essential Items		Low pay
	Out of work benefit Levels		Suicides
	Long term recipients of out of work benefits	Adults aged 25 years to retirement	Low income and work
Children	In low income households		Low income and disability
	In receipt of tax credits		Low income and Council Tax
	In workless households		Concentrations of Low Income
	Low Birth-weight babies		Wanting Paid Work
	Child health		Work and Disadvantaged Groups
	Underage pregnancies		Workless households
	Low attainment at school: 11 year olds		Low pay by gender
	Low attainment at school: 16 year olds		Low pay by industry
	School exclusions		Disadvantaged at work
Older People	In low income households		Support at work
	Benefit Take Up		Premature Death
	Excess Winter deaths		Limiting long standing illness or disability
	Limiting longstanding illness disability		Mental health
	Help from social services	Communities (Cont)	Without a bank account
	Anxiety		Without home contents insurance

	Anxiety		Transport
Communities	Homelessness		Polarisation by Tenure
	Mortgage Areas		Without central heating

Source: Palmer, MacInnes & Kenway (2006)

Table 5- Indicators of Social Exclusion used by Social Policy Research Centre (SPRC) Australia

Dimensions of Social Exclusion		
Disengagement	Service Exclusion	Economic Exclusion
No regular social contact with other people	No medical treatment if needed	Does not have \$500 saving for use in emergency
Did not participate in any community activities in the last 12 months	No access to local doctor or hospital	Had to pawn or sell something in the last 12 months
Does not have a social life	No access to dental treatment if needed	Could not raise \$2,000 in a week
No annual week's holiday away from home	No access to mental health service	Does not have more than \$50,000 worth of assets
Children do not participate in school activities or outings	No child care for parents (working- aged parents only)	Has not spent \$100 on a special treat for myself in the last 12 months
No hobby or leisure activity for children	No aged care for frail older people (70 years plus)	Does not have enough to get by on
Could not go out with friends and pay my way for the last 12 months	No disability support services when needed	Currently unemployed or looking for work
Unable to attend wedding or funeral in the last 12 months	No access to a bank or building society	Lives in a jobless household
	Couldn't keep up with payments for water, electricity, gas or telephone in the last 12 months	

Source: Sanders et al (2007, Table 8)

Appendix B – Projects being undertaken by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation - Immigration and Inclusion Program

Project Title	Description
<p>Living and working conditions of low wage immigrants Sarah Spencer, Centre on Migration Policy and Society, University of Oxford. (Publication May 2007)</p>	<p>The study aims to provide authoritative data and analysis on the working and living conditions of low wage migrants and their social inclusion; and on the consequences for legal and irregular migrants of being granted the economic and social rights of an EU national. The study focuses on workers from four accession countries and two non accession countries as comparators (Ukraine and Bulgaria) working in: construction, agriculture, hospitality and as au pairs. These sectors were chosen because they offer legal channels of employment for low wage migrant workers and (with the exception of au pairs) because they are thought to have a significant number of irregular workers. A first report, on employment experiences, has published (see below). The second report will focus on migrants' experiences of life in the UK.</p>
<p>New European Immigrants (non-EU) and Social Cohesion in Britain Sussex University, Richard Black and Eugenia Markova (formerly Sussex, now Research Fellow, Hellenic Observatory, LSE (Publication May 2007)</p>	<p>The aim is to build a profile of immigrants from selected non-EU states in Central and Eastern Europe (Albania, Bulgaria, Russia, Serbia-Montenegro and Ukraine), to explore their experiences and perceptions of life in Britain, and the extent of social cohesion with longer-term residents. Given that many new immigrants have settled in areas of existing migrant settlement, this will include exploration of the links between different communities. The study will address how migrants' legal status, background, age and gender influence social cohesion outcomes. Fieldwork based in London (Hackney and Harrow) and the city of Brighton & Hove.</p>
<p>Understanding Social cohesion: everyday interactions in diverse communities Policy Studies Institute, Maria Hudson (Publication May 2007)</p>	<p>This in-depth qualitative research investigates the nature and quality of intra and inter community interactions and relations at sites in two contrasting areas of the country: London (Tottenham) and Manchester (Moss Side); and looking at three communities: the Somali community, the Black Caribbean community and the White British community. It explores the everyday interactions between members of these three communities, including the nature of any intra-and-inter-community tensions.</p>
<p>Constructing Community in 'Cosmopolitan' South East Wales Cardiff University, Terry</p>	<p>This project probes the relationships between long-standing residents and recent arrivals in five contiguous and overlapping communities in South-East Wales to consider how movement of peoples intervenes and forms new kinds of</p>

