

**A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF
POVERTY DYNAMICS RESEARCH
REVIEW PROTOCOL – REVISED DRAFT
CRSP509**

**Laura Adelman
Kate Ashton-Brooks
Sue Middleton
Kate Legge**

July 2004

CONTENTS

	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW	3
2.1 Early Dynamic Poverty Analysis in the UK	3
2.2 Dynamic Data	4
3 DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION	7
4 IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH	8
4.1 Trial Searching	8
4.2 Search Terms	8
4.3 Search Sources	9
4.3.1 Electronic databases	9
4.3.2 Internet searches	9
4.3.3 Journals and hand searching	10
4.3.4 Reference checking	10
5 STUDY SELECTION CRITERIA	11
5.1 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria	11
5.1.1 Geographical coverage	11
5.1.2 Timing of studies	11
5.1.3 Indicators measured	12
5.1.4 Outcomes measured	13
5.1.5 Study design	13
5.1.6 Quality appraisal	13
5.2 Screening of Retrieved Studies	14
6 QUALITY APPRAISAL	16
7 MAPPING THE EVIDENCE	19
8 SYNTHESIS	21
9 INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE	23
REFERENCES	25
ANNEX A REVIEW ADVISERS	
ANNEX B PROPOSED SEARCH STRATEGY	
ANNEX C DATABASES/CATALOGUES TO BE SEARCHED	
ANNEX D WEBSITES TO BE SEARCHED	
ANNEX E JOURNALS TO BE HAND-SEARCHED	

1 INTRODUCTION

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) has commissioned the Centre for Research in Social Policy (CRSP) to undertake a comprehensive review of research on the dynamics of poverty and disadvantage in the UK. The main aims of the research are to produce findings that will:

- Inform policy in relation to the reduction/eradication of poverty and disadvantage and their outcomes;
- Highlight gaps in the research on poverty dynamics that might be filled by a future research initiative.

To achieve these aims, systematic review methodology will be used so as to ensure that all the available research evidence is retrieved. This project builds on the relatively recent – but increasing – use of systematic review methodology in social policy. In particular it has drawn on the methodologies used, and being further developed, at the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre, Institute of Education) and the ESRC-supported Systematic Reviews in Social Policy and Social Care node of the Evidence Network (University of York).

The first and critical stage of any systematic review is the review protocol. The purpose of the protocol is to describe all the decisions regarding how the review will be undertaken – in other words, before any literature is retrieved. This is a key element of eliminating bias from the review. The decisions in this review protocol have been developed with assistance and guidance from a number of people including: an internal team at CRSP; librarians at Loughborough University; the Project Advisory Group; and, other ‘experts’ in systematic review techniques (please see Annex A for details).

This document therefore discusses and describes the decisions that have been taken thus far with regard to the review. The following chapter provides some background to the need for a review of poverty dynamics research (Chapter 2). The

development of the research questions which the review will be answering are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 outlines the search strategy including terms and sources that will be used for uncovering the evidence. Chapter 5 considers the inclusion and exclusion criteria that have been established and the screening techniques that will be utilised. The following chapter pays attention to appraising the retrieved evidence for its quality (Chapter 6). Chapter 7 discusses the use, and development, of a map to provide an overview of the research evidence that is found. Chapter 8 describes how the evidence will be synthesised. Finally, the use of international evidence for the project is discussed in Chapter 9. It should be noted that international evidence is being gathered to identify the types of poverty dynamic analysis that has been undertaken elsewhere, providing ideas for possible research in this country. It does not form part of the systematic review.

2 BACKGROUND TO THE REVIEW

2.1 Early Dynamic Poverty Analysis in the UK

The dynamic, or life-cycle, theory of poverty was first expounded by Rowntree at the beginning of the twentieth century (Rowntree, 1901). However, the development of dynamic analytical techniques that can handle longitudinal data, is relatively recent in the UK and, indeed, in other countries. Whilst the UK has a longer tradition of birth cohort studies than elsewhere (see further below), these studies were not designed to provide an understanding of changes in living standards over time; rather their focus was on child development. For example, no income data was collected at birth in the National Child Development Study and, whilst later waves of the survey attempted to measure total household income, it has been reported that these met with limited success (Micklewright, 1986).

Among UK academics, interest in poverty dynamics arguably began with Walker and Ashworth's secondary analyses of the US Panel Study of Income Dynamics in the early 1990s to investigate the dynamics of childhood poverty (Walker with Ashworth, 1994). This followed earlier research using the same dataset by US academics such as Hill (1981); Bane and Elwood (1986); and Murray (1986). Although not centrally concerned with poverty, the application of dynamic techniques to longitudinal administrative data in the UK involving some of the poorest individuals and households was also pioneered in CRSP with Ashworth's analysis of Family Credit (Ashworth and Walker, 1992) and Income Support (Ashworth et al., 1995) records.

The development of genuinely dynamic approaches to the study of poverty in the UK was limited by the lack of availability of suitable longitudinal data, other than from the birth cohort studies, until the institution of the British Household Panel Survey in 1991. Therefore, the study of poverty over time was largely limited to point-in-time comparisons of poverty rates using repeat cross-sectional surveys such as the Family Resources Survey.

2.2 Dynamic Data

The type of data that is now available for such studies is considered here and some of the analyses that have been undertaken which are potentially available for inclusion in this review are identified.

