

**JRF programme paper:
Globalisation**

How globalisation is changing patterns of marginalisation and inclusion in the UK

Patrick Diamond

October 2010

This paper:

- explores the relationship between globalisation and the processes and patterns that determine the quality of life of communities in the UK;
- discusses how globalisation affects the labour market; and
- examines how governments and policy-makers should respond to the impacts of globalisation on poverty and inequality.

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) commissioned this paper as part of its programme on Globalisation, which explores and promotes awareness of the impacts of globalisation on the UK and focuses on communities and people in poverty.

ISBN 978 1 85935 774 3

© Joseph Rowntree Foundation

This paper was commissioned by Joseph Rowntree Foundation as part of its programme on Globalisation, which explores the impacts of globalisation on the UK, particularly on communities and people in poverty.

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has supported this project as part of its programme of research and innovative development projects, which it hopes will be of value to policy-makers, practitioners and service users. The facts presented and views expressed in this report are, however, those of the authors and not necessarily those of JRF.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation
The Homestead
40 Water End
York YO30 6WP
www.jrf.org.uk

This report, or any other JRF publication, can be downloaded free from the JRF website (www.jrf.org.uk/publications/).

© Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2010

First published 2010 by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this report by photocopying or electronic means for non-commercial purposes is permitted. Otherwise, no part of this report may be reproduced, adapted, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

ISBN: 978 1 85935 774 3 (pdf)

Ref: 2558

Contact:
Teresa Hanley
teresa_hanley@dsl.pipex.com

Contents

		Page
Section 1	Introduction	3
Section 2	Patterns and processes of marginalisation	6
Section 3	The Globalisation debate	10
Section 4	The changing priorities of government	11
Section 5	The race to the bottom in taxation	11
Section 5	The shift towards the high-skill economy	12
Section 6	The domestic trends and drivers of change	12
Section 7	Civic capacity and political participation	15
Section 8	Conclusion	16
	References	18
	About the author	20

Introduction

There are significant challenges and dilemmas that Britain must confront if it is to become a fairer and more equal society. Avoiding the extremes of wealth and income inequality that characterise many of the advanced capitalist economies will not be easy. Inevitably, attention has increasingly turned to the role of the state in mitigating rising inequalities. The evolving priorities of governments do have measurable and lasting effects on citizens' life chances, as well as the overall level of equity and fairness. But public policy does not operate against a static background. There are major structural undercurrents that governments must take into account in framing policy.

This paper addresses the impact of globalisation on patterns and processes of marginalisation among individuals and communities throughout Britain. It is chiefly concerned with the relationship between globalisation and the exclusionary practices and processes that determine the quality of social, economic, political and cultural life. Before this theme is explored more fully, several preliminary points are necessary.

The first concerns the extent of social and economic change and its wider impact on British society. Take the nature of place and the character of local communities. Many neighbourhoods in the UK are changing rapidly; areas that 20 years ago were relatively homogenous when observed through the conventional lens of ethnicity and social class have become considerably more diverse. Inner-city neighbourhoods that were once regarded as urban 'ghettos' have been increasingly captured by more affluent groups. International migration, alongside the demands of a regionally segmented service-orientated economy, has brought new communities into areas of Britain that were ethnically homogenous 30 years ago. As a result, it is no longer plausible to make a simple distinction between 'poorer' and 'richer' areas, just as the incidence of poverty within groups has become far more heterogeneous (Thomas and Dorling, 2007). There is significant variation in life chances within groups as well as between them, and the composition and distribution of Britain's population is changing rapidly. We are witnessing the emergence of more dynamic and complex dimensions of opportunity and disadvantage that are, in turn, helping to transform patterns of marginalisation and exclusion over each stage of the life-course.

