

Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation

——— *Arjan de Haan*

Introduction

This paper makes a strong plea for the use of the concept of social exclusion, and argues that it has relevance for richer as well as poorer countries.¹ The concept does not describe a new reality; neither is it the only appropriate or even a radically innovative concept to describe deprivation. The concept's advantage is that it focuses attention on central aspects of deprivation: deprivation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon, and deprivation is part and parcel of social relations. The concept of social exclusion can help to ground the understanding of deprivation firmly in traditions of social science analyses.

The concept has rapidly entered debates on deprivation and policies that combat deprivation. The first section briefly reviews this ascent, and discusses some of the uses of the concept. The second section aims to clear up some of the confusions around the concept,² and discusses its central elements. The next section

¹ This paper was initially prepared for the World Development Report 2001 Forum on 'Inclusion, Justice, and Poverty Reduction'. It is the result of the work done at the Poverty Research Unit, University of Sussex. This was mainly conceptual, in the context of comparing deprivation in North and South (see further the January 1998 IDS Bulletin).

² Discussions about the concept often reflect differences in disciplinary backgrounds — this is perhaps inadequately discussed in this paper. My argument implies a plea for widening economists' understanding of exclusion beyond analysis of income and productivity. Particularly the work by Silver (discussed below) shows how much such understanding can depend on analysts' backgrounds and political traditions.

compares the concept with the notion of poverty, and its various definitions, emphasising overlaps as well as differences. The fourth section argues that social exclusion can be measured but that the type of research is likely to be different from the measurement of income poverty. The fifth section discusses the policies in which social exclusion has been central, particularly in France and more recently in Britain, and the policies in developing countries that operate with similar understandings of poverty. Section six concludes, and points at ways in which work on social exclusion can be taken forward.

The history of the concept

The invention of the term social exclusion is usually attributed to Rene Lenoir, then Secrétaire d'Etat à l'Action Sociale in the Chirac government, who published *Les Exclus: Un Français sur dix*, in 1974. Lenoir's excluded included a wide variety of people: not only the poor, but also handicapped, suicidal and aged people, abused children, substance abusers, etc. – about 10 per cent of the French population. The term gained popularity in France during the 1980s (Silver 1994), the period of economic crisis and restructuring, the crisis of the welfare state, and various social and political crises. The term exclusion was used to refer to various types of social disadvantage, related to the new social problems that arose: unemployment, ghettoisation and fundamental changes in family life (Cannan 1997). Old welfare state provisions were thought incapable of dealing with these problems, and new social policies were developed.

The popularity of the new term was partly the result of the unpopularity in France of the (British) concept of 'poverty'. This was discredited because of its association with Christian charity, the *ancien regime*, and utilitarian liberalism. French Republicans have rejected both liberal individualism and socialism in favour of the idea of 'solidarity', and the welfare state was justified as a means of furthering social integration. Correspondingly, social exclusion was defined as a rupture of the social fabric, and attributed to a failure of the state.

The concept has since gained popularity in other countries (Silver, 1998: 53ff.). The EU has been committed to fighting social exclusion throughout the past decade. The Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties and the Structural Funds included a commitment to combat social exclusion. The change in terminology in the anti-poverty programmes was significant: while ‘poverty’ was a central concern in the first programme, in the third programme this had become ‘social exclusion’. The EU induced new thinking on the nature of urban poverty and integrated, participatory strategies of regeneration.

Recently social exclusion also has become central to British policies and debates. During the Conservative government the notion did not enter policy debates. However, it was taken up in research – though the French meaning of the term was perhaps not always properly understood. In 1992 the Economic and Social Science Research Council (ESRC) commissioned Jordan (1996) to review research on poverty and social exclusion, and it became an ESRC ‘thematic priority’ in 1995. But the debate became dominated by the New Labour government’s initiative to establish an interdepartmental Social Exclusion Unit in late 1997.³ The unit produced three reports, on neighbourhood renewal, on rough sleeping, and truancy and school exclusion. It is currently (at the time of writing) engaged in an assessment of 16-18 year olds not in education, and consultation about teenage parenthood and how to reduce its rate.