The Foundation wishes the review to include both evidence of poverty dynamics in terms of year on year transitions, but also evidence pointing to transitions over a much longer period, relating to inter-generational changes in, and transmissions of, poverty. The data to provide evidence of the latter is limited in Britain to three cohort surveys. These are:

- the National Survey of Health and Development, begun in 1946 and with 20 further collections of data (the latest being in 1999);
- the National Child Development Study, started in 1958, with follow-up surveys in 1965, 1969, 1974, 1981, and 1991; and,
- the 1970 Birth Cohort Study with follow-up surveys in 1975, 1980, 1986 and 1996.

A very wide range of studies have been undertaken using – and comparing (Ekinsmyth et al., undated) - these individuals, although as noted earlier, the emphasis has been on child development rather than poverty or living standards. Later waves of data have, however, allowed comparisons of, for example, employment and family outcomes (see for example Hobcraft and Kiernan, 1999; Kiernan, 2003; Hobcraft, 2003).

Two additional cohort studies are of interest, but which do not allow evidence of outcomes over a long period or transmissions of poverty. These are the Youth Cohort Studies (undertaken since 1985) which interview a sample of young people from the age of 16 until their late teens or early 20s¹ and the Millennium Cohort Study which has been designed along similar lines to the NCDS and BCS70, but currently has only one wave of data available.

¹ There were variations in data collection between cohorts. Some were collected annually, for others two yearly intervals were used.

To investigate poverty dynamics over shorter periods of time, data availability is much wider. The most important in terms of the length of study and the wide range of information it collects is the British Household Panel Survey, started in 1991 and now with eleven waves of data. As the survey matures its use is growing rapidly. Numerous new studies are undertaken each year, many focussing on poverty dynamics. A number of other surveys have a longitudinal element – often alongside a cross-sectional survey – in order to allow for dynamic analysis. These include the Survey of Low Income Families (SOLIF), the Families and Children Survey (FACS), Labour Force Survey, the Retirement Survey, the New Earnings Survey and the Lifetime Labour Market Database. As noted above, administrative data – such as the receipt of benefits – can, and has, also been used to track individuals' movements, although this is normally over relatively short periods of time and in relation to receipt of particular benefits.

Internationally, no countries appear to have cohort studies like our own that have followed individuals since the 1940s or 1950s. However, household panel data for the United States has been collected since 1968, following individuals (and their families and other household members) annually since that time. This allows for study of transmissions of poverty as well as changes over shorter periods of time, and is not restricted by a focus on just one cohort of individuals. Numerous studies have been undertaken using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) (see for example, Brooks-Gunn and Duncan, 1997; McKernan and Ratcliffe, 2002; Browne, 2001). A number of European Countries have also had panel data for longer than Britain, including Germany, Netherlands and Sweden. The introduction of the European Community Household Panel has ensured that all member countries of the European Union have had comparable longitudinal data from 1994 to 2001. Some European countries – such as Norway – have the advantage that their panel survey data can be matched to administrative data, providing information of greater detail.

Given the data availability, and the increased interest in poverty dynamics, particularly since the British Government now includes the persistence of child poverty in its indicators of poverty and social exclusion, it is unsurprising to find a

wealth of research evidence investigating the issue. The handful of examples presented below simply demonstrate the wide range of studies that have been undertaken:

- Government funded research, which has, for example, focused on movements into and out of poverty and persistent poverty for specific household types (Jenkins et al., 2001), outcomes for children of poverty (Ermisch et al., 2001), and deprivation and family change (Vegeris and McKay, 2002, and Marsh and Rowlingson, 2002).
- Research for the European commission which has included analysis of the ECHP to determine movements into and out of poverty, and experiences of deprivation from one year to the next (Apospori and Millar, 2003), and movements to and from minimum income (Roberts et al., 2002).
- The OECD has also been involved, publishing research on the use of longitudinal data and approaches to dynamic measurement of poverty (see, for example, Bynner, 1996 and OECD, 2001).
- UNICEF's project 'Children in and out of Poverty' (Bradbury et al., 2001) supported the study of dynamics of child poverty in seven countries.
- The Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion at LSE has also undertaken a wealth of work on both poverty dynamics and the intergenerational transmission of poverty (for example, Hills et al., 2002), and finally,
- JRF itself has been central with work such as 'Child Development and Family Income' (Gregg, Harkness and Machin, 1999).

Therefore the need for a review of this evidence is extremely timely, and will be of immense use to policy-makers to identify the trends in poverty dynamics. It will also be of use to researchers and the funders of research in order to identify the gaps in the knowledge of poverty dynamics.

3 DEVELOPMENT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTION

JRF's call for proposals document clearly highlights the desire to have a comprehensive overview of poverty dynamics research. Indeed, there are two key elements to the review, and therefore two research questions:

1. What research has been undertaken studying poverty changes over time among individuals, families and households in the UK?

2. What does this research tell us about poverty changes over time among individuals, families and households in the UK?

These two questions will be answered by two separate stages of the review. Question 1 will be answered by the mapping stage (see Section 7) which produces an overview of the level and type of research activity in the area of interest, in this instance poverty dynamics. Question 2 will be answered by the synthesis stage (see Section 8) which extracts and draws together the key findings from the available and relevant studies.

4 IDENTIFICATION OF RESEARCH

The aim has been to develop a search strategy which will facilitate the identification of as many relevant studies as possible in order to fully address the research question.