The second point concerns people's experience of income inequality: conventional metrics of deprivation and inequality generate an increasingly familiar picture of poverty and social need. The traditional concern with household poverty levels, for example, as measured by the consumption of a range of goods and services is necessary, but needs to be set alongside a robust account of subjective well-being. We need to overlay conventional indices with richer information about psychological well-being: how people think and feel about their lives, and the aspirations as well as the anxieties of different communities. The human rights model is not in itself a panacea, but it does strive

to conceive disadvantage as multi-dimensional, encompassing not only low income, but other forms of deprivation as well as the loss of dignity and self-respect (Donald *et al.*, 2009). Well-being provides a different frame through which to understand how globalisation is reshaping neighbourhoods and communities.

Thirdly, we need to be clear that by marginalisation we are referring to a complex process rather than a static end-point. Many individuals and groups move in and out of income poverty over the course of their lives, though low income is not the only source of marginalisation. Other barriers may be less overt but can have large effects on access and achievement including family structure and size, household formation, basic literacy and numeracy, cultural preferences, and so on (Saggar, 2008). Some analysts have argued that we should not be too alarmed by 'here and now' inequality: low wages and poorly rewarded jobs are less problematic if they are largely transitory (Esping-Andersen, 2007). Nonetheless, social mobility is negatively correlated with income inequality, so too much 'here-and-now' inequality can impair life chances and narrow the opportunities available across society. The critical task for policy-makers is to prevent social and economic exclusion from becoming entrenched, leaving permanent scarring effects. This presents a major barrier to social integration as the bedrock of an efficient economy and a strong society.

Finally, greater reflection needs to be given to the discourse of social policy itself, and how it keeps pace with important changes already signalled in this chapter. The welfare state historically has been a predominantly national concern, integral to the expansion in the role of the nation state from the late 19th century. The challenge in today's world is to understand how marginalisation and inclusion are influenced by structural forces that cut across the conventional boundaries of the state itself. Indeed, the very distinction between the 'domestic' and the 'international' in this context may be increasingly obsolete. The globalisation perspective has potentially profound implications for the concepts and theories used to analyse the development of social policy.

This paper looks at the most important changes that are associated with globalisation, and then examines which groups have been most affected. It analyzes the changing process of marginalisation and how this benefits certain communities, in part to the detriment of others. Globalisation is a disruptive and destabilizing force, simultaneously opening up and narrowing down opportunity structures for different groups. To understand the impact of globalisation it is necessary to focus on drivers within the nation state, as well as forces that operate outside the domestic context. We will examine evidence about the impact of globalisation on domestic sources of inequality and disadvantage, and whether it is mistaken to suggest that national governments are increasingly impotent in the face of globalisation challenges. Putting this in a UK context, the aim of this paper is to identify the most important pressures, challenges ahead, and options for how governments should respond.

Throughout, it is assumed that national governments actively participate in globalisation and regionalisation. A stronger focus on global democracy and global politics is necessary. This is not because the power of the nation state has disappeared. If national governments work in tandem at the global level, they can do more to contain the potentially negative impact of globalisation. This is particularly salient, for example, in relation to the European Union and the emergence of new policy spaces afforded by mechanisms such as the Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC) which enables EU countries to bench-mark progress, implementing policy solutions tried and tested by others.

More profoundly, however, wholly national government intervention in response to globalisation is surely too self-interested, particularly in an era characterised by the rapid movement of people across borders. Instead, we need to give greater emphasis to common human needs and collective transnational interests in developing social policy, shaped by a stronger understanding of the relationship between social justice and global justice (Miller, 2009). This is not just about the impact of international economic development on the capacity of British governments to pursue social justice at home, but issues of justice beyond the UK's shores. The traditional pursuit of the national interest appears narrow and increasingly morally indefensible in any contemporary account of social welfare and social justice.

Patterns and processes of marginalisation

We begin by assessing how far broader patterns and processes of marginalisation are changing, both those associated with globalisation and those arising from within the nation state. It is worth emphasizing that some features of poverty and exclusion in Britain have changed very little in the last 50 years (Mulgan, 2005). Generally, the places now at risk of deprivation are the same as half a century ago: the big former industrial cities and mining areas. There are also strong continuities within families, both of joblessness and deprivation more generally (Hills, 2010).