<p>Threadgold (Publication Autumn 2007)</p>	<p>belonging as part of 'multicultural Britain'. The project will consider how so-called 'host communities' are constantly reconstituted through diversity and difference and how this impacts on social cohesion. Fieldwork based in Cardiff (four sites) and Merthyr Tydfil. Alongside interview and focus groups with white long-standing communities, the researchers will also interview members of a wide range of established and new migrant communities including Chinese, Somali, Yemeni, and Portuguese.</p>
<p>Muslims and Community Cohesion University of Oxford, Steven Vertovec and Hiranthi Jayaweera (Publication Autumn 2007)</p>	<p>This project aims to increase understanding of the multiple factors which contribute to or undermine cohesion in areas with an established Muslim community, in to which there are recent Muslim arrivals. It will provide evidence and analysis to inform policy making at the local, national and EU level, helping to replace assumptions and misinformation with evidence secured through robust empirical research. Fieldwork based in Bradford, Birmingham and Newham (London). A short report setting out evidence from Bradford will be available from Spring 2007.</p>
<p>Improving our understanding of the relationship between recent immigration and social cohesion London Metropolitan University, Mary Hickman and Working Lives Research Institute, Umut Erel (Publication Spring 2008)</p>	<p>This is the largest project in the Immigration and Inclusion Programme, covering 6 sites over 2 years: Kilburn & Willesden (London), Downham (London), Peterborough, Leicester, Dungannon (N Ireland) and Glasgow. This project aims to provide evidence of local experiences of social cohesion in diverse neighbourhoods, characterised by deprivation and affluence, cohesion and fragmentation, ethnic homogeneity and diversity. This project will capture the voices of new migrants and long term residents through ethnographic and qualitative research across six sites in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland. It will explore the multi layered experience of migration in the UK. It aims to understand how people negotiate the contradictions of everyday life across borders, cultural and historic shifts, new economic circumstances, gender regimes and media representations, including recording successful strategies of community integration</p>

Source: Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2007)

Appendix C

**Table 6 – Summary of Criteria used for Selecting Social Indicators
(South Australian Research)**

Initiative	Criteria for selecting social indicator
Australian Bureau of Statistics - Measuring Australia's progress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be relevant to the particular dimension of progress or priority area • Be high level and summary in nature (is aggregated or composite indicators are avoided) • Where possible, focus on outcomes for the priority area (rather than on say, the inputs or processes to produce outcomes) • Show an unambiguous 'good' direction of movement (signalling progress and 'bad' direction (signalling regress) – at least when the indicators is considered alone, with all other dimensions of progress kept equal. • Be supported by timely data of good quality • Show trends over time (i.e. be available as a time services) • Be sensitive to changes it is meant to indicate • Preferably be capable of disaggregation by, say, geography or population group • Be intelligible and easily interpreted for the general read
Economic Development Board Recommendations (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on international best practice in everything we do, at the very least, the best in Australia; • Based on the key elements of the Framework for Economic Development • Measures of outcomes and not the inputs or efforts • Readily measurable and comparable with a standard • Understandable by the average South Australian • Capable of being influenced by

	action
Initiative	Criteria for selecting social indicator
European Union (2001)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indicator should capture the essence of the problem and have a clear and accepted normative interpretation • An indicator should be robust and statistically validated • An indicator should be responsive to policy interventions but not subject to manipulation • An indicator should be measurable in sufficiently comparable way across Member States and comparable as far as practicable with the standards applied internationally; • An indicator should be timely and susceptible to revision; • The measurement of an indicator should not impose too large a burden on Member States, on enterprises, nor on the Union's citizens • The portfolio of indicators should be balanced across different dimensions • The indicators should be mutually consistent and the weight of single indicators in the portfolio should be proportionate • The portfolio of indicators should be as transparent and accessible as possible to the citizens of the European Union
UK's Opportunity for All (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to the Government's overall strategy for tackling poverty and social exclusion (i.e. capture key current aspects of poverty and social exclusion or factors that increase the risk of experiencing deprivation in later life • Related to outcomes the

