UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE
CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

Expert meeting on measuring poverty and equality
26-27 September 2017, Budva, Montenegro
Session E: Measurement of vulnerability to poverty

Social Exclusion: An In-depth Study for the Conference of European Statisticians

Prepared by Statistics Canada

Abstract

Although an exact definition of social exclusion does not exist, the study of social exclusion generally focuses on the impacts of being absent or overlooked in certain parts of society through a non-monetary, multidimensional viewpoint. A person is considered social excluded if they suffer from a non-monetary deprivation, suffer from a poor quality of life, and do not actively participate in their respective society (Levitas et al, 2007).

Due to ambiguity surrounding the term, social exclusion, National Statistical Agencies (NSA)s have taken a number of different approaches to measure social exclusion, in their respective countries. Thus, they have used numerous different methods and indicators in attempt try and measure it. When trying to do quick multinational comparisons of social exclusion, often the Laeken indicators are used. The goals of this study to compile all of the current practices NSAs do to measure social exclusion, identify any data gaps, duplication of work, areas requiring more research, and emerging development needs and to focus on strategic issues and highlight concerns of statistical offices of both a conceptual and coordinating nature, in preparation for a Conference of European Statisticians (CES) paper.

Generally, when NSAs measure the extent of social exclusion within their borders, they use survey data with regards to material or social deprivation. The UK created the Breadline Survey, to measure the amount of people who did not possess or have access to 5 of 26 items deemed necessities, and accessed those who did not have them because of their poverty as being deprived. Eurostat modeled a similar deprivation index for all EU residences, and divided respondents by age, sex and country. The Australian Institute of Family Studies created a board devoted to the study of social exclusion, to show the impact policies changes had on social exclusion in Australia, as well as using ABS data to construct two indices focusing on multidimensional poverty. In 2013, Statistics Canada experimented with the Canadian Survey of Economic Well-being (CSEW), a new survey added to the Labour Force Survey, to see if any deprivation indices similar to those in the UK and the EU could be extrapolated from the data. However, the CSEW has not been conducted since. In Mexico, National Council for the Social Development Evaluation, (CONEVAL) measures multidimensional poverty by examining the

deprivations of its citizens. They conclude that an individual is deemed deprived if they do not have access to one of the following items: adequate educational attainment, adequate health services, social security, good housing and food security by using data from INEGI's surveys such as the National Survey of Household Income and the long form census.

Background

In April 2017, Statistics Canada volunteered to conduct an "In-depth Review" on the topic of social exclusion for the Conference of European Statisticians (CES), for presentation at the February 2018 CES meeting. The objective of the CES In-Depth Review is to compile current practices NSAs do to measure social exclusion, to identify any data gaps, duplication of work, areas requiring more research, and emerging development needs and to focus on strategic issues and highlight concerns of statistical offices of both a conceptual and coordinating nature. The present draft, dated August 15, 2017, is Statistics Canada's first attempt to describe the concept of social exclusion and to illustrate ways of measuring social exclusion in selected countries, mainly using information obtained from widely available sources. The draft also describes activities conducted by Statistics Canada, while acknowledging that there has been only limited effort to measure social exclusion in Canada. The paper also features significant input from Mexico's National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI) regarding efforts to describe social exclusion in that country. This draft will be presented to the UNECE Expert meeting on measuring poverty and inequality on 26-27 September 2017 in Budva, Montenegro. In the final draft of this paper, Statistics Canada will attempt to build upon feedback received from the UNECE meeting, and will hopefully include additional contributions from other NSOs

Introduction

Recently, there has been an increased focus on issues of social exclusion. Social exclusion can be defined as anything that limits a person's ability to fully participate in society, including physical characteristics, limited access to material and/or social resources, poor health, generational inequalities, or a denial of rights. The study of social exclusion generally focuses on the inequality of opportunity of individuals rather than the inequality of outcomes (OECD, forthcoming, 2017).

