An assessment of gender based variation in vulnerability to social exclusion among Pakhtun children

Asad Ullah, Mussawar Shah, Bushra Shafi and Abbas Ullah
The University of Agriculture, Peshawar

The research paper aimed at assessing the vulnerability of Pakhtun children to social exclusion and its gender based variations. A total of 500 male and female children (12-18 years old) from available religious denominations were interviewed from District Peshawar by systematic sampling. The association of social exclusion in male and female children was spurious by means of relations with family members, relations with their neighbors, power of making decision, participation in economic activities, competence in education/skills and environment of crimes at family level. However, the said relationship was non-spurious with access to economic resources, state of health and wellbeing and environment of crimes at community level. Establishing a welfare based governance, ensuring child participation in outdoor activities, eliminating underage employment, vital educational facilities encompassing the modern age needs, strong health interventions, strict crime controlling measures through law enforcing agencies, drive for coordination between family and community and addressing gender based disparities in working environment under a sound package were suggested as some of the policy recommendations in the light of the study.

Key words: Social Exclusion, Children, Gender, Deprivation, Resources

The term poverty as a strong ingredient of shaping human life embodies economic nature of disadvantage, grounded in application of a static set of indicators such as lack of income, access to quality health, education and housing, and the importance of the local milieu affecting people's well-being. Hence, a state of deprivation of people of opportunities to work, to live healthy and secure lives, to learn, and to live out secure retirement life are indicators of disadvantage (Department of Social Security, 1999). Understanding the concept of social exclusion helps to analyze the dynamic process that causes the conditions of disadvantage in broader social and economic context, as against using static indicators like income and poverty which are meant for human growth, comfort, health and social dynamics (Commins, 2004).It emphasizes on the process of causing detachment of individuals or groups from the bulk and caters for a broader range of competences that people enjoy or fail to enjoy for a more productive life. Social exclusion is a condition, when a number of people suffer from a combination of linked problems like unemployment, low skills, low income, poor housing, high crime environment, poor health and family breakdown with other combined factors to trap individuals/areas in a spiral of disadvantage (SEU, 1997; and DSS, 1999).It is associated to the process of shutting out from one of social, economic, political and cultural system, necessary for integrating individuals in a society, usually shaped after denial to social relations, customs, where majority participates or sometime with physical incapability to participate as individual's un-controlling inabilities or lacking the decision power and integration to participate (Walker and Walker, 1997; Gordon et al., 2000; Burchardt et al., 2002; and Room, 1995).Social exclusion helps society in assessment of its performance and risks specifically with reference to social unity and individuals' prosperity".

The phenomena of social exclusion could easily be explained through two major facets i.e. denial to participate (as external) and inability to participate (as internal) (Barnes et al., 2006). The problem of exclusion could not be confined to old people; rather it further aggravates through disadvantage, especially in children. It is an outcome of dysfunctional institution whereby a person is forced to indecent situation, with the only solution left over is the abundance of resources along with provision of rights for properly addressing and functioning of human rights (Marsh et al., 1999).

Structural characteristics like poverty and equality are macro driving forces besides demographic labor market and social policies as further influencing factors for social exclusion (Silver and Miller, 2003; and Bradshaw et al., 2004). Moreover, social exclusion could further be explained as exclusion across more than one domain or dimension of disadvantages with extreme negative consequences appealing the quality of life, wellbeing and futuristic chances. This sort of exclusion which is usually termed as "deep exclusion" revolve around economic, social, political, neighborhood, individual, spatial and group aspects (Bradshaw et al., 2004; Miliband, 2006; and Levitas et al., 2007)

Atkinson et al. (2002) has presented social exclusion indicators with three levels. The first level comprise of rise of financial poverty, income inequality, unemployment, low education, regional disparities in employment and long term unemployment. Level-2 explains these variables as financial difficulties in the household, un affordability of some basic needs, un affordability of consumer durables, disadvantageous housing conditions, poor health (life expectancy; self-perceived health status), infrequent

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mussawar Shah, Professor and chairman, Department of Rural Sociology, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Email: dr.mussawarshah@aup.edu.pk

contacts with friends and relatives, dissatisfaction with work or main activity. However, the third level, less tangible in indicating towards its dimensions has mostly been put as criteria as confinement to situational factor at each and every state independently (Gordon et al., 2000; Robinson and Oppenheim, 1998; and Stewart 2002).

Convention on the right of the child (1989) as ratified by United Nations General Assembly pronounced childhood to distinctive assistance and care because of their mental and physical immaturity. The convention gives an outline for legal and social principles to protect children and their welfare, especially those children of poor countries that live in extremely harsh living conditions. Children have been shown as one of the most demanding research agent of Social exclusion (Levitas et al., 2007). The basic philosophy of addressing the issue would certainly ensure an environment based on wellbeing and development encompassing the health, security, enjoyment, achievement, participation and economic growth. The most eminent risk factors are the disparities of ethnicity, dismemberment of neighborhood, inequalities in gender, physical disabilities, broken family, inferior family occupation and family income as major indicating factors leading towards social exclusion in children (Bradbury and Markus, 1999; DfES, 2006a; DfES, 2006b; Middleton and Loumidis, 2001; Better Regulation Task Force, 2004; Gordon et al., 2000; Gordon and Peter, 2000; Adelman et al., 2003; Magadi and Middleton, 2005; and Levitas et al., 2007).