The way in which the concept has been used across Europe differs significantly. The British use of the term seems strongly rooted in – in terms of Silver’s paradigms, discussed below – an Anglo-Saxon liberal individualism.⁴ Despite the adoption of the French term,

³ The Social Exclusion Unit is an example of the British Government’s ‘joined-up’ policy making. Though the notion of social exclusion rapidly came to occupy center stage, it should also be noted that it linked well with other developments and innovations that had been going on in the UK for some time (Parkinson 1998).

⁴ Lister (1998) emphasises the influence of the US on current British social policy debates. Powell (1995: 28-29), writing on Ireland, notes: ‘attitudes towards poverty have fundamentally changed in postmodern society, redefining citizenship in terms

American models of welfare reform seem to have been more influential in the British social policy debates. The French notion, particularly with the left-wing government, remains based more strongly in a national solidarity paradigm.⁵

The notion has so far found limited entry into development studies debates. ILO work so far has produced the only significant output of research in which the notion has been central.⁶ But the concept has met with a degree of (healthy) scepticism. Else Oyen for example believes that researchers ‘pick up the concept and are now running all over the place arranging seminars and conferences to find a researchable content in an umbrella concept for which there is limited theoretical underpinning’⁷. And though not always so strongly stated, similar opinions have been expressed on many occasions. I believe that the concept has the potential to provide useful insights into the debate, and will try to argue this below; first, however, I will try to clarify some conceptual misunderstandings.

Defining social exclusion

There is an ‘official’ French definition of the concept, which defines social exclusion as a *rupture of social bonds* – which reflects a French emphasis on the organic and solidaristic nature of society. More broadly, social exclusion has been defined as ‘the process through

of duties and obligations rather than the Marshallian construct of social, as well as civil and political rights.’ Silver’s work is described in more detail in the next section.

⁵ This paper does not allow for further analysis of this theme, and the differences within Europe are offered as hypotheses. In probably all European countries there has been increasing targeting of welfare benefits, emphases on duties, and attempts to reduce government expenditure, partly driven by the fiscal goals set for the EU’s monetary union.

⁶ This has produced a large number of literature reviews, and a set of country case studies. Summary publications include ILS (1994, 1996), Rodgers *et al.* (1994, 1995), Gore and Figueiredo (1997), Figueiredo and de Haan, eds. (1998).

⁷ Quoted in Sen (1998: 3). It is not evident that this is unique to the development of this particular concept. More importantly, the term does have theoretical underpinnings.

which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live'⁸. Social exclusion is defined as the opposite of social integration, mirroring the perceived importance of being part of society, of being 'included'.

The concept has two main defining characteristics. First, it is a multi-dimensional concept. People may be excluded, for example, from livelihoods, employment, earnings, property, housing, minimum consumption, education, the welfare state, citizenship, personal contacts or respect (Silver 1994). But the concept focuses on the multi-dimensionality of deprivation, on the fact that people are often deprived of different things at the same time. It refers to exclusion (deprivation) in the economic, social and political sphere. Second – less discussed in the literature but perhaps more relevant for the theoretical contribution of the concept – social exclusion implies a focus on the relations and processes that cause deprivation. People can be excluded by many different sorts of groups, often at the same time: landlords exclude people from access to land or housing; elite political groups exclude others from legal rights; priests in India may exclude scheduled castes from access to temples; minorities may be excluded from expressing their identity; labour markets, and also some trade unions exclude people (non-members) from getting jobs; and so on. Exclusion happens at each level of society. Group formation is a fundamental characteristic of human society, and this is accompanied by the exclusion of others. The concept takes us beyond mere descriptions of deprivation, and focuses attention on social relations and the processes and institutions that underlie and are part and parcel of deprivation.

