

Insight into ‘working class voices’ in economic policy

Report Two

Place Based Economic Recovery, Regeneration and Resilience Network

March 2022

Authors:

Dr. Muhammad Waqas

Dr. Muhammad Khawar

PERN

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Working-class perception about the relevance of their voice.....	4
Methods	5
Principal variables of interest	5
Explanatory variables	5
Empirical model	6
Results	7
Descriptive analysis.....	7
Empirical analysis.....	9
Working-class perception of public policy.....	9
Working-class inclusion in public policy.....	11
Conclusion	15
References.....	17

Executive Summary

This report uses 350,000 responses of two longitudinal British household surveys and systematically analyses detailed sets of ten demographic characteristics of participants to analyse the relevance of working-class voices to the public policy. The report focuses on two key areas, i.e., the perception of working-class about the public policymaking systems; and inclusion of their voices to the public policy.

Educated individuals and high-income earners have positive perception of the system and they consider their voice included in the public policy.

Their perception and belief have become stronger between the surveys.

Additionally, some demographic groups (widowed, more kids, and two regions South-East & South-West) have positive perception of the system but they do not consider their voices included in the public policy.

The formal and consistent engagement involved in education and work/business may have resulted in positive outcome from educated and high-income earners.

Further time-series analysis is needed

- a) To analyse the change in participants responses over time
- b) To study the change in participants positive perception to negative views
- c) To explore the procedures that may have resulted in positive outcomes for educated and high-income earners

Introduction

Social inclusion has been widely studied in a broader context of the inclusion of individuals and social groups in society. This issue is on the priority list of many in the current pandemic context, including The World Bank (2022). However, the inclusion of working classes in economic policymaking has not been studied. According to the recent census, only 13.6% of workless households, while 59.7% of households have all members over 16 in employment. These workers are directly affected by the economic policies of the country. Therefore, it is essential to study their inclusion in public policy.

We use two longitudinal British surveys, namely the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) and its successor, the UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS), to analyse participants' views about their engagement in public policy. Additionally, the surveys' data allows us to explore participants' demographics alongside their opinions about public policy inclusion. Moreover, we use the five working-class categories identified by the National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-SEC) to categorise the survey responses into five working classes.

More specifically, in this report, we concentrate on two dimensions of the working-class responses in the surveys, i.e., their perception of public policymaking and their inclusion in public policy. Thereafter, we evaluate these responses for nine demographics of the survey participants, namely: working-class, income, age, gender, UK born status, number of kids, education, regions, marital status, and ethnicity. Finally, we use pooled and fixed-effect regressions to estimate the impact of these nine factors on participants' perception and inclusion in public policy.

This report finds an overall dominant view among most demographic groups that their opinions do not matter for public policy and they do not consider included in public policymaking. However, educated, and high-income individuals believe otherwise. Additionally, individuals with widowed married/cohabiting status, individuals with more kids and individuals living in South-East and South-West perceive their views matter for public policy. Educated and high-income individuals consider their voices are considered in public policy.

This report makes policy recommendations to introduce formal and consistent engagement channels with all demographic groups in line with education and high-income groups. In addition, the existing engagement channels with all demographic groups should be evaluated because of the dominant negative trend of individuals' inclusion in public policy. Finally, the report highlights further research needs to evaluate the recommendations and find the most suitable policies to enhance inclusion in public policy.

Working-class perception about the relevance of their voice

Social identity theory developed by Tajfel (1974) may explain various trends in the working-class perception of their inclusion in the economic policymaking. This theory states that the internal characteristics of a group of people (ingroup) could be a source of discrimination from another group possessing contrasting internal characteristics (outgroup). For example, the working class in one socio-economic category may act differently from another, and one ethnic working-class group may behave differently. Moreover, these socio-economic categories and demographic groups may consider the policymakers as an outgroup resulting in disengagement with the policymaking process.

The basic understanding of different working classes and their inclusion in policymaking is grounded in one's view of the structure of the society. However, there might be different strands of opinions and theories on the structure of society. Hence research concerning the working class would shape in line with the theoretical framework adopted by a researcher. These theories conceptualising the social structure can be broadly identified and contrasted as categorical vs process (Acker and Piper, 1985) and modernist vs postmodern (Bradley, 2015).

