



HAL
open science

How useful is the concept of social inclusion when applied to rural older people in the UK and the US?

Suzanne Moffatt, Nina Glasgow

► To cite this version:

Suzanne Moffatt, Nina Glasgow. How useful is the concept of social inclusion when applied to rural older people in the UK and the US?. *Regional Studies*, 2009, 43 (10), pp.1291-1303. 10.1080/00343400903002697. hal-00538022

HAL Id: hal-00538022

<https://hal.science/hal-00538022>

Submitted on 20 Nov 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



How useful is the concept of social inclusion when applied to rural older people in the UK and the US?

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2007-0151.R2
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	I3 - Welfare and Poverty < I - Health, Education, and Welfare
Keywords:	poverty, social exclusion, rural older people



1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **How useful is the concept of social exclusion when applied to rural older people**
8 **in the UK and the US?**
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Suzanne Moffatt PhD
23 Senior Lecturer in Sociology of Health
24 Institute of Health and Society
25 Newcastle University
26 Medical School
27 Newcastle upon Tyne
28 NE2 4HH
29 s.m.moffatt@ncl.ac.uk
30

31
32
33 Nina Glasgow PhD
34 Senior Research Associate
35 Department of Development Sociology
36 Cornell University
37 332 Warren Hill
38 Ithaca, New York 14853
39 ng14@cornell.edu
40
41
42
43
44

45 Received June 2007; in revised form October 2008
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Abstract
6
7
8
9

10 This paper explores the now widespread use of the concept 'social exclusion' in the
11 UK and examines why discourses of social exclusion have not been used in the US.
12
13 The relationship between social exclusion and poverty is critically applied to rural
14
15 older people, a group only recently appearing in debates about social exclusion in the
16
17 UK. Despite extensive debates about social exclusion in the UK, we show that state
18
19 provided income programmes are crucial to reducing poverty among older people and
20
21 that data to indicate progress on addressing any of the more relational aspects of
22
23 social exclusion are largely insufficient.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Key Words: poverty, social exclusion, rural older people
33
34

35 La notion d'exclusion sociale, à quoi est-ce qu'elle sert quand elle est appliquée
36
37 aux personnes âgées des zones rurales au Royaume-Uni et aux Etats-Unis?
38
39

40 Moffatt & Glasgow
41
42

43 Cet article cherche à étudier l'emploi très répandu de la notion d'exclusion sociale au
44
45 Royaume-Uni et à examiner pourquoi des discours sur l'exclusion sociale n'ont pas
46
47 été employés aux Etats-Unis. On applique d'un oeil critique le rapport entre
48
49 l'exclusion sociale et la pauvreté aux personnes âgées des zones rurales, un groupe
50
51 qui ne fait figure que récemment dans les débats sur l'exclusion sociale au Royaume-
52
53 Uni. En dépit des débats approfondis sur l'exclusion sociale au Royaume-Uni, on
54
55 montre que les prestations financières sont d'une importance cruciale dans le but de
56
57 réduire la pauvreté des personnes âgées et que les données sur les progrès faits afin
58
59 d'aborder l'exclusion sociale dans toutes ses perspectives plutôt relationnelles sont
60
dans une large mesure insuffisantes.

Pauvreté / Exclusion sociale / Personnes âgées des zones rurales

Wie nützlich ist das Konzept der sozialen Ausgrenzung bei einer Anwendung auf
ältere Menschen in ländlichen Gebieten Großbritanniens und der USA?

