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PART 1

Introducing theories of social exclusion and social connectedness
1.1 Introduction

Overview

This research-based book is aimed at a wide range of different readerships globally. The book addresses issues of concern for those engaged in debates about the provision of health and social welfare services, the case for collective responsibilities, and the public service ethos more generally. Our focus is particularly upon the role of social and cultural factors in the creation and re-creation of categories of exclusion and inclusion; this finds relevance in a wide range of fields (health sciences, public health, health promotion, occupational therapy, disability studies, social work and social policy). The exploration of implications for policy and practice will make the book of relevance to a practitioner audience as well to academics.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that there are a plethora of books on social exclusion. Why another? The outline above indicates the particular approach that we wish to take, which we believe is not covered in any depth in any of the competing titles. Most of the existing titles are very strongly focused in terms of discipline and/or geography, for example (we could extend this list to several times its current length): Pierson (2001), Collins (2003), Weiss (2003), MacDonald (2004), Levitas (2005), Williams et al. (2005), Feldman (2006), Harness Goodwin (2006), Ryan (2007). Others, while being more multidisciplinary in approach, focus on the economistic aspects of social exclusion and do not fully address the important role of cultural and social factors in creating and re-creating categories of inclusion and exclusion, for example: Byrne (2005) and Hills et al. (2002). Few seek to address both issues of theory and professional practice.

The concept of social exclusion attempts to help us make sense out of the lived experience arising from multiple deprivations and inequities experienced by people and localities, across the social fabric, and the mutually reinforcing effects of reduced participation, consumption, mobility, access, integration, influence and recognition. The language of social exclusion recognises marginalising, silencing, rejecting, isolating, segregating and disenfranchising as the machinery of exclusion, its processes of operation. By way of contrast, the language of social connectedness recognises acceptance, opportunity, equity, justice, citizenship,
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expression and validation as the machinery of connectedness. As we will argue later, we see connectedness as the preferred conceptualisation of the opposite of exclusion, finding the concepts of inclusion and participation problematic both theoretically and in terms of policy formulation and implementation.

This book works from a multidisciplinary and intersectoral approach across health, welfare and education, linking practice and research to our growing understanding of the processes and principles that foster exclusion. We develop existing theories of exclusion and connectedness through reflection, analysis and commentary, across international perspectives and experiences recognising both global and local issues. Our focus on the role of cultural and social factors in theorising social exclusion implies a particular focus on the psychological, individual and symbolic elements of exclusion as experienced by different groups.

In this first part of the book, we review and reflect on existing thinking, literature and research into social exclusion and social connectedness. Theories of exclusion are developed concentrically across areas of action and experience, moving from the person as an excluded/connected agent, through structural, shared communities and places, to the upstream, culture, population and society. The links between these spheres of exclusion and connectedness are also discussed, to theorise an integrated framework for understanding the dynamics of social exclusion across dimensions of social action and along pathways of social processes.

The second part of the book presents a series of chapters, addressing areas of interest and knowledge gained through the experience and research of the authors. These chapters are presented so that, as readers, we come first to know the machinery of social exclusion and connectedness before coming to know the pathways towards exclusion, and finally come to know the excluded through their experience of exclusion and connection.

The third and final part of the book draws together the chapters thus far, finding points of congruence and dissension between spheres of action and applied areas of interest. In this short concluding part, we explore some of the implications for policy and practice, drawing on the chapters and research studies presented in Part 2 of the book. We also consider briefly a research agenda for the future.

A linguistic and cultural turn

At the outset, it is important to say something about the theoretical resources we use in our focus on social and cultural factors. Our understanding is that all social experiences and narratives about them are discursively constructed. This sets limits and constraints on the positions of exclusion, inclusion and connectedness that individuals and groups can take up. However individuals and groups are active, resistant agents in these processes and can shape the realm of discursive possibilities. Such a position recognises the importance of language, requiring a shift in view from language as a 'neutral tool, out there' to language
as highly contingent: 'the fact that there is no way to step outside the various vocabularies we have employed and find a metavocabulary which somehow takes account of all possible vocabularies, all possible ways of judging and feeling' (Rorty 1989: xvi). We make sense of the world, our understandings of it, and our place in it, through language; our use of language creates, contests and recreates power, authority and legitimation.

Connected to this is the importance of a shift in view about identity, as Butler expresses it:

\[
\text{the reconceptualisation of identity as an } \text{effect}, \text{ that is, as } \text{produced} \text{ or } \text{generated}, \text{ opens up possibilities of 'agency' that are insidiously foreclosed by positions that take identity categories as foundational and fixed. For an identity to be an effect means that it is neither fatally determined nor fully artificial and arbitrary. That the } \text{constituted} \text{ status of identity is misconstrued along these conflicting lines suggests the ways in which the feminist discourse on cultural construction remains trapped within the unnecessary binarism of free will and determinism. Construction is not opposed to agency; it is the necessary scene of agency, the very terms in which agency is articulated and becomes culturally intelligible.}
\]

(Butler 1990: 147)

This notion of identity is taken up again in Chapter 1.2.

In terms of the analysis of social exclusion we present below, the foregoing should alert the reader that our analysis is based on a position of theoretical pluralism, which we argue is necessary to do justice to the complexity of the forces and relationships that shape individuals' and groups' experience of exclusion and being excluded. Suitable conceptualisations of notions of power are also required, and this is discussed later in Chapter 1.5.

**Defining social exclusion**

The notion of 'social exclusion' is a relatively new concept and is embedded in the economic, political and cultural/social structures of society; thus we need to be mindful of different interpretations of social exclusion, as well as of social inclusion and of social connectedness. It is a contested concept, with multiple meanings. We reserve discussion of social inclusion and connectedness for later, and here consider only social exclusion. Box 1.1 offers a short sketch of the history of use of the term, while Box 1.2 summarises some of the most often quoted definitions of social exclusion.

A number of different approaches to defining typologies that can assist in understanding social exclusion have been produced by various writers. Table 1.1 presents three rather different approaches. In the first, the approach focuses on defining different forms of exclusion; the second focuses on defining different types of participation, and the third on different types of exclusionary relationship.
Box 1.1. A brief history of social exclusion

- Term ‘social exclusion’ originated in France (Lenoir 1974) initially; French socialist politicians used social exclusion to refer to individuals who were not covered by the social security system.

- Over time the term broadened to cover other groups seen as excluded, for example, disaffected youth, the unemployed and the homeless. Reflected in Durkheimian philosophy, ‘exclusion threatens society as a whole with the loss of collective values and destruction of the social fabric’ – a ‘deficiency in solidarity’. During the 1980s in France, the definition of social exclusion expanded to include the term *les éclus*, ‘the pariahs of the nation’, which gave rise to xenophobia, political attacks upon and restrictions on the rights of immigrants. In 1990s, exclusion included the issue of ‘les banlieues’, the deprived outer suburbs, which gave rise to combating ‘urban exclusion’ (Silver 1994).

- The terminology of social exclusion was adopted by the European Commission in its mandate to report, on a European-wide basis, about prevailing levels of poverty and unemployment. ‘Social exclusion’ was substituted for ‘poverty’ within European Union poverty programs from the 1990–4 programs onwards (Room 1995).

- There is a range of international European-based government agency programmes set up to ameliorate the impact of social exclusion: European Commission; World Bank; International Labour Organisation; United Nations Development Agency, which all have funded initiatives in place. These pan-national organisations tend to utilise the term in a broad sense to denote individuals and groups who are unable to secure adequate material (i.e. financial) and cultural capital (i.e. education and knowledge). In other words, social exclusion is used to describe those without the resources to access employment and educational networks.

- A moral discourse of ‘social solidarity’ saw ‘The Third Way’ emerge (Finlayson 1999; Jordan 2001; Levitas 2004), ‘that would reconcile individual rights with state responsibility and socialist rejection of exploitation’ (Silver 1994: 537). Social exclusion was adopted in Britain as a central notion in the UK Labour government’s policies, post its 1997 election success. That year it established a government policy-making, multidisciplinary Social Exclusion Unit with the mission of tackling social exclusion.