A person who faces social exclusion is less likely to be promoted or to get adequate public services in their communities to deal with their health or educational needs, due to their societal position (OECD, forthcoming, 2017). Social exclusion also contributes to a lower sense of self-worth (OECD, forthcoming, 2017). Many of the problems associated with social exclusion are large systemic problems that exist in all societies (UNECE, 2017).

Moreover, the extent to which social exclusion is a problem in society is hard to measure because it is difficult to quantify the number of people who face social exclusion, or to the degree to which people are at risk for social exclusion. As well, very few surveys or statistical methods are exclusively designed to measure social exclusion. Therefore, most numeric measurements of social exclusion rely heavily on methods that measure material and social deprivation, and then interpret an individual's level of social exclusion.

Concepts

Poverty is often linked with the idea of social exclusion, but the two ideas are in fact separate. Rather, the study of poverty focuses on the limitations a person has due to their low income, poor living conditions, and/or debts they acquired.

Social exclusion is generally discussed within the social cohesion and social inclusion framework. Social cohesion and social inclusion are often used as synonyms, however there are important differences between the two. Both focus on the importance of community but view it in different terms. Social cohesion focuses on the personal feelings and satisfaction of feeling like a person belongs as a member of society, whereas social inclusion looks at the non-psychological benefits of being a participatory member of society (ECLAC, 2007a).

Something often ignored by those who study cohesion and inclusion is the fact that neither is inherently good for society if done in a disorganized format (ECLAC, 2007a). Both can produce a new type of tribalism among different factions of society, or people could have a sense of belonging, or benefit from networking opportunities, in criminal organizations, thereby decreasing overall social cohesion and social inclusion (ECLAC, 2007a).

On the other side of the spectrum is the definition social exclusion, the direct antonym of social inclusion, and it can be rather ambiguous, as it is often defined by what it is not than by what it is (Behrman et al, 2002). Many people cannot define social exclusion, but can provide examples because "(they) know it when they see it" (Behrman et al, 2002, pg.10).

Still, there are empirical guidelines to determine whether or not a person is socially excluded. Social exclusion is most often linked with material deprivation (lacking material resources) or social deprivation (lacking social resources). However, people who face material and social deprivation are not the only types of people who are at risk for social exclusion. If a person falls into one of the following groupings, they are considered social excluded:

1) faces some type of non-monetary deprivation
2) does not actively participate economically, socially, politically, or culturally
3) has a poor quality of life (Levitas et al, 2007, pg. 10).

Therefore, social exclusion is sometimes a symptom of a person's level of poverty, but the reason for a person's inability to actively participate in society could be due to one of the other factors listed above. Additionally, if a person can be described to be in more than one of the aforementioned categories, the person is thought to face a higher level of social exclusion than had they only been described in one category (Levitas et al, 2007).

Capabilities Model

One of the better known social exclusion models is Amartya Sen's capabilities model. In *Development as Freedom*, Sen argues that social exclusion is a social justice issue that should concern everyone and that social exclusion, capabilities deprivation, and relative poverty are all synonymous with each other (Sen, 1999). In the book, Sen discusses the ideas behind his capabilities model, describing the history of economic justice theory and how social policy should focus on the limitations people face that prevent them from being full active members of society, instead of relying solely on income measures (Sen, 1999).

Others have since adopted Sen's capabilities approach as a framework to monitor social exclusion in societies. Denmark, Sweden, Finland and the UK's National Statistical Organizations (NSOs) use the capabilities normative approach when forming their multidimensional indicators (Duclos, 2011, pg. 32). Thus, changing the priorities of some NSOs from strictly measuring personal income levels to now measuring citizens' life satisfaction, access to services, material and social deprivation and environmental conditions (Duclos, 2011, pg. 33).