	<p>Government wants to achieve rather than processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Based on publicly available and statistically robust data• Unambiguous interpretation (i.e. the indicator should not improve without this either reflecting a reduction in poverty and social exclusion or a reduction in an important casual factor.
--	---

Source: (Department of Premier & Cabinet, 2004:13)

Appendix D – General Social Survey Measures (2006)

ABS General Social Survey Key Area	Indicator	Definition
Demographics	Age	The age of the person on their last birthday
	Sex	
	Marital Status	
	Country of Birth	
	Main language spoken at home	
Health	Self assessed health status	
	Disability Status	
	Disability Type	
	Has education restriction	
	Has employment restriction	
Housing	Tenure type	
	Landlord type	
	Weekly rent and mortgage payments	
Mobility	Length of time in current dwelling	
	Number of times moved in last five years	
	Length of time in previous dwelling	
Education	Highest educational attainment	
	Main field of highest educational attainment	
	Highest year of school completed	
	Level of highest non school qualification	

	Full time/ part time study; type of educational institution	
Work	Labour force status	
	Full time/ part time status	
	Hours usually worked in all jobs	
	Occupation in main jobs	
	Expected future duration in current job	
	Leave entitlements in main job	
	Retirement Status	
Income	Gross weekly income	
	Type of government pension/allowance	
	Whether government support has been main source of income in last 2 years	
Financial Stress	Ability to raise emergency money	
	Number and types of cash flow problems	
	Number and types of dissaving actions	
Assets and Liabilities	Value of dwelling	
	Equity in dwelling	Calculated as the value of the dwelling less the amount owing on mortgages or secure loans against the dwelling
	Type of selected assets	
	Amount owing on mortgage	
	Consumer debt	Debt or liabilities usually associated with the purchase of consumables
Information Technology	Whether used computer at home	
	Frequency of internet access	
	Purpose of internet activity	
Transport	Perceived level of difficulty with transport	
	Access to motor vehicles	
	Travel time to work each day	
Family and Community Context	Types of personal stressors in last 12	

	months	
	Type of social activity in 3 months	
Family and Community Networks	Frequency of contact with family or friends	
	Source of support in time of crisis	Refers to whether there is someone outside the person's household that could be asked for support in a time of crisis. Support could be in the form of emotional, physical or financial help. Potential sources of support could be family members, friends, neighbours, work colleagues and various community, government and professional organisations
	Ability to ask for small favours	
Family and Community Support for Others	Whether provide support for children 0-17 living outside the household	
	Whether provide support for children 18-24 living outside the household	
	Number of children 18-24 supported	
	Type of support for children outside the household	
	Reasons children living in another household	
	Whether provide support for other relatives outside the household	
	Type of support for other relatives	
Crime	Victim of physical or threatened violence	A person who had physical force or violence used against them or threatened in person to be used against them. It

		includes violence or threats made by persons know to the person
	Victim of actual attempted break –in	A person who had experienced a break in or attempted break in at any place they had lived in the last 12 months.
	Feelings of safety at home along during day and at night	
Attendance at cultural venues	Whether attended selected cultural venues and events in last 12 months	
	Types of venues or events attended	
Sports attendance	Whether has attended any sports events in last 12 months	
Sports participation	Whether has participated in sport or recreational physical activity in the last 12 months	
Social Capital	Level of generalised trust	<p>To ascertain feelings of trust in others, and in some major institutions, they were asked how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the following statements, giving a rating on a 5 point scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That most people can be trusted? • That your doctor can be trusted? • Those hospitals can be trusted to do the right thing by you? • That police in your local areas can be trusted? • That police outside your local area can be trusted? <p>The phrase 'most people' is based on the respondent's interpretation – there is no specific definition. The idea is</p>

		whether persons can go about their affairs confidently, expecting that people will generally deal fairly with them and act in the ways normally expected in our society.
	Level of trust in institutions – doctor, hospitals, police in local area, police outside local areas	
	Feel able to have a real with family/ friends/ within community on important issues	
	Active involvement in social groups/ civic groups/ community groups in the last 12 months	
	Type of civic activity engages in	
	Has family members or friends can confide in	
	Number of family members or friends can confide in	
Social Capital Network Structures	Frequency of face to face contact with family and friends living outside the household	
	Frequency of other forms of contact	
	Other forms of contact used with family and friends	
	Frequency of internet or SMS contact	
	Type of participation in group activities as child/youth	
	Whether parents did voluntary work	