- Mid-1990s, UK Economic and Social Research Council adopted ‘social integration and exclusion’ as one of its nine thematic priorities in social science research (Marsh and Mullins 1998: 759).
1997 – an Economic and Social Research Council funded ‘Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion’ was set up at the London School of Economics and Political Science.

2006 – Social Exclusion Knowledge Network (SEKN) set up, one of nine knowledge networks set up under WHO’s Commission on Social Determinants of Health.

February 2008, the final report of SEKN was produced (Popay et al. 2008).

Box 1.2. Frequently quoted definitions of social exclusion

- original French definition (‘exclusion sociale’), as a ‘rupture of social bonds’ (European Foundation 1995, cited in de Haan 1998: 12)
- ‘a shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of problems, such as unemployment, poor skills, low income, bad housing, high crime, poor health or lack of transport’ (Social Exclusion Unit and Cabinet Office 2001: 2)
- ‘inability to participate effectively in economic, social, political and cultural life, alienation and distance from the mainstream society’ (Duffy 1995: 17)
- ‘the dynamic process of being shut out ... from any of the social, economic, political and cultural systems which determine the social integration of a person in society’ (Walker and Walker 1997: 8)
- ‘sense of social isolation and segregation from the formal structures and institutions of the economy, society and the state’ (Somerville 1998: 762)
- ‘an individual is socially excluded if (a) he or she is geographically resident in a society but (b) for reasons beyond his or her control he or she cannot participate in the normal activities of citizens in that society and (c) he or she would like to participate’ (Burchardt et al. 1999: 229)
- ESRC Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion (Hills et al. 2002) suggests four dimensions: consumption – capacity to buy (now and future); production – participation in economically or socially valuable activities; political engagement – in local or national decision-making; social interaction with family, friends and community
- ‘the continuous and gradual exclusion from full participation in the social, including material as well as symbolic, resources produced, supplied and exploited in a society for making a living, organizing a life and taking part in the development of a (hopefully better) future’ (Steinert 2007a: 5)
• ‘Social exclusion is a complex and multi-dimensional process. It involves the lack or denial of resources, rights, goods and services, and the inability to participate in the normal relationships and activities, available to the majority of people in society, whether in economic, social, cultural, or political arenas. It affects both the quality of life of individuals and the equity and cohesion of society as a whole’ (Levitas et al. 2007: 9)

• ‘Exclusion consists of dynamic, multi-dimensional processes driven by unequal power relationships interacting across four main dimensions – economic, political, social and cultural – and at different levels including individual, household, group, community, country and global levels. It results in a continuum of inclusion/exclusion characterised by unequal access to resources, capabilities and rights which leads to health inequalities’ (Popay et al. 2008: 2)

In terms of particular disciplinary stances on social exclusion, Todman (2004) and Morgan et al. (2007) provide useful overviews of social exclusion (and its measurement) for social policy and mental health respectively. In examining Box 1.2, we can see conceptualisations of social exclusion as a state, a process or both. The definitions emphasise a varying list of factors that give rise to social exclusion which work together in such a way that often they end up reinforcing each other.

As a result of this inability to clearly define social exclusion, the term is often used in an indefinite way that is laden with economic, political and cultural nuances (Silver 1994). Further to this, attempts to establish a typology of social exclusion have been described as reductionist (Silver 1994). Social exclusion can be seen as a dynamic multi-dimensional process (Peace 2001; Steinert 2007a). As Bhalla and Lapeyre emphasise:

Anglo-Saxon thinking is rooted in the Liberal paradigm and views society as a mass of atomized individuals in competition within the market place. Therefore, exclusion may reflect voluntary individual choices, patterns of interests or a contractual relationship between actors or ‘distortions’ to the system, such as discrimination, market failures and unenforced rights.

(Bhalla and Lapeyre 1997: 415)

Importantly, no matter how social exclusion is conceptualised or defined, the notion often lends itself to the idea of deviance or non-conformity. This is particularly evident in current Australian welfare policy, for example, ‘work for the dole’, welfare to work, the Northern Territory indigenous policies including widespread alcohol bans, medical screening of all indigenous
Table 1.1 Typologies for understanding social exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology label</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Forms          | • disengagement – lack of participation in social and community activities  
                 • service exclusion – lack of adequate access to key services when needed  
                 • economic exclusion – restricted access to economic resources and low economic capacity | Saunders et al. (2007)      |
| Levels of participation | • survival, access to food, shelter, clothing etc  
                        • social relations, enhanced personal and familial reproduction  
                        • security, of means of survival and enhanced reproduction  
                        • production, autonomy of production of local, national and wider relevance  
                        • politics, organisation of infrastructure of production and reproduction  
                        • progress, take part in development of forces of production | Steinert (2007b)           |
| Exclusionary relationships | • Horizontal vs. Vertical – horizontal exclusion excludes one from belonging to a group or network at the same level on the ‘vertical ladder’. Vertical exclusion prevents individuals from climbing the vertical (social) ladder  
                              • Intentional vs. Unintentional – ‘Intent’ in social exclusion is typically linked to discrimination  
                              • Formal vs. Informal – while exclusion can be entrenched in institutions and legislation (e.g., the apartheid regime in South Africa), informal exclusion is more complex and challenging to confront, as it can involve traditional behaviours and patterns in society that may be difficult to detect  
                              • Multiple factor social exclusion – various forms of social exclusion can be experienced at once, for example (in the Nepali case) a Dalit woman from a remote area faces at least three causes of social exclusion, being a woman, being Dalit and being from a disadvantaged region  
                              • Reinforcing social exclusion – when groups are excluded from society, a domino effect can ensue (e.g., job loss leads to poverty leads to intergenerational disadvantage, etc.) | Renner et al. (2007)        |

children and quarantining welfare payments (Ring and Wenitong 2007). As Peace (2001) posits, using social exclusion as a policy framework runs the risk of structuring social policy negatively. Such a policy imposes power structures which perpetuate disparity and persistently work to undermine the empowerment attempts of the excluded (Alexander 2005). This is taken up and examined in several of the chapters in Part 2 including Cook’s chapter (2.3) about women welfare recipients, and Taket, Foster and Cook’s chapter (2.15) on silencing.

In their report on social exclusion produced for the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health, Popay et al. (2008) explored differences across
the globe in discourses on social exclusion, as well as competing discourses operating within regions, pointing out how these draw on a range of different understandings of the term, linking these to the different national and international agencies active in the region, and stressing the importance of recognising this discursive diversity for policy and practice. Some of these issues are explored further in Part 2 in Lamaro’s chapter about her work in South Africa (Chapter 2.13) and Renzaho’s chapter about immigration (Chapter 2.9).

Social exclusion operates to prevent people from participating in the mainstream activities of society and accessing the standards of living enjoyed by the rest of society. At this point, it is useful to consider the distinction Viet-Wilson (1998) makes between weak and strong versions of social exclusion as they are expressed in policy discourse. Weak forms of social exclusion are based on a horizontal rather than a vertical model of social inequality. In vertical conceptions of inequality a continuum of positions is recognised, and the affluence and status of those higher up the continuum is dependent largely on the poverty and lack of status of those lower down. In the horizontal model, only a dichotomous distinction is recognised, one in which there are only the included and the marginalised; this renders the rich and powerful invisible, a small part of the large group of the included. Marmot’s (2004) analysis points powerfully to the inadequacy of this horizontal model based on a simple dichotomy, and the material presented throughout this book also supports a more nuanced and complex understanding. The chapters in Part 2 by Pease on privilege (2.1) and Crisp on professional discretion (2.2) reflect on social exclusion from positions of power.

In the weaker versions of the discourse on social exclusion, the solutions to social exclusion lie in changing the characteristics of the excluded individuals in order to enhance their integration into society. In contrast the stronger forms of the discourse place emphasis on the role of those perpetuating the exclusion and aim to reduce their power. This is examined further in Pease’s chapter (2.1).