Nonetheless, the overall picture of marginalisation is arguably more complex – certainly more so than two decades ago – partly as the result of larger global trends. Increased mobility and fluidity combined with global economic, social and political integration is creating additional variance and transience in the patterns and processes of marginalisation. Many issues and concerns have become less clear-cut. This presents new challenges for policy-makers, to which we will return in the concluding section of the paper.

Our focus is the social and economic impact of globalisation and how this affects the capacity of different groups within the UK population to fulfil basic citizenship rights. Marginalisation can be defined spatially, in terms of place and the geography and dispersal of power. This is important because where people live is an increasingly important determinant of subsequent life chances, and should be central to any credible account of the dynamics of social inclusion. But understanding the impact of place alone is insufficient.

What is crucial is the extent to which individuals and groups have access to core economic and social entitlements, and how these in turn shape broader patterns of democratic participation and engagement. This entails a shift from the traditional focus on needs, to socially and legally guaranteed rights: from notions of charity to notions of duty and mutual responsibility.

Globalisation is often treated as an issue that concerns the consequences of global market integration and trade, in particular how the globalisation of labour impacts on the position of the low-skilled and those who have skills that are potentially outsourceable to other countries. These questions are of central importance and this paper focuses on access to the labour market and employment. Labour market exclusion is not the only factor in economic integration, and there are other facets of globalisation – such as the impact of climate change and rising commodity prices – that need to be taken into account. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that the labour market is a key driver of marginalisation and inclusion, and serves as an important proxy for the fulfilment of economic and social rights.

The first observation about changing patterns of marginalisation relates to the socio-economic status of Britain's ethnic minority communities. In the early 1970s, it was common to speak of ethnic minority groups as a homogenous category, and to focus on policies that tended to divide the majority from minorities. Today, such approaches look increasingly outdated, and the real danger of conflating ethnic categories is all too apparent. Some minority groups have quickly overtaken the white majority in relation to educational achievement and earnings, particularly Chinese and Indian communities. More than 75 per cent of the Indian age cohort in the UK now go on to university: nearly double the average. A tenth of Chinese girls have school results in the top 1 per cent overall (Saggar, 2008).

Many others are falling behind, however, particularly among Pakistani, Afro-Caribbean and Bangladeshi groups who perform far worse in relation to employment and school attainment than the general population. Pakistani men and women fare especially poorly. But even here there is significant variation: for example, median total household wealth for black-African households is £14,000 compared to £80,000 for Pakistani households (Hills, 2010). Gender further complicates the picture, with Afro-Caribbean girls doing far better at school than boys, and so on.

Recent research suggests that people from ethnic minority groups continue to suffer education and employment penalties. But despite the evidence of continuing discrimination, more complex patterns are slowly emerging. Some groups are relatively privileged while others are experiencing real deprivation and exclusion, not least the Muslim community, increasingly cast as the 'pariah' population of western societies (Saggar, 2008).

It is not straightforward to assess how far these changing patterns relate to globalisation, or to processes associated with globalisation. There have certainly been shifts in the occupational structure that appear to benefit some groups over others, but there is no clear correlation with globalisation per se. Different groups have been differentially affected by the acceleration of job polarisation, for example, but this does not necessarily originate in globalising forces.

The second observation about changing patterns of marginalisation relates to migration. Over the last decade, migration to the UK has increased markedly, prompted partly by increasing political and civil instability in East Africa and Eastern Europe, as well as the attractions of Britain's open and flexible labour market and service-orientated economy. But many migrants are at risk of entering permanent social and economic exclusion, with relatively weak long-term life prospects and opportunities. Migrants are themselves largely heterogeneous, differing across many dimensions at least as much from each other as the general population (Glover *et al.*, 2001). Migrant experiences are more polarised than for the population at large, with larger concentrations at the extremes, particularly when measured in terms of education and skill levels. In

Britain there are both more highly educated migrants, and more who are relatively unskilled.