However, there has been a necessary compromise between the sensitivity of the search strategy (in order to identify as much material as possible), and the need to focus the search in order both to exclude irrelevant studies and to contain the amount of material retrieved.

4.1 Trial searching

The process of refining the search strategy in order to make the search both more accurate and more productive, has proved a difficult and time-consuming exercise. The master search strategy (outlined in Annex B) has evolved through a protracted process of trial searching and subsequent amendments, aimed at producing the best and most accurate results possible. Some initial search terms have been replaced (e.g. 'depriv*' has been replaced by 'deprived' and 'deprivation') or omitted (e.g. 'history', since it was generating a lot of historical material); and new search terms have been added (e.g. keywords to identify the types of data sources used). The final list of search terms is one which the project team are confident that the resultant search strategy will capture the material required to enable the review to answer the research questions in great depth.

4.2 Search Terms

The proposed electronic search strategy (shown in Annex B) is relatively straightforward. As defined by the research questions, the aim is to produce a systematic review of poverty dynamics research within the UK. Thus, the search strategy consists of two main sections which seek to include studies which, while their main focus may be "poverty dynamics", do not actually use this term. Search terms have therefore been developed to describe both "poverty" and "dynamics", and the search strategy combines these terms:

- The first section (lines 1 to 8) identifies terms which may be used to mean “poverty”. References generated from this section will only be retrieved if COMBINED with terms from the other main section.
- The second section (lines 10 to 19) identifies terms which may be used to signify “dynamics”. Again, references generated from this section will only be retrieved if COMBINED with terms from the other main section.

4.3 Search Sources

During the process of developing the search strategy, the sheer volume of the material resulting from such a broad research question has become apparent. Various strategies aimed at narrowing the focus of the search (and reducing the number of results) have been tried and rejected. However, one way in which the team feels it is legitimate to narrow the focus of the search has been the pragmatic decision *not* to search those sources which will only, or predominantly, contain comparative international material. Although the project does not seek to *exclude* comparative material which examines poverty dynamics within the UK, at the same time the team feels that the boundaries of this research project cannot extend to deliberately seeking out such material. Thus, European and international databases and websites have been omitted from the lists of sources to be searched.

4.3.1 Electronic databases

A number of databases and other electronic sources have been identified across various relevant disciplines including the social sciences and economics, as well as the main library catalogues (see Annex C). Sources of grey literature and unpublished materials are also included.

While the process outlined in Annex B represents the master search strategy for the electronic search, different search terms and combinations of terms will have to be used for each of the different databases. This is an unavoidable complication of the search process since the sophistication of the possible search strategies varies enormously from database to database. An individual search strategy is being

developed for each database by the project team as a whole in order to ensure, as far as possible, consistency within the search process.

It must also be noted that the electronic search of databases and other sources, will be reliant upon the identification of search terms within the titles, abstracts and keywords of the studies they contain. The comprehensiveness of the material retrieved will inevitably be constrained by the quality of the abstracting and indexing of the databases being used (Grayson and Gomersall, 2003).

4.3.2 Internet searches

The research team have also identified a number of internet sites belonging to academic, research, government and charitable organisations, which may yield relevant material for the review (see Annex D). Although it is impossible to ensure that the searching of such sources is entirely systematic, to ignore them would be to lose potentially valuable material unobtainable elsewhere.

4.3.3 Journals and hand searching

A number of academic and other journals have been identified by the team as potential sources of material of interest to this review (see Annex E). All but two of the journals ('Family Policy Bulletin' and 'Benefits') will be searched electronically, where possible. Hand-searching of 'Family Policy Bulletin' and 'Benefits', and of more recent journal issues not yet available electronically, will also be carried out. A Zetoc 'alert' has been set up by the project team to aid the searching process.

4.3.4 Reference checking

The references cited in each of the studies retrieved are to be used to identify further studies which have not been found through the electronic search. The websites of the Centre for Longitudinal Studies at the Institute of Education, and that of the UK Data-Archive, will also be used to identify references and publications arising from the various relevant longitudinal data sources.

5 STUDY SELECTION CRITERIA

5.1 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been developed to assist with providing a review that has coherence and is manageable. These criteria are discussed in turn (and are summarised in Table 5.1 below):

5.1.1 Geographical coverage

The JRF is most interested in the evidence from the UK. Therefore, as the research questions identify, the systematic review will only include studies of the UK (or countries/regions within the UK). It will also include UK evidence from comparative studies. However, it would not be possible for this review to identify all comparative research that includes the UK because a large amount of evidence will not be written in English. Therefore, the review will not deliberately ‘seek out’ comparative studies, but if these are identified using the search strategy they will be included.

Evidence about other countries, either in comparative or single-country studies, will be excluded from the systematic review. International evidence will be included in the report separately from the systematic review (see Chapter 9 below).

5.1.2 Timing of studies

Following advice from the PAG, and after running trials, the literature search includes studies published from 1946 onwards.

REVISED SECTION: If resources would allow, the preference would be not to have a cut-off point with regard to publication date. However, following a brief review of earlier evidence, it seems reasonable to establish a cut-off point, such that only studies published since 1990 are included. This is because, although studies from the cohort-style datasets exist prior to this date, by far the majority are not specifically interested in poverty and disadvantage, and it is believed that the trade off between a large amount of time spent on irrelevant studies compared to greater time being spent on more recent studies (and therefore of greater policy relevance) is worthwhile. Indeed, a greater length of time would be spent excluding irrelevant studies, and it is also likely that retrieving older studies would take longer. In addition, many of the databases to be searched do not include references until the 1980s, and therefore including earlier studies will not necessarily lead to a (more) systematic review.