The last three definitions in Box 1.2 are appealing to us for a number of different reasons. First they make explicit the idea that social exclusion is broader than poverty, broader than unemployment, encompassing issues of the denial of rights and lack of participation. Second they emphasise not only what social exclusion is, but what it gives rise to – its consequences, for individuals and for society, in both the short-run and over the longer term. These issues are taken up further in Part 2 in Savage and Carvill’s chapter on carers (2.6), and Carey et al.’s chapter on childlessness (2.10). We incorporate elements of them into the framework presented below.

The framework we present for the analysis and understanding of processes of exclusion distinguishes three levels at which social exclusion operates: individual, community and society. In the three chapters that follow we explore these three levels in turn, before turning in Chapter 1.5 to exploring their dynamic interaction. Figure 1.1 depicts the framework.
Key:
- Arrows - determinants of relations of exclusion – social, political, economic, etc. – whose effects are interactive, mediated discursively and non-discursively and operate variously at different levels, times, space and places
- Communities – of interest – bounded not by geography but by characteristics (hidden or visible) that constitute some shared interest. For any individual or family there will be multiple memberships, not all of which will be acknowledged or recognised at any particular time
- Localities – of life – living, working, leisure – ‘communities defined by spaces and places

Figure 1.1 Framework for analysis of the production of relations of exclusion

In terms of the chapters that follow, our first level of focus is at the centre of Figure 1.1, where individuals and their experience of exclusion are considered. Next, in Chapter 1.3, we move on to the level of the community – considering here both communities defined by geography (localities on the figure) and those defined by interest. Chapter 1.4 considers the broader societal level. Finally in Chapter 1.5, we consider the links between the three different spheres of action.
1.2 The individual’s experience

This chapter will focus on agency and the individual’s experience of social exclusion. Whilst it is evident that the three levels are inextricably linked, the purpose of this section is to disentangle the experience of the socially excluded from the community and wider society in order to understand and explore the process of exclusion/inclusion for the individual. Social exclusion has a number of dimensions including the economic (concerned with income, employment and the labour market and the production of and/or access to goods and services including housing, health and education), the social (including participation in decision-making and opportunity for social participation), the political (civil and political rights and citizenship) and the spatial. Each of these can be related to the individual and the individual’s relationship with the State and society (Bhalla and Lapeyre 1997).

An individual who is not socially excluded is not necessarily ‘included’. Likewise, social inclusion does not imply social connectedness. Social connectedness refers to the relationships people have with others and the community (Ministry of Social Development 2007). The process of social connectedness is linked to social fabric and capital whereby multiple dimensions interact to create connectedness. Whilst an individual may be excluded, they may also experience strong social networks and connections. The mechanisms that influence social exclusion are linked to one’s social capital. Social capital is a collective notion with its origins in individual behaviour, attitudes and predispositions (Brehm and Rahn 1997). Social capital facilitates individuals to gain (or lose) access to resources (Szreter and Woolcock 2004). It can be conceptualised as one of the building blocks that bond together individuals and communities. We return to this issue in Chapter 1.5.

Social exclusion of individuals is often based on assumptions of deviant behaviour and has often been conceptualised in terms of an ‘underclass’ which is confined to behavioural or biological representation of the lowest stratum of society (Martin 2004). The ‘excluded’ have traditionally included, but are not limited to, the unemployed, the poorly educated, the homeless, single parents, those with a disability, mental illness or substance use problem and criminals. Social exclusion has its roots in the labour market and economic wealth where an individual was either ‘deserving’ or ‘undeserving’. The
deserving were seen as those unable to support themselves such as the sick and elderly and the undeserving were those who in theory should have been able to support themselves. The latter group are assumed to be one or more of idle, lazy and criminal, and were subjected to punitive policies of control designed to force them into employment and self-sufficiency. This labelling can be seen throughout history and is evident in the English Poor Law Act of 1601 (Alcock 1997). However, over time, and as a result of welfare reform, the distinction of the excluded has shifted.

The individual's experience or process of exclusion may be voluntary or involuntary (Burchardt et al. 1999). The latter refers to the 'otherness' of individuals that experience disadvantage due to gender, age, ability, employment status, government policy or legislation, social norms and values and so forth. The voluntarily excluded refers to those individuals who choose to exclude or disconnect themselves from society. Burchardt et al. (1999) propose five dimensions by which to measure an individual's social exclusion: participation in activities of consumption, savings, production, politics and social. These are influenced by an individual's characteristics (e.g. health or education levels), life events, characteristics of the area in which one lives, and social, civil and political institutions of society. Chapter 2.14 by Barter-Godfrey and Taket returns to the issues of othering, marginalisation and pathways to exclusion in health.

The excluded are not a homogenous group; rather they are heterogeneous, crossing sociological lines, beliefs, cultures, political or religious affiliation and so forth. As such it is difficult and problematic to identify and describe the excluded in definitive terms. Individuals may experience exclusion in some aspects or times of their lives but in others feel complete inclusion. Whilst the critical realist approach allows for the empirical testing of theories of social exclusion, such an approach must first recognise that the language of exclusion and inclusion implies a dualism whereby one is either included or excluded. Such language is suggestive of people being excluded in relation to a particular variable or factor (O'Reilly 2005). Of course this raises the question of, if one is not excluded does that mean one is included? Rather than such a dualistic approach, exclusion should be seen as a continuum whereby individuals are positioned along a fluid continuum of absolute inclusion through to absolute exclusion, in terms of specific contexts. Thus, the positioning of any particular individual at a particular time in a particular context can be characterised as a multiple combination of inclusion and exclusion.

Individual agency operates at the micro-level in social exclusion and connection. The focus often is on the present experience of being socially excluded or connected and the behaviours, values, preferences and psychological factors associated with individual inclusion or exclusion. Status, class and consequence of life-choices are conceptualised as both the pathways to, and outcomes of, social exclusion. Bhalla and Lapeyre (1997) posit that individual citizens have the right to a certain basic standard of living and the right to participate in the major social and occupational institutions of the society.
Their arguments link individual behaviour, capacity for action and structural constraints and suggest that social exclusion occurs when individuals suffer from disadvantage and are unable to secure these social rights (Bhalla and Lapeyre 1997). Young (n.d.) posits that there are three basic positions in relation to agency. First, the victim blaming approach whereby the individual is 'blamed' for their own exclusion. Then there is the failure of the system, lack of employment opportunities, and thereby a lack of role models, which lead to social isolation. This is explored further by Stagnitti and Jennings in Chapter 2.8 in which they demonstrate how improving the reading skills of disadvantaged children lead to much greater levels of connectedness for whole families. The final position is that which sees the downsizing of industry, the stigmatisation of the workless, and the stereotyping of an underclass which is criminogenic, drug ridden with images which are frequently racialised and prejudiced as actively creating the excluded (Young n.d.). It is important to recognise that each of these three positions offers room for the exercise of individual agency; however there are often different moral understandings in operation in the different discourses attached to these positions (O'Reilly 2005).

In the public policy arena a focus on specific different households can be linked with a labelling or pathologising approach that is often heavily value-laden and pejorative, even where there is a desire to identify disadvantage or diversity around gender, age, ethnicity or disability. It is all too short a step from identifying a group as one which faces problems, and is perceived as ‘different’, to presenting them as failures, deviant or culturally deficient.

(Harrison 1998: 796)

Goffman provided the classic definition of stigma as a 'deeply discrediting attribute that globally devalues an individual' (Goffman 1963: 12). Negative health outcomes arise from different types of stigma, and fear of being stigmatised and feeling stigmatised lead to avoidance of potentially distressing situations, amounting to self-regulated exclusion. This provides a key mechanism by which social exclusion is created and maintained. Hall (2004) explores the social exclusion that many people with learning disabilities in Scotland experience. Despite their physical inclusion within communities in terms of housing and even employment, socially and culturally they narrate feeling unwelcomed and rejected, leading to them restricting their participation within certain spaces and places in their local communities of the non learning disabled, while at the same time seeking out and cultivating safe and welcoming spaces and places. Part 2 returns to the operation of stigma in processes of exclusion in Chapters 2.14 by Barter-Godfrey and Taket and 2.15 by Taket et al., where we consider a number of different examples where stigma is implicated in inclusion or exclusion: those who experience intimate partner abuse,
lesbians, gay men and bisexuals' use of the health service, women's participation in breast cancer screening and HIV positive women, while Chapter 2.11 by Nevill discusses the stigmatisation of older people.