This is highly relevant in understanding the dynamics of exclusion and marginalisation since migration is an important example of globalising trends. Globalisation symbolises the rapid movement of capital, labour and commodities across the world. Migrants have had very mixed success in the UK labour market: some migrants are highly successful, but others have been unemployed or inactive for long periods. Overall, their wages may be higher, but this average masks the polarisation of experience with migrants concentrated both at the top and bottom of the income distribution, often with lower economic activity rates than the native population. Migrants are often disadvantaged in the UK labour market: when they first work in Britain, men typically earn over 30 per cent less and women 15 per cent less than their British-born counterparts (Dickens and McKnight, 2008). Education and English language fluency are key determinants of labour market success, increasing the mean hourly occupational wage for ethnic minority males by up to 17 per cent (Shields and Price, 1999).

Migration has also been a significant factor in the globalisation debate since it is perceived to erode the real wages and employment prospects of the less advantaged core of the 'white' majority in the UK. Most studies do not, however, find any significant effect on the wages or employment prospects of native workers, even where there is a large and rapid influx of migrants into a particular industry (Card, 2001). A study of 18 European countries in 2003, for instance, found that if immigrants' share of total employment rises by 10 per cent, native employment falls by 0.2 per cent (Angrist and Kugler, 2003). Recent research has shown that a 1 per cent increase in the number of immigrants in the labour force led to a 0.1 per cent fall in real wages (Longhi *et al.*, 2004).

One possible explanation is that the migration of workers into a particular sector allows it to expand rapidly, leaving the wages and employment of the existing workforce largely unchanged. There is no denying, however, that increases in the labour supply have had negative effects, especially at the low-skilled end of the labour market (Gordon *et al.*, 2007). In the UK, for example, this was found to have contributed to the rise in unemployment among 18–24 year olds looking for unskilled jobs.

The third observation about marginalisation relates to geographical polarisation: despite the continuities already referred to, some features of exclusion have changed markedly since the early 1980s. It is clear, for example, that wider inequalities have increasingly opened up between different regions and cities in Britain, including far greater differences within particular cities and regions, as well as between them. The traditional concept of a 'north-south divide' in the UK that has continued to inform the debate about regional policy looks increasingly anachronistic. While some UK towns and cities have powered ahead in recent decades, others are locked into a seemingly inexorable process of decline.

At each spatial level in the global economy – world, nation, region, city and locality – economic activity is clustered, generating a spatially uneven pattern with booming cities and city-regions on the one hand, and decaying industrial regions and rural regions with lower levels of development and well-being on the other (Perrons, 2009). This unevenness or clustering is increasingly seen as an inherent characteristic of contemporary global capitalism (Krugman, 1991).

Overall, it is clear that changing processes of marginalisation and inclusion in the UK create new opportunities for some groups, while reinforcing the exclusion and relative deprivation of others. Globalisation has helped to unlock new structures of opportunity, particularly for those ethnic minority groups in the UK such as the Chinese and Indian communities who are able to translate the benefits of improved educational performance into stronger labour market outcomes, particularly among younger cohorts.

In particular, education appears to operate as a protective factor enabling these groups to escape the threat of long-term inactivity and labour market exclusion, while strengthening upward social mobility, leading to higher real incomes across time (Saggar, 2008). The absence of educational qualifications and key labour market competencies, however, may expose individuals to the growing risk of polarisation and exclusion. Educational achievement is a critical factor in the changing process of marginalisation. Education is increasingly seen for most groups as the pathway to a decent job, but this can be threatening to those in society whose families have traditionally failed in the formal school system.

This also translates into widespread and growing fear of globalisation: nearly half of all British citizens, for example, believe that the gap between rich and poor is likely to grow in the future (MORI, 2009). The workings of educational meritocracy, the erosion of traditional jobs in the manufacturing sector, and the perceived threat of globalisation to wages and living standards combine to increase social pessimism. There is some evidence that this is greatest among already disadvantaged groups (Sefton, 2005).

The Globalisation debate

The debate about the origins and impact of globalisation itself is highly contested, partly because there is no widely accepted definition of what globalisation amounts to. In the mid-1990s, globalisation was a concept that was being applied in academic sociology and social theory. Now it is part of popular vocabulary. Globalisation is widely seen as the most significant shaping factor of modern times, changing the contours of political debate markedly.