5.1.3 Indicators measured

Income poverty, although certainly not all there is to poverty, remains central to its analysis because, in many cases, it is the nearest indicator to a lack of resources that is available. In addition, it is important because it provides a simple method by which to make international comparisons. There are numerous national, international and comparative studies investigating the dynamics of income poverty which will fall under the remit of this review in addition to those outlined above (for example, Hill and Jenkins, 1999, Hill et al., 1998).

However, the Foundation's interest is not just in (income) poverty dynamics, but also the dynamics of disadvantage. Therefore, agreed definitions of what is meant by 'poverty' and 'disadvantage' are crucial.

The inclusion/exclusion criteria outlines the indicators of poverty to be included in this review; income poverty, material deprivation, expenditure poverty and subjective measures of poverty. The intention behind using these indicators is, firstly, to make it possible to undertake the review within the time-frame, but also to help focus the synthesis.

These four indicators of poverty have been chosen in order to exclude other indicators which are often confused with poverty, such as poor health, living in a deprived area, and so on. They have also been developed so as to exclude studies which analyse social exclusion – unless of course 'social exclusion' is used to describe income poverty, material deprivation, expenditure poverty or subjective measures of poverty (as it often is). These indicators also lead to the exclusion of studies of income inequality which do not include a focus on poverty. Finally, and perhaps most crucially, studies investigating benefit receipt transitions are excluded. Although these transitions are sometimes used as proxies for movements into and out of poverty, they are often associated with movements into and out of employment – and, therefore, if these transitions were included, it would arguably also be necessary to include movements into and out of unemployment/workless households for example. Similarly, studies investigating the dynamics of low pay/low earnings will be excluded.

5.1.4 Outcomes measured

To be a study of poverty dynamics, poverty status data clearly has to be collected over a period of time. However, it may be the case that different measures are used to analyse poverty over time. These studies will be excluded because for any meaningful measurement of movements into or out of poverty, the same measures need to be used at all time points.

5.1.5 Study design

Following the inclusion/exclusion criteria developed by Baldwin et al. (2002), only studies with empirical evidence will be used in this review. In addition, where there are duplications of the same material in more than one study, just one of the studies will be chosen. If the evidence differs, however, all the studies would be included.

5.1.6 Quality appraisal

This criteria is discussed in more detail in the following Chapter. However, it is worthy of note here that only studies that meet all the essential quality criteria outlined in Table 6.1 will be included in the review. This is being used simply to exclude studies which are flawed such that their results would be of no use for this review. It is not the intention of this quality criteria to assess 'how good' a study is, simply whether it is 'good enough' to form part of the evidence for this review.

This quality assessment process will, however, take place only when all other criteria have been met. In other words, it will not be necessary to assess the quality of all retrieved studies, only those that, when screened using the title/abstract and/or full text, meet the other inclusion criteria.

Table 5.1 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Exclusion number	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
1	<i>(topic)</i> Studies that relate to poverty in the UK (including comparative studies which analyse the UK)	Studies that do not relate to poverty or not on poverty in the UK (either single-country studies or comparative studies that do not include the UK)
2	<i>(timing of evidence)</i> Studies investigating evidence from 1946 onwards	Studies investigating periods before 1946
3	<i>(study design)</i> Studies based on empirical evidence	Book reviews, discursive material (e.g. opinion or policy pieces), conference papers, (non-systematic) literature or research reviews* and newspaper or magazine articles will be excluded. Where there are duplications of the same material in more than one study, just one of the studies will be chosen. If the evidence differs, however, all the studies would be included.
4	<i>(nature of evidence)</i> Studies that measure the poverty status of the same individuals, families or households over time – in other words, using longitudinal data (quantitative or qualitative).	Studies that do not measure the poverty status of the same individuals, families or households over time – either they do not investigate individuals, families or households and/ or they use cross-sectional data.
5	<i>(indicators measured)</i> Studies that measure poverty using indicators of income poverty, expenditure poverty, material deprivation or subjective poverty	Studies that measure income (inequality) (without specific reference to poverty), or measure poverty using alternative concepts such as benefit receipt, or measuring social exclusion (which is not defined as income poverty, expenditure poverty, material deprivation or subjective poverty)
6	<i>(outcomes measured)</i> Poverty measures used to compare poverty status over time must be consistent within each study	Studies that measure other outcomes, but not poverty status or measure poverty differently over time
7	<i>(quality appraisal)</i> Studies will be included if they meet all the essential quality criteria outlined in Table 6.1	Studies will be excluded if they do not meet all the essential quality criteria outlined in Table 6.1

*** although reviews will not be sought out in the searching process, if they are found and relate to the topic under investigation in this review, the studies which the review refers to and/or the reference list will be checked.**

5.2 Screening of Retrieved Studies

The studies that are found through the search strategy will be 'screened' using the inclusion and exclusion criteria. This will happen in three stages – based upon the EPPI-Centre's 'The Review Process' diagram which uses the following:

1. Studies found using the search strategy will be entered into a reference management database (Refworks) 'screen me'
→ titles (using the first three criteria only) and then abstracts and keywords (using all criteria) of studies retrieved will be screened
2. relevant or possibly relevant studies will be transferred to 'get me' (second reference management database)
→ once retrieved, the full reports of possibly relevant studies will be screened with the inclusion/exclusion criteria
3. all relevant studies will be transferred to 'include me' (third reference management database).

