Towards a Useful Definition: Advantages and Criticisms of ‘Social Exclusion’

Fletcher Farrington

Abstract

This paper identifies the variety of ways in which ‘social exclusion’ has been conceived. Definitions, their advantages, and the policy issues that arise are systematically dealt with. Finally, overall problems of the ‘social exclusion’ paradigm are discussed and further policy implications are identified. It is concluded that social exclusion is a useful way of perceiving multiple-disadvantage, however, it must be defined and dealt with in a way that recognises difference. Overall inequalities and their causes also must be addressed.
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Introduction

The way society deals with social exclusion, ultimately, is dependent on how it is defined. Each conception of exclusion can create unique problems and necessitate different policy solutions. This paper seeks to describe these differences and to highlight both the advantages and disadvantages implicit in how you define ‘social exclusion’. This debate is summarised in Appendix A.

Definitions of Social Exclusion

The breadth of debate and multitude of definitions of social exclusion highlights the importance, both politically and socially, this issue has gained in recent years. While there is a need to unify these theories of exclusion, as Ruth Levitas (1998) and Hilary Silver (1994) have tried to do, there is still value to be gained by conceiving exclusion in such broad terms. “[T]he expression is so evocative, ambiguous, multidimensional and elastic that it can be defined in many different ways … [therefore] … it can serve a variety of political purposes” (Silver 1994, pp. 536-41). Social exclusion can be defined in terms of the processes of exclusion, the people it effects and the world which these processes and people inhabit. Table 1 classifies these ways in which social exclusion has been defined and maps out the framework for this study.

Table 1. Classifying Definitions of Social Exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition Class</th>
<th>Definition Title</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Conditions and Processes</td>
<td>Exclusion is the state of being excluded and the process of becoming excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Multi-Dimensional</td>
<td>There are different sources and different processes working dynamically to cause social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>The processes and results of exclusion are joined-up and compound each other in a vicious cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td>The breakdown of social ties between people and a community that does not work, inhibits participation in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Excluded</td>
<td>Exclusion can be conceived of in terms of individuals, groups or society as a whole, however, it affects everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Economics and the Labour Market</td>
<td>Exclusion is primarily from the labour market and stems from economic restructuring and a lack of risk-taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Systems</td>
<td>Exclusion occurs with the breakdown of social systems: social, economic, institutional, territorial and symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources and Prospects</td>
<td>Social exclusion is seen as either a lack of resources or a lack of prospects, and is, therefore, involuntary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These definitions of social exclusion are assessed on the basis of the value they can add to the debate and on their ability to aid in policy development.

**Condition and Process**

Byrne (1999, p.77) who warns that “we must go beyond nominalism,” was critical of the use of social exclusion to describe the state of being excluded rather than the process of social exclusion itself. The British Social Exclusion Unit’s official definition of exclusion (Cabinet Office 2000) highlights that to which Byrne is referring. It is “very much focussed on outcomes and makes no reference to the processes that create the problems identified in the definition” (Percy-Smith 2000, p.4). As well, there is value in conceiving social exclusion as a condition. As Silver (1994, p.545) points out, “the very differentiation and isolation of the excluded may be responsible for their collective inability to demand inclusion on their own.” Barry’s (1998, p.21) description of social exclusion as a condition of “common fate” summarises this relationship between process and condition. This being said, the majority opinion sees exclusion, primarily or wholly, as a process (Arjan de Haan in *Background Briefing*, 7 February 1999; CESIS 1999, p.19; Goodland 1999; Leney 1999, pp.35-6). Those who define exclusion in these terms appear to be distancing themselves from previous, condition oriented definitions of poverty.