Housing (Somerville 1998) presents one example where we can observe these processes of the creation of individuals belonging to a moral underclass (we discuss Levitas's work on the moral underclass discourse later in Chapter 1.4). Somerville examines social housing policy and highlights the cultural and behavioural individuality of two important groups in Britain; public housing tenants and the homeless. These groups are linked to unfavourable behaviours such as crime, substance use and teenage pregnancy (Watt and Jacobs 2000). The individual's behaviour is judged by societal norms and values and is viewed as deviant. These individuals or collectives of individuals are viewed as the 'problem' rather than as victims of the political, socio-economic and cultural structures which create the inequality. This inevitably leads to blaming the victim – those at the centre of what is perceived as deviant behaviour. Public housing is generally based on need and ability to wait; as such, the transient, young people, those with a disability or mental illness are often excluded from affordable, available housing. However, not being able to afford home ownership does not necessarily result in social exclusion, particularly if good quality rented accommodation can be secured. However, it also does not ensure inclusion (Somerville 1998). The labelling of individuals impacts on their housing access. Those seen as less deserving are channelled in to lower quality housing. We consider housing further in Chapter 2.4 by Henderson-Wilson.

A number of chapters in Part 2 illustrate similar processes at work in different domains for different types of individuals, for example, Chapter 2.3 by Cook looks at women's access to welfare benefits. Chapter 2.5 by Owens looks at people with disabilities and their access in a range of different domains. Chapter 2.11 by Nevill examines ageing, and Chapter 2.12 by Martin and Pallotta-Chiarolli considers bisexual young people in relation to substance abuse.

The notion of social exclusion is gendered in that those who hold roles such as mothers and carers are judged by society as not participating in the labour market or contributing to society, suggesting little value is placed on these roles. Cook and Marjoribanks' (2005) work suggests that the current welfare policies in Australia are closely aligned with the moral underclass discourse. This is particularly evident in regard to low-income mothers who feel penalised by factors outside their control which impact on their ability to contribute to the labour market (Cook and Marjoribanks 2005). Such welfare agendas demonstrating the labelling of individuals at a policy level based on their circumstance can induce a victim blaming approach and the connotations of such labelling can be part of the process by which they are excluded, rather than the circumstances themselves. Two particular examples discussed in Part 2 are Cook's chapter about female welfare recipients (Chapter 2.3) and Carey et al.'s chapter about childless women (Chapter 2.10).
The moral underclass discourse suggests that social exclusion of individuals occurs as a process which is influenced by what is viewed deviant or immoral. Sexuality is one such area where individuals have been socially excluded from 'mainstream' society based on their sexual behaviour. For example, non-heterosexuality has historically been viewed as immoral, particularly by church groups. As a result individuals are excluded from full civic participation (Kitchin and Lysaght 2004). From this perspective it is clear that social exclusion at the individual level is not just associated with the labour markets. It is influenced by societal beliefs and structures which act to 'exclude' individuals based on personal characteristics. Similar patterns can be seen in regard to culture and ethnicity. Kabeer (2006) explores this area in terms of what she calls the challenge of durable inequality in the development of Asian social protection policies, identifying that there are significant forms of persistent disadvantage not fully captured by economic approaches or measurements in some Asian cultures. These revolve around aspects related to identity, and reflect the cultural devaluation of people based on who they are, or rather, who or what they are perceived to be. This may relate to membership of a particular group of people, who acknowledge their commonality, have shared beliefs and values and act in collective ways. Caste, ethnicity and religion are examples of such group identities. Alternatively, the identities may relate to categories of people defined on the basis of some shared, devalued or stigmatised characteristic. Street children, people with leprosy or AIDS and undocumented migrants are examples of such socially excluded categories. Part 2 takes up these issues in Chapters 2.12 in relation to sexuality, and 2.9 and 2.15 in relation to ethnicity as well as HIV positive status.

Steinert and Pilgram (2007) present a fascinating insight into cross-European diversity in individuals' understandings and experience of exclusion. Their study, carried out in eight European cities with very diverse welfare regimes, is based on respondent-centred interviews with 1,281 individuals yielding 3,291 narratives about episodes of exclusion. The study is an excellent example of the value of comparative research across different welfare systems and social policy contexts. For example, Ronneling and Gabás i Gasa (2007) explore how the narratives of the Swedish and Spanish informants differ according to the normative assumptions present about the welfare system and its operation. The Swedish respondents expected a wide scope and efficient functioning of the welfare system – where these expectations were not fulfilled, frustration and indignation towards the system were expressed. In contrast, amongst the Spanish respondents expressions of indignation were rare, the level of expectation and scope was different, and the focus of the narratives was on the alternative ways of coping. As the authors point out however, we do not know to what extent, or if at all, non-state resources play a role in coping strategies in Sweden; we only learn that the respondents placed more emphasis on public resources.

Having considered briefly social exclusion at the level of the individual, we next turn our attention to the level of the community.
1.3 Social exclusion and community

The English satirical novelist Sue Townsend has written of a nation in which intentional communities for the socially excluded was government policy:

In a desperate attempt to be seen to be 'doing something' about crime and social disorder, the Government's Department of Liveability embarked on a bold program to convert the satellite council estates into Exclusion Zones, where the criminal, the antisocial, the inadequate, the feckless, the agitators, the disgraced professionals, the stupid, the drug-addicted and the morbidly obese lived cheek by jowl.

(Townsend 2006: 11–12)

One of the exclusion zones in this fictional world was the ‘Flowers Exclusion Zone’ (FEZ), owned by multi-millionaire Arthur Grice, whose private police force enforced the numerous restrictions on residents as well as continuously monitoring every aspect of their existence:

A twenty-foot-high metal fence topped with razor wire and CCTV cameras formed the boundary between the back gardens of Hell Close and the outside world. At the only entrance to the FEZ, on a triangular piece of muddy ground, squatted a series of interconnected Portakabins, housing the Grice Security Police. The residents of the zone were required to wear an ankle tag and carry an identity card at all times. Their movements were followed by the security police on a bank of CCTV screens, installed in one of the Portakabins. ...

There were many prohibitions and restrictions imposed on the residents of the FEZ. A strict curfew had to be adhered to; residents must be inside their homes from 10 p.m. until 7 a.m. at weekends. During the week they must be inside their houses from 9.30 p.m. Residents were not allowed to leave the estate. All correspondence, both in and out of the Exclusion Zone, was read and censored as appropriate. The telephone system did not extend to the outside world. There were only two free-to-view channels, the Advertising Channel, which showed a few programs now and
then, and the Government News Channel, which, unsurprisingly, had a perceptible bias in favour of the Government.

(Townsend 2006: 12–13)

Although Townsend has produced a caricature of a community which is almost entirely comprised of individuals who are at risk of social exclusion, and which is cut off from the wider world, it nevertheless reflects the thinking underpinning many policy and practice interventions to reduce social exclusion. Policy initiatives regularly target local communities on the basis of having high numbers of individuals who have low incomes and/or are members of an ethnic minority or some other factor which suggests social exclusion is likely (Geddes 2000; Watt and Jacobs 2000; Andersen and van Kempen 2003; Judge and Bauld 2006). This is despite the claims that socially excluded individuals are more likely to live outside areas where social exclusion is readily recognised (Commins 2004). For example, while rural environments are increasingly being packaged as ‘consumption products’ sold to urban populations to meet their leisure needs, it is important however not to regard rural areas as idyllic or problem-free as Maidment and Macfarlane note in Chapter 2.7. Despite the fact that images of poverty and social exclusion may not be as readily apparent as on some urban housing estates, life for many rural dwellers is not the romantic dream encapsulated in picture postcards (Commins 2004) and social exclusion is a very real issue despite contentions that it tends to be a problem only for urban communities (Mullins et al. 2001; Power and Wilson 2000).