Categorical work-class classification is the most common approach in research because of the ease of data availability and data processing. This approach is also used by government agencies, including the

ONS, to report the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NS-SEC) (ONS, 2022). However, there are criticisms on identifying and maintaining these classifications over time and across different agencies. Moreover, these classifications assume homogeneity within each classification and consistency in the nature of operations within each class.

Therefore, these classifications need constant revisions to adjust for changes over time. For example, the socio-economic classifications were revised in 1998 to replace the previous occupation-based classifications used by the ONS. In addition, there are eight-, five- and three- class versions available for NS-SEC, creating further comparability issues across different research outputs based on various categories. On the other hand, a more fundamental criticism of categorical classification comes from the postmodern perspective that argues that social classification cannot be based only on occupations without linking one's identity (Archer et al. 2002).

Our research uses the categorical classification of NS-SEC to benefit from rich longitudinal public survey publishing data on working-class views about inclusion in public policymaking. However, we also study the relevance of individuals' characteristics in an identity theory framework to address some of the concerns posed by postmodern perspectives.

Methods

We use information from two longitudinal British surveys, namely the BHPS and its successor, the UKHLS, annually collecting data relating to individuals' views on various social matters and individual characteristics. For the BHPS, we focus on the section addressing people's opinions of how the governments work and use the following two survey questions' data: "on the whole, what governments do in Britain/the UK reflects the wishes of the people" and "ordinary people don't really have a chance to influence what governments do". Similarly, we use the corresponding survey questions' data from UKHLS: "public officials don't care much about what people like me think" and "people like me don't have any say in what the government does". We label the first question in each survey as working-class perception and the second question as working-class inclusion.

Principal variables of interest

The main variables of our interest, i.e., working-class perception and working-class inclusion, are set differently in each longitudinal survey. Hence, we run a separate analysis for each survey. The participants' responses are recorded in the surveys on a scale of 1 to 5, which we have adjusted to reflect 1 as strongly disagree to 5 as strongly agree.

Explanatory variables

Firstly, we use the five working-class categories identified by the National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-SEC) as our first set of explanatory variables. These categories include Higher managerial, administrative, and professional occupations; Intermediate occupations; Small employers and own account workers; Lower supervisory and technical occupations; and Semi-routine and routine occupations. Next, these categorical variables are measured as dummies omitting Higher managerial, administrative, and professional occupations.

Secondly, we include nine additional sets of variables to measure their impact on the main variables of interest. These variables help evaluate the effect of any individuals' characteristics on their views about inclusion in public policy. These individual characteristics are:

1. Income, measured as log values
2. Age, measured in years
3. Gender, measured as a dichotomous variable with male = 1 and female = 0

4. UK born status, measured as a dichotomous variable with born in the UK = 1 and otherwise = 0
5. Number of kids
6. Education, measured as categorical variables with three categories: higher degree, other degree and uneducated. Our research uses each category as a dichotomous variable omitting the 'uneducated' category.
7. Regions, measured as categorical variables with twelve categories representing each region in the UK, i.e., North-East, North-West, Yorkshire, East Midlands, West Midlands, East of England, South-East, South-West, London, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. Our research uses each category as a dichotomous variable omitting the 'London' category.
8. Cohabiting, measured as categorical variables with four categories, i.e., Single, Together , Divorced/Separated, and Widowed. Our research uses each category as a dichotomous variable omitting the 'Single' category.
9. Ethnicity, measured as categorical variables with four categories, i.e., White, Mixed, Asian, Black, and Other. Each category is used in our research as a dichotomous variable, omitting the 'White' category

Finally, we include wave dummies to control for any periodic influences. There are 28 combined waves containing 19 waves from BHPS and nine from UKHLS. These waves are inserted as dichotomous variables omitting the first wave for the separate analysis of each survey.