This condition/process paradigm is a recurring theme in debates about social exclusion. Social exclusion has been defined in terms of relativity (condition) and agency (process). It is “necessarily a relational concept” as people are excluded from a particular society (Percy-Smith 2000, p.6; also Atkinson 1998, p.13; Randolph & Judd 1999, p.5; Spicker 1997, p.135). However, the process of exclusion requires an act by “an agent or agents” (Atkinson 1999). Hence, it is “something that is done by some people to other people” (Byrne 1999, p.1; also Barry 1998, p.4; Murray 1998).
By identifying these processes it is possible to address underlying causes of exclusion. Through the identification of agents of exclusion and excluded groups, “a framework for policy assessment and coordination of sectoral interventions” (International Institute for Labour Studies 1996) can be developed. By merely identifying the condition of exclusion, only the outcomes can be improved.

**Multi-Dimensional**

There is consensus of opinion regarding the multi-dimensional nature of social exclusion (Atkinson 2000, p.1040; Byrne 1999, p.2; Commission of European Communities 2000; Hague et al. 1999, p.294; International Institute for Labour Studies 1996; Levitas 1996, p.8; Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.752; Percy-Smith 2000, p.7; Silver 1994, p.543). ‘Multi-dimensional’ refers to the different sources of deprivation (Percy-Smith 2000, p.15) and the different processes (social, economic, cultural and political) that enable it (Randolph & Judd 1999, p.6). Social exclusion also has been defined in terms of vagueness and malleability (Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.753) in that it can mean different things to different people (Atkinson 2000, p.1042) or that it can be defined “in a way which [is] appropriate to a particular country situation” (International Institute for Labour Studies 1996).

The value of this concept is that, to be successful, policy solutions must reflect this multi-dimensional aspect of social exclusion. There must be an “overall mobilisation of efforts and combination of both economic and social measures” (Spicker 1997, p.137; also Council (Employment and Social Policy) 2000). Social exclusion has also been defined as a multi-temporal concept. This is referring to the dynamic nature of the exclusionary processes (Byrne 1999, p.1; Levitas 1996, p.8; Percy-Smith 2000, p.4) and of the dynamic change in the circumstances of those excluded (Atkinson 1998, pp.14,15; Byrne 1999, pp.70,73; Leney 1999, p.35).

**Connectivity**

Two significant issues are raised under this multi-dimensional definition of social exclusion. The first, discussed above, was the dynamic nature of exclusion. The second, to be discussed here, relates to connectivity. The debate on connectivity occupies three realms. There are those who merely recognise the interconnectedness of social exclusion (Andrew Cappie Wood in The World Today, 29 November 1999; Cabinet Office, 2000; CESIS 1999, p.16; Murray 1998; Randolph & Judd 1999, pp.2,6; Randolph & Judd 2000, pp.91,2). Others recognise the cumulative and compounding effects of these joined-up problems of social exclusion (Madanipour, in Byrne 1999, p.2; Council (Employment and Social Policy) 2000; Kilmurray 1995; Percy-Smith 2000, p.11; Select Committee on Social Security 1998). Finally, some describe the exclusionary process as a “vicious cycle” or as a “spiral of disadvantage” (Geddes 2000, p.783; Tameside Metropolitan Borough 2000; also Hunter 2000; Kabeer 2000, p.88; Levitas 1996, p.13).

In this paradigm, the exclusionary effects themselves are included as a compounding factor in the explanation for social exclusion. The true value of the concept of social exclusion is not that it is a multi-dimensional issue, requiring multi-dimensional solutions, rather, the multitude of causes and effects are “joined up” or interconnected (Randolph and Judd 1999, pp.7,2), and require joined-up policy solutions. This
perspective can also help “promote a more self-reflective role in the policy domain by drawing attention to the operation of social policy as a mechanism of exclusion itself” (Kabeer 2000, p.94). Hence, under the vicious cycle explanation, exclusion must be addressed in its own right, rather than merely attacking the compounding elements that initially caused that exclusion.