	Whether knows of someone in organisation would feel comfortable contacting for information/ advice	
Social Capital Network Transactions	Provision of unpaid assistance in past four weeks to ex-household persons	
	Provision of unpaid assistance by recipient	
	Whether provided unpaid care, help or assistance in last 4 weeks to others because of a disability, long term illness or problems related to old age	
	Whether attended a community event in the past six months	
	Whether ever been active in project or organise new service or activity, or preserve existing one in the local area	
Social Capital Network type	Proportion of friends of similar age	
	Proportion of friends with same level of education	
	Number of organisations where personally knows someone	
Voluntary Work – Person Level	Whether did unpaid voluntary work in the last 12 months	
	How first became involved in volunteer work	
	Length of time since first volunteered	
	Number of organisations volunteered for	
	Reasons for being a volunteer	
	Total annual hours of volunteer work	
	Expenses related to volunteer work	
	Whether donated money to an organisation in last 12 months	
Visa category	Whether hold Australian citizenship	

	Visa category	
	Whether temporary resident before becoming permanent	
	Whether main applicant	
Difficult accessing service provider	Whether had difficulty in communicating with service providers	
	Whether had difficulty accessing service providers	
	Type of service provider where difficulty was experienced	
Voluntary work organisation level	Sector and type of organisation	The provision of unpaid help willingly undertaken in the form of time, service or skills, to an organisation or group, excluding work done overseas.
	Type of volunteer activity done for the organisation	
	Length of time volunteered for the organisations	
	Total annual hours worked for the organisation	
	Group which organisation aims to assist	

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006) General Social Survey User Guide, Category No 4159.0.55.002, pp 12-17

Appendix E Bibliography

- Atkinson, A. (1998) Social Exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment in Atkinson, A., & Hills, J., (Eds) *Exclusion Employment and Opportunity* (CASE Paper No.4), London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion: London School of Economics
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006) *General Social Survey User Guide*, Category No 4159.0.55.002
- Barnes, M., (2005) *Social Exclusion in Britain – An Empirical Investigation and Comparison with the European Union*, Ashgate Publishing, Britain
- Bernard, P., (1999) 'Social Cohesion: Updating the State of Research' in *CPRN Discussion Paper*, Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks
- Berghman, J., (1995) 'Social Exclusion in Europe: Policy Context and Analytical Framework' in Room, G., (Ed.) *Beyond the Threshold: The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol: The Policy Press
- Cantle, T., (2004) *The End of Parallel Live? The Report Of the Community Cohesion Panel*, The Home Office, London
- Cantle, T., (2005) *Community Cohesion: A New Framework for Race and Diversity*, The Home Office, London
- Costa, D., & Kahn, M., (2002) "Civic Engagement and Community Heterogeneity: An Economist's Perspective", *Conference paper presented at the Conference on Social Connectedness and Public Activism*, Harvard University: USA
- Cross T., Bazron, B., Dennis, K., & Isaacs, M., (1989) *Towards a Culturally Competent System of Care*, Volume I, Georgetown University Child Development Centre, CASSP Technical Assistance Centre, Washington, D.C.
- Department for Work and Pensions (2002) *Opportunity for All: Fourth Annual Report*, Department for Work and Pensions, UK
- Department of Social Security (2000) *Opportunity for All: Tackling Poverty and Social Exclusion*, London: The Stationery Office
- Department of Premier and Cabinet (2004) *Evaluation: The Social Inclusion Initiative Big Picture, Roundtables, Background Discussion Paper Two*, Social Inclusion Initiative Indicators, Social Inclusion Unit, Department of Premier and Cabinet, South Australian Government