⁸ European Foundation (1995: 4). For the British Social Exclusion Unit, according to Carey Oppenheim, in April 1998 the establishment of a working definition was still a key challenge (*The Guardian*, 1 April 1998). For the EU's Economic and Social Committee on the cost of poverty and social exclusion in Europe (1998), 'complete social exclusion' is the 'final culmination of a series of specific exclusions from basic rights'.

The disadvantages faced by the excluded tend to be interrelated. People belonging to minorities or school drop-outs may have a greater risk of being unemployed or be employed in precarious jobs and hence be low-paid, less-educated, recipients of social assistance, possess little political power, and fewer social contacts. Research on social exclusion focuses on the extent to which these dimensions overlap. Which of these dimensions is central is dependent on the context. The concept of social exclusion provides the basis for context-specific analyses, and can allow definitions of integration to be contested. Thus in some societies or among some groups labour market participation may form the crux around which other elements of deprivation revolve; whereas elsewhere or among other groups religious identity is more important.

The work of Hilary Silver (1994) – whose work this paper heavily draws on – has stressed the variety of definitions given to social exclusion and integration, depending on contexts, and has noted that the definitions come with ‘theoretical and ideological baggage’. The French Republican tradition, drawing on Rousseau, with its emphasis on solidarity and the idea of the state as the embodiment of the general will of the nation, has given the notion a specific meaning. Exclusion is primarily defined as the rupture of a social bond – which is cultural and moral – between the individual and society. National solidarity implies political right and duties. The poor, unemployed and ethnic minorities are defined as outsiders.

In an Anglo-Saxon tradition, social exclusion means a rather different thing. One of the main theoretical differences appears to me to be the fact that ‘poverty’ is seen as an issue which is separate from ‘social exclusion’ – perhaps akin to the underclass debate – rather than as an *element of* social exclusion. The Anglo-Saxon tradition is characterised by Silver as a specialisation paradigm, drawing on liberal thinkers like Locke. This perceives social actors primarily as individuals, who are able to move across boundaries of social differentiation and economic divisions of labour. Unenforced rights and market failures are seen as common causes of exclusion. Liberal models of citizenship emphasise the contractual exchange of rights and obligations. In this paradigm,

exclusion reflects discrimination, the drawing of group distinctions that denies individuals full participation in exchange or interaction.

The third paradigm described in Silver's work is the 'monopoly paradigm'. This draws on the work of Weber and is particularly influential in northern European countries, and also in Britain – though recent debates about social exclusion in Britain make me emphasise the influence of the liberal tradition. Unlike the liberal tradition, the monopoly paradigm emphasises hierarchical power relations in the constitution of a social order. Group monopolies are seen as responsible for exclusion. Powerful groups restrict the access of outsiders through social closure. Inequality is thought to overlap with such group distinctions, but it is mitigated by social democratic citizenship and participation in the community.

This emphasis on paradigms helps to stress that social exclusion is a theoretical concept, a lens through which people look at reality, and not reality itself. It does not connote a particular problem such as 'the new poor', an 'underclass'⁹, the long-term unemployed, or the marginalised as understood in a Latin American context. Of course, the notions are applied with respect to these problems – perhaps most notably by Lenoir – and it has become popular at a time of crisis of the welfare state, and perhaps of a crisis in social science paradigms. Yet social exclusion remains a concept, and the discourse emphasises that it is a way of looking at society.

People can be – and usually are – excluded in some areas (or dimensions), and included in others. Jackson, in her critique of the notion of social exclusion, emphasises that women are not categorically excluded but integrated in particular ways, through reproductive labour for example.¹⁰ Also, marginality may produce

⁹ Particularly in the US, 'underclass' has become a metaphor in debates about inner city crises (Katz 1993). In the popular press this has been often associated with 'drugs, crime, teenage pregnancy, and high unemployment', and not so much with poverty.