Empirical model

Our primary empirical model assumes that the inclusion of individual i in economic decision-making at time t (Y_{it}) is determined by the socio-economic characteristics (X_{it}). Moreover, Age (A_{it}), gender (G_{it}), Cohabiting (C_{it}), number of kids (K_{it}), income (I), Education (ED_{it}), Region (R_{it}), UK born status (UKB_{it}), and Ethnicity (E_{it}), are additional determinants in our model to explain the working-class inclusion in the economic decision-making. However, UK born status and ethnicity of individuals are only UKHLS surveys. Therefore, the regression model is expressed in the following equation:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{it} + A_{it} + G_{it} + C_{it} + K_{it} + I_{it} + ED_{it} + R_{it} + UKB_{it} + E_{it} + v_t + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

This model is used to estimate the perception and inclusion of the working class. Moreover, each estimate considers the socio-economic determinants (X_{it}) only as a base estimate, followed by the inclusion of the rest of the determinants in the above equation. This two-step approach enables us to examine the isolated impact of the socio-economic determinants on each dependent variable before including any influences of the individual traits. Additionally, we have estimated all the above occurrences of this model as fixed- effect and pooled OLS models. Moreover, due to the

differences between the BHPS and UKHLS survey questions, all these occurrences are also separately estimated for each survey.

Results

Descriptive analysis

Table 1 presents the summary statistics of our main variables across both surveys. Panel A presents the results for both main survey questions, i.e., government don't care about my views, and I have no say in policymaking where the former represents the perception of inclusion by the working-class and the latter represents the inclusion of the working-class in policymaking. For both surveys, over one-third of the working class do not perceive inclusion in policymaking (34.68% for UKHLS and 41.14% for BHPS) and a similar proportion of the working class do not consider themselves included in policymaking (33.32% for UKHLS and 52.86% for BHPS). Additionally, a further one-tenth of the working class firmly hold such views on their perception (10.24% for UKHLS and 9.22% for BHPS) and inclusion (11.48% for UKHLS and 11.53% for BHPS).

On the other hand, a comparatively smaller proportion of the working class perceive inclusion in policymaking (20.46% for UKHLS and 18.64% for BHPS), and they do not consider themselves included in the policymaking (25.14% for UKHLS and 19.36% for BHPS). However, only a smaller additional proportion of the working class firmly holds such perception (1.93% for UKHLS and 0.65% for BHPS) and belief (2.56% for UKHLS and 1.36% for BHPS). Moreover, a considerable proportion of the working class holds a neutral view of their perception (32.68% for UKHLS and 30.36% for BHPS) and belief (27.48% for UKHLS and 14.89% for BHPS) of inclusion. Hence, these initial observations indicate an overall negative perception of the working class regarding their perception and inclusion in policymaking. Our regression analyses will further analyse the determinants of these views towards working-class inclusion.

Continuing with the descriptive stats, Panel B of the same table presents various characteristics of our sample measured as percentages of categorical and dichotomous variables. Similarly, Panel C shows summary stats for our continuous variables. These characteristics are presented for both surveys; however, UK born status and ethnicity variables are only available for UKHLS.

Table 1. Summary statistics of the working-class inclusion in policymaking, socioeconomic working-class categories, and individual characteristics of the working class.

	UK Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS) N = 202,828		British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) N = 146,618	
Panel A	Dependent Variables		Dependent Variables	
	Negative Perception of Working-Class about Inclusion (%)	Does Not Consider Included (%)	Negative Perception of Working-Class about Inclusion (%)	Does Not Consider Included (%)
Strongly Agree	10.24	11.48	9.22	11.53
Agree	34.68	33.32	41.14	52.86
Neither Agree/Disagree	32.68	27.48	30.36	14.89
Disagree	20.46	25.15	18.64	19.36
Strongly Disagree	1.93	2.56	0.65	1.36
Panel B				
Explanatory Variables	%		%	
Job Type				
Large Employers	12.5		9.7	
Lower Managerial	28.3		24.6	
Intermediate Occupation	13.8		15.2	
Small Employers	17.1		19.7	
Semi-Routine/Routine	28.4		30.8	
Gender				
Male	46.0		48.6	
Female	54.0		51.4	
Education				
Higher Degree	44.0		24.6	
Other Degrees	49.8		60.0	
No Degree	5.8		14.6	
Cohabiting				
Single	19.2		19.0	
Together	69.9		71.7	
Divorced/Separated	8.3		7.1	
Widowed	2.4		2.2	
Region				
North-East	3.5		3.3	
North-West	9.9		9.5	
Yorkshire	7.8		7.2	
East Midlands	7.5		6.8	
West Midlands	7.8		6.8	
East of England	8.7		7.4	
London	10.9		7.1	
South-East	12.2		11.8	
South-West	8.4		7.5	
Wales	7.3		10.8	
Scotland	9.2		13.8	
Northern Ireland	6.7		8.0	
UK Born				
No	12.3			
Yes	87.7			