1
2
3
4
5 Suzanne Moffatt and Nina Glasgow
6

7 Abstract

8 In diesem Beitrag untersuchen wir die inzwischen weit verbreitete Nutzung des
9 Konzepts der 'sozialen Ausgrenzung' in Großbritannien und versuchen
10 herauszufinden, warum die Diskurse der sozialen Ausgrenzung in den USA bisher
11 noch keine Anwendung gefunden haben.
12

13 Die Beziehung zwischen sozialer Ausgrenzung und Armut wird kritisch auf ältere
14 Menschen in ländlichen Gebieten angewandt – eine Gruppe, die erst in jüngster Zeit
15 in den Debatten über soziale Ausgrenzung in Großbritannien aufgetaucht ist. Wir
16 zeigen, dass trotz umfangreicher Debatten über soziale Ausgrenzung in
17 Großbritannien staatliche Einkommensprogramme ein unverzichtbares Instrument zur
18 Senkung der Altersarmut darstellen und dass die Daten zur Ermittlung des Fortschritts
19 bei der Lösung von eher relationalen Aspekten der sozialen Ausgrenzung größtenteils
20 unzureichend sind.
21

22
23 Key Words:

24 Armut Soziale Ausgrenzung Ältere Menschen in ländlichen Gebieten
25
26

27 ¿Cuál es la utilidad del concepto de la exclusión social cuando se aplica a ancianos de
28 zonas rurales del Reino Unido y los EE.UU.?
29

30 Suzanne Moffatt and Nina Glasgow
31

32
33 Abstract

34 En este artículo analizamos el uso ahora bien extendido del concepto de 'exclusión
35 social' en el Reino Unido y examinamos por qué los discursos de exclusión social no
36 se han utilizado en los Estados Unidos.
37

38 La relación entre la exclusión social y la pobreza se aplica críticamente a ancianos de
39 zonas rurales, un grupo que tan sólo recientemente ha aparecido en el debate sobre la
40 exclusión social en el Reino Unido. Pese a los amplios debates sobre la exclusión
41 social en el Reino Unido, mostramos que los programas de ingresos proporcionados
42 por el Estado son cruciales para reducir la pobreza entre la población anciana y que,
43 en gran medida, son insuficientes los datos para indicar los avances en solucionar
44 cualquiera de los aspectos más relativos de la exclusión social.
45
46

47 Key Words:

48 Pobreza Exclusión social Ancianos de zonas rurales
49
50

51
52 Jel codes: I3 - Welfare and Poverty I - Health, Education, and Welfare
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

The widespread use of the concept *social exclusion* in United Kingdom (UK) and European Union (EU) social science research and policy has been an attempt to understand the multi-dimensional, dynamic processes that surround poverty and low income. Social exclusion is a broader concept than poverty, and its use is aimed toward understanding processes of change that result in individuals' or groups' exclusion from mainstream society, with consequent reductions in life-chances (PHILIP and SHUCKSMITH, 2003; BARNES, 2005).

Until recently the social exclusion literature focused on children and working-age people, not older people, and even fewer studies have focused on social exclusion among *rural* older people. Yet societies all over the world, especially in more developed countries, are ageing rapidly and, within countries, rural areas are ageing more rapidly than urban areas (LOWE and SPEAKMAN, 2006). We thus believe examination of the relationship between poverty and social exclusion among rural older people is particularly warranted.

A diversity of conditions exists across rural areas, some of which are due to historical legacies and some to rapid changes in contemporary rural structures. For example, significant in-migration primarily from cities of pre- and post-retirement age individuals alters economic and other characteristics of high-growth rural retirement destinations, and often results in improved economic indicators in destination communities (BROWN and GLASGOW, 2008). Other rural communities have stagnant or declining populations with high concentrations of older people, and a differing, less favourable set of local conditions, opportunity structures and social relationships. This diversity in conditions across rural areas (CLOKE *et al.* 1995)

1
2
3 points to another important reason for studying poverty and social exclusion among
4
5 rural older people.
6
7