Department of Premier and Cabinet (2004), *Social Inclusion Initiative – Evaluation and Research Guiding Framework*, Social Inclusion Unit, Department of Premier and Cabinet, South Australian Government

Forrest, J., & Kearns, A., (2001) 'Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood' *Urban Studies*, 38 (12) pp 2125-43

Goode, T., (2002) *Promoting Cultural Diversity and Cultural Competency – Self Assessment - Self Assessment Checklist for Personnel Providing Services and Supports to Children with Disabilities & Special Health Care Need*, National Centre for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University, America

Gilliard, (2008a) Speech; *Social Innovation, Social Impact: A New Australian Agenda*, Canberra, Downloaded on 18 August 2008 on <http://www.alp.org.au/download/now/jg28feb.pdf>

Griffiths, D., (2006) "Refugee Community Organisations and Dispersal in Britain" , *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*

Griffiths, D., Zetter, R., & Sigona, N., (2005) *Refugee Community Organisations and Dispersals: Network, Resources and Social Capital*, Bristol: The Policy Press

Harris, P., & Williams, V., (2003) "Social Inclusion, National Identity and the Moral Imagination" in the *Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 3 (3), pp 205 - 222

Healy, K., Hampshire, A., Ayres, L., Ellwood, S., & Mengede, N., (2007) *Creating Better Communities: A Study of Social Capital Creation in Four Communities*, Benevolent Society, Sydney

Hayes, A., & Gray, M., & Edwards, B., (2008) Social Inclusion, Origins, Concepts and Key Themes, Paper prepared by the Australian Institute of Family Studies for the Social Inclusion Unit, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet

Homel, R., Cashmore, J., Goodnow, J., Hayes, A., Lawrence, J. et al (1999) *Patterns and Precursors of Adolescent Behaviour*, Canberra: Attorney-General's Department

Jenson, J., (1998) *Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research*, Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc, Ottawa

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2007) *Immigration and Inclusion Programme*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation; UK

Katz, I., (2008) *Social Inclusion – Just Another Passing Fad?* Paper presented at Fairer Future Conference TASCOS, October 2008, Hobart, Social Policy Research Centre

La Ferraa, E., (2002) "Inequality and Group Participation: Theory and Evidence from Rural Tanzania" *Journal of Public Economics*, 85 (2): 333 -73

Lindert, P., (1996) "What Limits Social Spending? " *Explorations in Economic History*, 33 (1): 1-34

Markus, A., & Dharmalingam, A (2007) *Mapping Social Cohesion – The Scanlon Foundation Surveys*, Monash Institute for the Study of Global Movements, Monash University, Victoria

Newman, L. Bbiedrzycki, K., Patterson, J., & Baum, F., (2007) *A Rapid Appraisal Case Study of South Australia's Social Inclusion Initiative*, A report prepared for the Social Exclusion Knowledge Network of the World Health Organisation's Commission on Social Determinants of Health by the Australian Health Inequities Program, (Department of Public Health, Flinders University of South Australia) and the Social Inclusion Unit (Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Government of South Australia) Adelaide Australia

Palmer, G., MacInnes, T., & Kenway, P., (2006) *Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion* (2006), Joseph Rowntree Foundation and New Policy Institute: York

Putnam, R., (1996) "The Strange Disappearance of Civic America", *the American Prospect*, Vol. 24, pp 34 – 48

Putnam, R., (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Saunders, P., Naidoo, Y., Griffiths, M., (2007) *Towards New Indicators of Disadvantage: Deprivation and Social Exclusion in Australia*, Sydney: Social Policy Research Centre, University of NSW

Stone W., (2001) *Measuring Social Capital – Towards a Theoretically informed Measurement Framework for researching Social Capital in Family and Community Life*, Research Paper No 24, Australian Institute of Family Studies: Melbourne

Volunteering Australia and Australian Multicultural Foundation (2004) *National Survey of Australian Volunteers from Diverse Cultural Backgrounds*, Volunteering Australia and Australian Multicultural Foundation VIC.

Zetter, R., Griffiths, D., Signora, N., Flynn, D., Pasha, T & Beyond, R. (2006) *Immigration, Social Cohesion and Social Capital – What are the Links?* Joseph Row tree Foundation, York