At all stages records will be kept, detailing the studies that have been excluded and for what reason(s). Also, the report will provide examples of studies that have been excluded and the reasons for their exclusion.

The application of the inclusion/exclusion criteria will be checked by more than one reviewer. The intention is to select ten per cent of studies for which the inclusion/exclusion criteria will be applied by two reviewers. Inconsistencies will be checked and the criteria adjusted, where appropriate, to establish clearer guidelines.

6 QUALITY APPRAISAL

It has been reported that researchers have concerns about excluding research from the review on the basis of quality (Wallace et al., 2003). However, it seems unarguable that if the findings of this research are to have value in informing policy and practice, then an assessment of the quality of the evidence in relation to the research question is essential. Policy makers and others interested in the findings will require an indication of the extent to which the findings can be relied upon as internally and/or externally valid and generalisable. Put simply, is the quality of a study sufficient so that its results can be trusted in making policy and practice recommendations?

Issues of quality will need to be addressed at least two levels: first, the quality of the longitudinal data collected and, secondly, the quality of subsequent secondary analyses of the data. It should be noted that some reviewers have pointed to the poor reporting of methods (Wallace et al., 2003), in which case it may prove necessary to contact authors for clarification (although it should also be noted that this is a time-consuming exercise and may not always be fruitful).

The quality appraisal criteria developed by Croucher et al. (2003) seems particularly well-suited to this review, as it is anticipated that this review will retrieve studies with similar types of study design. They identified 10 criteria on which studies are to be based. In Croucher et al. six of these criteria were essential and studies had to meet all of these to be included in the review.

Building on the researchers' experiences of these criteria, some modifications have been made to their list, rewording some of the criteria to realistically reflect the often scarce reporting of methodology and, most importantly, reducing the number of essential criteria (E) which studies must meet to be included in the review to four (the remaining six criteria are desirable features (D)). In this manner, it can be assured that the studies included in the Map (see Chapter 7) and the Synthesis (see Chapter 8) are of sufficient quality on which to base conclusions regarding gaps of (good) evidence and the 'stories' that the evidence provides. As noted above, this

procedure is to ensure that studies are ‘good enough’ for inclusion in the review, excluding the ‘inarguably’ poor studies.

Table 6.1 Quality Appraisal Criteria

1	Question	Is the research question clear?	D
2	Theoretical perspective	Is the theoretical or ideological perspective of the author (and/or funder) explicit, and has this (inappropriately) influenced the study design, methods or research findings?	D
3	Study design	Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question?	E
4	Context	Is the context or setting adequately described?	D
5	Sampling	(Qualitative) Is the sample adequate to explore the range of subjects and settings, and has it been drawn from an appropriate population? (Quantitative) Is the sample size adequate for the analysis used and has it been drawn from an appropriate population?	E
6	Data collection	Was there evidence that the data collection was rigorously conducted to ensure confidence in the findings?	E
7	Data analysis	Was the data analysis adequately described and rigorously conducted to ensure confidence in the findings?	E
8	Reflexivity	Are the findings substantiated by the data and has consideration been given to any limitations of the methods that may have affected the results?	D
9	Generalisability	Do any claims to generalisability follow logically, theoretically and statistically from the data?	D
10	Ethics	Have ethical issues been addressed and confidentiality respected?	D

Within the data collection criteria (number 6), a number of specific issues will be addressed for studies using quantitative methods. The first is whether the response rate was sufficient and whether any non-response has been analysed and (where appropriate) adjusted for? This is of particular relevance for this review because accounting for attrition in longitudinal datasets is extremely important. Secondly, the use of the retrospective collection of data within quantitative studies has been questioned, with particular difficulties centred around recall error (Bynner, 1996; Ruspini, 2002). Therefore, our quality criteria for quantitative data collection includes the requirement that in the original survey the collection of poverty data must be within the previous calendar year. This would exclude studies based entirely on retrospective data such as the Work and Family Lives Survey which collected data on these issues from all respondents from the age of 16.

Finally of note, if decisions cannot be made by reviewers with regard to excluding a study on the basis of its quality, other quantitative and qualitative research experts within CRSP would be asked for their judgement on the study.

7 MAPPING THE EVIDENCE

As described above, a major part of this review is providing JRF with an overview of the research that has already been undertaken on poverty dynamics – research question 1. Therefore, EPPI-Centre’s method of using a map to describe the studies that exist (but NOT their findings) will be utilised.

The map will provide knowledge about the studies that exist. This will enable JRF to identify gaps in poverty dynamics research that can be filled by a future research initiative. In so doing, it is anticipated that the following questions of particular interest to the Foundation will be answered via the map:

- Is further research needed for any particular sub-groups?
- Are there any gaps in knowledge?
- Is there potential for exploiting existing data sources?
- What recommendations can be made on future secondary analysis and where JRF’s priorities in this area should lie?