8 The purpose of our paper is to critically apply the concept of social exclusion
9
10 to rural older people. We focus on three key issues: (a) why we would expect poverty
11
12 and social exclusion to be more prevalent among rural than urban older residents; (b)
13
14 whether a focus on social exclusion, rather than poverty per se, is likely to more
15
16 successfully contribute to poverty alleviation among older people; and, (c) why we
17
18 believe academic, political and policy discourses on social exclusion have not entered
19
20 discussions of poverty in the US. Our paper is structured as follows. We begin by
21
22 conceptualising social exclusion and then comparing this with contemporary debates
23
24 on poverty. We then examine data findings on poverty among older people in the US
25
26 and UK, before going on to focus on the measurement of social exclusion and the
27
28 application of these measurements to older people. In the final section of the paper,
29
30 we discuss the key issues outlined above.
31
32
33
34
35

36 37 38 Conceptualising social exclusion 39

40 The term social exclusion is widely used in social policy throughout Europe,
41
42 Canada and Australia, yet is notable by its absence in the United States (US). Within
43
44 the European Union (EU), the promotion of social inclusion and social cohesion has
45
46 been a central strategic political goal. In the UK the social exclusion concept, in its
47
48 various definitions, has formed the basis for a raft of social policies, aimed at tackling
49
50 social exclusion or its corollary, enhancing social inclusion. In 1997 the New Labour
51
52 government established a Social Exclusion Unit. The widespread use of the term
53
54 requires some exploration, and BYRNE (2005) provides an excellent overview of the
55
56 concept's emergence, which originated in France, arguing that it is rooted in
57
58 longstanding political discourses about inequality that, on the one hand, blame the
59
60

1
2
3 poor and promulgate notions of a cultural underclass transmitting disadvantage across
4
5 generations, and, on the other hand, raise concerns about the rights of the poor.

6
7
8 BYRNE (2005) views social exclusion as a continuation of long running culture vs.
9
10 structure debates.

11
12 It is generally agreed that the term 'social exclusion' gained currency
13 throughout the early 1990s in the UK as a more acceptable way of discussing
14
15 'poverty,' a phenomenon not recognised by Conservative politicians between 1979
16
17 and 1997 (BURCHARDT et al., 2002; LEVITAS, 2006). This was over a period of
18
19 time when the proportion of UK citizens living in households with less than 60 per
20
21 cent of the median household income (a *relative* measure of poverty) increased from
22
23 14 per cent in 1983 to 21 per cent in 1990 (GORDON and PANTAZIS, 1997).
24
25
26 Between the beginning and the end of the 1990s, 'social exclusion' went from being a
27
28 little known and little used term to one frequently invoked, although as HILLS
29
30 (2002:226) points out, one that is used in different ways with the danger of 'talking at
31
32 cross purposes.'

33
34
35 Social exclusion is itself a contested term, but VEIT-WILSON (1998:45)
36
37 makes an important distinction in its conceptualisation:

38
39
40
41
42
43
44 In the 'weak' version of this discourse, the solutions lie in altering these
45
46 excluded peoples' handicapping characteristics and enhancing their integration
47
48 into dominant society. 'Stronger' forms of this discourse also emphasise the
49
50 role of those who are doing the excluding and therefore aim for solutions [that
51
52 address factors] which reduce the powers of the excluded.

53
54
55 Essentially, the weak version of social exclusion depoliticised the poverty and income
56
57 distribution debate (VEIT-WILSON, 1998, LEVITAS, 2006). BYRNE (2005: 57)
58
59 contends that:

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

New Labour's inability to conceive of social exclusion as a process engendered by any agents other than the excluded, commits the party to the weakest possible weak version as a basis for social politics.

1
2
3 LEVITAS (1998) reviews the different and competing discourses of social
4 exclusion which she characterises in three ways: first, as a traditional redistributive
5 discourse (RED), second, a moral underclass discourse (MUD), and, third, a social
6 integrationist discourse (SID). She suggests that MUD and SID now underlie the
7 social politics of New Labour. Certainly, the rhetoric of New Labour is replete with
8 'equality of opportunity' but 'equality of outcome' has largely been expunged from
9 the record (LEVITAS, 2006).