Ethnicity				
White	86.9			
Mixed	1.6			
Asian	7.5			
Black	3.4			
Other	0.6			
Panel C	Mean (SD)	Min/Max	Mean (SD)	Min/Max
	46.17		41.35	
Age (Years)	(14.84)	18/96	(14.04)	18/93
	0.6		0.7	
Number of Kids	(0.96)	0/8	(0.98)	0/8
	8.16		7.74	
Income (log)	(0.71)	-2.5/11.5	(0.74)	-2.5/11.4

Empirical analysis

Using pooled regression, Table 2 presents the estimates of working-class perception and working-class inclusion in public policy. The estimates are given separately for both surveys, and coefficients of BHPS presented in separate columns in the table are referred to in parenthesis in our discussion. Moreover, each dependent variable is estimated in two steps, i.e., firstly based on the socio-economic categories and secondly based on all explanatory variables. Following the same estimation pattern, Table 3 presents results using a fixed-effect regression model, which works as further analysis for the robustness of our main results presented in Table 2.

We discuss our main variables of interest findings using both regression models in the following sections. Then, we discuss our results for all ten explanatory variables using both regression models for each variable.

Working-class perception of public policy

Our results for the first dependent variable in Table 1, Columns 1 and 3, show a significant (1%) positive association between working-class categories and negative perceptions about inclusion in policymaking. Moreover, this significant association increases from 0.13 (0.14) for lower managerial working-class to

0.37 (0.22) for working-class in semi-routine/routine operations. Therefore, non-managerial socio-economic working classes have higher negative perceptions about their inclusion in policymaking. These results are robust using the fixed-effect model as in Table 3, Columns 1 and 3, with coefficients of 0.08 (0.03) to 0.20 (0.06) for both working classes, respectively.

Moreover, we find a similar significant association (1%) in Columns 2 and 4 of Table 1, rising from 0.11 (0.09) for the lower managerial working class to 0.23 (0.14) for semi-routine routine. Finally, these results are confirmed for robustness in Table 3, Columns 2 and 4, with coefficients of 0.08 (0.03) and 0.14 (0.05) for both working-class categories, respectively. Hence, we conclude that the

working class has a negative perception about their say in public policy, and this perception is comparatively lower for the non- managerial working class.

Continuing with the extended regression model including all ten explanatory variables, we find older and male working-class to have significantly (1%) greater negative perceptions about their inclusion in public policy with coefficients of 0.00 (0.00) and 0.08 (-0.08), respectively. These findings hold for robustness using the fixed-effect model with coefficients 0.00 (0.00) and 0.07 (-0.07), respectively, in Columns 2 and 4 of Table 3. As the results for 'gender' change from a negative sign to a positive sign in both tables, we can also conclude that the male working class previously perceived themselves as included in public policy, but more recently, they do not hold this perception.

A similar significant association is found for UK born working-class with coefficients of 0.08 (0.09) in Table 2 and 0.10 (0.11) in Table 3, which suggest that the UK born working-class do not perceive their voices matter in public policy. These findings are consistent in both regression models with a similar pattern across both surveys in Columns 2 and 4. However, the coefficients show a slight decrease from

0.11 to 0.10, suggesting a slight improvement in the UK-born working-class's perception of public policy.

Furthermore, working-class with all ethnicities, i.e., Mixed, Asian, Black, and Other, with coefficients of 0.09, 0.10 (0.10), 0.14 (0.11), and 0.22 (0.14), respectively. These findings suggest that all working class from all ethnicities do not perceive their voice matter in public policy. Moreover, this negative perception is higher for certain ethnicities than for White. These results hold for robustness check using the fixed- effect model in Table 3.

On the other hand, the working class with degree-level education does not significantly (1%) negatively perceive their inclusion in public policy. More specifically, the working class with a higher degree shows a more significant increase in this perception (coefficient increases from -0.09 to -0.22) than other degrees (coefficient increases from 0 to -0.06). The results in Table 3 support these findings. Hence, we can conclude that the working class with education degrees has an increasing perception of their voices relevant to public policy.