Globalisation as an idea has been applied in many different contexts: economic, political, social, military, cultural, and so on. There are advocates of the globalisation thesis who argue that the rapid expansion of the global economy, combined with the growth of information technology and communications, has facilitated faster contact across national boundaries and between cultural groups. For some, the consequence appears to be greater cultural heterogeneity and the rise of new forms of cosmopolitanism. For others, the result is paradoxically an increasing appeal to local and national identity, even the resurgence of nationalism. It is striking, for example, that in the recent British citizenship survey the great bulk of black and Asian Britons declare stronger attachment to British identity than their white counterparts.

There are three central forces of globalisation and regionalisation that impact on marginalisation in the UK labour market. The first is the shift towards high-skill employment in the UK economy. The second is evidence of 'a race to the bottom' in taxation policy. And the third relates to the changing priorities of governments.

One influential view propounded by a range of globalisation sceptics is that increases in global trade make it even more difficult to manage and control the national economy, with negative consequences for the welfare state. Capital in particular is increasingly mobile. As competition increases due to the openness of global markets, companies become ever more resistant to regulation and corporate taxation.

It is argued that this limits the capacity of national governments to mitigate the impact of globalisation: activist fiscal policy, redistribution and the welfare state are increasingly squeezed. This, in turn, makes it far harder to contain the rise in inequality and exclusion that globalisation is often thought to accentuate. These concerns stem partly from the fact that many welfare states have come under increasing fiscal and political pressure since the late 1970s, during a period in which the global economy widened its reach significantly.

The changing priorities of government

The evidence about the impact of globalisation, however, appears to suggest otherwise. Governments, by and large, are still able to raise revenue and much of Britain's industrial base remains internationally competitive. The strategies pursued by national governments are as influential as ever, and the capacity of the nation state to pursue social justice strategies domestically does not appear to have been greatly compromised.

Of course, globalisation can serve to limit the policy options that are available to national governments. While the UK has retained operational control over monetary policy through the Bank of England, for example, in large parts of the world power has been passed to central banks in order to secure low inflation and macroeconomic stability (Hirst and Thompson, 2002).

Even then, however, the importance of the state as an actor in the national economy may have risen rather than declined in the last 30 years. Fiscal policy still has a crucial role to play, particularly in equipping people with the skills and capacities necessary for countries to remain internationally competitive. Investment in research and development, infrastructure and technology, for example, remains crucially important. Indeed, globalisation may even serve to entrench support for the national welfare state, offering pillars of security and stability in an increasingly uncertain world.

The race to the bottom in taxation

There are also those who doubt that globalisation as traditionally understood has actually taken place (Hay, 2000). While the volume of cross-border transactions has increased significantly over the last 30 years, most economies, particularly in Europe, have become more integrated with their regional neighbours rather than across the globe. The impact of the pressures of globalisation is not as extensive as was once feared (Hay, 2000). That said, the trends and drivers alluded to in this paper do create significant challenges, requiring a considered response from UK governments, policy-makers, and leading actors in civil society.

The shift towards the high-skill economy

There is a substantial evidence base which suggests that globalisation is driving out many industrial sectors in Western Europe, with serious consequences for jobs and living standards. This is particularly acute in Britain where the speed of economic decline has been greater than many other advanced economies. That points to the emergence of a polarised, 'hour-glass' labour market with significant increases in income and wealth inequality, further disadvantaging already marginalised groups. Several analysts have highlighted the risks attached to this scenario – in particular the emergence of scarring effects associated with higher levels of poverty particularly in families where no-one is in work – impairing the healthy cognitive development of children (Esping-Andersen, 2007).

The domestic trends and drivers of change

This account hints at a number of pessimistic future scenarios. Nonetheless, it is important to acknowledge that many trends and drivers may originate within the nation state rather than from globalisation per se, and are far more amenable to public policy intervention than might be supposed.