10
11 BURCHARDT *et al.* (2002) emphasise the breadth of the term 'social
12 exclusion,' arising from differing standpoints about its underlying causes which can
13 be summarised as due to: individual behaviour and moral values; institutions and
14 systems – from the welfare state to late capitalism and globalisation; and
15 discrimination and lack of enforced rights. These differing views about the causes are
16 related to differing views about individual *agency*. One view is that social exclusion
17 is due to a lack of agency on the part of the excluded (blaming the individual) and the
18 other is that exclusion is the outcome of the economic, political and civil institutions
19 that make up the system. ATKINSON (1998) asserts that *agency* is a key issue in the
20 social exclusion debate. Those taking positions which hold that individual agency is
21 the primary explanation suggest a neo-liberal agenda lacking a genuine interest in
22 reducing poverty and social exclusion.

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 Social exclusion versus poverty

51
52 Most writers on the subject begin by differentiating the concepts 'social
53 exclusion' and 'poverty.' Social exclusion is often couched in terms of what it can
54 add to analyses of poverty and deprivation. BURCHARDT *et al.* (2002:1) emphasise
55 the common ground that social exclusion has with the idea of 'capability poverty'
56 (SEN, 1992), with both reflecting 'forms of non-participation in society, arising from
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 constraint rather than choice.’ WALKER and WALKER (1997:8) in their
4
5
6 comparison of poverty and social exclusion suggest that the latter is:
7

8 ... a more comprehensive formulation [than poverty]... which refers to the
9 dynamic process of being shut out, fully or partially, from any of the social,
10 economic, political or cultural systems which may determine the social
11 integration of a person in society. Social exclusion may, therefore, be seen as
12 the denial (or the non-realisation) of the civil, political and social rights of
13 citizenship.
14

15
16 Social exclusion is not just denial of material security but rather includes being cut off
17
18 from society more generally (SHUCKSMITH, 2001). A primary goal of government
19
20 policy then becomes social integration and social cohesion with society. However,
21
22 while it is important to clarify conceptually the difference between poverty and social
23
24 exclusion, it can be difficult in practice to do so because of the strong association
25
26 between both.
27
28

29
30 BURCHARDT *et al.* (2002:6) argue that the concept of social exclusion is a
31
32 valid way of broadening research on poverty and multiple forms of deprivation
33
34 because it enables the identification of those unable to participate in society as a result
35
36 of discrimination, chronic ill-health, geographical isolation, or cultural identification.
37
38 Indeed for many years in the UK, exclusion from social participation has been
39
40 included in definitions of poverty (MACK and LANSLEY, 1985; TOWNSEND,
41
42 1979). In fact, a leading group of researchers on deprivation in the UK have titled
43
44 their most recent survey, ‘The Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey’ (PANTAZIS *et*
45
46 *al.*, 2006: 7), the purpose of which is to measure the scale and severity of poverty
47
48 among adults and children and to ‘extend this tradition to the modern investigation of
49
50 social exclusion so that for the first time the relationship between poverty and social
51
52 exclusion can be examined in depth.’
53
54
55
56
57

58 Social exclusion, however, remains a contested concept within the UK.

59
60 ATKINSON (1998:6) argues that ‘exclusion means all things to all people,’ and

1
2
3 SILVER (1995:536) suggests that the expression is so, 'evocative, ambiguous and
4
5 elastic that it can be defined in many different ways.'
6
7