The coverage of the map will be led by the characteristics of studies identified in the review, but it is anticipated that the data to be collected for the map regarding each study will include:

- Unique identifier for each report (including author and title)
- Where was the study found? – Electronic database, website, handsearch, citation, contact, other (please specify)
- What is the study’s status? – Published, in press, unpublished
- What area is covered by the study? – UK, Britain, England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, Regional, Local
- Which type of dynamic is measured?
- Which measure(s) of poverty are analysed? – Income, deprivation, expenditure, subjective, combination (please specify)
- Which other outcomes are measured? – Employment, health, education, family, other (please specify)

- What is/are the population focus/foci of the study? – e.g. Whole population, age, ethnicity, family type, employment status, gender, social class (please specify)
- Which dataset is used for the analysis?
- What date is covered by the analysis?
- What time period is analysed? – <5 years, 5-9, 10-19, 20-29, 30+ years
- How many records/waves are analysed? – 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11+
- What type of analysis has been undertaken?

To produce information for the map simply, for each study this information will be entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This will be a useful tool as it will allow frequencies and cross-tabulations to be run on the studies, describing what work has been carried out so far and thereby identifying any gaps. For example, it will be possible to identify how many studies have investigated income poverty dynamics, and for which sub-groups. It is anticipated that this Map Database will be published separately.

The coding of the studies will be checked by more than one reviewer for a proportion of studies.

8 SYNTHESIS

The next stage of the review process will be to synthesise the material included in the review in order to provide the best possible evidence to inform policy and practice.

The results of the studies included in the review will be compared and contrasted in order to assess the extent to which they are telling a consistent story that has implications for policy and practice, or are providing inconsistent evidence that may lead to conclusions about the need for further research. Reported results will be categorised according to the review's themes, identified within the research questions, namely: year on year changes; childhood to adulthood transitions; and, intergenerational transmission of poverty. However, within these themes, further areas of stratification will be informed by the map's overview of the available evidence provided. It may be suitable to synthesise studies on, for example, the basis of the study population, the poverty measure, or the time period analysed. To use systematic review terminology, this method of synthesis would be described as 'narrative'.

It is intended that both qualitative and quantitative studies will be synthesised together; only by judicious blending of the results can the maximum understanding be gained of the way in which poverty and disadvantage are experienced (qualitative), within the context of how much poverty is experienced by whom (quantitative). Although it is anticipated that this will follow an initial separate synthesis of qualitative and quantitative studies.

As well as devising themes for the synthesis, the *results* from the studies will need to be extracted and analysed, using a qualitative data analysis package. It is anticipated that the results to be extracted will include:

- what factors contribute to – and result from – poverty (dynamics)?
- what factors keep people out of (persistent/severe) poverty?
- which groups and individuals experience (persistent/severe) poverty?
- what factors/measures can help reduce or eradicate (persistent/severe)

poverty?

- what effect does child poverty have on later outcomes as an adult?
- how does household and individual poverty change over time (and how does it vary for different sub-groups)?
- what are the key transitions in people's lives that either lift them out of poverty and social exclusion or pull them down?
- what is the effect of transitory poverty (as opposed to persistent poverty)?

9 INTERNATIONAL EVIDENCE

JRF's priority for evidence from international studies is the experience other countries have of using longitudinal data for the examination of poverty dynamics, 'particularly in countries that have a long record of such data collection'. The evidence from these countries is not to form part of the review. It will be provided as an Annex to the final report. The intention is for the international evidence to identify techniques for the analysis of poverty dynamics that it may be suitable to carry out in this country.

A number of countries have been identified by the project team as having a long tradition of longitudinal research. However, the suggestion is that a selection of these are chosen to allow greater detail to be retrieved. In this way, the review will include a thorough review of longitudinal analysis/evidence in those countries, rather than scant detail from the long list of countries with longitudinal data available. The selection of countries is based upon the length of time countries have collected longitudinal data and also their poverty levels, because these factors may influence the way in which poverty dynamics are analysed. The countries, and details of their data and poverty levels, are:

	Longitudinal data since:	Child poverty rate 2001 Percentage below 60% median national income	Child poverty rate Percentage below 50% median national income
Denmark	1994	5	5.1 (1992)
Germany	1984 & 1994	14	10.7 (1994)
Ireland	1987 & 1994	26	16.8 (1997)
The Netherlands	1984 & 1994	16	7.7 (1994)
Spain	1985 & 1994	26	12.3 (1990)
Sweden	1984 & 1994	10	2.6 (1995)
USA	1968	Not available	22.4 (1997)

National experts will be contacted in each of these countries with a detailed questionnaire, in order for the research team to gain in-depth knowledge of the research activity on poverty dynamics that these countries have undertaken. The review protocol will be provided to the experts so they are aware of the project's focus, but they will not, of course, be expected to carry out a systematic review for their country; rather the project requires an overview of the work that has been carried out so that lessons can be learnt for the UK.

The advantage of this method, rather than including the international countries in the systematic review, is that, firstly, it reduces the resources required for the systematic review which will already be large, but secondly, it ensures that studies not in the English language can be included.