The state of Pakistan in context of deprivations amongst children is below average, touching almost the alarming level. The most visible reason of this underdevelopment, with particular reference to gender, is the non-provision of benefits of economic growth ought to be trickled down to the needy masses. This factor resultantly gives birth, high mortality rate of almost 27 % and with child mortality 19 % high than nations of similar economic position. Moreover, 67 % higher death rate has been noticed in girls as compared to boys within age bracket of 1-4 years. Illiteracy has adopted formidable shape of 24% with 32% higher in female and 16% in males. The school enrolments also depict a gender based discriminatory environment with some visible barriers to female education (SPARC, 2011). The sociological studies conducted with respect to social exclusion in Pakistan identifies the social class as a major line of fragmentation within the social structure due to the prevailing feudalistic milieu in most part of the country, with further dividing factors like religion, class, caste and ethnicity. Social capital with specific relation to youngsters are facing a dire consequences in the situational aspects as reflected of community based division on ethnic grounds, where most of the benefits are only received by the upper class and the poor are forced to be at the back (SEU, 2002; Silver, 1998; and Australian Government, 2009).

Levitas et al. (2007) presented three Domains Model under Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix (B-SEM). The B-SEM model under the conceptualization of the framework for the existing study comprised of eight independent variables and a dependent variable. These variables worked as a reagent for logical interpretation of data under the shadow of the applied model. The conceptual framework of this study is based on the same model.

Futuristic vision to induct capable workforce into society demands for understanding children's problems in their voices. The research are criticized for their information based on proxy responses, where voices of children are missing and the information lack in depth to understand child's networks, relations and associated problems. The recent international approaches for studying child problems emphasize for involving children and young people's own participation by conducting research with children rather on children, where children are on foreground and their active participation acknowledged. There is a mounting need to have objective view, as how the children see their societal networks and supports around themselves, and how they want to be involved (Castillejo, 2012; James, 2007; Christensen and James, 2000; and Prout et al., 2006).

Objectives of the study

The main objectives of this paper are outlined as;

1. To find out the vulnerability of children to social exclusion in context of various socio-economic factors.
2. To ascertain gender based variations in social exclusion among children.

Method

The present study was carried out in Peshawar District to determine the relationship between social exclusion, through socio-economic causes. The research study was a "Cross Sectional" study on the basis of its time horizon (Babie, 1989). The diversity in population helped to study the diversity in extent of social exclusion, multiplicity of grounds of exclusion in children, and their behavior in socio-economic participation. Moreover, the study area comprised of 461 registered high schools (BISE Peshawar, 2011) and fifteen different shopping streets (Bazars) spreader over the whole District Peshawar (Bureau of Statistics, 1998). Population of school going age children in District Peshawar amount to 8,61,122 numbers out of which only 33 % were enrolled, the rest of the population was mostly exposed to child labor and 6 % of child population was estimated to be disabled (Bureau of statistics, 2007-08).

Sekaran (2003) recommended a sample size of 500 respondents for a larger population, like one in this study. Therefore, a sample size of 500 respondents was drawn from randomly selected seven schools and seven shopping streets. To ascertain firm grip of the researcher and ensure better quality of research through reliable data regarding study

variables, a systematic sampling procedure was adopted (Cooper and Pamela, 2010).

The respondents comprised of the following characteristics were selected.

1. Children belonging to age group from 12 up to 18 years, who are physically and mentally sound to properly respond to the questions.
2. Children enrolled in high schools, both from public and private schools, including those students that are engaged or free from economic activities after school hours.
3. Children not enrolled in the school, including all those involved in labor at various shops/workshops, etc.

The conceptual frame work was designed with dependent variables (Social Exclusion in children) gender as a background variable and eight independent variables (Table1).

Table 1
Conceptual framework

Background variables	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
Gender	Material or economic resources Access to services Social resources Economic participation Education and skills Health and well-being Living environment Criminalization	Social Exclusion in children

Measurement of social exclusion

Measurement of social exclusion in the respondents was based on nine attributes namely non-participation in social activities out of fear of failure to meet people's expectations, feeling of disrespect from others, feeling of representation from low caste, poverty, deprivation, child labor, poor aspirations for future life, left out by people due to unwanted personality and poor access to contacts. The responses were obtained on a dichotomous scale such that "No" (inclusion on particular attribute) was given the value of 0 and "Yes" (Social exclusion) was given the value of 1. The attributes were indexed for squeezing the data and getting a summary result. A child was considered as socially excluded if he was excluded on five or more attributes of social exclusion.