Social Relationships

Social exclusion is frequently conceived of in terms of social relationships. In these instances, the ‘process’ of exclusion is seen as the breakdown of social ties (CESIS 1999, p.22) and social and symbolic bonds (Silver 1994, pp.533-4). While exclusion has been defined in merely negative terms of ‘isolation’ (Hague 1999, p.294; Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.752; Somerville 1998, p.761; Spicker 1997, p.136), a more useful method of conceiving exclusion is in positive and active terms of ‘participation’. Here, social exclusion is either a process that stops people participating in society (Beland & Hanson 2000, p.55; EU 1999; Hague et al. 1995, p.293; Plymouth HAZ 2000) or the inability to participate in society itself (Barry 1998; Judge 1999, pp.2-3; Kabeer 2000, p.84; Percy-Smith 2000, pp.4,15). Participation can be defined broadly, as the inability to participate in “the normal activities of citizens” (Barry 1998; Judge 1999, pp.2-3) or more specifically, as an inability to participate in “institutions” (Barry 1998, p.iv) or “economic growth and progress” (Korevaar, in EU 1999, p.3).

The greatest value of discussing exclusion in terms of social relationships is gained when exclusion is defined in terms of community. Social exclusion occurs where “the community doesn’t work” or it “just doesn’t exist” (Shell 2000), or where “the fabric of community is falling apart” (Bill Payne, on The World Today, 29 November 1999). This value is derived from ‘community’ being perceived as a catalyst for the building of social capital. Participation in community networks forms the basis, the currency, with which to obtain trust, support and reciprocal help and, therefore, the growth of social capital. Hence, it is social capital, through greater participation in community, that is seen as an “antidote to social exclusion” (Percy-Smith 2000, p.6). As such, social exclusion has been defined, explicitly and implicitly as a “lack of social capital” (Percy-Smith 2000, p.6; also Randolph & Judd 1999, p.7; Randolph & Judd 2000, p.91; Shell 2000; Spicker 1997, p.135). Similarly, social exclusion has been “conceived in terms of the denial … of citizenship rights” (Atkinson 2000, p.1046; also Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.752; Powell 2000).

The Excluded

Social exclusion has been defined on the basis of those affected by exclusion. Exclusion inhabits three levels, involving individuals (Judge 1999, p.2; Randolph & Judd 1999, p.7), groups or society as a whole (Byrne 1999, p.1). Those who prefer to see exclusion as a group issue, define those groups either socially (Kabeer 2000, p.89; Somerville 1998, p.771; Byrne 1999, p.1) or spatially (Barry 1998, p.4; Judge 1999, p.2; Percy-Smith 2000, p.4; Randolph & Judd 1999, p.7).

This debate is problematic. Despite its title, social exclusion is not an ‘exclusive’ process. Everyone is affected by the social and economic costs of exclusionary processes (International Institute for Labour Studies 1996, p.830; also Byrne 1999, p.1). It was upon this very fact that Tony Blair sold his social exclusion policy; with
excluded citizens posing a social (criminal) and economic threat (Levitas 1998; also Levitas 1996, p.16; Lister 1998, pp.216-7). However, by creating a debate about groups, those groups are identified and further marginalised. The breadth of this definition will not permit exclusion to be “swept under the carpet” in the same way poverty can be (International Institute for Labour Studies 1996, p.830), especially if social exclusion really is “part and parcel of how society is arranged” (Malcolm Harrison in Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.757).

Economics and the Labour Market

The socially excluded have been defined as “the ones that economic growth forgot” (Donzelot & Roman in Silver 1994, p.533). They have been excluded from the labour market as it has altered in line with economic restructuring (Atkinson 2000, p.1049; Percy-Smith 2000, p.2). Similarly they have been equated with the long-term unemployed (Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.753). Social exclusion is also seen as a result of unemployment (Shell 2000), or more specifically, as a result of “[t]he corrosive effects of unemployment upon the lives of several generations” (Badcock 1999, p.243).