¹⁰ Jackson (1998). In her view, in the social exclusion discourse 'the assumption that marginality is the problem remains pervasive.'

the conditions for women to protest, and be included in collective organisations. However, the social exclusion debate does not focus on bounded groups, but stresses societal relations and *processes* through which people are being deprived, taking the debate beyond mere descriptions of people's situations.

Social exclusion research does not need to start from one central top-down definition of integration, though some debates tend to do so. Silver's focus on different interpretations of the notion opens up the possibility of thinking about forms of integration as being contested. A social exclusion concept can provide context-specific frameworks for analysis and policy. It starts from a general idea of the importance of integration in society, but the way this is put into operation can and should be dependent on local circumstances. Also, people may choose not to be included, while others are included against their will. In that sense, one may want to conceive of exclusion as exclusion from rights or entitlements: what counts is people's access to food, training, employment, etc. – and less whether they decide to use that access.

Social exclusion and poverty compared

How does this notion relate to the more traditional Anglo-Saxon concept of 'poverty'? In Britain, poverty has been a central concept at least since the Poor Law. Since Hume and Smith, and in reaction to mercantilist thought in which poverty was seen as necessary for national development, economic growth has been seen as the remedy for poverty. An individualistic approach has been central: the market consists of free individuals entering voluntarily into contracts, and poverty is therefore an individual problem. The concept of 'basic needs', deriving from Rowntree's work, is based on an individualistic theoretical approach to society. Basic needs are defined as a minimum consumption basket, which can include water and healthcare, and the poor as those who cannot afford this. The approach is different from the eighteenth century economists' concern in that it is welfarist, but it is similar in that it focuses on the individual and on individual utility.

As in the basic needs approach, the analytical focus of poverty assessments in developing countries using absolute poverty lines is at the individual or household level. This is clearly distinct from a French social exclusion approach, with its focus on society, and the individual's ties to society. Lack of basic necessities is the focal point of analysis, rather than the processes that lead to exclusion from access. Poverty analyses do not only count the poor, but study the 'correlates' of poverty: characteristics such as education, labour market status, gender and location, that are correlated with poverty status. This brings us closer to a notion of social exclusion, though an essential difference remains in terms of the central unit of analysis. Research on transient poverty, shedding light on whether situations of exclusion are permanent, is also rooted in what Silver describes as the liberal specialisation paradigm.

The notion of 'relative deprivation' is more closely related to a concept of social exclusion, and it is often noted that rising inequality in various countries has contributed to the popularity of the notion of social exclusion.¹¹ Townsend emphasises the concept of relative deprivation, in which the poverty line is set not as an absolute minimum but is dependent on the country's wealth. This is now common in European poverty debates, where the poverty line is set at a level of, for example, half the average national income.

Notions of vulnerability are closer to the concept of social exclusion. According to Chambers (1989), vulnerability is not a synonym for poverty. Whereas poverty means lack or want, and is usually measured for convenience of counting in terms of income or consumption, vulnerability means insecurity, defencelessness, and exposure to risk and shocks. A concept of vulnerability focuses on the variety of dimensions of deprivation, and is clearly a more relational approach to deprivation than the focus on measurement

¹¹ The 'association of poverty with a more divided society has led to the broader concept of social exclusion, which refers not only to material deprivation, but to the inability of the poor to fully exercise their social, cultural and political rights as citizens' (Powell 1995: 22-23)

of income or consumption poverty.

Nobel prize winner Amartya Sen's work on capabilities (1981) has stressed that what counts is not what (poor) people possess, but what it enables them to do. He argues that Townsend's concept confuses the lack of commodities with the individual's or household's capabilities to meet social conventions, participate in social activities, and retain self-respect. Capabilities are *absolute requirements* for full membership of society. He draws attention away from the mere possession of certain goods, towards rights, and command over goods, using various economic, political, and social opportunities within the legal system. In a recent contribution, Sen (1998) welcomes the social exclusion framework, because of its focus on *relational roots of deprivation*. He believes that a social exclusion framework reinforces the understanding of poverty as capability deprivation.¹² He distinguishes the constitutive relevance of exclusion (exclusion or deprivation is of intrinsic importance in its own right) from its instrumental importance (exclusion itself is not impoverishing but it can lead to the impoverishment of human life). The two can overlap, like landlessness which can be responsible for generating deprivation (instrumental) but also have disvalue in itself, for example, when being without land is like 'being without a limb of one's own' (constitutive). Also, Sen differentiates active from passive exclusion: active exclusion occurs, for example, when immigrants are not given full political status or citizenship; while passive exclusion exists when deprivation is caused without deliberate attempt, for example because of a sluggish economy.