Measurement of causative factors of social exclusion

Measurement of independent variables, as causative factors of social exclusion, was based on attitudinal statements pooled from available literature. All the attributes so developed were floated to the respondents for the purpose of collecting information. The responses for all questions were obtained on a dichotomous scale.

Indexation and reliability analysis

Attitudinal statements of all the variables, involving two or more items were indexed by combining these items for measurement of a single variable. Prior to indexation of variables, a reliability analysis test was carried out to ascertain that the components of an index under observation are internally consistent and are pertaining to a single concept. Cronbach's alpha test was used to determine the reliability of the scales in the present study. All the independent variables showing Cronbach's alpha coefficient value of more than 0.7 were indexed and cross tabbed with dependent variables, while keeping gender of respondents as control variable, for finding spuriousness of relationship among variables. The data was analyzed by using multi-variate techniques of data analysis. Chi-square test was used to test the association between the two variables. Statistical procedure devised by Tai (1978) was adopted to calculate the value of chi-square statistics.

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{c} \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{O}ij - \mathbf{e}ij)^2}{\mathbf{e}ij}$$

Where

$\chi 2$ = Chi-Square

Oij = Observed frequencies in ith row and jth column

$\mathbf{e}ij$ = expect frequencies corresponding to ith row and jth column

r = number of rows

c = number of columns

df = (r-1) (c-1) (Tai, 1978)

Condition for a chi-square test include that the subjects for each group are randomly and independently selected, each observation must qualify for one and only one category, sample size must fairly be large such that no expected frequency is less than 5, for r and c > 2, or < 10 if r=c=2. However, this assumption was violated in the data and therefore, Fisher Exact Test was used instead of simple Chi-square. The relationship developed by the Fisher is given in equation below (Baily, 1982);

$$\mathbf{Fis}\boldsymbol{her}\ \mathbf{exect}\ \boldsymbol{test} = \frac{(a+b)!\,(c+d)!\,(a+c)!\,(b+d)!}{N!\ \ a!\,b!\,c!\,d!}$$

Where a, b, c and d were the observed numbers in four cells of contingency Table and "n" the total number of observations.

Kendall's Tau-b was used measure for calculating association for contingency tables. Kendall's tau-b is most appropriate measure of association for two levels response

data, where marginal distribution is uneven in 2×2 tables with many ties.

Kendall's tau–b is expressed through formula below; (Nachmias, 1992).

$$T^b = \frac{Ns - Nd}{\sqrt{(Ns + Nd + Tx)(Ns + Nd + Tx)}}$$

Where;
T^b= Kendall's Tau-b
Ns = same order pairs
Nd = different order pairs
Tx = pairs tied on *X*

Results and Discussions

Association between access to economic resources and social exclusion in children (controlling gender)

The influence of gender on the respondent's access to economic resources and their social exclusion showed that male respondents had negative (T^b=-0.148) and significant (p=0.003) relationship between aforesaid variables (Table 2). The association of foresaid variables was also negative (T^b=-0.300) and significant (p=0.003) for female respondents. Significance value and Kendall's Tau-b coefficient value for male and female genders showed non-spurious relationship. The result indicated that respondents of both genders were almost equally restricted to economic and material resources leading to social exclusion with slighter variation in gender composition. Although female were more suffered due to poor economic accessibility than males, as indicated by the Kendall's Tau-b Coefficient value, yet the difference was negligible. Thus access to economic resources has universal recognition as a major contributor to social exclusion in children irrespective of their gender. These findings are in line to the Kantor (2009) conclusion that female had restricted access to work outside the home due to the prevalent social barriers. Variation in access to resources on gender basis, although universal but with slighter inclination to female, could be related to poverty and structural restrictions with differential approaches on gender basis (Attree, 2004; and Roker, 1998).

Table 2
Association between access to economic resources and social exclusion in children (controlling gender)

Gender	Economic resources	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Poor economic resources	112 (27.3)	96 (23.4)	208 (50.7)	χ^2 = 9.018
	Economically resourceful	138 (33.7)	64 (15.6)	202 (49.3)	(0.003)
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	T^b= -0.148
Female	Poor economic resources	10 (11.1)	39 (43.3)	49 (54.4)	χ^2 = 8.996
	Economically resourceful	20 (22.2)	21 (23.3)	41 (45.6)	(0.003)
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.6)	90 (100)	T^b= -0.300

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between social relations with family member and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