8 MICKLEWRIGHT (2002) asks whether social exclusion offers any greater
9
10 value than a multi-dimensional measure of poverty or deprivation and suggests that
11
12 the term 'poverty' has greater resonance than exclusion and is also more easily
13
14 defined. Usefully, he draws attention to differences in conceptualisations and
15
16 measurement of poverty between the established member states of the EU and the US.
17
18 The US takes an *absolute* approach to poverty measurement, while the UK views and
19
20 measures poverty *relatively*. Official poverty statistics in the UK set the poverty
21
22 threshold at 60 per cent of the median income of the British population as a whole
23
24 (BARNES, 2005). This *relative* measure is adjusted as median income goes up or
25
26 down in the UK. In the US, the poverty threshold is set based on an assessment of
27
28 how much income is needed for a decent standard of living, taking into account the
29
30 size of the household and age of household head. This *absolute* measure of poverty is
31
32 adjusted as the Consumer Price Index (inflation indicator) rises or falls. It is not,
33
34 however, adjusted as the median income of the population goes up or down. Scholars
35
36 have contended that it is this emphasis in the UK on one's economic and social
37
38 position *relative* to others in society that spurred discourses on social exclusion. The
39
40 focus on *absolute* poverty very likely helps explain why social exclusion is not a
41
42 common discourse in the US.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The US, however, has many more sources of longitudinal data upon which to
51
52 draw to examine trends in poverty and the dynamic pathways into and out of poverty.
53
54 This has led to a US focus on antecedents and consequences of poverty, with a
55
56 recognition among researchers and policy makers that factors such as the politics of
57
58 poverty and the institutional structures that perpetuate discrimination against
59
60

1
2
3 minorities, women, older people and other groups are associated with low income and
4 poverty (SNIPP *et al.*, 1993). Poverty of place and the social isolation of individuals
5 and communities have been seen as precursors to individual-level poverty
6
7
8 (GLASGOW *et al.*, 1993; SNIPP *et al.*, 1993; GLASGOW and BROWN, 1998) – an
9
10 emphasis similar to discourses on social exclusion in Britain. WILSON'S (1990)
11
12 analysis of the urban underclass, or ghetto poverty, in US cities implies that social
13
14 exclusion is one cause of poverty. He demonstrates that the underclass is socially
15
16 isolated and that its members have lost social buffers and role models, which he
17
18 contends contribute to social behaviour counter to obtaining education and securing
19
20 jobs. Therefore, poverty analysts in both the UK and the US have argued that poverty
21
22 represents more than economic hardship, but in the US arguments have not been
23
24 couched in social exclusion terminology.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 The direction of causation is not clear from discussions of poverty and
33
34 social exclusion. Does material poverty result in social exclusion, or does social
35
36 exclusion cause poverty and low income? In various definitions, poverty is taken to
37
38 be one component of the definition of social exclusion (i.e., exclusion from material
39
40 resources). The general model that researchers and policy analysts in the UK seem to
41
42 work from is that an increase in policies to address social exclusion results in a
43
44 decline in exclusion (i.e., greater integration in society), which in turn results in a
45
46 decline in material poverty. Schematically, this general model is:
47
48
49

50
51 Policy (up) → Social Exclusion (down) → Poverty (down)
52

53
54 Leaving aside policies to address social exclusion, we would argue that two-
55
56 way causation operates in the dynamic processes of poverty and social exclusion. For
57
58 example, a poverty level income is associated with poorer health status (KAWACHI
59
60 *et al.*, 1999; CHANDOLA *et al.*, 2007). But also an individual whose health declines

1
2
3 sharply as a discrete event can fall into poverty due to the high cost of health care in
4
5 the US, or if s/he becomes disabled and unable to work (SCHILLER, 2004).
6
7
8
9