Thus, there are large overlaps between a notion of social exclusion and definitions of poverty. With a broadening of notions of income-poverty, incorporating notions of vulnerability, and the entitlements framework, thinking about deprivation has converged. A notion of social exclusion – especially as defined

¹² He refers to Gore's (1995) stated preference for a social exclusion approach over the capability framework, which 'still remains wedded to an excessively individualist, and insufficiently social view'.

within a 'solidarity' paradigm – may take us a step further in the direction of an holistic understanding of deprivation. The application of the notion is not restricted to particular situations of deprivation; the value of the notion lies in the light it sheds on these situations, and hence would be equally relevant for deprivation in richer countries as in situations of mass poverty. The policy implications of such an understanding may also be different, which I explore in some more detail later, after discussing measurement issues.

The measurement of social exclusion

Measuring multi-dimensional aspects of deprivation in developing countries is not new. It has been the central emphasis in the UNDP's Human Development Index, and is implicit in poverty assessments' correlates of poverty. Probably more challenging is operationalising what Sen called the relational roots of deprivation. This section discusses how this might be done.

Within Europe, there have been significant initiatives to measure and monitor social exclusion. For example, focusing on the polarisation within British cities, the London Research Centre (1996) provides an index of deprivation of areas. Through factor analysis of a large set of economic and social variables, six major factors that determine polarisation were identified. Silver (1998: 62-71) describes a whole range of approaches to monitoring social exclusion, from macro to micro level. The French Action Plan for Employment provides 35 quantitative evaluation indicators, and the EU is establishing quantitative indicators to evaluate social inclusion initiatives. Britain's New Labour's 'poverty charter' proposed about 30 measures to track movement towards nationally defined social integration goals. There are also initiatives to approach this in a dynamic sense, such as French panel studies focusing on the subsequent activities of participants in training programmes. Silver also refers to the notion of measurement of social capital, to capture exclusion and inclusion in social networks.

It is both possible and important to use such a range of indicators.

But the concept goes beyond such mapping of exclusion. Taking the relational features of deprivation seriously – and this is relevant for policies, since they point to causes of deprivation and not just the measurement of outcomes – implies a different research emphasis. Paugam's (1995) research on social exclusion in France is a fascinating example of the kinds of insights this type of analysis can provide. He describes 'spirals of precariousness' — how, in France's deprived neighbourhoods loss of unemployment tends to be accompanied not only by loss of income, but also (as the classic study of Marienthal during the Great Depression showed) by social and psychological forms of deprivation, such as marital problems and loss of 'social capital'. Paugam's quantitative analysis of the correlations between elements of deprivation helps to characterise specific vulnerable groups – but equally important, it serves to illustrate the processes that lead to, and are part and parcel of deprivation.

Such type of analysis can be equally applicable to developing countries. There also, deprivation is multi-dimensional: a landless female daily labourer of scheduled caste in India is very likely to be poor, illiterate, in poor health, have little social capital, and thus find it difficult to exercise her constitutional rights. It is crucial to see this as a process, and not just as a description of outcomes, and to focus, for example, on the labour market that determines these outcomes and on the gender and caste ideologies that inform labour market practices, as well as other forms of interaction.