We find similar results for the income of the working class with their perception (coefficients of -0.09 (-0.05) and -0.03 (-0.02) in Table 2 and 3, respectively), suggesting that the working class with higher income consider their views to be relevant to public policy. Moreover, the increasing coefficients indicate a trend of increasing perception between the surveys.

Similarly, on the cohabiting factor, we find that working-class with divorced/separated status do not perceive (coefficient 0.03 (0.05)) their voices being heard for public policy. However, the working-class with widowed status holds the opposite view (coefficient -0.06), which in conjunction with the decreasing coefficient for divorced/separated class, suggests a trend of lacking perception of inclusion.

Moreover, individuals from all UK regions, except East Midlands and East of England, have significant (at 5% or less) perceptions about inclusion in public policy. However, only the South-East and South-West regions do not negatively perceive such inclusion, with coefficients of -0.03 (-0.03) and -0.02, respectively. In contrast, the working class in all other regions, namely North-East, North-West, Yorkshire, West Midlands, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland, have negative perceptions about inclusion in policymaking with coefficients of 0.15, 0.07 (-0.06), 0.03 (-0.07), 0.06, 0.09 (-0.04), 0.03 (-0.05), and 0.016 (-0.05), respectively.

Finally, benefitting from the chronological difference between both surveys, we also observe a shift in individuals' perceptions. Interestingly, this shift in all cases has been from significant positive perceptions about inclusion to significant negative perceptions, for example, male individuals. Moreover, in other instances, significant positive perception has changed to statistically insignificant perception, such as the number of kids. Similarly, all regions' positive perceptions about inclusion switch to negative perceptions except for South-East and South-West. Hence, an overall trend of a shift in the perception of the working class emerges from positive perception to negative perception between the surveys.

Working-class inclusion in public policy

Table 2 further presents our regression results for the second dependent variable using both surveys. Again, we adopt the same two-step analysis as for the first dependent variable analysis, and coefficients of BHPS are referred to in parentheses in this discussion.

Starting with the socio-economic working classifications in Columns 5 and 7, we find significant (1%) associations like the perception of inclusion above. Moreover, we see a similar trend of increasing coefficient from 0.11 (0.09) for lower managerial working-class to 0.45 (0.34) for semi-routine/routine working-class. Notably, the non-managerial working-class comparatively consider themselves excluded from the policymaking greater than their perception of the inclusion. Additionally, we find similar rising coefficients for non-managerial socio-economic classes in Columns 6 and 8, where we use all explanatory variables in the regression model. Similarly, these findings are confirmed by the robustness checks using the fixed-effect model as presented in Table 3. Hence, we conclude the non-inclusion of all socio-economic working-class categories in public policy.

Continuing with the association of other explanatory variables with working-class inclusion in public policy, male individuals and individuals with more kids do not consider included, with coefficients of 0.07 and 0.01 (0.01), respectively. Moreover, the older working class shows similar results for the former survey (BHPS). We cannot comment on the change in results between both surveys because either the results are not significant for one of the surveys or the results have stayed the same for both surveys. However, considering the overall significant results for all three variables, we can conclude on lack of inclusion in public policy for all three variables.

Similarly, irrespective of the cohabiting status, individuals do not consider included in public policy with coefficients of 0.04 (0.09), 0.09 (0.09), and 0.03 (0.07), respectively for individuals living together, divorced/separated, and widowed. Except for divorced/separated, individuals with other statuses consider themselves comparatively less excluded from public policy across both surveys, as shown by the reduction in their respective coefficients. The robustness test in Table 3 supports the results for cohabiting and divorced individuals.

Moreover, UK born individuals and individuals with all ethnic origins except Mixed do not consider included, which is in line with their previously discussed perceptions. Similarly, unlike the perception of inclusion, individuals in none of the UK regions consider included in the policymaking. Moreover, South- East and South-West, previously with a positive perception of inclusion, significantly consider themselves excluded from public policy.

On the other hand, individuals with higher education degrees and other degrees consider included in public policy (coefficients of -0.32 (-0.23) and -0.13 (-0.5), respectively). These individuals have similar positive perceptions about their inclusion in public policy. Interestingly, their positive views about their perception and inclusion become stronger between the surveys. Similar results are shown for income with coefficients of -0.10 (-0.06), suggesting individuals with higher income are included in the public policy, which has increased between the surveys. These findings for education and income are robust using the fixed-effect model, as shown in Table 3.