Current European Statistics and Goals

Depending on definition of social exclusion the research team choses, the statistical indicators could indicate that social exclusion is a very large or a very small problem affecting society. The EU has a set an aspirational target to lift 20 million people out of relative poverty or social exclusion by 2020 (UNECE, 2017). Currently, the EU estimates 23.7 % of its citizens are at risk for social exclusion or poverty, when only examining social exclusion as a type of material deprivation (Eurostat, 2016).

However, Levitas (2006) used eight political and social indicators for a deprivation index created from data in the Poverty and Social Exclusion Britain Survey and stated that if a respondent faced one deprivation they were socially excluded. By her estimate, 76% of UK citizens cope with at least some sort of social exclusion (Levitas, 2006). The large discrepancy between the two statistics demonstrates the importance of defining the term in the context of a paper or report before proceeding to present the results.

International Measurements

Introduction to International Measurements
At a macro level, the international community tends to use the Laeken Indicators when trying to do comparisons of social exclusion across countries (ECLAC, 2007b). Laeken Indicators include, but are not limited to, the Gini coefficient, the 90:10 income ratio, life expectancy at birth, and education rates (ECLAC, 2007a).

When measuring social exclusion at a micro level, it is often measured through surveys, asking people about their level of material and social deprivation. These questions generally focus on material goods deemed necessary to be an active member of society, the level of involvement they display in their communities or contact with family members (Levitas, 2006). Other times, the surveys may ask people to describe the level of involvement they have politically, or their current employment situation (Levitas, 2006).

Note, when using numerical indicators in analysis regarding social exclusion, it is important that the chosen weighting method(s) in terms of household composition and survey participants are apparent to the reader. The easy to interpret weights allow for more discussion and analysis with other possible contributors to the degree in which social exclusion is a problem in society (UNECE, 2017).

Latin America
The ECLAC uses a variety of indicators to measure social exclusion and social cohesion within and across Latin American countries. The ECLAC uses the International Labour Organization's (ILO) long-term unemployed and underemployed as indicators for social exclusion (ECLAC, 2007b). The ECLAC argues the underemployed and long-term unemployed face potential poverty if they have no savings, as well as not having the type of social network one may have if in a permanent position, contributing to their potential social exclusion (ECLAC, 2007b).

Other indicators the ECLAC uses for measuring social exclusion and social cohesion include the GINI index and the income quintile ratio, to measure the variation in salaries among citizens (ECLAC, 2007b). They also measure the percentage of people contributing to government welfare programs through taxation, as these programs are smaller in Latin American countries compared to Europe and therefore their success rate should be dependent on size (ECLAC, 2007b).

For health indicators, the ECLAC measures the infant mortality rate as well as the HIV mortality rate among 1,000 citizens (ECLAC, 2007b). Finally, they measure different types of education rates, including the amount of children in pre-primary programs, enrollment rates for school-aged children, and adult literacy rates (ECLAC, 2007b).

The United Kingdom
The British Department for Work and Pensions also releases the Household Below Average Income (HBAI) as a way to measure poverty through income measures. The HBAI does not measure social exclusion, as its primary focus is to measure 60% of median income before and after housing costs (Department for Work and Pensions, 2017). Social exclusion, by definition, is a non-monetary measure, and given the fact HBAI relies solely on income and cost measurements, it is an improper method to use when trying to measure social exclusion.

Eurostat
In 2009, Eurostat began measuring the degree to which material deprivation affects citizens from across the EU (Guio et al, 2017). The 2017 revision of material deprivation variables focuses on 13 items (Guio et al, 2017). Then, the rate of deprivation is calculated by an unweighted sum to calculate an alpha, which is then used to calculate the rate of deprivation, at a national level and EU level, as well as for different age ranges (Guio et al, 2017).