The specificity of the example is less relevant than the general point. The notion of social exclusion is a way of conceptualising society, including (and with a focus on) the processes of deprivation that are an integral part of that society. The mapping and monitoring of deprivation as descriptions of outcomes is important; but a social exclusion framework takes us beyond that, and identifies the processes that lead to and cause deprivation. This framework also has specific policy implications, as described next.

Social integration policies

This paper is primarily about the conceptual merits of the notion of social exclusion, and the question of its relevance for developing countries; however this section briefly discusses some policy implications. The notion itself has direct implications for policy approaches. The stress on the multi-dimensional nature of deprivation points to the need to integrate sectoral approaches. And the focus on the relational nature of deprivation emphasises the need to address the social processes and institutions that underlie deprivation. Both these aspects are central to recent innovations in European social policies.

Though elements of the approach have existed elsewhere, the ‘model’ of anti-exclusion policies was developed in France during the 1980s.¹³ Economic crisis, rising unemployment and the crisis of the social security system forced a redefinition of social policies. Unlike elsewhere, the approach continued to assume a central responsibility of the state for active policies for education, training and the labour market. During Mitterand’s socialist government a new model of social policies was developed, promoting economic development, enterprise values, a culture orientated towards both market and social ideals, new management methods in public administration, and decentralisation. Specific policies included education priority areas, programmes of ‘insertion’ for the long-term unemployed, and the social development of neighbourhoods. Throughout all this, solidarity remained a key concept, and insertion of individuals, families and groups the main objective.

With the changes in French government both practice and discourse changed, but overall social integration policies have continued to be central (Silver, 1998: 42ff). While reduction of the fiscal deficit was crucial in France, an anti-exclusion bill was finally passed – under much social pressure – by the socialist government of Jospin

¹³ This section draws heavily on the work of Cannan (1995, 1997), Evans *et al.* (1995), and Silver (1998).

in 1998. This seems very much a continuation of the social integration policies of the 1980s,¹⁴ with a focus on the various groups suffering from the most serious forms of deprivation, combinations of supply and demand policies, integrated decentralised initiatives, 300,000 new '*contrats d'initiative locales*', and a focus on national solidarity.

The similarities with new initiatives elsewhere is striking (Parkinson, 1998). Britain's new Social Exclusion Unit similarly has a focus on various forms of deprivation. The 'Third Way' stresses a multi-sectoral approach illustrated by the Social Exclusion Unit as a form of 'joined-up' government. The New Deal for youth and new Welfare to Work programmes show many similarities with French policies, as does the stress on partnerships. But there are differences. In the British debate, for example, responsibility is a much more important concept than solidarity – though in both countries targeting of welfare benefits has been important. And the Third Way seems to put much more emphasis on supply side policies, illustrated by the three priorities of 'education, education, education'.

Evaluations of these initiatives so far have shown mixed results. For example, though isolation of neighbourhoods has been broken down in many cases, poverty tends to be dealt with less well.¹⁵ However, important for the purpose of this discussion is whether such social integration programmes have relevance for countries where mass poverty predominates. There seem to be good reasons why a multi-dimensional approach would work well – though the institutional implications are crucial. Poor people may be able to achieve durable progress only when they can meet several prerequisites, such as income, health and education, jointly. Studies

¹⁴ Though the new social policies in the early 1990s have been seen as a radical departure from the post-war Bismarckian system in France (Bouget 1998).

¹⁵ Cannan (1997) notes the reduction in neighbourhood deprivation, as well as the positive aspects of working in partnership and increasing responsiveness to the inhabitants' needs. Yet participation remains problematic, as is the proliferation of intermediate bodies, a relative neglect of (income) poverty, and the variety and lack of clarity of goals.

have shown, for example, that a much greater gain in child health in developing countries is achieved if resources available for primary healthcare and food supplementation are divided between the two than if the resources are concentrated on either one (Lipton 1996).