References

- Apospori, E., and Millar, J. (2003), *The dynamics of social exclusion in Europe: comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Ashworth, K and Walker, R. (1992) *The Dynamics of Family Credit*. Centre for Research in Social Policy, Working Paper No 172.
- Ashworth, K., Walker, R., Trinder, P. and Jenkins, S. (1995) *The Dynamics of Income Support and Unemployment Benefit*. Centre for Research in Social Policy, Working Paper No. 242.
- Baldwin, S., Wallace, A., Croucher, K., Quilgars, D. and Mather, L. (2002), *How effective are public and private safety nets in assisting mortgagors in unforeseen financial difficulties to avoid arrears and repossessions? Review Protocol*. University of York.
- Bane, M., and Elwood, D. (1986), 'Slipping into and out of Poverty: The Dynamic of Spells', in *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 1-23.
- Bradbury, B., Jenkins, S., and Mickelwright, J. (2001), *The Dynamics of Child Poverty in Industrialised Countries*, Cambridge: UNICEF.
- Brooks-Gunn, J. and Duncan, GJ. (1997) 'The Effects of Poverty on Children'. *Children and Poverty*. 7(2): 55-71.
- Browne, I. (2001) *When Do Poor Girls Become Jobless Women? The Legacy of Growing up in Poverty Neighborhoods on Female Labor Force Participation*. Atlanta: Emory University.
- Bynner, J. (1996) *Use of Longitudinal Data in the Study of Social Exclusion*. Report for the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Croucher, K., Quilgars, D., Wallace, A., Baldwin, S., and Mather, L. (2003), *Paying the Mortgage? A Systematic Literature Review of Safety Nets for Homeowners*, York: Dept of Social Policy and Social Work, University of York.
- Ekinsmyth C, Bynner J, Montgomery S and Shepherd P. (undated) *An integrated approach to the design and analysis of the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS70) and the National Child Development Study (NCDS)*. SSRU Inter-Cohort Analysis Working Paper 1. Centre for Longitudinal Analysis, London.
- Ermisch, J., Francesconi, M. and Pevalin, D.J. (2001) *Outcomes of Poverty for Children*. London: Department for Work and Pensions Research Report No. 158.
- Grayson, L., and Gomersall, A., (2003), *A difficult business: finding the evidence for social science reviews*, London: ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice Working Paper 19.

Gregg, P., Harkness, S. and Machin, S. (1999) *Child Development and Family Income*. York: JRF.

Hill, M. S. (1981) 'Some dynamic aspects of poverty' in Hill, M., Hill, D. and Morgan, J., (eds.) *Five Thousand American Families: Patterns of Economic Progress*, Vol 9, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Hill, M.S. and Jenkins, S.P. (1999) *Poverty among British children: chronic or transitory?* ESRC Research Centre on Micro-Social Change, Working Paper 99-23, Colchester: University of Essex.

Hill, M., Hill, D. and Walker, R. (1998) 'Intergenerational dynamics in the USA: poverty processes in young adulthood' in Leisering, L. and Walker, R. (eds) *The Dynamics of Modern Society: Policy, Poverty and Welfare*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Hills, J., Le Grand, J., Piachaud, D., and Agulnik, P., (eds.), (2002), *Understanding Social Exclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobcraft, J. (2003) *Continuity and change in pathways to young adult disadvantage: results from a British birth cohort*, CASEpaper 66, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, London.

Hobcraft, J. and Kiernan, K. (1999) *Childhood poverty, early motherhood and adult social exclusion*, CASEpaper 28, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, London.

Jenkins, S., and Rigg, J., with the assistance of Devicienti, F., (2001), *The dynamics of poverty in Britain*, Leeds: Corporate Document Services.

Kiernan, K. (2003) *Cohabitation and divorce across nations and generations*, CASEpaper 65, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics, London.

Marsh, A., and Rowlingson, K., (2002), *Low/moderate-income families in Britain: changes in 1999 and 2000*, Leeds: Corporate Document Services, 2002.

McKernan, S. and Ratcliffe, C. (2002) *Transition Events in the Dynamics of Poverty*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Micklewright, J. (1986) *A note on household income data in NCDS3*. NCDS User Support Group Discussion Paper 18, Social Statistics Research Unit, City University, London.

Murray (1986) *According to Age*, Washington: America Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

OECD (2001) *Employment Outlook*, OECD, Paris.

Roberts, S., Adelman, L., Groenez, S., Middleton, M., and Nicaise, I., (2002) 'Traps, springboards and gaps in European minimum income systems' in Kaliterna, L. and Dahl. S-A (Eds.) *Employment Policies and Welfare Reform*. Pilar Institute, Zegreb.

Rowntree, B. S. (1901) *Poverty: a study of town life*. 2nd Edition, Thomas Nelson & Sons: London.

Ruspini, E., (2002), *Introduction to Longitudinal Research*, London and New York: Routledge.

Vegeris, S., and McKay, S., (2002), *Low/moderate-income families in Britain: changes in living standards 1999-2000*, Leeds: Corporate Document Services.

Walker, R., in association with Ashworth, K., (1994), *Poverty dynamics: issues and examples*, Aldershot: Avebury.

Wallace, A., Croucher, K., Quilgars, D., and Baldwin, S., (2003), *Meeting the Challenge: Developing Systematic Reviewing in Social Policy*, York: Paper presented to Social Policy Association Conference, University of Teeside 16 July 2003.