First, there are changes to the labour market and the growth of the service-driven economy. These often evolve in developed economies in ways that are unrelated to globalisation. The demand for skills is primarily driven by new technologies. At the same time, changing patterns of demand for services reflect changing consumer preferences as societies get richer, and affluent consumers ascend Maslow's 'hierarchy of needs'. As productivity in manufacturing has risen due to technological advances, for example, the numbers employed in production in the UK have tended to fall. Technological transformation and the long-term shift in consumer demand have a marked effect on the quality of work that is available to different groups within the population.

The shift towards a service-based economy since the early 1970s may have beneficial effects, but there is evidence that high-skilled former manufacturing workers have struggled to find jobs that offer comparable remuneration, and may prefer to remain permanently inactive from the labour market (Gregg, 2008). This partly accounts for the considerable rise in inactivity rates seen in the UK over the last 20 years.

There also appears to be a significant regional and gender dimension, hitting working-class men particularly hard in the former industrial areas of North West and North East England, Central Scotland, and South Wales. Another concern with the shift towards a service-orientated economy is that there are fewer

intermediate jobs and progression opportunities within the labour market, stifling the opportunities for further upward mobility.

The most important debate, however, relates to the polarisation of work. There are two dominant concerns here. The first relates to the quality of work and employment. The second concerns the amount of work that is available. The polarisation between 'lovely' and 'lousy' jobs in the UK over the last 20 years has been stark. The share of jobs at the bottom of the job-quality distribution has risen by 17 per cent and the share of jobs at the top has increased by nearly 80 per cent over the period from 1979 to 1999 (Goos and Manning, 2007).

It is likely that further technological change will continue to replace human labour in a wide range of jobs, and that polarisation may well accelerate in the coming years. But to emphasise the point, globalisation and technological change are separate processes that should not be conflated. During the 1980s, the level of worklessness in the UK increased dramatically, while becoming increasingly concentrated within particular groups, especially among disabled people and some ethnic minority groups (Gregg, 2008). Other developments related to the rise in female labour-force participation, accompanied by occupational segregation and the clustering of women into casualised, low-paid work, as observed in 'Working Futures' modelling undertaken by the Warwick Institute for Employment Research.

Second, there are important changes in UK household composition and demography. We cannot understand the impact of globalisation without also considering changing demographic realities: how the shape of families continues to evolve as the population ages in most developed countries. There has been a sharp rise in the number of single-parent households that are increasingly prone to the risks of low income and unemployment — from 5.8 million in 1996 to a projected 7.9 million by 2016. Other pressures will arise from the potential generational clash between demands for the funding of pension systems, and the need to support the real incomes of younger workers and families.

Third, there are major changes in the cost pressures on the welfare state, and these have a significant impact on domestic political choices. While globalisation far from invalidates discretionary action by national governments, there are increasingly stark budgetary constraints. One of the key drivers concerns rising expectations among affluent voters. As electorates grow richer, the demand for high-quality healthcare and education rises, putting even greater pressure on public spending and diverting expenditure away from fiscal transfers and redistribution. Another driver relates to patterns of demand. An ageing population within Europe, for example, increases the pressures on health and social services exponentially. The overall effect is that the share of national wealth available for redistribution to those who are losing out from the combined effects of globalisation and domestically-driven inequality and polarisation is reduced.

It is reasonable, in summary, to assume the following scenarios for Britain in the future: labour markets will become even more flexible, particularly in terms of wage-setting and job protection; post-industrial job growth will be biased in favour of high-skilled employment; the combination of the ageing society and increasing female labour-force participation will lead to a sizeable growth in low-skill service jobs; as a result, income inequalities are likely to rise even further.

It is important in this respect to grasp how globalisation reinforces trends that may be domestic in origin. For example, new competition from emerging economies is squeezing key sectors from textiles to motor manufacturing, even though the contraction may have started with new technologies and changing patterns of consumer demand. There is greater potential for the radical unbundling of economic activities previously considered untradeable as companies slice up the value chain, specialise vertically, and off-shore many jobs that would once have been regarded as at the irreducible core of the firm's activities (Baldwin, 2006).