More difficult perhaps is the second aspect, the emphasis on social and psychological, or relational aspects of deprivation. But in this sense also a social exclusion approach has potential for the poorest countries. The social aspects of deprivation are not only a result of deprivation, but are an integral part of it, and also cause the overall situation of deprivation. Work by Narayan and Pritchett (1997) on social capital suggests the independent role of the density of people's networks in causing income poverty. More generally, increasing social cohesion can be a precondition for poverty alleviation, rather than a second priority. Colombia's social fund (*Red de Solidaridad Social*),¹⁶ for example, shifted, soon after its introduction, from poverty-reduction objectives with precise criteria towards a more flexible approach with greater responsiveness towards local communities' priorities. In the context of a violence-ridden society, the fund has a contribution to make to the creation or restoration of civil society, building human capital, and the realisation of citizenship. It is acknowledged that there may be a trade-off with immediate (income) poverty reduction objectives, but the original targeted anti-poverty approach was thought to be unsustainable.

This example may seem far removed from the European policies described above. However, the similarity in the way deprivation has been approached is striking. Both see social relations and social integration as determining — a crucial element of deprivation. The creation of a new social model, of course, does not have a blueprint, and as in Colombia will be context-dependent. The central point for this discussion is that the building of such policies departs from an holistic view of society, and places social relations in the broad

¹⁶ This was part of a review of targeted anti-poverty interventions for the World Bank's OED (de Haan *et al.* 1998).

sense in the centre of the analysis of deprivation.

Conclusion

The problem with the term social exclusion seems that it can be applied to just about any situation. As Sen (1998) points out, we could use the language to describe crop failure, and Jackson (1998) observes that social exclusion research tends to concentrate on categorical groups. But the main value of the concept lies in the perspective it brings to the understanding of society and deprivation. This perspective has clear implications for policies. The value of the concept has to be proven in further research, but realisation of the value will depend on taking its two defining characteristics seriously.

First, we need to focus on the multi-dimensional nature of deprivation, and hence 'social exclusion' does provide a useful framework to analyse situations of crop failure (where the household's deprivation also depends on its access to, for example, state provision, support from relatives, or labour markets), or to put gender analysis in a wider framework where gender forms one of the axes – however central – of deprivation, besides class and race, for example. In this perspective, income poverty is an *element of* social exclusion, and poverty reduction a part of social integration. In particular, social exclusion research can shed light on the extent to which various dimensions overlap.

Second, and more challenging, research needs to take the focus on actors and processes seriously. The mapping of various dimensions of social exclusion is important, but the understanding of the social relations that determine deprivation requires an understanding of the processes that include some groups and exclude others. These processes are as much of an economic and political as cultural nature, requiring the interpretation of material and of the formal aspects of deprivation as much as of identity and ideology. If applied in that sense, social exclusion and integration may be a useful language in which to look at deprivation in a holistic sense, and in a way that takes us away from seeing deprivation as an

outcome towards understanding the multi-dimensional way in which outcomes come about.

Finally, a social exclusion and integration framework needs to be informed by a notion of rights. Ultimately, social integration needs to refer to individuals' and groups' right to be integrated and the right to a society's products and values, leaving open the possibility of contesting definitions and practices of integration. An analytical framework of social exclusion should allow for differing definitions of integration, and varying prioritisation of dimensions of inclusion and exclusion. A social exclusion framework is primarily an analytical framework for understanding society and deprivation, with context dependence – both of definitions and of practices of exclusion and integration – as a central point of departure.

Arjan de Haan is Social Development Adviser at the Department for International Development, but work for this paper was carried out mainly when he was at the Poverty Research Unit, University of Sussex. Opinions expressed in this paper are the author's only, and do not reflect DFID policy.