Eurostat's material deprivation index is one of the three sub-indicators that are part of a larger indicator, the AROPE (Eurostat, 2013, pg. 3). One of the other sub-indicators is "a relative component:

the at-risk-of poverty rate/monetary poverty (AROP)" (Eurostat, 2013, pg. 3) which is anchored in time with the poverty threshold set at 60% of median earnings in 2008 (Eurostat, 2013, pg. 7-8).The last component of the AROPE regards those who are excluded from the labour market (Eurostat, 2013, pg. 3).

People who are present in more than one of the sub-indicators are only counted once as being social excluded, even though they are experiencing social exclusion from various perspectives (Eurostat, 2013, pg. 4).

Ireland

Ireland's consistent poverty measure is a combination of their material deprivation index and their risk of poverty line (Callen et al, 1993). Their material deprivation index contains 11 indicators, and their risk of poverty line is defined as 60% of median earnings (Callen et al, 1993). Unlike the HBAI, the consistent poverty measure is constant with being a social exclusion measure as it not only focuses on income, but incorporates a material deprivation index into the indicator.

Australia

The Australian government created the Australia Social Inclusion Board to measure to the extent social exclusion affects her citizens, and how different policy changes increase or decrease social exclusion within the country (McDonald, 2011). The main goals of the board is to measure Australians participation in civil society based on their socio-economic standing, marital status, race, gender and their employment status, as well as the effect these statuses having on their children (McDonald, 2011).

The Australia Social Inclusion Board publishes two indices that measure different dimensions of social exclusion, using data provided by the ABS. First, a deprivation index called "People in Households with Low Economic Resources and High Financial Stress" (Australia Social Inclusion Board, 2012, pg. 28). The indicator uses data from the Household Expenditure Survey for data on the bottom 30% of the income distribution and whether people reported five or more financial stresses out of a possible 15 in the past 12 months (Australia Social Inclusion Board, 2012, pg. 28).

The second index, "Proportion of People 18 to 65 Experiencing Three or More Disadvantages" calculates the percentage of Australians who face social deprivation through six categories through data collected by the ABS General Social Survey (Australia Social Inclusion Board, 2012, pg. 23). The categories of focus include those who are 'low income, not working, in poor health, low education, feeling unsafe and report low levels of support' (Australia Social Inclusion Board, 2012, pg. 23).

Canadian Experience of Social Exclusion and Material Deprivation Indices

Canadian Material Deprivation Indices and Other Measurements of Social Exclusion

In 2009 exclusively, the Canadian province of Ontario added the Ontario Material Deprivation Index (OMDI) to their wellbeing indicators as part of their Poverty Reduction Strategy (Statistics Canada, 2009). The OMDI was an additional survey added to the Labour Force Survey (LFS) (Statistics Canada, 2009). The OMDI separated the idea of deprivation and income and interpreted a person as being materially deprived if they reported not having of two of 10 predetermined items (Statistics Canada, 2009).

In 2009 to 2011, the no longer active Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) measured the same 10 possible material deprivations that were included in the OMDI. Since the discontinuation of the SLID, no other survey added the 10 OMDI material deprivation items as questions to survey participants.

Then in 2013 exclusively, Statistics Canada created the Canadian Survey of Economic Well-being (CSEW), similar to the OMDI, as an additional survey to the LFS (Notten et al, forthcoming). The survey simulated previous surveys focused on material deprivation using 17 indicators to measure wellbeing, economic hardship, household income and personal income (Notten et al, forthcoming).

Notten et al (forthcoming) used the CSEW to create a deprivation index, and compared it to Canada's low income line statistics and found some people were not counted as deprived when using low

income measurements alone. Of the 17 indicators used, 71.2% of the sample reported no deprivation, and only 9.2% reported being deprived of 4 or more indicators (Notten et al, forthcoming). They conclude by stating that a material deprivation index would serve to compliment the already existing Canadian poverty measurements (Notten et al, forthcoming).