The influence of gender on the respondent's relations with family members and their social exclusion showed that male respondents had negative (T^b=-0.208) and highly significant (p=0.000) relationship between aforesaid variables (Table 3). Contrary to male respondents the association of foresaid variables was non-significant (p=0.465) and negative (T^b=-0.077) for female respondents. Both the significance values of chi-square test and Kendall's Tau-b values for male and female genders showed spurious relationship. The result indicated that male respondents with weak family relations are more prone to social exclusion than female. In female, though the relationship was negative but not significant. This could be attributed to the cultural demand for male as a sign of masculinity, conducting economic activities in the shape of economic assets for their family and had the potential to mitigate poverty while working hard outside for the family cause in the job market. In patriarchal society male is bread winner, a sigh of masculinity and ought to face hardship encountered by the relative family along with the notion of being an economic asset for his family. Moreover, the little importance of female was due to their subordinate position in the family and had little freedom of expression and restricted environment for participating in the economic activities outside their home. Carr et al. (1996) has also disclosed patriarchal family as a main source of giving direction for male superiority in all activities pertaining to family and community. In addition the prevalent cultural norms, if not supporting enough proved to be barrier for female movement outside house (Kantor, 2009). Support to children outside home activities (Wood, 2004) were present in all societies with special reference to neighborhood, however, found biased in favor of male. The role of family, friends and neighbors has an important standing in expression to social relations. Useful participation could guarantee a stable environment for children to get adjusted to the mainstream activities, thus minimizing the gender discrimination mechanics (SEU, 2006).

Table 3

Association between social relations with family member and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Relations with family member	Social Exclusion Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Weak relations	52 (12.7)	64 (15.6)	116 (28.3)	χ^2 = 17.72 (0.000)
	Strong relations	198 (48.3)	96 (23.4)	294 (71.7)	T^b= -0.208
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	
Female	Weak relations	5 (5.6)	14 (15.6)	19 (21.1)	χ^2 = 0.534 (0.465)
	Strong relations	25 (27.8)	46 (51.1)	71 (78.9)	T^b= -0.077
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between social relations with neighbors and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

The influence of gender on the respondent's relations with their neighbors and their social exclusion indicated a negative (T^b=-0.221) and significant (p=0.036) relationship for female respondents between above mentioned variables (Table 4). Contrarily the association of above-mentioned variables was non-significant (p=0.376) and negative (T^b=-0.030) for male respondents. Both the significance values of chi-square test and Kendall's Tau-b values for male and female genders showed spurious relationship. The result indicates that female respondents were more prone to social exclusion due to their weak relations with neighbors than boys. In boys, though the relationship was negative but not significant. Neighborhood is important source of participation and socialization on the basis of cultural provision supposed to be alike for both genders. However, the prevailing culture, under the shade of patriarchal system had more inclination to male than female; thus, male had a high response from their neighbors and relatives as compared to female. Understanding the effects of social exclusion could only be interpreted under the purview of culture with relation to gender, age, religion and ethnicity (Attree, 2004). Moreover, relationship between poverty and social exclusion had a significant association while explaining the children relationship with their neighbors, as neighbors had a shielding effect against the aforementioned facts. In addition, social relationship is also important whenever measured through the established links with neighbors and friends. Little participation means more exclusion as disclosed by (Wood, 2004; Ridge, 2007; and Saunders, 2007).

Table 4

Association between social relations with neighbors and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Social relations with neighbors	Social Exclusion Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	Statistics χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Weak relations	41 (10)	30 (7.3)	71 (17.3)	χ^2 = 0.376 (0.546)
	Good relations	209 (51)	130 (31.7)	339 (82.7)	T^b= -0.030
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	
Female	Weak relations	5 (5.6)	23 (25.6)	28 (31.1)	χ^2 = 4.38 (0.036)
	Good relations	25 (27.8)	37 (41.1)	62 (68.9)	T^b= -0.221
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between power of making decision and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

A negative relationship (T^b=-0.220) was found between power of making decision in male and their social exclusion (Table 5). The relationship between these variables was highly significant (p=0.000). Contrary to above group, in female this relationship was non-significant (p=0.469) and negative (T^b=-0.076). The result of male and female indicated a spurious relationship between power of making decision in children and their social exclusion at bivariate level while controlling gender. Thus male had an edge over the female regarding decision making power while encountering social exclusion. It could be attributed to the local cultural milieu where male had great liberty in decision making than female. Confidence derived out of liberty had enabled the local youngsters with more choice and freedom as indicated by Sutton et al. (2007) that participation in social activities enhancing the decision power amongst the male. Moreover, group activities dictates towards four possible options like right to survival, right to development, access to information and right to participation. All these four dimensions are the strong indicators of social participation (Whites et al. 2002). Moreover, increased participation of youngsters in social activities ensures cultural progress and social development. Social capital needs to be understood if any aspect of social exclusion is supposed to be under debate (Berti, 2003; and Hoffmann-Exstein et al., 2008).

Table 5

Association between power of making decision and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Power of making decision	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Weak decision making abilities	200 (48.8)	153 (37.3)	353 (86.1)	χ^2 = 19.89
	Strong decision making abilities	50 (12.2)	7 (1.7)	57 (13.9)	(0.000)
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	T^b= -0.220
Female	Weak decision making abilities	28 (31.1)	58 (64.4)	86 (95.6)	χ^2 = 0.523
	Strong decision making abilities	2 (2.2)	2 (2.2)	4 (4.4)	(0.469)
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	T^b= -0.076