Civic capacity and political participation

Having focused on changes associated with access to the labour market and employment, it is important to consider how this impacts on patterns of social and democratic participation, relating to citizens' broader integration into economic, social and political life. These are best understood as a series of related exclusionary processes and practices: for example, discrimination, access to public services, income poverty, and the propensity to participate in formal elections are closely correlated. In relation to the British Muslim community, for instance, Shamit Saggar concludes: 'The very long tail of Muslim under-achievement in schools and employment is magnified in entrenched patterns of residential segregation, inward-looking community norms, grievance narratives and leadership styles' (Saggar, 2008).

The analysis of General Household Survey data in particular reveals that attitudinal measures of civic engagement are closely related to socio-demographic characteristics (Fahmy, 2003). It might be predicted that higher levels of economic marginalisation in the employment market, for example, would lead to the lower propensity of disadvantaged groups to vote. Importantly, the concept of marginalisation enables us to link issues of agency such as the willingness to engage in civic activity with structural characteristics such as lifestyle processes, socio-economic drivers, and demographic changes.

Conclusion

In reflecting on the implication of these trends and drivers for public policy, it is clear that the pressures and challenges ahead will be even more complex and fine-grained than in the past. Taking the life chances of ethnic minorities in the UK as a key example, the policy challenge has become far more nuanced, demanding a sophisticated response from governments and civil society. Crude measures to raise employment in ethnic minority groups such as those used in many public sector organisations in the 1980s, for example, are unlikely to reach the real sources of deprivation and to assist those most affected (Mulgan, 2005).

There is also a need to move away from the broad-brush aggregates that have traditionally informed social policy thinking given the degree of complexity and the shift towards a more diverse society. Many of the critical tasks such as the creation of full employment, the elimination of child poverty, and closing the gaps between poorer and richer areas remain significant. The challenge, as always, is to prevent permanent exclusion from becoming entrenched. That requires greater attention to be paid to the dynamics of how individuals and groups move in and out of poverty and exclusion over the course of their lives. This includes focusing on protective factors such as the acquisition of high-value skills and access to particular social networks that prevent poverty from becoming permanent (Ferrera, 2006).

There can be little doubt that the labour market position of the low-skilled is deteriorating: without opportunities to acquire new skills and manage labour market transitions smoothly, too many risk being trapped on a carousel of bad jobs and unemployment (Esping-Andersen, 2007). The evidence examined in this paper suggests that the combination of globalisation alongside domestic drivers is diminishing the life chances and opportunities of many groups in Britain who have experienced disadvantage for successive generations.

There is no evidence, however, that globalisation precludes the adoption of policies designed to improve the life chances of the most marginalised groups. It should be possible to build new 'social bridges' that offer access to ladders of opportunity throughout the life-course, including better transitions through the labour market reducing the risk of polarisation, and a more anticipatory approach to social policy that tackles problems at source.

New ways must be found to tackle embedded disadvantage. This remains the most significant public policy challenge, and the emphasis on child-centred investment strategies has become increasingly influential. This combines the strong emphasis on early childhood development with measures to strengthen equality of opportunity. It is important to consider that people need not just once chance at 5, 11 or 16, but new chances throughout their lives.

Finally, it is vital to pursue the argument about forging genuinely transnational conceptions of social justice and development. In some contexts, the human rights model has provided a powerful banner under which communities unite around shared injustice, challenging stereotypes of the marginalised as fraudulent or feckless, and contesting discourses that are punitive and stigmatising.

There is an opportunity to develop new paradigms that are able to shape public debate and public policy in relation to social inclusion and marginalisation. Globalisation is still a widely misinterpreted and often ill-defined concept. It may, however, provide the stimulus that is needed to revise the basic analytical frameworks that must underpin future approaches to social exclusion, providing a much stronger international and global orientation. This should examine how the link between rights and territory has become much looser since the break-up of the post-war settlement, with greater emphasis on the co-ordination of social security regimes, particularly within the European Union, increasingly challenging the discriminatory and exclusionary prerogatives of national governments. Contemporary social policy would surely be none the worse for such an opening up.