Additionally, several Canadian provinces constructed their own individual dashboard approaches to measuring deprivation. These provincial dashboard indicators were created to determine the progress of their poverty reduction strategies. The dashboards are created by first specifying what multidimensional poverty is. Second, by deciding on indicators they think best represents the type of deprivations people in their provinces face. Finally, then choosing to either use available data, or create a new survey to gather data in monitoring progress of decreasing multidimensional poverty.

Canadian Social Inclusion Statistics

Statistics Canada has mostly focused on inclusionary statistics, as opposed to studying social exclusion. Currently, the Canadian government is in the process of unveiling its *Poverty Reduction Strategy* that targets particular groups that have often been social excluded (HUMA, 2017). These groups in the Canadian context include the homeless, those struggling with mental illness, Aboriginal people, and recent immigrants. It is important to note that these groups are not exclusive, and there can be overlap in which people can belong to more than one group.

Data limitations exist in Canada surrounding Aboriginal people, as Statistics Canada data is only collected for the census for those living on reserve, and few surveys collect data in the Canadian territories, where the majority of Inuit live. Despite these limitations, Statistics Canada still has data available, most notably, the Aboriginal People Survey (APS) which focuses solely on gathering data from those who self-identify as Aboriginal. Additionally, the Canadian census does provide some information on all Aboriginal people living on and off-reserve.

Canadian Aboriginal people have high self-reported levels of mental health and physical health issues (Rotenberg, 2016). They also reported facing high levels of discrimination in the past five years (General Household Survey on Victimization, 2014). Aboriginal people also suffer from inadequate housing, and are also less likely than the rest of the Canadian populous to have completed secondary school (Uppal, 2017). This can often make them feel disconnected to the rest of the population.

Immigrants tend to have higher levels of education compared to Canadian citizens (Vézina et al, 2017). Despite that, their incomes are often lower than Canadian citizens. Recent immigrants are also more likely to live in "ethnic enclaves" in and around Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, in communities, where residents who share a cultural background live in the same neighbourhoods (Vézina et al, 2017). Immigrants also report more social isolation compared to the rest of the populous, but second-generation immigrants, (their children who were born in Canada) report no more social isolation than the general populous (Vézina et al, 2017).

The 2012 Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) had a special section pertaining to mental health not included in other versions of the CCHS (Gilmour, 2014). The 2012 CCHS estimated 27.5% of Canadians possibly met, or did met the criteria for one of the six mental or substance abuse disorders measured in the CCHS (Gilmour, 2014). Canadians earning less than $20,000 annually were twice as likely as the rest of the population to report having a mental illness (HUMA, 2017). People suffering from a mental illness were also "less likely to work or have adequate housing compared to people with other disabilities, or people without disabilities" (HUMA, 2017, pg. 54).

The standard CCHS also asks survey participants their self-rated mental health, happiness, their level of coping, and life satisfaction (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2016 pg.1). These along with other positive mental health outcomes, individual, family, community and society determinants, found in various Statistics Canada surveys, are included in the Public Health Agency of *Canada's Positive Mental Health Surveillance Indicator Framework* (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2016, pg.1-2).

With the exception of the census, homeless populations are excluded from all Statistics Canada surveys due to their lack of a permanent address. The homeless population in Canada is normally divided into differing groups: those who live in shelters, and those who are living with friends or relatives for an

indeterminate time period, ie. 'couch-surfing' or 'hidden homelessness'. Their lack of a permeant address also limits their ability to get government services like healthcare, which can ultimately leave them more socially excluded.

In Canada, 8% of the population that is 15 or older has experienced 'hidden homelessness' (Rodrigue, 2016). Using the General Social Survey, Rodrigue (2016, pg. 8) found Aboriginal people, people who have less than a university degree, were sexual and/or physically abused as a child, have two or more disabilities, and/or have moved three or times in the past five years were more likely to have experienced 'hidden homelessness' in their lifetimes compared to other Canadians.