While recognising that there are communities which include high numbers of individuals who are socially excluded from the wider society, it is important to recognise two other ways in which notions of community and social exclusion interact. The first of these concerns exclusion of individuals or groups within a community. The second concerns the exclusion of communities from full participation in the wider society.

**Exclusion within communities**

In any community, individuals who perceive they are outside societal norms, for example as a result of gender, sexual orientation, race and ethnicity, disability or illness, religion or political views, may feel alienated from both the wider community and/or from their own bodies (Cheng 2006). While who is excluded may be formally denoted and maintained by policies and procedures of government and/or other public authorities (Lukes 1997) or outspoken lobby groups (Kitchin and Lysaght 2004), the criteria by which individuals come to experience exclusion may not be readily articulated. Exclusion can even occur despite specific intentions aimed at ensuring inclusion (Kitchin 1998; Kitchin et al. 1998). Irrespective of how exclusion occurs, perceptions of being excluded can readily lead to the situation whereby ‘much effort will be expended not to be among the losers, whether in terms of finance, health, reputation or whatever’ (Alison 2003: 29–30). This process can begin in
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childhood. Even though they may not know why they are excluded, children readily learn of their excluded status (Richardson and Le Grand 2002).

As to who is excluded, this can vary considerably between communities, but those most at risk of exclusion are those with limited opportunities for financial advancement, newcomers to a community and persons who transgress the ideologies or dominant moral code of a community. The likelihood of exclusion is enhanced, the more categories an individual or group falls into. For instance, in many countries, foreigners are marginalised in respect of their place in the labour market and in other areas of social and cultural participation (Somerville 1998). However, there can be exceptions to these theories, and in some circumstances those one might expect to be excluded are embraced by a community. For example, it has been suggested that the predominantly Catholic Polish migrants have been well accepted in Spain, as many brought with them forms of religious practice and commitment which had in previous generations been widespread among the Spanish, and of which contemporary Spaniards had fond memories (Goicoechea 2005).

Historically, length of residence, of either the individual or their family, has frequently been regarded as a predictor of a sense of belonging to a particular community. The theory is that those who are long-established within a community are more likely to be more involved both in community activities and have larger social networks (Sampson 1991). However, in an era in which neighbourhoods are increasingly being packaged as products for consumption (Forrest and Kearns 2001), understandings of inclusion and exclusion based on length of tenure are being overturned. Indeed it has been suggested that:

> the sense of place, its meaning and people's attachment to a locality or neighbourhood is no longer constructed through historical attachments or long residence, leading to an 'authentic' attachment to place, but instead is constructed out of mobility, global interconnections and, especially for the middle classes, a deliberate decision to live there and identify with that place.  

(McDowell et al. 2006: 2164)

Conversely, it has been proposed that 'mobility is now understood to be a freedom bought by money and education. Remaining in the same place symbolizes a lack of choice that is the lot of the poor, the elderly, and people with disabilities' (Sheldrake 2001: 48). For young people whose access to education and employment opportunities may be restricted as a result of living in a rural area, leaving may be perceived as the only viable option (Alston and Kent 2003).

The extent to which an individual or group feels included or excluded in a particular community may differ substantially from the extent to which they feel accepted by the wider society. Members of minority groups are much more likely to become involved in their community when they are aligned with one of the dominant groups within that community (Portnoy and Berry
Participation can also be affected by the physical infrastructure such as adequate community facilities (Kitchin 1998; Kitchin and Law 2001) or transport systems (Barrett et al. 2003). While an absence of these can make it difficult for disabled people to venture outside the home at any time, poor infrastructure can result in partial exclusion of other members of the community. For example, in many places women are encouraged not to use public transport or walk alone at night, particularly in areas which are unlit. Those who do so, are made to feel that it is their own fault if they are attacked or abused in such circumstances (Hodgson and Turner 2003).

In an era when an increasing number of life functions, including banking, shopping, work, leisure activities and communication, can all be transacted online, it is sometimes proposed that for individuals who feel alienated from their geographical community, the internet is a safe place to connect with like others on issues, when they would not feel safe to do so in their own community (Cheng 2006). The internet has also opened up opportunities for non-dominant perspectives to be shared more widely:

Might this be a way to build virtual community at a time of increasing fragmentation? Might it be a medium that would allow the deaf to far more effectively engage in a conversation whose words need to be seen, and from which they experience exclusion by the hearing? (Simmonds 2000: 264)

While, undoubtedly, the internet has much potential for reducing feelings of isolation of individuals who experience exclusion, it is not a panacea to the effects of exclusion within communities. Notwithstanding debates as to the necessity for some degree of 'enfleshed encounters' (Simmonds 2000: 264), the financial costs involved may be beyond those of many individuals who experience marginalisation within their communities. Furthermore, access to high-speed internet connections which are increasingly necessary to use many internet-based services, are not always available, particularly in rural communities, as Maidment and Macfarlane note in Chapter 2.7.

**Excluded communities**

When substantial numbers of excluded individuals live in a community, stigmatisation of the entire community may result. In communities which are stigmatised on the basis of seemingly high crime rates or perceptions that socially unacceptable behaviours flourish, such as illegal drug use, teenage pregnancies, high unemployment and/or truancy from schools, discourses about a moral underclass are readily transformed from being a debate about some members of a community to imputing beliefs about all members of the community (Watt and Jacobs 2000). Consequently, living in a stigmatised community can hinder one’s prospects of participation in employment or other
opportunities afforded to those who live in neighbouring communities which are viewed more favourably by outsiders (Richardson and Le Grand 2002). Not surprisingly, there are frequently many individuals and families who will seek to move from what they experience as excluded communities to live in what they perceive to be better neighbourhoods or communities. However, there will also be families who make a deliberate choice to live in stigmatised neighbourhoods, on the basis that housing prices are substantially lower, which might result in an overall higher standard of living (Buck 2001).

Communities with a high level of social capital are more likely to receive effective and efficient services which benefit all members of the community (Narayan and Pritchett 1999). This can occur even in communities which on many other indicators would be ranked as highly marginalised. An example of such a community is Fitzroy in the inner suburbs of Melbourne. In the 1940s, it was regarded as the ‘worst slum in Melbourne’, but efforts from a local welfare agency in partnership with the local community enabled the poor housing conditions to be filmed and shown to the relevant politicians, as well as protests against unfair laws for tenants and landlords being organised which also received attention outside the local community. These actions resulted not only in the clearance of the slums but in a major change in the provision of public housing in the state of Victoria (Brotherhood of St Laurence n.d.). Several decades later when the Fitzroy community faced the closure of its swimming pool in 1994, a high profile media campaign, including a ‘pool party’ attended by 4,000 people in the empty swimming pool which was addressed by community members with high media profiles, was credited with saving this community facility (Crisp 2000).

Communities which are outside the viewpoint of policy makers are particularly at risk of exclusion. In particular, it has frequently been argued that urban policy makers tend not to take into account the perspectives of rural stakeholders in their determinations. For example,

Development policy and planning have historically revolved around quests for large successes. Policy makers, usually located in urban centres, take a bird’s-eye view of nations or regions and set out to create change at a macro scale, with significant impacts – through a major new industry, or a large and visible infrastructure project, or public policies based on utilitarian principles. Yet over time, it has become increasingly obvious that macro-scale successes can only be micro-scale disasters. At the same time as a nation or a region overall may reap benefits, particular communities and groups can be suffering losses: of land, livelihoods, opportunities, or autonomy. And, while the macro-statistics may indicate more production, more infrastructure, better health and housing, more access to employment and education, or more services – that is, successful development – significant pockets of the population may find themselves isolated from these benefits.