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between participation in economic activities and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Relationship between participation in economic activities and social exclusion in children was positive (T^b=0.584) and highly significant (p=0.000) in male respondents. Similarly, the relationship in aforementioned variables was highly significant (p=0.000) and highly positive (T^b=0.878) in female respondents (Table 6). The result of boys and girls was spurious for above mentioned variables. These findings suggested a high social exclusion among female working children than male working children. The attributable factor could be low subordinate position given to female by the local culture. Moreover, highly patriarchal in nature, working conditions were highly conducive for male instead of female. The outcome of this findings are similar to Kabeer (2000) findings that gender based segregation in economic activities is culturally biased. Female are meant for assisting in the household chores, mostly unpaid in nature, while male had to go out and participate in economic activities. These factors are participation in return, minimizes the exclusion factor to a greater extent as compared to female (Kantor, 2009; and Levitas et al., 2007). In Pakistan children are mostly involved in paid job while facing hard working conditions and low wages devoid of medical protection and leave (SPARC, 2011).

Table 6

Association between participation in economic activities and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Participation in economic activities	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Passive participation	147 (40.1)	17 (4.6)	164 (44.7)	χ^2 = 125.3
	Active participation	64 (17.4)	139 (37.9)	203 (55.3)	(0.000)
	Total	211 (57.5)	156 (42.5)	367 (100)	T^b = 0.584
Female	Passive participation	28 (31.5)	4 (4.5)	32 (36)	χ^2 = 68.59
	Active participation	1 (1.1)	56 (62.9)	57 (64)	(0.000)
	Total	29 (32.6)	60 (67.4)	89 (100)	T^b= 0.878

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between competence in education and skills and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

A negative relationship (T^b=-0.154) was found between competence in education/skills in boys and their social exclusion (Table 7). The relationship between these variables was also highly significant (p=0.000). Contrary to above group, in girls this relationship was non-significant (p=0.875) and negative (T^b=-0.017). The result of boys and girls indicated a spurious relationship between competence in education/skills in children and their social exclusion. The main factors attributing to these inferences are the gender based disparities in education with more inclination for boys over female. Males are taken as custodian of future in economic, social and cultural terms while female are restricted o household activities. This situation always indicated towards a limited environment of low quality formal education for female than male. Increased competence in education and related skills are highly dependent on parental focus on their children education and thus having high chances of avoiding exclusion while participating in the competence based activities. High dropout rate and social exclusion amongst children are the outcome of socio-economic deprivation and poor educational achievements. Behr et al. (2002) has also linked the high school dropout to poverty. Moreover, some other factors could also be attributed to lesser educational attainments like poor student teacher relationship and the subsequent effect in the shape of low confidence to participate in the developmental activities are some of the eminent outcomes (Hirsch, 2007; Duncan et al., 1998; UNICEF, 2012; and UNICEF, 2007).

Table 7
Association between competence in education and skills and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Competence in education and skills	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Low competence	76 (18.5)	73 (17.8)	149 (36.3)	χ^2 = 9.77
	High competence	174 (42.4)	87 (21.2)	261 (67.3)	(0.002)
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	T^b= -0.154
Female	Low competence	10 (11.1)	21 (23.3)	31 (34.4)	χ^2 = 0.025
	High competence	20 (22.2)	39 (43.3)	59 (65.6)	(0.875)
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	T^b= -0.017

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between state of health and wellbeing and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

As depicted in Table 8apositive (T^b=0.144) and significant (p=0.004) relationship in male was observed between state of health/wellbeing and social exclusion in children. In female this relationship in aforementioned variables was significant (p=0.020) and positive (T^b=0.245). The effects of state of health on social exclusion in boys and girls were almost identical as evident from their significance and Kendall's Tau-b coefficient value. Therefore, the results of boys and girls whereon-spurious for above mentioned variables. It is conclusive from present findings that, health and wellbeing is a universal factor in influencing social exclusion in children irrespective of gender considerations. Poor behavioral outcomes and health are directly related to least caring attitudes on part of the person (Levitas et al., 2007). Moreover, long standing illnesses is an attributable factor of social exclusion. Low income is another key indicator of social exclusion with poor policies of looking for maximum participation. In addition poor health and feeling of isolation drastically affect the childhood and adulthood as well (Nevile, 2005; and Burchardt et al., 2002).

Table 8
Association between state of health and wellbeing and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	State of health and wellbeing	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Poor health	111 (27.1)	48 (11.7)	159 (38.8)	χ^2 = 8.52
	Good health	139 (33.9)	112 (27.3)	251 (61.2)	(0.004)
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	T^b= 0.144
Female	Poor health	16 (17.8)	17 (18.9)	33 (36.7)	χ^2 = 5.38
	Good health	14 (15.6)	43 (47.8)	57 (63.3)	(0.020)
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	T^b= 0.245

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

In boys, the relationship between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children was positive (T^b=0.254) and highly significant (p=0.000).The relationship between these variables was positive (T^b=0.385) and highly significant (p=0.000) as depicted in (Table 9) amongst female also. Therefore, the results of boys and girls were non-spurious for above mentioned variables, as indicated by their significance and Kendall's Tau-b coefficient value. Criminality at community and society level had common influencing factors with strong relationship to social exclusion irrespective of gender considerations. Levitas et al. (2007) has also related social exclusion matrix with the environment of crimes amongst children. Then on-participatory behavior amongst the deprived classes usually outfitting the peer group activities in unpredictable direction. It may include avoiding establishing liaison with friends. Moreover, criminal victimization in Pakistani society is the outcome of poor performance on part of law controlling agencies with high fear of victimization and crimes in the socially excluded children (Willow, 2002; Adelman et al., 2003; SPARC, 2011; and Bradshaw et al., 2004).