ANNEX A
REVIEW ADVISERS

ANNEX A REVIEW ADVISERS

A1 Internal CRSP Team

Abigail Davis
Yvette Hartfree
Elspeth Pound
Joanne Rennison
Dr Simon Roberts
Dr Bruce Stafford
Liz Sutton

A2 Loughborough University Librarians

Frank Parry
Laurie Salemhamed

A3 Project Advisory Group

Vaughan Birbeck	Library and Information Officer, JRF
Henry Bottomley	Statistician, Work Incentives and Poverty Analysis, HM Treasury
Emily Cattell	Principal Research Officer, Poverty and Children, Department for Work and Pensions
Dr David Gough	Deputy Director, EPPI-Centre, Institute of Education
Chris Goulden	JRF Project Manager
Professor John Hobcraft	Social Policy Department, London School of Economics
Dr Maria Iacovou	Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Essex
Professor Stephen Jenkins	Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Essex
Alison Wallace	Department of Social Policy, University of York

A4 OTHER EXPERTS

Alan Gomersall	Associate Director (Information and Dissemination), ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Queen Mary University
Lesley Grayson	Research Fellow (Information Access), ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Queen Mary University
Professor Jennie Popay	Institute for Health Research, Lancaster University

ANNEX B

PROPOSED SEARCH STRATEGY

ANNEX B

PROPOSED SEARCH STRATEGY

No. Request

- 1 deprived or deprivation
- 2 disadvantage or disadvantaged
- 3 excluded or exclusion
- 4 social inclusion
- 5 hardship
- 6 income inequalit* or low income* or income distribution or lifetime income
- 7 poverty
- 8 poor or poorer or poorest
- 9 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8

- 10 dynamic*
- 11 episod*
- 12 generation* or intergeneration*
- 13 life course or life cycle
- 14 mobility or movement*
- 15 persist*
- 16 spells
- 17 trajector*
- 18 transition* or transmi*
- 19 longitudinal* or panel* or cohort* or follow-up
- 21 #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19

- 22 #9 near (i.e within 10 words of) #21

ANNEX C
DATABASES/CATALOGUES TO
BE SEARCHED

ANNEX C

Databases/Catalogues to be searched

Article First (OCLC)
ASSIA (CSA)

British Humanities Index (CSA)
British Library Catalogue

Caredata

PsycInfo (BIDS)

Regard

IBSS (BIDS)
Index to Theses

Rlab (London School of Economics)

Social Services Abstracts (CSA)
Sociological Abstracts (CSA)

UKOP

Web of Science

ZETOC

ANNEX D
WEBSITES TO BE SEARCHED

ANNEX D

Websites to be searched

Barnardo's	www.barnados.org.uk
Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion	http://sticerd.lse.ac.uk/case
Centre for Analysis of Social Policy	www.bath.ac.uk/casp
Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion	www.cesi.org.uk
Centre for Housing Policy	www.york.ac.uk/inst/chp
Centre for Longitudinal Studies	www.cls.ioe.ac.uk
Centre for Market and Public Organisation	www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/CMPO
Centre for Policy on Ageing	www.cpa.org.uk
Children in Scotland	www.childreninscotland.org.uk
Child Poverty Action Group	www.cpag.org.uk
Department for Work and Pensions	www.dwp.gov.uk
Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (including Research Centre on Micro-Social Change)	www.esrc.ac.uk
Family Policy Studies Centre	www.apsoc.ox.ac.uk/fpsc
Institute of Fiscal Studies	www.ifs.org.uk
Institute of Education Social Science Research Unit	www.ioe.ac.uk/ioss
Institute for Social and Economic Research	www.iser.essex.ac.uk
Institute of Public Policy Research	www.ippr.org.uk
Joseph Rowntree Foundation	www.jrf.org.uk
Local Government Association	www.lga.gov.uk
London School of Economics Rlab	www.rlab.lse.ac.uk
National Association of Citizens Advice Bureaux	www.nacab.org.uk
National Centre for Social Research	www.natcen.ac.uk
National Council for One Parent Families	www.oneparentfamilies.org.uk
New Policy Institute	www.npi.org.uk
Northern Ireland Social and Political Archive	www.ark.ac.uk
Online CERC Information Service	www.cerc.co.uk
Personal Finance Research Centre	www.ggy.bris.ac.uk/research/pfrc
Policy Studies Institute	www.psi.org.uk
Save the Children	www.savethechildren.org.uk
Social Disadvantage Research centre	http://users.ox.ac.uk/nsdrc
Social Exclusion Unit	www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk
Social Policy Research Unit	www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru
Townsend Centre for International Poverty Research	www.bris.ac.uk/poverty
Trade Union Congress	www.tuc.org.uk

UK Data Archive
University of Cambridge website,
including Dept of Applied Economics

www.data-archive.ac.uk
www.cam.ac.uk
www.econ.cam.ac.uk/dae/index.htm

ANNEX E

JOURNALS TO BE HAND-SEARCHED

ANNEX E

Referred to in reworks/databases
Electronic copy available via library
Neither of above – hard copy search required

Journals to be hand-searched

Ageing And Society

Benefits Quarterly

Cambridge Journal Of Economics

Children And Society

Critical Social Policy

Family Policy Bulletin

International Journal Of Social Economics

International Journal Of Social Welfare

International Journal Of Sociology And Social Policy

Journal Of European Social Policy

Journal Of Social And Economic Development

Journal Of Social Distress And The Homeless

Journal Of Social Issues

Journal Of Social Policy

Journal Of Social Welfare And F

Family Law

Journal Of Socioeconomics

Journal Of Sociology And Social Welfare

Policy And Politics

Policy Research Series- Economic And Social Research Institute

Poverty

Social Choice And Welfare

Social Development

Social Indicators Research

Social Justice Research

Social Philosophy And Policy

Social Policy

Social Policy And Administration

Social Policy And Society

Social Politics

Social Science Research

Socio-Economic Review