Hence, we conclude that individuals with all their other demographics (seven), excluding education and income (two), do not consider included in public policy. On the other hand, individuals with education degrees and higher income consider otherwise. Moreover, these consideration increases between the surveys for all factors.

Table 2. The relationship between the working-class inclusion and socioeconomic working-class categories

Explanatory Variables	Dependent Variables							
	Negative Perception of Working-class about Inclusion				Working-Class Does Not Consider Included			
	UKHLS		BHPS		UKHLS		BHPS	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Working-Class								
Lower Managerial Occupations	0.13*** (0.01)	0.11*** (0.01)	0.14*** (0.01)	0.09*** (0.01)	0.11*** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.01)	0.09*** (0.01)	0.06*** (0.01)
Intermediate Occupations	0.24*** (0.01)	0.16*** (0.01)	0.21*** (0.01)	0.13*** (0.01)	0.25*** (0.01)	0.15*** (0.01)	0.21*** (0.01)	0.12*** (0.01)
Small Employers	0.34*** (0.01)	0.20*** (0.01)	0.25*** (0.01)	0.18*** (0.01)	0.38*** (0.01)	0.21*** (0.01)	0.34*** (0.01)	0.20*** (0.01)
Semi-Routine/Routine	0.37*** (0.01)	0.23*** (0.01)	0.22*** (0.01)	0.14*** (0.01)	0.45*** (0.01)	0.26*** (0.01)	0.34*** (0.01)	0.20*** (0.01)
Age		0.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)		0.00 (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)
Gender		0.08*** (0.00)		-0.08*** (0.00)		0.07*** (0.00)		-0.00 (0.01)
Number of Kids		0.00 (0.00)		-0.02*** (0.00)		0.01*** (0.00)		0.01*** (0.00)
Education								
Higher Degree		-0.22*** (0.01)		-0.09*** (0.01)		-0.32*** (0.01)		-0.23*** (0.01)
Other Degrees		-0.06*** (0.01)		0.00 (0.01)		-0.13*** (0.01)		-0.05*** (0.01)
Income		-0.09*** (0.00)		-0.05*** (0.00)		-0.10*** (0.00)		-0.06*** (0.00)
Cohabiting								
Together		0.01 (0.01)		0.10*** (0.01)		0.04*** (0.01)		0.09*** (0.01)
Divorced/Separated		0.06*** (0.01)		0.13*** (0.01)		0.09*** (0.01)		0.09*** (0.01)
Widowed		-0.03** (0.02)		-0.02 (0.02)		0.03* (0.02)		0.07*** (0.02)
Region								
North-East		0.15*** (0.01)		0.01 (0.02)		0.20*** (0.01)		0.10*** (0.02)
North-West		0.07*** (0.01)		-0.06*** (0.01)		0.10*** (0.01)		0.02 (0.01)
Yorkshire		0.03*** (0.01)		-0.07*** (0.01)		0.07*** (0.01)		0.00 (0.01)
East Midlands		-0.00 (0.01)		-0.03** (0.01)		0.03*** (0.01)		0.06*** (0.01)
West Midlands		0.06*** (0.01)		-0.01 (0.01)		0.07*** (0.01)		0.06*** (0.01)
East of England		0.02 (0.01)		-0.04*** (0.01)		0.02** (0.01)		0.00 (0.01)
South-East		-0.03*** (0.01)		-0.03*** (0.01)		-0.01 (0.01)		0.06*** (0.01)
South-West		-0.02** (0.01)		-0.01 (0.01)		-0.00 (0.01)		0.01 (0.01)
Wales		0.09*** (0.01)		-0.04*** (0.01)		0.11*** (0.01)		0.10*** (0.01)
Scotland		0.03** (0.01)		-0.05*** (0.01)		0.04*** (0.01)		-0.00 (0.01)
Northern Ireland		0.16*** (0.01)		-0.05*** (0.01)		0.25*** (0.01)		0.12*** (0.01)
UK Born		0.08*** (0.01)				0.09*** (0.01)		
Ethnicity								
Mixed		0.09*** (0.02)				0.02 (0.02)		
Asian		0.10*** (0.01)				0.10*** (0.01)		