REFERENCES

- Bouget, D. (1998), 'The Juppé Plan and the Future of the French Social Welfare System', *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.8, No.2, pp.155-72.
- Cannan, C. (1995), 'Urban Social Development in France', *Community Development Journal*, Vol.30, No.3, pp.238-47.
- Cannan, C. (1997), 'The Struggle Against Social Exclusion. Urban Social Development in France', *IDS Bulletin*, April, pp.77-85.
- Chambers, R. (1989), 'Vulnerability: How the Poor Cope', editorial *IDS Bulletin*, April 1989.
- Economic and Social Committee on the Cost of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe (1998), *Opinion*, SOC/322, Internet.
- European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (1995), *Public Welfare Services and Social Exclusion: The Development of Consumer Oriented Initiatives in the European Union*, Dublin: The Foundation.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION

Evans, M., Paugam, S. and Prellis, J.A. (1995), 'Chunnel Vision: Poverty, Social Exclusion and the Debate on Social Welfare in France and Britain' London School of Economics, Welfare State Programme, Discussion Paper WSP 115.

Figueiredo, J.B. and A. de Haan, eds (1998), *Social Exclusion: an ILO Perspective*, Geneva: ILO.

Gore, C. and J.B. Figueiredo (1997), *Social Exclusion and Anti-Poverty Policy: A Debate*. Geneva, International Institute for Labour Studies, ILO.

de Haan, A. (1997), 'Poverty and Social Exclusion: A Comparison of Debates', PRUS Working Paper No.2. Brighton, University of Sussex

de Haan, A. (1998), 'Social Exclusion in Policy and Research: Operationalizing the Concept' in: Figueiredo and de Haan, eds, pp.11-24.

de Haan, A., E. Darbellay, M. Lipton, I. Matin (1998), 'Anti-poverty Projects in Developing Countries: Towards Evaluating Success', Paper commissioned by World Bank, Operations Evaluation Department.

Jackson, C. (forthcoming), 'Social Exclusion and Gender: Does One Size Fit All?' *European Journal for Development Research*.

Jordan, B. (1996), *A Theory of Poverty and Social Exclusion*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lenoir, R. (1974/1989), *Les Exclús: Un Français sur Dix*. 2nd. ed. Paris: Editions de Seuil.

Lipton, M (1996), 'Successes in Anti-Poverty', Issues in Development, Discussion Paper No. 8, Geneva: ILO.

Lister, R. (1998), 'From Equality to Social Inclusion: New Labour and the Welfare State', *Critical Social Policy*, Vol.18, No.2, pp.215-25.

London Research Centre (1996), *The Capital Divided. Mapping Poverty and Social Exclusion in London*. London, London Research Centre.

Narayan, D., and L. Pritchett (1997), 'Cents and Sociability: Household Income and Social Capital in Rural Tanzania', Washington: World Bank.

Katz, M.B. ed. (1993), *The Underclass Debate: Views from History* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Parkinson, M. (1998), *Combating Social Exclusion. Lessons from Area-based Programmes in Europe*, Bristol: the Policy Press.

Paugam, S. (1995), 'The Spiral of Precariousness: A Multidimensional Approach to the Process of Social Disqualification in France', in: Room, ed., pp. 49-79.

Powell, F. (1995), 'Citizenship and Social Exclusion', *Administration*, Vol.43, No.3, pp.23-35.

Room, G., ed. (1995), *Beyond the Threshold. The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Room, G. (1998), 'Social Exclusion, Solidarity and the Challenge of Globalisation', University of Bath.

Sen, A. (1981), *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Destitution* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (1998), 'Social Exclusion: A Critical Assessment of the Concept and Its Relevance' Paper presented at the Asian Development Bank.

Silver, H. (1994), 'Social Exclusion and Social Solidarity: Three Paradigms', *IILS Discussion Papers* No 69. Geneva: ILO.

Silver, H. and Wilkinson, F. (1995), 'Policies to Combat Social Exclusion: A French-British Comparison', *IILS Discussion Papers* No.83. Geneva: ILO.

Silver, H. (1997), 'Poverty, exclusion and citizenship rights', in: C. Gore and J.B. Figueiredo, eds, pp.78-82.

Silver, H. (1998), 'Policies to Reinforce Social Cohesion in Europe', in: Figueiredo and de Haan, eds, pp.38-73.

Social Exclusion Unit, Internet page.