10 Measuring social exclusion

11
12 Establishing appropriate indicators of social exclusion is difficult because it is
13
14 not a unitary concept which can be captured in a single measure such as relative lack
15
16 of income. The choice of indicators depends not only on the underlying
17
18 conceptualisation of social exclusion, but also the available data. The UK Centre for
19
20 the Analysis of Social Exclusion's (CASE) initial definition was: 'an individual is
21
22 socially excluded if he or she does not participate in the key activities of the society in
23
24 which he/she lives; ... the individual is not participating for reasons beyond his/her
25
26 control; and he or she would like to participate' (BURCHARDT *et al.*, 2002: 30, 32).
27
28 In operational terms, this concept is limited to examining participation in key
29
30 activities of consumption; production; political engagement; and social interaction, as
31
32 this is information that can be obtained from the British Household Panel Survey
33
34 (BHPS). LEVITAS (2006) illustrates the problems of mapping available indicators to
35
36 definitions, which is particularly problematic in relation to those in unpaid work, the
37
38 disabled, and men and women over retirement age. For example, non-employment is
39
40 socially legitimate among older persons, who therefore are not necessarily socially
41
42 excluded. LEVITAS (2006) examined the links between poverty and social exclusion
43
44 on eight dimensions including poverty; not in paid work; jobless household; service
45
46 exclusion; non-participation in social activities; socially isolated; poor social support;
47
48 and disengaged. She found approximately three quarters of those surveyed were
49
50 socially excluded on one or more indicators, but less than one quarter on four or more
51
52 indicators. She concludes:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The question might therefore be posed as to whether social exclusion is a
4 coherent or useful concept. Given that much of what social exclusion covers
5 ... is either integral to or consequent on the concept of overall poverty, it
6 might be seen as dispensable. On the other hand, social exclusion does draw
7 attention to the social aspects and consequences of poverty, which, despite
8 being incorporated into the definition of overall poverty, are not necessarily at
9 the forefront of people's minds (LEVITAS, 2006:154).
10
11
12

13 14 Poverty among older people in the UK and US

15
16 We turn now to examine what the available data tell us about the degree to
17 which poverty is experienced by older people in the UK and US. Since the formation
18 of the welfare state in 1948, successive UK governments have not undertaken, nor
19 funded, nationally representative studies on poverty (PANTAZIS *et al.*, 2006)
20 although since 1989 government statistics have been available on households below
21 average income (DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS, 2006a). By
22 contrast, since the 1960's, a number of sources of longitudinal data in the US have
23 shown trends and the dynamic pathways into and out of poverty (RANK, 2005). The
24 different definitions of poverty and the consequent non-comparability of datasets
25 make UK/US comparisons difficult. From the existing data, however, it is possible to
26 ascertain some idea of poverty trends for older people in the UK and US separately
27 and also to make some, albeit limited, comparisons. We noted earlier that in the UK
28 the period from the early 1980s was one in which income inequalities across the
29 population as a whole increased substantially and this was also the case in the US
30 (RANK, 2005). Using an absolute measure of poverty, RANK (2005) points out that
31 poverty in the US today is more severe than it was forty years ago when the measure
32 of absolute poverty was first defined and used. GLENNERSTER (2002:90)
33 comments that,
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 If the present rate of income growth continues and the poverty line remains
60 unchanged, the poverty line will soon be equivalent not to half of median
earnings [as it was when it was invented], but to a quarter of median earnings.

Poverty rates among older people (those aged 65 and older) in the US have fallen 35 per cent since 1959 and currently stand at 10.4 per cent which is below the overall poverty rate of 12.1 per cent (RANK, 2005). This trend can be directly attributed to the Social Security system and the introduction of Medicare in 1965 and is in stark contrast to the opposite trend for children. Nonetheless, RANK and HIRSCHL (1999) show that the risk of experiencing a spell of poverty increases with age and that nearly 30 per cent of 60 year olds will experience poverty at some point in their later years. These data also highlight the influence of race, education and marital status on the risk of poverty in later life, showing the importance of life course trajectories. For example, 13 per cent of white, married women with twelve or more years of education experience poverty by age 85; the equivalent figure for black, unmarried women with fewer than twelve years of education is a staggering 88 per cent (RANK and HIRSCHL, 1999).