(Eversole and Martin 2005: 176)
An example of this occurring is that in a time of severe drought in much of Australia, decisions were often being made by urban bureaucrats as to whether farm families in an area were eligible to seek financial assistance. In regions where farmers received some drought compensation payments, this not only benefited farming families but also the wider community through the injection of money into local economies. In areas in which farmers did not receive these payments, but considered their circumstances to be similar to their peers in other areas who did benefit from the seemingly discretionary decisions made from afar, the impact on the community could be substantial (Alston 2005).

In order to get their views heard by urban policy makers, rural communities may have to be pro-active, rather than wait for someone to come and consult them. The skills and capacities of both individuals and organisations are crucial for enhancing the participation of local communities in regional decision-making, as well as providing a regional voice into statewide or national decision-making processes (Head 2005). This in turn may require specific training to be designed for community members, if partnerships between local communities and outside providers of services are to be effective (Hull 2006).
1.4 Social exclusion at the societal level

Social exclusion theories of population and society have evolved over time, and definitions of social exclusion are closely linked to the ways social integration at the societal level have been defined and theorised. Silver (1994) distinguished three paradigms describing social exclusion, and our discussion of these draws on her paper and Saraceno’s (2001) commentary on it: solidarity, specialisation and monopoly.

The first of these paradigms, the solidarity paradigm, was dominant in France, where exclusion was seen as a deficiency of solidarity (having both cultural and moral connotations) within society rather than an economic or political phenomenon. The paradigm can be traced to French republican notions of solidarity. The solidarity paradigm is aligned with Levitas’ (1998) social integrationist discourse.

The second paradigm, specialisation, is Anglo-American in origin and is based on liberal-individualism. Here exclusion results from the operation of discrimination and inability to overcome various different types of barriers. There is a shared understanding of inclusion as occurring mainly through paid work so that it is necessary ‘to make work pay’, however the British tradition recognises that social exclusion also involves access to social rights. This paradigm is aligned with Levitas’ (1998) moral underclass discourse. Fear of a permanent underclass exists, suggesting the poor may be permanently excluded. Criticism has been directed to this line of thinking, arguing it is important to differentiate between groups who go through transient phases of poverty compared with those who are permanently poor or excluded.

The third paradigm, the monopoly or social closure paradigm stems from Weberian work in the antipositivist tradition, and is prevalent in many northern European countries. This paradigm foregrounds power relations, pointing to powerful class and status groups, which have distinct social and cultural identities as well as institutions, and which use social closure to restrict the access of other groups to different types of valued resources, including good jobs, good benefits, education, urban locations, valued patterns of consumption, etc. This paradigm is also aligned with Levitas’ (1998) redistributive discourse. In examining this paradigm, Saraceno (2001: 8)
commented that this ‘points to the material and cultural/symbolic privileges of the insiders as the cause of the exclusion of outsiders’.

Implicit in the foregoing discussion is an emphasis on understanding exclusion in terms of processes (rather than as a state) and further, understanding these processes as particularly dynamic. This means, in understanding these processes we need to identify both the factors affecting the processes of exclusion as well as the particular groups experiencing exclusion.

Room and Britton (2006) draw attention to the dynamics of social exclusion in terms of interactions between different levels, changing circumstances at the level of households are mediated by processes at the institutional level. As they identify, organisations and institutions whose activities shape household fates do so in ways that are socially unequal. Households that are already disadvantaged are in general less able to shape these institutional priorities and processes. More serious perhaps, is that under some circumstances, factors can progressively reinforce each other to such an extent that some households are sent along catastrophic downward trajectories, while the institutions that support them are progressively degraded. The dramatic effects of negative feedback loops in the system are well illustrated in Wilson’s (1987) analysis of the US urban ghetto.

Citizenship is an important form of participation at the macro, state level, and lack of or ineligibility for citizenship is a form of social exclusion, a form for which examples abound. Berman and Phillips (2000) discuss examples such as where children of foreign parents born in Austria do not automatically gain citizenship, and consequently suffer restricted access to education and employment. Other sources of exclusion at the state or national level can be found in various forms of discriminatory legislation that establishes different levels of rights for different population groups. One example with far-reaching consequences is the status and rights of indigenous peoples. The extent to which the rights of indigenous peoples have been compromised varies across the globe, and their exclusion has often been supported by legislation which has taken a long time to overturn as discriminatory (Stavenhagen 2005). Within Australia, exclusion of indigenous people has also been maintained through official discourses such as law, government reports, policy and program objectives, media commentary and scholarship, as Have mann (2005) illustrates in his analysis of the origins of and the consequences of exclusion still manifest in the placelessness of Australia’s indigenous people. He identifies a history of some steps towards reconciliation, but also a clear statement of where these fall short. Since his analysis, further positive steps, including Kevin Rudd’s historic apology have taken place, but these fall far short of removing the exclusionary processes that continue to saturate Australian federal and state institutions and their policies.

Humpage (2006), considering the case of the Maori in New Zealand, illustrates the need for societies containing indigenous peoples to develop policy that reflects their own socio-political circumstances, rather than simply adopt policy discourses that are popular internationally. She explores how the
goal of an ‘inclusive society’, which has framed New Zealand social policy since 1999, promotes an equal opportunity approach that sits in tension with the specific needs and rights of Maori as indigenous peoples and partners in the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi. The New Zealand ‘Closing the Gaps’ strategy of the 1990s stressed that the socio-economic exclusion of Maori set them apart from other New Zealand citizens. In contrast, the foreshore and seabed policy framed Maori as the same as other New Zealanders; they deserved the right to enjoy full protection of the seabed and foreshore but only under an equal citizenship approach, not a Treaty rights framework. The social exclusion/inclusion discourse could not conceive of rights additional to citizenship, such as indigenous and Treaty rights. In addition, despite promising to tackle the ‘root causes’ of exclusion through social investment, the Labour-coalition government used this discourse to shift away from endorsing a structural explanation for Maori socio-economic exclusion and from accepting that a shift in power between the state and Maori is necessary for the latter to be included.

Takács (2006) reviews a wide range of European research which demonstrates the vulnerability of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in EU member states to social exclusion in most aspects of their lives, as was also demonstrated by Heaphy and Yip (2006) in their work on older lesbians and gay men.

Exclusion has a geographic dimension, as participation in society depends on proximity, mobility, networks and location. Even being located in a lower socio-economic environment may precipitate discrimination at many levels Klasen (n.d.). Khakee et al. (1999) demonstrates the extent to which minority and migrant groups have been excluded from the process of urban renewal in various European contexts. Changes in the employment sphere and transformation in the relationships between waged work, gender and class in McDowell’s (2000) study have resulted in a situation where, in terms of education and employment, young men in particular are falling behind and into economic exclusion. This is the case, in the USA, for African-American males (Sanchez-Jankowski 1999; Johnson et al. 2000), but also for migrant groups in European cities (Khakee et al. 1999).

Kenna (2007) reports a study of the contribution of master planned estates to polarisation in the urban landscape. Her research analysed the intentions, imagery and outcomes of a specific master planned estate in suburban Sydney. The developers and place marketers played a key role in the construction of an image of an exclusive and prestigious estate for white nuclear families. This ultimately superseded some of the more socially inclusive planning objectives for the area. Her conclusion was that there is an explicit connection between intentions and imagery, which encourages socio-spatial polarisation.

Selwyn (2002) viewed the UK’s use of information and communication technology (ICT) as a social inclusion strategy as shifting attention from the real causes of social exclusion. Nevertheless, Van Winden (2001) reports the results of a study into the beneficial contributions of ICTs in three European
cities (Manchester, Rotterdam and The Hague) on participation in social networks, local decision making and political processes and economic life. No convincing evidence was found that social networks of excluded groups were being strengthened; nor were there any signs of increased political participation and influence of deprived groups. However, for the economic dimension of exclusion, there were some indications that ICT policy may lead to reintegration in the economic system. Van Winden advances a number of reasons why the results were not as favourable as hoped, including insufficient time for full adoption, and concludes that there is a role for ICT in the support of social inclusion policy, and this depends upon, among other things, the capacity of urban management to align the application of ICT with other social inclusion policies.