Mexican Experience of Social Exclusion and Material Deprivation Indices

In Mexico, there are no direct measures on social exclusion, nevertheless there are measurements of multidimensional poverty. The National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy (CONEVAL[1]), a decentralized autonomous body created in 2004 with the approval of the General Law of Social Development (LGDS[2]), is the responsible institution for creating such measures. CONEVAL establishes one of its central objectives as

> ... to guarantee the full implementation of rights established in the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, ensuring all the population has access to social development (LDSG, as quoted by CONEVAL, 2010, pg. 17).

The LGDS indicates the goals of the national policy of social development the promotion of conditions that ensures individual or collective social rights[3], as well as the enhancement of economic development with a social sense that increases the income of the population and contribute to reducing inequality.

In this context, CONEVAL (2017) established the guidelines and criteria for defining, identifying and measuring "Multidimensional Poverty" in Mexico, as mandated in the LGDS, taking into consideration the following indicators:

1) Per capita income
2) Average educational gap in the household
3) Access to health services
4) Access to social security
5) Quality and spaces in the dwelling
6) Access to basic services in the dwelling
7) Access to nutritious and quality food
8) Degree of social cohesion
9) Degree of accessibility to paved road

For the multidimensional measurement of poverty in Mexico, CONEVAL decided to separate the economic aspects from the social ones. Therefore, it proposed two main dimensions of poverty: one that considers economic well-being and another that focuses on identifying deficiencies in social rights.

In order to measure the insufficiency in terms of economic well-being, people whose incomes are insufficient to obtain the goods and services required for the satisfaction of their needs are identified. For this purpose, CONEVAL defines a line of wellbeing "La Línea de Bienestar" and a line of minimum wellbeing "Línea de Bienestar Mínimo". "La Línea de Bienestar" considers the income required for the acquisition of goods and services to satisfy the food and non-food needs of the population. Conversely, the "La Línea de Bienestar Mínimo" focuses only on the amount required only for the satisfaction of food needs.

---

[1] Its Spanish acronym

[2] Ibid

[3] i.e.: education, health, nutritious and quality food, housing, healthy environment, work, social security and those related to the non-discrimination terms included in the Mexican Constitution

CONEVAL constructed a social deprivation index to identify people who people lacked at least one of the rights established in the LDSG. When measuring poverty, CONEVAL classifies people according to their present income and their current social deprivation. According to its methodology, a person may be classified in only one of the following categories:

- Multidimensionally poor - income is lower than the value of the wellbeing line and has at least one social deficiency[4].
- Vulnerable due to social deprivation - income is higher than the wellbeing line and has at least one social deficiency.
- Vulnerable due to insufficient income, - not socially deprived, but income is below the wellbeing line.
- Not multidimensionally poor and not vulnerable - people who do not have social deprivations and income exceeds the value of the wellbeing line.

The "Línea de Bienestar" and the "Línea de Bienestar Mínimo" values are updated monthly, based on changes in the National Index of Consumer Prices (INPC[5]). The INPC is calculated and published by the National Institute of Statistics and Geography (INEGI[6]).

According to the LGDS, the measurement of poverty must be made every two years at the state level and every five at the municipal level. In 2008, it was agreed to use the National Household Income and Expenditure Survey (ENIGH[7]), which is carried out every two years, and includes the Socioeconomic Conditions Module (MCS[8]) as a complement, for a better data gathering[9]. INEGI provides the information CONEVAL uses to complete a social deprivation index.

As of this year, the MCS has been made in biennial manner. However, in 2015, with the intention to improve the quality of the information and to extend the thematic content it was decided to realize the data collection independently to the ENIGH. Other sources of information for this type of measurement are the Population and Housing Censuses, the 2015 Inter-censal Survey and other household surveys. As well, in 2015, INEGI carried out the National Survey on Consumer Confidence (ENCO[10]), which included a self-reported welfare module (subjective well-being).