References

- Angrist, D. and Kugler, M (2003) 'Protective or Counter-productive? Labour market institutions and the effect of immigration on EU citizens', *The Economic Journal*, Volume 113, No. 488, pp. 301–333.
- Baldwin, M. (2006) 'Patterns of Migration in the Balkans', Mediterranean Migration Observatory Working Paper No. 9, www.mmo.gr
- Card, D. (2001) 'Immigrant Inflows, Native Outflows, and Higher Immigration', *Journal of Labor Economics*, Volume 19, No. 1
- Dickens, R. and McKnight, A. (2008) 'The changing pattern of earnings: employees, migrants and low paid families', Joseph Rowntree Research Paper
- Donald, A. *et al.* (2009) 'Evaluating the impact of selected cases under the Human Rights Act on public services provision', Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report Series
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2007) 'Rethinking the Welfare State', in Pearce, N. and Margo, J. *Politics for a New Generation: The Progressive Moment*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Fahmy, E. *Civic capacity, social exclusion and political participation in Britain. Evidence from the 1999 Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey. ESRC/ODPM Postgraduate Research Programme Working Paper 3*, for Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004.
- Ferrera, M. (2006) 'Friends, Not Foes: European Integration and European Welfare States', in Giddens, A. *et al.*, *Global Europe, Social Europe*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Glover *et al.* (2001) 'Migration: an economic and social analysis', RDS Occasional Paper No. 67, London: Home Office
- Goos, M. and Manning, A. (2007) 'Lovely and Lousy Jobs: The Rising Polarisation of Work in Britain', *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 89, No. 1
- Gordon, I. *et al.* 2007, 'The impact of recent immigration on the London economy', London: City of London Corporation.
- Gregg, P. (with Jonathan Wadsworth) (2008) 'Two Sides to Every Story: Measuring Worklessness and Polarisation at the Household Level', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 171, pp. 857–875

- Hay, C. (2001) (ed.), *Demystifying Globalisation*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hills, J. (2010) 'Report of the National Equality Panel', London: Government Equalities Office
- Hirst, P. and Thompson, G. (2002) 'The Future of Globalization', *Co-operation and Conflict*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 247–265
- Krugman, P. (1991) 'Increasing Returns and Economic Geography', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 99, No. 3
- Longhi, S. *et al.* (2006) 'The Impact of Immigration on the Employment of Natives in Regional Labour Markets: A Meta-Analysis', IZA Discussion Paper No. 2044
- MORI/IPSOS MORI (2009) *Political Issues Index*, May 2009.
- Miller, D. (2009) 'Social Justice Verses Global Justice?', in Cramme, O. and Diamond, P., *Social Justice in the Global Age*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Mulgan, G. (2005) 'Going with and against the grain', in Pearce, N. and Paxton, W., *Social Justice: Building a Fairer Britain*, London: Methuen Politicos
- Perrons, D (2009) 'Spatial and Gender Inequalities in the Global Economy: A Transformative Perspective', in Cramme, O. and Diamond, P., *Social Justice in the Global Age*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- Saggar, S. (2008) *Pariah Politics: The rise of Western Radical Islam and what to do about it*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Sefton, T. (2005) 'Changing Social Attitudes', in Pearce, N. and Paxton, W., *Social Justice: Building a Fairer Britain*, London: Methuen Politicos
- Shields, M. and Price, S.W., 'The English language fluency and occupational success of ethnic minority men living in English Metropolitan areas', *Population Economics*, Vol. 15, No. 1
- Thomas, B. and Dorling, D (2007) *Identity in Britain: A cradle to grave atlas*, Bristol: Policy Press

About the author

Patrick Diamond

Senior Research Fellow at Policy Network

Gwilym Gibbon Fellow at Nuffield College, Oxford

Visiting Fellow in the Department of Politics, University of Oxford

Elected member of Southwark Council.