Fairclough's interesting analysis of the language used by New Labour in Britain yields the central conclusion that: 'In the language of New Labour social exclusion is an outcome rather than a process - it is a condition people are in rather than something that is done to them' (Fairclough 2000: 54). Hence the conception of social exclusion drawn on is the weakest of the weak versions. Byrne's own analysis of the UK concludes that 'the character of UK “anti-exclusion” policies and the form of understanding of social exclusion that informs them actually contributes to the development of an excluding post-industrial capitalism based on poor work for many and insecurity for most' (Byrne 2005: 1). His further analysis focused on the US, France and Germany leads him to conclude that 'advanced industrialised societies are converging on a norm of social politics organized around a flexible labour market and structural social exclusion'. In other words, social exclusion is something required by advanced market capitalism for its functioning. As Finlayson (1999) points out, others, like Giddens (1998), are not convinced that capitalism has structural tendencies towards exclusion and oppression. It was to Giddens' views that the UK Labour government under Tony Blair looked for the theoretical underpinning of its view on the third way and its policy stance on social exclusion.

Byrne's analysis further identifies how the weak usage of social exclusion, and Fairclough's adjectival as opposed to verb form use of the expression, positions exclusion as a condition rather than a process. This is exceptionally important in helping construct the range of possible social politics in post-industrial societies and in stifling challenges to the view of market capitalism is the only possible form of future social arrangement.

Note however that Byrne's analysis, although it calls for a recognition of a strong form of social exclusion (defined as that form that emphasises the role of those who help constitute the relations of excluding) and aims for solutions that reduce the powers of exclusion, is of a limited nature in that it concentrates on social exclusion as economic exploitation (a political economic analysis) and not as domination. So that for Byrne, the question of exclusion on the basis of gender, sexuality, race, etc., although he recognises all as being valid - referring to this as 'excluded identities' - is not what is dealt with in
the current debate on social exclusion. This is a limitation of his analysis – in that he ignores the multiple forms of social exclusion that are alluded to in discussion, for example, in regeneration circles at the local level in non-political circles (Raco 2002), and his field of analysis is restricted to the economic sector within the national policy arena. So while his analysis is extremely important, in this book we want to turn the main focus of our attention to the other sectors in society, and the different spheres of action.
1.5 Social exclusion and the threads between the spheres

We have proposed that social exclusion and connection can be considered in three broad spheres of action: individual agency, community and society. Our approach has similarities to that of Gallie (2004), who presents his ideas on social isolation by describing three major spheres of sociability: the primary (micro) sphere involving connection to immediate family and household residents; the secondary (meso) sphere regarding interactions with people outside the household, and the tertiary (macro) sphere involving participation in external structures and the broader environment. There are also resonances with three levels (biographical, life-world and structural) used in Steinert and Pilgram (2007). Our approach also has strong similarities with the relational framework described in Abrams and Christian (2007), whose analysis distinguishes four different elements: the actors in an exclusion relationship (sources and targets of exclusion), the relationship context (across a series of levels from intrapersonal through to societal and trans-national), the modes/forms of exclusion (ideological/moral, representational, categorical, physical, communicative) and the dynamics of the exclusion relationship (the why and when exclusion happens). Where our emphasis differs, however, is on its focus on the interactions between the different elements in the system that create and recreate exclusionary relationships.

We have seen similar themes occurring within these different spheres, such as deprivation as individual poverty, underserved communities and population inequities of resource allocation or availability; and isolation as family breakdown, fractured communities and disengaged populations. Therefore in order to understand the dynamics of exclusion and connection across different layers of human action and interaction, it is important to reflect on how these concentric spheres influence each other and the common pathways that run through them. The following section discusses the ‘threads’ that extend between individuals, communities and populations.

The threads that permeate our daily spheres of activity can be the ‘snakes and ladders’ of disadvantage, being the dynamic processes and pathways to exclusion and inclusion/connectedness. For social exclusion, these threads can be the labour market, low income, unemployment, education, ill health, housing, transport, crime and fear of crime, language, mobility, social policies and social
capital (Buchanan 2007). Issues relating to housing policy are considered in Chapter 2.4 by Henderson-Wilson, education policy by Stagnitti and Jennings in Chapter 2.8, and health policy by Barter-Godfrey and Taket in Chapter 2.14.

For inclusion/connectedness, these threads act as the ladders of opportunity and access, acceptance, identity and citizenship (Sullivan 2002). Owens’ Chapter 2.5 considers the specific case of access and people with disabilities, while Stagnitti and Jennings, in Chapter 2.8 look at the role of a pre-school reading preparation program on social inclusion of marginalised families. These threads can be the outcomes, structures, processes and barriers that lead to inclusion and exclusion, and can affect many domains within everyday life, such as health, public order, economic stability and debt, integration and neighbourhood decline/renewal (Welshman 2006a, 2006b).

However, these barriers and opportunities are not evenly distributed throughout a society; social exclusion often reflects unfair economic, power and class structures (Labonte 2004). Burdens of social exclusion may be geographic, demographic or social; and include age, ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, disability, citizenship and socio-economic ones (Train et al. 2000; Jarman 2001). The comprehensive report of the WHO Commission on the Social Determinants of Health, chaired by Michael Marmot (CSDH 2008) makes this, and the links to consequent burdens of ill-health and lack of wellbeing, abundantly clear. There are particular challenges for different groups. Nevill, in Chapter 2.11, looks at the case of older people, while Martin and Pallotta-Chiarolli (Chapter 2.12) examine the complex issues involved in bisexual young people, marginalisation and mental health in relation to substance abuse. These life chances, rather than life choices, represent threads of burden that are inequitably concentrated in vulnerable, disempowered, deprived and poor parts of a society, geographically and socially. Social justice calls for action to achieve the absence or alleviation of these experiences and social biases that leave people ‘captive, bound and double-ironed’ (Dickens 1843), based on three principles of social justice: equal rights to basic liberties, equality of opportunity, and the balance of inequalities to favour the least advantaged (Lutz 2002; Rawls 1971). In this way, exclusion and connectedness are not necessarily converse ideas, but are embedded within broader principles of justice, equity and fairness. It is with the idea of embeddedness that we next consider our threads as the connections within and between societies.

Social capital, contested concept though it is, represents the sticky threads that glue us together and is a useful heuristic to draw links between the micro, meso and macro levels of disadvantage and our three spheres of action (Cat- tell 2004; Schuller et al. 2000). It has long philosophical roots, but was revived as a concept in the last two decades of the twentieth century, with structures, functions and resources being important dimensions in understanding the role of connections in social exclusion and inclusion (Morrow 2001; Patulny and Svendsen 2007).

Following Putnam’s model, bonding social capital is ‘social glue’, analogous to Marx’s bounded solidarity and Durkheim’s mechanical solidarity,
where social cohesion is shared by people with similarities, which can range from similar ideals and objectives, similar activities or mutual social relationships. Bridging capital is 'social oil' and may be parallel to Marx’s aggregate social capital and Durkheim’s organic solidarity, as a source of social cohesion through the networks, cooperation, reliance and reciprocity between different groups and strata in civic society (see Marx 1894; Durkheim 1893; Putnam 1993, 2000; Aldridge et al. 2002; Wilson 2006). Whereas these bonding and bridging forms of social capital have different social functions for the common good and civic resources, earlier models emphasised civic resource structures and accessing individualised benefits.

Bourdieu describes social capital as first the social relationships that facilitate individual access to resources, and second the proliferation and quality of resources, so that social capital requires civic investment to develop social capital structures, which cumulatively foster other forms of capital, such as economic, cultural and human capital, as the outcome of social action and connection (see Bourdieu 1985, 1986). Social capital is therefore a comment on both the prevalence of sticky threads within a community or population, and also, on whether or not these threads permeate into the sphere of a particular individual.