Black		0.14*** (0.01)				0.11*** (0.01)		
Other		0.22*** (0.03)				0.14*** (0.03)		
Constant	3.07*** (0.01)	4.40*** (0.07)	3.21*** (0.01)	3.65*** (0.03)	3.00*** (0.01)	4.10*** (0.30)	3.31*** (0.01)	3.76*** (0.04)
Observations	202,611	197,385	146,229	145,991	202,828	197,591	146,618	146,379
R-squared	0.0 2	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.0 3	0.05	0.02	0.04

Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3. The relationship between the working-class inclusion and socioeconomic working-class categories

Explanatory Variables	Dependent Variables: Negative perception of Working-class about inclusion; Working-class does not consider included							
	Negative Perception of Inclusion				Does Not Consider Included			
	UKHLS		BHPS		UKHLS		BHPS	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Working-Class								
Lower Managerial Occupations	0.08*** (0.01)	0.08*** (0.01)	0.04*** (0.01)	0.03** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.01)	0.06*** (0.01)	0.04*** (0.01)	0.03* (0.01)
Small Employers	0.11*** (0.01)	0.08*** (0.01)	0.06*** (0.01)	0.04*** (0.01)	0.13*** (0.01)	0.10*** (0.02)	0.07*** (0.02)	0.05*** (0.02)
Semi-Routine/Routine	0.19*** (0.01)	0.14*** (0.01)	0.08*** (0.01)	0.07*** (0.01)	0.22*** (0.01)	0.15*** (0.02)	0.12*** (0.02)	0.08*** (0.02)
Age		0.20*** (0.01)	0.14*** (0.01)	0.06*** (0.01)	0.05*** (0.01)	0.24*** (0.01)	0.16*** (0.02)	0.13*** (0.02)
Gender		0.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)		0.00*** (0.00)
Number of Kids		0.07*** (0.01)		-0.07*** (0.01)		0.07*** (0.01)		-0.00 (0.01)
Education		0.01* (0.00)		-0.01*** (0.00)		0.01* (0.00)		-0.00 (0.00)
Higher Degree			-0.23*** (0.02)		-0.07*** (0.02)		-0.33*** (0.02)	
Other Degrees			-0.10*** (0.02)		-0.02 (0.02)		-0.15*** (0.02)	
Income			-0.03*** (0.00)		-0.02*** (0.00)		-0.04*** (0.00)	
Marital Status				0.06*** (0.01)		0.04*** (0.01)		0.05*** (0.01)
Together		0.01 (0.01)		0.03** (0.02)		0.05*** (0.02)		0.03 (0.02)
Divorced/Separated		-0.06** (0.03)		0.03 (0.04)		0.01 (0.03)		0.06* (0.03)
Widowed								
Region								
North-East		0.17*** (0.03)		0.01 (0.04)		0.19*** (0.03)		0.06 (0.04)
North-West		0.07*** (0.02)		-0.03 (0.03)		0.11*** (0.02)		-0.00 (0.03)
Yorkshire		0.04** (0.02)		-0.04 (0.03)		0.07*** (0.02)		-0.01 (0.03)
East Midlands		0.01 (0.02)		-0.03 (0.03)		0.04** (0.02)		0.03 (0.03)
West Midlands		0.05*** (0.02)		-0.01 (0.03)		0.06*** (0.02)		0.00 (0.03)
East of England		0.02 (0.02)		0.01 (0.03)		0.02 (0.02)		-0.00 (0.03)
South-East		-0.02 (0.02)		-0.03 (0.03)		-0.02 (0.02)		-0.01 (0.03)
South-West		-0.00 (0.02)		0.01 (0.03)		0.00 (0.02)		-0.01 (0.03)
Wales		0.08*** (0.02)		-0.03 (0.03)		0.11*** (0.02)		0.07*** (0.03)
Scotland				-0.03		0.03		-0.02