Table 9
Association between environment of crimes at community level and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Environment of crimes at community level	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Peaceful environment	206 (50.2)	95 (23.2)	301 (73.4)	χ^2 = 26.5
	Violent environment	44 (10.7)	65 (15.9)	109 (26.6)	(0.000)
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	T^b= 0.254
Female	Peaceful environment	26 (28.9)	28 (31.1)	53 (60)	χ^2 = 13.33
	Violent environment	4 (4.4)	32 (35.6)	36 (40)	(0.000)
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	T^b= 0.385

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Association between environment of crimes at family level and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

The relationship between social exclusion in children and environment of crimes at family level in male respondents was negative (T^b=-0.149) but significant (p=0.003) also (Table 10). Contrary to male, in female respondents this relationship was negative (T^b=-0.045) but non-significant (p=0.672). The result of male and female respondents indicated a spurious relationship between environment of crimes at family level and social exclusion in children. Socialization of patriarchal training in male family members is a source of arrogance. Female as family members had to tolerate all sort of hardships due to their restricted role and secondary status imparted through the socialization under the umbrella of local culture with strong dictation for patriarchy. Thus female had little chances to fall prey to any criminal activities rather male, by virtue of their superiority, masculinity and dominance. Group violence, joblessness (Sutton et al., 2007) are the probable outcomes of economic disadvantages, the main virtue of poor families with little control over their children activities. Prisoners while remained unemployed for longer period of time had low profile of competence as compared to ordinary citizens and more prone to criminal offences (SEU, 1998).

Table 10
Association between environment of crimes at family level and social exclusion in children (controlling gender of the respondents)

Gender	Environment of crimes at family level	Social Exclusion			Statistics
		Socially Excluded	Socially Included	Total	χ^2 (P-Value) T^b
Male	Peaceful environment	171 (41.7)	131 (32)	302 (73.7)	χ^2 = 9.13
	Violent environment	79 (19.3)	29 (7.1)	108 (26.3)	(0.003)
	Total	250 (61)	160 (39)	410 (100)	T^b= -0.149
Female	Peaceful environment	25 (27.8)	52 (57.8)	77 (85.6)	χ^2 = 0.18
	Violent environment	5 (5.6)	8 (8.9)	13 (14.4)	(0.672)
	Total	30 (33.3)	60 (66.7)	90 (100)	T^b= -0.045

Values in table present frequency while values in parenthesis represent percentage proportion of respondents

Conclusions and recommendations

The study concluded that poor access of children to economic resources heightened their chances of social exclusion from mainstream society. Children belonging to poor families were subjected to underage employment and harsh working conditions. The sense of resentment from the society was high among these working children; besides, they were experiencing poor health state individually or at their family level. The state of social exclusion was further aggravated when the children failed to establish sound relations with their family and neighbors. Besides, fear of crime and violence at home and living place kept children in continuous state of stress and loneliness. The after effects of poor social relations and criminal environment were visible in low decision making power of excluded children. However, augmentation in educational facilities and skill enhancement were effectively diluting the exclusionary effects in children. Girls were particular victims of these socio-economic deprivations and experienced higher level of social exclusion than boys. In nutshell deprivation among excluded children were multidimensional and complex and were particularly harsh on female gender.

Findings of this study validated the Three Domains Model presented under Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix (B-SEM). The data strongly supported the theory and upkeep the domains of resource, participation and quality of life, as outlined under B-SEM model, were decisive in determining and explaining social exclusion in children. However, it was established by this study that these domains were spurious

in their exclusionary effects based on gender. Therefore, it is concluded that deprivations among children due to access to services, state of education and skills, state of health and wellbeing, family income, participation in paid work, physical state of living environment and environment of crimes had determining influence on social exclusion among children. The extents of influence of these domains in social exclusion, however, were unequal in their effects, especially with respect to gender.

In light of study findings the following recommendations are made:

1. Provision of practical education and skills to children at school level besides establishment of sound and augmented relationship between students and teachers through providing proper trainings to the teachers, its implementations and evaluation through feedback from students.
2. Broadening the base of existing service delivery institutions for provision of basic facilities at low cost and at the doorstep of all segments of society on equity basis.
3. Enforcement of child labor laws in its true spirit for curbing underage employment besides provision of welfare support to such poor families to meet their economic needs in a dignified way.
4. Strengthening the cultural base of social values, ethics and moralities for creating a congenial environment at family and community level to socialize children and enable them for their productive participation in societal goals.
5. Putting national laws and policies for women's rights in place for safeguarding their rights and interests and reduce their feelings of deprivations.