Complementary to these two approaches, Halpern’s model combines components, functions and levels. Components include networks, norms and sanctions. Functions draw on principles of bridging and bonding capital, as well as linking capital that bridges between asymmetric power relationships, and levels of analysis and action cover micro-level close family and friends, meso-level communities and associations and the macro, national level (Halpern 2005). In this way, there are top-down threads, structures and sanctions imposed through population processes surrounding individual ‘hubs’, coupled with bottom-up threads and functional norms generated within communities. This relatively broader ‘Catherine wheel’ conceptualisation of social capital is useful for capturing the complexities of social factors and emphasising the embeddedness of capital and cohesion processes.

Models of social capital, in particular Halpern’s but also its antecedents, can be helpful to draw out and explain the intuitive threads running through social spheres and experiences, moving beyond the more categorical approaches to threads as barriers, ladders and shackles. Unlike principles of equity and access, social capital is not necessarily a benign process and may be both inclusive and exclusive; mutuality and affiliation can reinforce inequalities, concentrate power without mandate and quango community norms, including criminality and exclusion (Lin 2001; Portes 1998). Bonding capital in particular may increase exclusion by protecting the boundaries of the in-group and norms of participation (Piachaud 2002; Leonard 2004). Bourdieu’s approach to social capital (Bourdieu 1985, 1986) recognises the inherent value of conflict and power-negotiation in developing social capital, trust and community-established advancement, and celebrates differences within populations, even when that leads to competition or difference in ideals.
Like Foucault's concept of "technologies of power" (Foucault 1978), some of the connecting threads between individuals and groups are forms of control, normalisation and adherence. Marginalisation can therefore be the outcome of a mismatch between the norms and aspirations communicated through threads of social power and control, and the individual's identification with or ability to achieve those expectations. A culture of high-expectation can be empowering for those who can achieve but can also foster alienation when fulfilment of commonly held aspirations is not attainable in all communities (Young 1998) where the threads of social desirability are prevalent and idealised, but do not reach equitably into communities and do not reach far enough into individuals' spheres. In this way, exclusion is not merely the absence of inclusion; connections may reinforce alienation when they are irreconcilable with other dimensions of an individuals' reality whilst gaps in economic and social connections amplify other exclusionary processes.

Other aspects of Foucault's theoretisation of power are also important to us here. The threads winding between the spheres from individual up through to societal level point to the importance of a critical scrutiny of the construction of the subject/identity and the operation of power, as the point of its operation is also the point at which resistance is/can be sited (or sighted). Three of Foucault's methodological precautions in looking at power are of particular pertinence here: to examine domination and the material operators of power; to study 'power at the point where its intention ... is completely invested in its real and effective practices' (Foucault 1976: 97); to analyse power as something that circulates, recognising that 'individuals ... are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising ... power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application' (Foucault 1976: 98).

Following Gordon's discussion of Foucault (Gordon 1980), we argue that our understanding of the constructed nature of subjects/identity requires an exploration of the historical conditions of possibility of present social/human science in relation to (against and with) the exploration of a vast array of practices and techniques, both discursive and non-discursive, that contribute to the disciplining, surveillance, administration and formation of groupings of individuals, at levels from the smallest unit of the individual subject, through the family through communities to national and supra-national populations. It also requires the recognition that this is not a strictly hierarchical structure.

Communities of interest can constitute themselves across a variety of different levels, and the internet has enabled the mobilisation of such communities to achieve social and political goals. A classic example is provided by its use in late June 1999, to provide a networked form of organisation of the protests/carnivals that took place in cities across the globe on 18 June 1999, timed to coincide with the opening of the G8 summit in Cologne. A campaign to cancel Third World debt was the touchstone but the aims of the day were far wider. Organised by loose networks of small groups and individuals,
within internet-based communication of information, a wide variety of action took place – electronic forms of protest (a virtual sit-in), as well as actions requiring physical presence; central co-ordination or direction were not apparent. Web sites contained links to 43 different country sites, alternative sites were made available for when the traffic on others became too great. This form of organising was heralded in some quarters as posing a unique challenge to the authorities in terms of attempting to respond. Reports presented a mixture of predominantly carnival, with some violence against property (on the part of the demonstrators) and against people and property (on the part of the police and authorities). The events are documented still at various places across the internet, see http://www.urban75.org/j18/index.html (last accessed 22 November 2008) for example.

There is also a need to set aside the polarisation of the subject-object relationship which privileges subjectivity as the form of moral autonomy, in favour of a conception of domination as able to take the form of a subjectification as well as of an objectification; and second, the rejection of the assumption that domination falsifies the essence of human subjectivity, and the assertion that power regularly promotes and utilises a ‘true’ knowledge of subjects and indeed in a certain manner constitutes the very field of that truth. So, with Foucault, we view the ‘subject’ as a constructed entity, and this requires a methodological scepticism about both the ontological claims and ethical values which humanist systems of thought invest in the notion of subjectivity:

Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of this kind of political ‘double blind’, which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures. The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try and liberate the individual from the state and from the state’s institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualization which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed upon us for several centuries.

(Foucault 1982: 216)

Overall the concepts of social capital, and Foucault’s work on power, can inform our understanding of social exclusion and connection by recognising inequalities and power differences within society, employing multi-dimensional mapping of spheres, settings, resources, communities, cultures and structures; and multidirectional dynamics of normative processes, trust, cohesion, access and identity.

The other side of exclusion – inclusion or connectedness?

Marmot (2004) summarises the considerable body of evidence that social standing directly affects health, and furthermore unpicks the (difficult) concept
of ‘social standing’ into something far more concrete (and strongly related to social exclusion): ‘Autonomy – how much control you have over your life – and the opportunities you have for full social engagement and participation are crucial for health, well-being and longevity’ (Marmot 2004: 2). Putting this together with the discussions throughout this chapter on the complex interaction of factors that create and recreate social exclusion, we can note a challenge in terms of building understanding as to how to formulate and implement policies that sidestep the twin dangers of: paying lip service to involvement and thereby fostering dependency through reinforcing lack of control and failing to tackle the issue of employment security and adequate recompense.

Given the importance of language in the operation of social exclusion, we therefore argue that the use of the term connectedness can more easily be seen to offer possibilities of agency and empowerment than the somewhat paternalistic notion of inclusion – inclusion is something done to people rather than by them.

A human rights approach to social exclusion

At a number of places already in this chapter we have alluded to the notion of rights in connection with the discussion of social exclusion. There are advantages to making these links much more explicit. Some writers conceptualise inclusion/exclusion in terms of various types of rights, for example Atkinson et al. (2002), discussing the EU, who utilise definitions based in terms of the ability to exercise, or not, basic social rights.

Room (1999) uses rights-based argumentation to describe social exclusion as the denial or non-realisation of civil, political and social rights of citizenship. Such a rights-based approach to the problem of social exclusion has much to recommend it, and has parallels to the rights-based approaches to health that have been increasingly developed since the 1990s (Gruskin et al. 2007; Beyrer et al. 2007; Singh et al. 2007). Renner et al. (2007) agree that a human rights-based approach should be the means to tackle social exclusion. Klasen (n.d.) suggests a rights-based approach to social exclusion has four advantages, similar to the advantages of Sen’s capabilities-based approach (Sen 2000).

First, it emphasises that the inability to participate in, and be respected by, mainstream society is a violation of a basic right that should be open to all citizens (or residents). In contrast to a phrasing that positions social exclusion as a ‘social’ or ‘welfare’ issue, the rights-language considerably strengthens the case for society to ensure that it enables participation and integration of all its members; it also highlights the role of political, economic and social factors in creating (and maintaining) exclusion. Second, a rights-based approach does not demand uniformity of outcomes, but instead calls for equal freedoms for all – and it thus makes an important distinction between a choice of individuals to not participate in mainstream society, and their inability to do so.
Third, it recognises the diversity of people in their ability to make use of opportunities. Thus calling for equal capabilities (or the ability to exercise civil and social citizenship rights) may necessitate extra efforts by society to provide equal capabilities to such people. An equal starting point (or 'equal opportunities') may not be enough to ensure equal capabilities. Finally, it focuses on ends and not on means. We return to the rights-based approach to social exclusion in Part 3 of the book.