The process of social exclusion has occurred within a changing economic environment, marked by the shift from industrial to post-industrial modes of production. Social welfare has been restructured in line with this changing economic environment. In response to these changes, the shield from risks has been brought down. Hence, Geoff Mulgan (Background Briefing, 7 February 1999) defines the excluded as those unable “to face [the] risks they never believe they’d have to face.” Definitions of social exclusion must take these changes into consideration, if they are to provide the basis for policy solutions. We cannot merely ride out these changes in the hope that exclusion will be reversed in better times. If definitions such as these are to be adopted, paid work must be taken as the route back into full inclusion (Levitas 1998, p.4).

Social Systems

Social exclusion can be defined “in terms of the failure of one or more systems [of belonging] regarded as fundamental for the functioning of society” (Euvard & Prelis in Stroebel 1996, p.179; Atkinson 2000, p.1041). Similarly social systems are seen as something from which people are excluded, or unable to participate in (CESIS 1999, p.21). These systems have been identified by many (Atkinson 2000, p.1041; Berghman in Randolph & Judd 1999, p.6; CESIS 1999, p.21; Percy-Smith 2000, p.8). Table 2 compiles the various systems.

Table 2. Social Systems from which People are Excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Sub-Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Family, labour market, neighbourhood, society, community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Resources (wages, social security, savings, assets) market of goods and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Legal system, education, health, political rights, justice, bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td>Demographic (migration), accessibility (transport and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Euvard and Prelis (in Stroebel 1996, p.179) talk of the failure of only one of these systems. Within the multi-dimensional model that has been described above it is likely that the breakdown of a number of these systems is necessary to constitute social exclusion. Atkinson (2000, p.1041) concurs, stating “we can only talk of social exclusion when, for individuals or groups, several of these systems break down as part of a chain reaction.” This conception of social exclusion draws attention away from purely material aspects of deprivation. While this inhibits the identification of exclusion, with previous indicators of poverty no longer being appropriate, it permits causative analysis. Government has a direct influence in a number of these systems, therefore, through their identification, reforms and funding can effectively be targeted.

**Resources and Prospects**

Despite clear links between a lack of resources and lack of prospects, these two aspects rarely appear together in definitions of social exclusion. Exclusion results from, and is perpetuated by, an inability to access the resources necessary for inclusion in society (Atkinson 1998, p.20; Randolph & Judd 1999, p.6; Spicker 1997, p.134). These resources can be material, economic, political or cultural (Lister 1998, p.221). The “denial of opportunities open for all” is the result of this lack of resources, and has been equated with a denial of social justice (Barry 1998, pp.14-5).

Within a definition of social exclusion, where it is seen as a dynamic process, the idea of an absence of prospects appears contradictory. However, if the state of exclusion is transitory, the excluded person must have gained access to resources in order to escape. This can be reconciled by understanding the excluded state as the end stage of a dynamic process, where the lack of prospects can be equated with a lack of resources. This necessary relationship between resources and prospects invalidates the voluntary/involuntary debate (Barry 1998, p.iv; Spicker 1997, p.136), as someone who is excluded voluntarily does not lack the resources to regain inclusion.

Like the ‘exclusion from what?’ debate, the listing of resources unobtainable to excluded people can trivialise the issue and mask the compounding nature of exclusion. The true extent of exclusion becomes hidden under a mass of apparently insignificant problems. In addition, there is an unwillingness, especially in government, to define exclusion as a lack of prospects. Issues of inevitability and permanency must be avoided if policy solutions are to work.

**Criticisms**

Bob Holman (*Background Briefing*, 7 February 2000) does not find the concept “useful at all.” What are the conceptual problems of ‘social exclusion’ that led Holman to this conclusion? Three criticisms are immediately obvious regarding the
concept of social exclusion. It is a complex and problematic concept with no agreed conceptual definition. This is primarily attributable to the newness of the debate (Atkinson 2000, p.1042). It is this newness that accounts for social exclusion being an “essentially contested concept” (Silver 1994, p.540). These criticisms can be categorised as either definitional or social and economic.