References

Adelman, L., Middleton, S. and Ashworth, K. (2003). *Britain's poorest children: Severe and persistent poverty and social exclusion*. *Save the Children UK*: London.

Atkinson, T., Bea, C., Eric, M. and Brian, N. (2002). *Social Indicators: The EU and Social Inclusion.* London: Oxford University Press.

Attree, P. (2004). *Growing up in disadvantage: A systematic review of the qualitative evidence.* Child: Care, Health and Development, 30 (6), 679-689.

Australian Government. (2009). *Transforming Australia's higher education system.* Retrieved on 15October 2012, from http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Documents/PDF/Additional%20Report%20-%20Transforming%20Aus%20Higher%20ED_webaw.pdf

Babie, E. (1989). *The Practice of Social Research.* Belmont, California, Wades worth Publishing Company.

Baily, K. D. (1982). *Methods of Social Research*. 2nd Ed. New York. Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Barnes, M., Blom, A., Cox, K., Lessof, C. and Walker, A. (2006). *The social exclusion of older people: Evidence from the first wave of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA), Final report,* London: SEU/OPDM, January.

Behr, A., Bellgardt, E. and Rendtel, U. (2002). *Extent and determinants of panel attrition in the European Community Household Panel,* CHINTEX Working Paper No 7, November.

Berti, R. (2003). *Pistoia: A city that values children, Education Pistoia: edizione junior (pp. 4-6). Pistoia: Comune di Pistoia. Children, Young People and Social Inclusion: Mobilising to Address Disadvantage on the NSW North Coast: a Literature Review,* Wilks Wilson ARACY Literature review 12 May 2010.

Better Regulation Task Force. (2004). *The regulation of child employment,* London: Cabinet Office.

BISE Peshawar. (2011). *Gazette book SSC examination*. Board of intermediate and secondary education Peshawar. Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Bradbury, B. and Markus, J. (1999). *Child poverty across industrialized nations*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF, Innocenti Centre.

Bradshaw, J., Kemp, P., Baldwin, S. and Rowe, A. (2004). *The drivers of social exclusion: A review of the literature for the Social Exclusion Unit in the Breaking the Cycle series,* London: SEU/ODPM.

Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (2002). *Degrees of exclusion: developing a dynamic multidimensional measure, in J. Hills, J. Le Grand and D. Piachaud (eds) Understanding social exclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 30-43.

Bureau of statistics. (1998). *Demographic indicators.* Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. Government of Pakistan. Retrieved on 20October 2012, from http://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/demographic-indicators-1998-census.

Bureau of statistics. (2007). *Pakistan Demographic Survey*. Pakistan Bureau of Statistics. Government of Pakistan. Retrieved on 20October 2012, from http://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/pakistan-demographic-survey-2007.

Carr, M., Chen, M. A. and Jhabvala, R. (1996). *Speaking out:* Women's economic empowerment in South Asia. London: IT Publications.

Castillejo, C. (2012). *Exclusion: A hidden driver of Pakistan's fragility.* NOREF Policy Brief. Norwegian Peace Building Resource Centre.

Christensen, P.and James, A. (2000). *Childhood, diversity and commonality: some methodological insights. In P. Christensen and A. James (Eds.), Research with children* (pp. 160-179). London: Palmer Press.

Commins, P. (2004). *Poverty and social exclusion in rural areas:* Characteristics, processes and research issues. SociologiaRuralis, 44, 60-75.

Convention on the Rights of the Child. (1989). *United Nations High Commissioner for human rights*: United Nations Human Rights. Retrieved on 20th April 2012, from http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx.

Cooper, D.R. and Pamela, S.S. (2010). *Business Research Methods*. Islamabad. National Book Foundation.

DfES. (2006a). *Every Child Matters: Integrated working to improve outcomes for children and young people.* Retrieved on 20October 2012, fromwww.everychildmatters.gov.uk/deliveringservices/integratedworking/

DfES. (2006b). *Outcomes framework: Every Child Matters.* Retrieved on 20October 2012, fromwww.everychildmatters.gov.uk/_content/documents/Outcomes%20Framework.pdf

DSS (Department of Social Security). (1999). *Opportunity for All: Tackling poverty and social exclusion,* Cm 4445, London: The Stationery Office.

Duncan, G.J., Yeung, W.J., Brooks-Gunn, J. and Smith, J.R. (1998). *How much does childhood poverty affect the life chances of children?* American Sociological Review, 63, 406-423.

Gordon, D. and Peter, T.(eds.). (2000). *Breadline Europe: The Measurement of Poverty*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Gordon, D., Adelman, L., Ashworth, K., Bradshaw, J., Levitas, R., Middleton, S., Pantazis, C., Patsios, D., Payne, S., Townsend, P. and Williams, J. (2000). *Poverty and social exclusion in Britain*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Hirsch, D. (2007). *Experiences of poverty and educational disadvantage: Round-up-Reviewing the evidence.* Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York, UK.