In May 2017, the Mexican Government, within the framework of the National Inclusion Strategy, published a report using 2014 data from the latest CONEVAL poverty measure. The report stated that 46.2% of the Mexican population is poor, which is equivalent to 55.3 million people (México Gobierno de la Republica, 2017). Of those, 11.5 million face extreme poverty (México Gobierno de la Republica, 2017).

Likewise, 7 out of 10 Mexicans have at least one social deprivation and 2 out of 10, suffer from three or more deficiencies (México Gobierno de la Republica, 2017). A little more than 7% of the population does not have any social deprivations, but their income is below to the welfare line, that is, they are vulnerable due to insufficient income (México Gobierno de la Republica, 2017). The population that is not poor and not vulnerable due to income represents a fifth of the population (20.5%) (México Gobierno de la Republica, 2017).

Summary

Social exclusion is a concept that is difficult to completely distinguished from poverty, the study of limitations placed on a person due to monetary factors, or from social inclusion, the study of the non-physiological benefits of belonging in society. Rather, social exclusion focuses on a non-monetary multidimensional view of a person's wellbeing.

---

[4] A person is considered extremely poor if its income is lower than the minimum wellbeing line and has social deprivation in three or more categories
[5] Its Spanish acronym
[6] Ibid
[7] Ibid
[8] Ibid
[9] Required for the measurement of socio-economic phenomena such as poverty and social exclusion
[10] Its Spanish acronym

The most commonly referenced prescription-oriented social exclusion model is Sen's capabilities model. The capabilities model describes someone is socially excluded, why they are social excluded, and then giving them something that enables them become active in all aspects of society.

The international community has used various measurements to find the extent to which social exclusion is a problem. Different methods can alter results, causing social exclusion to seem like a larger or smaller problem than it actually is. The most common ways for NSOs to measure social exclusion is through material deprivation indices, with items deemed to be necessities in their national society, as well as constructing dashboard indicators.

Statistics Canada experience on social exclusion is limited. Previously, there had been three surveys that measured the material deprivation of Canadians, however, these surveys are no longer active. However, Statistics Canada continues to study social inclusion, with a focus on groups that have been marginalized from Canadian society in the past, and are now a part of the Canadian government's *Poverty Reduction Strategy*. The identified marginalized groups include, but are not limited to, Aboriginal people, those suffering from mental illness, immigrants, and the homeless.

The Mexican experience with measuring multidimensional poverty includes its *"La línea de bienestar"*, a basic needs line constructed by CONEVAL using INEGI data from surveys such as the ENIGH and the Population and Housing Censuses. The two *"Línea de bienestar"* indicate the number of people who are considered to be one of the following: multidimensionally poor, vulnerable due to social deprivation, vulnerable due to insufficient income, and not multidimensionally poor and not vulnerable. The latest Mexican government report with the CONEVAL multidimensional poverty statistics found that 70% of Mexicans have at least on deprivation (México Gobierno de la Republica, 2017).

References

Amartya, S. (1999). Development as Freedom. Random House. pp.54-110

Australian Social Inclusion Board (2012). Social Inclusion in Australia: How Australia is faring. Commonwealth of Australia.

Behrman J.R., Gaviria, A. Szekely, M. (2002). Social exclusion in Latin America: Introduction and overview. Working Paper

Callan, T., Nolan, B., Whelan, C. T. (1993) Resources deprivation and the measurement of Poverty. Retrieved August 8th, 2017 from http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047279400019280

CONEVAL (2010). Metodología para la medición de la pobreza en México. Available at: http://www.coneval.org.mx/Informes/Coordinacion/INFORMES_Y_PUBLICACIONES_PDF/Metodologia_Multidimensional_web.pdf

CONEVAL (2017). Medición de la pobreza - Evolución de las líneas de bienestar y de la canasta alimentaria. Retrieved from http://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Paginas/Lineas-de-bienestar-y-canasta-basica.aspx

Department for Work and Pensions (2017). Households Below Average Income: An analysis of the UK income distribution: 1994/95-2015/16.