		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.03)
Northern Ireland		0.14***		-0.03		0.23***		0.10***
		(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.02)		(0.03)
UK Born		0.10***				0.11***		
		(0.01)				(0.02)		
Ethnicity								
Mixed		0.10***				0.02		
		(0.03)				(0.04)		
Asian		0.10***				0.10***		
		(0.02)				(0.02)		
Black		0.16***				0.11***		
		(0.02)				(0.03)		
Other		0.20***				0.13**		
		(0.05)				(0.05)		
Constant	3.18***	3.61***	3.32***	3.47***	3.12***	3.52***	3.44***	3.58***
	(0.01)	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.14)	(0.01)	(0.05)
Observations	202,611	197,385	146,229	145,991	202,828	197,591	146,618	146,379
No. of PIDP	40,001	38,963	18,246	18,237	40,038	38,997	18,313	18,304

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Conclusion

We analysed around 350,000 survey responses from UKHSL and BHPS to study the impact of socio-economic working classes and nine other demographics on individuals' views about inclusion in public policy using pooled and fixed-effect regression models. Moreover, our analysis is set in a social theory context, assuming the working classes discriminate against the public policymakers by not participating in the policymaking process. We measure this participation using two survey questions focussing on the individuals' perception of public policy and the inclusion of their views in public policy. Based on our findings, we conclude the following:

All socio-economic working classes perceive their views are irrelevant to public policy, and they do not consider themselves included in public policy. These findings have become stronger in the recent survey. Moreover, these findings are stronger for non-managerial working classes.

The dominant perception of most of the demographics used in the analysis is that their voices do not matter for public policy, with the following exceptions:

1. The first exception to this dominant perception is 'education', where degree holder individuals have a strengthening positive perception of public policy.
2. The second exception is 'income' with similar strengthening trends.
3. The third exception comes from individuals with 'widowed' cohabiting status with a similar strengthening trend between both surveys.

4. The fourth exception is for individuals with more kids to positively perceive the relevance of their voices to public policy. However, this finding is only from the former survey, while the most recent survey does not show any significant results.
5. The fifth and final exception is for two out of twelve UK regions, South-East and South-West. However, we do not find a strengthening trend in both regions.

On the other hand, a comparatively more substantial view is found regarding inclusion in public policy. Individuals in most of the demographics do not consider themselves included in public policy, and this trend has mostly strengthened in the recent survey. However, 'education' and 'income' are two exceptions to this overall view of exclusion from public policy. Therefore, we can further conclude that only two are included in the public policy of the five demographic groups perceiving their views as relevant to public policy. A possible reason for their inclusion in the public policy could be their engagement with public systems in a formal context consistently for the long term. For example, higher education setups and profession/trade setups relating to education and the source of income for each case, respectively.

There are two important policy recommendations of our findings. Firstly, to set up long-term consistent channels and venues of engagement with all demographic groups to promote inclusion in public policy as found for educated and higher-income earning individuals. The evidence supporting this recommendation is grounded in longitudinal and independent public survey data with robust results. Secondly, the diminishing trends in all other demographic groups regarding their perception of the relevance of their voices and the inclusion of their voices in public policy suggest the possible failure of the existing mechanisms engaging these demographic groups with the public policy.

The above policy recommendations would require further investigations. Firstly, further research is needed to identify the engagement channels for these two demographic groups and evaluate their effectiveness in leading to positive inclusion related outcomes. This research can be initiated by further exploring the longitudinal surveys to analyse these two demographic groups to find their association with other relevant responses. Moreover, further analysis can explore compulsory and higher education settings to find relevant practices causing this positive inclusion in public policy. A similar approach could be explored for high income earning demographic groups. Secondly, the surveys' data could be further analysed to explore changes between each wave of responses, providing further evidence on timings and patterns of changes in individuals' views about inclusion.

References

Acker, S., Piper, D.W., 1985. Is Higher Education Fair to Women? *British Journal of Educational Studies* 33(3), 302-303.

Bank, T.W., 2022. Social Inclusion. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/social-inclusion#1> (accessed on: 23 March 2022).

Bradley, H., 2015. *Fractured identities: Changing patterns of inequality*. John Wiley & Sons. ONS, 2022.

The National Statistics Socio-economic classification (NS-SEC).

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/classificationsandstandards/otherclassifications/the-national-statistics-socio-economic-classification-ns-sec-rebased-on-soc2010> (accessed on: 5 February 2022).

Tajfel, H., 1974. Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information* 13(2), 65-93. 10.1177/053901847401300204.