**Definitional Problems**

Social exclusion is a term that can mean “all things to all people” (Atkinson 1998, p.13). There are “as many theories of social exclusion as there are writers on the subject” (Atkinson 2000, p.1039). This certainly holds true given the breadth of definitions above. As such there is a consensus of opinion that social exclusion has been defined in terms that are vague and diffuse (Marsh & Mullins 1998, p. 754; Randolph & Judd 1999, p.5; Select Committee on Social Security 1998; Silver 1994, p. 532). It is not surprising, therefore, that there also is wide support for perceiving social exclusion as hard to define (Beland & Hansen 2000, p.54; Silver 1994, p.535; Spicker 1997, p.134).

These definitional problems, themselves, reveal further serious flaws in the concept of social exclusion. These broad and vague definitions can render social exclusion useless. It becomes a “catch-all notion … a politically correct and ultimately meaningless mask” (Stroebel 1996, p.129). Governments can “commit themselves to an imprecise, but nonetheless worthy-sounding, mission” (Marsh & Mullins 1998, p.751), without any widely accepted methods of identifying exclusion (Atkinson 2000, p.1042; Hague et al.1999, p.295). The biggest fear is that social exclusion theories “run the risk of being reductionist” (Leney 1999, p.37; also Silver 1994, p.536; Stroebel 1996, p.174). Over-simplification into an excluded/included dichotomy might further marginalise those who are excluded. At the extremes of this concern is a “fatalistic acceptance of social exclusion” (Percy-Smith 2000, p.3). Although, a “trawl through the ranks of the ‘excluded’ could lead to a dismissive attitude towards the whole issue” (Murray 1998). Some middle ground between specifics and broad definitions must be found.

Social exclusion is criticised for being “just another link in a chain of shifting terminology” (Kilmurray 1995). There is concern that the adoption of ‘social exclusion’ represents nothing more than the relabelling of previous concepts such as poverty. As Seamus O’Cinneide (in Kilmurray 1995) forcefully puts it “there is no point in using the term simply as a new piece of jargon, a pretentious flavour-of-the-month synonym for the familiar grim reality we once called poverty.” Simply adopting the terminology, without adopting an adequate approach to tackle problems of social exclusion, will ultimately result in failure. Long-standing and locally developed responses to local social problems may be replaced with a broadly irrelevant inclusive policy.

**Social and Economic**

There are concerns that the concept of social exclusion may perpetuate theories and actualities of underclass. It has been criticised for being “a largely negative, ideological and value laden concept reflecting middle class prejudice and implying a crude ‘them and us’ dichotomy” (Randolph and Judd 1999, p.5). Silver (1994, p.
has shown that institutionalisation may “create a social boundary or a permanent division between the ‘ins’ and ‘outs.’” Similarly she points out (Silver 1994, p.540) that:

“exclusion discourse may also ghettoize risk categories under a new label and publicise the more spectacular forms of cumulative disadvantage, distracting attention from the general rise in inequality, unemployment, and family dissolution”

The emphasis on excluded minorities has been in preference to recognising inequalities amongst all classes of society (Levitas 1996, p.19; Lister 1998, p. 224). Proponents of exclusion also fail to acknowledge the role of economic restructuring in maintaining these societal divisions. Instead, preference is given to spatial, neighbourhood-oriented solutions to exclusion. This marginalisation of underlying causes confirms the perceived inevitability of class inequality (Revauger in Atkinson 2000, p.1039; also Marsh & Mullins 1998, pp.753-4; Levitas 1996, pp.18-9).