Duclos, J.Y., (2011) Report on a framework for the possible use of capabilities in Canada's social data system, A. Working Paper.

ECLAC (2007a). Social cohesion: Inclusion and a sense of belonging in Latin America and the Caribbean. United Nations. Santiago, Chile.

ECLAC (2007b) .System of indicators for monitoring social cohesion in Latin America, A. United Nations. Santiago, Chile.

Eurostat (2013). The measurement of poverty and social inclusion in the EU: achievements and further improvements. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Conference of European Statisticians Session 3: Interlinkages between poverty, inequality, vulnerability and social inclusion. Working Paper

Eurostat. (2016) Europe 2020 indicators - poverty and social exclusion.

Eurostat (Ed.). (2017, March). Europe 2020 indicators - poverty and social exclusion. Retrieved June 26, 2017, from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Europe_2020_indicators_-_poverty_and_social_exclusion

General Household Survey on Victimization. (2014) Statistics Canada.

Gilmour, H. (2014) Positive mental health and mental illness. Statistics Canada Health Reports

Guio, A.C., Gordon, D., Najera, H., et al (2017, forthcoming). Revising the EU material deprivation variables. Eurostat.

HUMA (2017). Breaking the cycle: Study on poverty reduction, A.

INEGI (2017). El Módulo de Condiciones Socioeconómicas de la Encuesta Nacional de Ingresos y Gastos de los Hogares (MCS-ENIGH): Insumo para la medición de la pobreza multidimensional en México.

INEGI (2017). La medición de la inseguridad alimentaria en el Módulo de Condiciones Socioeconómicas (MCS) de la ENIGH, México.

LDGS (2016). Ley General de Desarrollo Social. Cámara de Diputados del H. Congreso del Unión. México. Retrieved from: http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/264_010616.pdf

Levitas, R (2006). Concept and measurement of social exclusion, The. Excerpt from: Pantazis, C., Gordon, D. and Levitas, R. (2006) Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain, Bristol, U.K. The Policy Press.

Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E et al. (2007) Multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion. Department of Sociology and School for Social Policy Townsend Centre for the International Study of Poverty and Bristol Institute for Public Affairs University of Bristol

México Gobierno de la Republica (2017) Estrategia nacional de inclusión. Documento rector. Retrieved July 21st, 2017 from: https://www.gob.mx/cms/uploads/attachment/file/225459/Documento_Rector_ENI_20170522.pdf

McDonald, M (2011) Social exclusion and social inclusion resources for child and family services. Australian Institute of Family Studies

Notten, G., Charest, J., Heisz, A. (forthcoming) Material wellbeing in Canada. Working Paper

OECD (2017, forthcoming) How's life. Chapter 2. Multidimensional inequalities in well-being.

Poverty and Social Exclusion (n.d). Breadline Survey 1983. Retrieved July 18th, 2017 from http://www.poverty.ac.uk/pse-research/past-uk-research/breadline-britain-1983

Public Health Agency of Canada (2016). Positive Mental Health Surveillance Indicator Framework.

Rodrigue, S. (2016) Hidden homelessness in Canada. Statistics Canada. Insights on Canadian Society.

Rotenberg, C. (2012). Social determinants of health for the off-reserve First Nations population, 15 years of age and older. Statistics Canada. Aboriginal Peoples Survey, 2012.

Statistics Canada (2009). Ontario Material Deprivation Index. Retrieved July 18, 2017 from http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=5161

UNECE (2017), Guide on Poverty Measurement, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

Uppal, S. (2017) Young men and women without a high school diploma. Statistics Canada. Insights on Canadian Society.

Vézina, M., Houle, R. (2017) Settlement patterns and social integration of the population with an immigrant background in the Montréal, Toronto and Vancouver metropolitan areas. Statistics Canada Ethnicity, Language and Immigration Thematic Series.