Hoffmann-Ekstein, J., Michaux, A., Bessell, S., Mason, J., Watson, E. and Fox, M. (2008). *Children's agency in communities: A review of the literature and the policy and practice context,* The Benevolent Society, ANU, Social Justice Social Change Research Centre University of Western Sydney, NAPCAN.

James, A. (2007). *Giving voice to children's voices: practices and problems, pitfalls and potentials.* American Anthropologist. 109: 261-272.

Kabeer, N. (2000). *Social exclusion, poverty and discrimination.* IDS Bulletin. 31(4): 83–97.

Kantor, P. (2009). *Women's Exclusion and Unfavorable Inclusion in Informal Employment in Lucknow, India: Barriers to Voice and Livelihood Security.* World Development. 37 (1): 194–207.

Levitas, R., Christina, P., Eldin, F., David, G., Eva, L. and Demi, P. (2007). *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion.* Bristol institute of Public Affairs, Bristol.

Magadi, M. and Middleton, S. (2005). *Britain's poorest children revisited: Evidence from the BHPS (1994-2002),* London: Save the Children.

Marsh, A., Gordon, D., Pantazis, C. and Heslop, P. (1999). *Home Sweet Home? The impact of poor housing on health,* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Middleton, S. and Loumidis, J. (2001). *Young people, poverty and part-time work, in P. Mizen., C. Pole. and A. Bolton. (eds.) Hidden hands International perspectives on children's work and labor,* London: Routledge/Falmer.

Miliband, D. (2006). *Social exclusion: The next steps forward,* London: ODPM.

Nachmias. C. F. and David Nachmias. (1992). *Research Methods in Social Sciences.* 4th Ed. St Martin's Press Inco. New York. USA.

Nevile, A. (2005). *Policies to combat poverty and social exclusion: Does the south have anything to offer the north?* Paper presented at the 'Looking back, Looking forward'

Prout, A., Simmons, R. and Birchall, J. (2006). *Reconnecting and extending the research agenda on children's participation: mutual incentives and the participation chain In E. K. M. Tisdall (Eds.), Children, young people and social inclusion: participation for what?* (pp. 75-104). Bristol: Policy Press.

Ridge, T. (2007). *Negotiating child poverty: Children's subjective experiences of life on a low income. In H. Wintersberger, L. Alanen, T. Olk and J. Qvortrup (Eds.), Childhood, Generational Order and the Welfare State:* Exploring Children's Social and Economic Welfare, Vol. 1 of COST A19: Children's Welfare, University Press of Southern Denmark: Denmark.Robinson, P. and C. Oppenheim. 1998. Social Exclusion Indicators. London: IPPR.

Roker, D. (1998). *Worth more than this: Young people growing up in family poverty,* London: The Children's Society.

Room, G. (1995). (Eds.) *Beyond the threshold: The measurement and analysis of social exclusion,* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Saunders, P. (2007). *Towards New Indicators of Disadvantage Project: Bulletin No. 2: Deprivation in Australia*. Social Policy Research Centre Newsletter No. 96, May 2007: 7-10.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business*. USA, Hermitage Publishing Services.

SEU (Social Exclusion Unit). (1997). *Social Exclusion Unit: Purpose, work priorities and working methods,* London: SEU.

SEU. (1998). *Rough sleeping*, London: SEU.

SEU. (2002). *Young runaways*, London: SEU.

Silver, H. (1998). *Policies to Reinforce Social Cohesion in Europe, In Social Exclusion:* An ILO Perspective, 38–73. Geneva: ILO.

Silver, H. and Miller, S.M. (2003). *Social Exclusion: the European approach to social disadvantage.* Indicators.2 (2).

SPARC. (2011). *The state of Pakistan's children.* Retrieved on 24th October 2012, fromwww.sparcpk.org.

Stewart, K. (2002). *Measuring Well-Being and Exclusion in Europe's Regions. CASE Paper 53,* Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.

Sutton, L., Smith, N., Dearden, C. and Middleton, S. (2007). *A child's-eye view of social difference.* Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York, UK.

Tai, S. W. (1978). *Social Science Statistics, it Elements and Applications.* California, Goodyear Publishing Company.

UNICEF. (2007). *Child poverty in perspective: An overview of child well-being in rich countries.* UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre Report Card No.7. Innocenti Research Centre: Florence, Italy.

UNICEF. (2012). *State of the world's children.* UN.

Walker, A., and Walker, C. (1997). *Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s.* Child Poverty Action Group.

White, H., Levy, J. and Masters, A. (2002). *Comparative Perspectives on Child Poverty: A Review of Poverty Measures.* Save the Children UK: London.

Willow, C. (2002). *Bread is free: Children and young people talk about poverty.* Save the Children UK: London.

Wood, G. (2004). *Informal security regimes: The strength of relationships. In I. Gough, and G. Wood (Eds.), Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social policy in development contexts* (pp. 49–87). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Received: Aug, 12th, 2014
Revisions Received: Nov, 20th, 2014