Conclusion

Social exclusion is a useful way of perceiving multiple-disadvantage, however, it must be defined and dealt with in a way that identifies difference. The key to the problem of social exclusion lies in the construction of an appropriate definition, which distinguishes societal differences and which does not exacerbate the problems experienced by those excluded from society. Any definition must merely be one of ‘best-fit’, which reflects the social, economic and political reality of the state. A process and agency-based approach is less problematic than those that focus on people or their environment. It will permit pre-emptive action to be taken against the processes of exclusion, rather than simple ameliorative steps to address the exclusionary results. As well any definition must also identify the inherent inequalities between all groups in society, and not just between the excluded and the rest.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Issues Raised / Policy Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Social exclusion is a condition of common fate and an outcome. It is the state of being excluded.</td>
<td>It is useful to recognise the state of exclusion as, itself, a factor in the exclusionary process. It also validates spatially oriented policy that targets the results rather than the causes of exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>The majority sees social exclusion as the process of exclusion.</td>
<td>The processes of exclusion are complex and difficult to identify and redress. However, any policy here will go to the cause of exclusion rather than the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>Exclusion can be defined in terms of relativity. People are excluded from</td>
<td>Identification of the multitude of opportunities and facilities from which people are excluded may have further exclusionary results. This ‘condition oriented’ definition also ignores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td>The process of exclusion requires the act of an agent or agents. It is something that is done to people by other people.</td>
<td>The identification of the culprits of exclusion can provide a convenient scapegoat for government. The responsibility for exclusion and its solution can be passed on to the responsible agencies. It is also a process-oriented definition, therefore, solutions go to cause rather than effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Dimensional</strong></td>
<td>There are different sources of deprivation and different processes that enable it.</td>
<td>While multi-dimensional can be equated with vague, the flexibility that this form of definition permits is widely recognised. Effective solutions will reflect this multi-dimensional nature of social exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic</strong></td>
<td>Social Exclusion is a multi-temporal and dynamic process.</td>
<td>The differing time scales of exclusion must be identified as indicative of different causes and, therefore, different solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connected</strong></td>
<td>The various causes of social exclusion are connected.</td>
<td>This is a weaker definition that refers to mere relationships. Policy must be assessed on the basis of its effects on other policy instruments and on all groups in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative</strong></td>
<td>The various causes of social exclusion compound each other.</td>
<td>As the causes and effects of social exclusion are joined-up, policy to redress social exclusion must also be joined-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vicious Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Not only do the various causes of exclusion compound one another, exclusion itself is factored in as causative.</td>
<td>This definition represents the true value of the concept of social exclusion. The identification of exclusion itself allows for exclusion specific policy to be implemented, in addition to policy which addresses the other causes and effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Social exclusion is the breakdown of social ties and bonds; the absence of social capital.</td>
<td>Exclusion must be seen in positive terms of participation rather than isolation, with policy oriented towards achieving greater participation. Policy can promote community and social capital rather than being spatially oriented through neighbourhood strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labour Force</strong></td>
<td>Social exclusion has been defined on the basis of the people, groups or society that is excluded.</td>
<td>Exclusion affects the excluded and those who are not. Groups can be subject to blame and their mere identification can lead to further marginalisation. Policy must identify exclusion and its effects on everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Restructuring</strong></td>
<td>Exclusion is the result of economic restructuring.</td>
<td>Changing modes of production and the resulting economic changes must be identified as both the causes of social exclusion and of the inequalities between all groups in society. The plight of excluded people can not be left to the vagaries of the free market and inherent inequalities must also be redressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Social Relationships**
Social exclusion is the breakdown of social ties and bonds; the absence of social capital. Exclusion must be seen in positive terms of participation rather than isolation, with policy oriented towards achieving greater participation. Policy can promote community and social capital rather than being spatially oriented through neighbourhood strategies.

**Labour Force**
Social exclusion has been equated with Paid work must be adopted as the route back to full inclusion.
Social Systems

Social exclusion results from the failure of social, economic, institutional, territorial and symbolic systems. This system approach draws attention away from purely material aspects of deprivation. The identification of complex systems creates difficulties in the identification of exclusion and suggests complex and multi-dimensional policy solutions.

Resources

Social exclusion is defined as the lack of resources. Solutions must be more than the mere identification of the multitude of resources that are lacking, as this can have exclusionary effects.

Prospects

Social exclusion is defined as a lack of prospects. This definition has undertones of helplessness and suggests inevitability, and an impossibility to redress the problem. Social exclusion must be perceived as a dynamic process. Policy must create prospects through the provision of resources.
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