A similar overall trend in the improvement in living standards for people over state pension age can be discerned from the available UK data, although the data do not stretch back to the 1950's. Between 1979 and 1996/97 the position of pensioners improved relative to the rest of society (EVANDROU and FALKINGHAM, 2005). Average gross incomes of all pensioner households increased in real terms by 62 per cent (DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS, 2004). For those in the poorest fifth of the population, however, incomes grew by only 31 per cent, less than the growth in real earnings, and all the evidence suggests that income inequalities in later life are widening (BARDASI *et al.*, 2002; HIGGS *et al.*, 2005). An analysis of low income dynamics using British Household Panel Survey data for the period 1991-2004 showed that the proportion of pensioners persistently living below 60 per cent of

1
2
3 median income rose between 1991-2001, but fell thereafter (DEPARTMENT FOR
4 WORK AND PENSIONS, 2006b). The longitudinal data indicated that pensioners
5
6 had relatively low levels of transition out of poverty, which, if it occurred, was
7
8 associated with a rise in state-provided income benefits.
9
10
11

12
13 There are no currently available comparable datasets on poverty among older
14 US and UK citizens. RANK (2005), however, draws upon the Luxembourg Income
15 Study (LIS) to compare income and poverty levels among older people in the UK and
16 US in the 1990s. The percentage of older people living below 50 per cent of the
17 median income was 20.7 per cent (US) and 13.9 per cent (UK); the overall average of
18 all eighteen developed countries included in the study was 11.6 per cent. Imposing
19 the official US poverty line definition on LIS data, the percentage of the older
20 population living in poverty was 13.6 per cent (US) and 15.7 per cent (UK) (RANK,
21 2005). The overall average for the eleven countries where data were available was
22 8.6 per cent. On both measures, Australia had the highest proportions of older people
23 living in poverty, followed by the US and the UK,
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 ... even though the United States is considerably wealthier than each of the
40 comparison nations, it has a higher rate of absolute poverty than nearly all the
41 comparison countries. (RANK, 2005: 35)
42
43

44 Applying the concept of social exclusion to older people
45
46

47 Although some UK researchers have proposed alternative definitions
48 appropriate to older people, one difficulty when applying the concept of social
49 exclusion to older people is the centrality in most definitions of labour force
50 participation. PATSIOS (2006) examined four dimensions of social exclusion among
51 people of pensionable age (exclusion from adequate income, the labour market,
52 services and social relations). Arguably, the labour market dimension was of little
53 relevance since 93 per cent of the sample were economically inactive. This may
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 change through the combined impacts of the UK Age Discrimination Act and the
4
5 policy drive to extend working life beyond state pension age. Although still small, the
6
7 US has recently experienced an up-tick in the proportion of older men in the labour
8
9 force full time (GENDELL, 2006). This is thought to be due to feelings of increasing
10
11 insecurity regarding the solvency of the Social Security system and whether
12
13 employer-provided pensions and personal savings are adequate to carry individuals
14
15 through their “retirement” years. With greater longevity in an increasingly aged
16
17 society and a faltering economy, anxieties about economic security seem to be
18
19 propelling older people to work longer.
20
21
22
23

24
25 SCHARF *et al.* (2005) point out three ways in which discourses of social
26
27 exclusion need to be developed to better reflect the lives of older people: first, by
28
29 shifting the focus somewhat from participation in the paid labour market; second,
30
31 acknowledging that older people are less likely than other age groups to move out of
32
33 poverty/social exclusion, particularly where income is concerned; and, third,
34
35 recognising that because older people tend to spend more time in their immediate
36
37 locality than younger people, the neighbourhood dimension is particularly salient.
38
39 Their empirical work centred on deprived parts of three English cities, from which
40
41 they recruited 600 people aged 60 and over for interviews. They operationalised their
42
43 definition of social exclusion as exclusion from: material resources; social relations;
44
45 civic activities; basic services; and neighbourhood. Approximately one third were not
46
47 excluded on any domains; one third were excluded on a single domain; and one third
48
49 experienced two or more forms of social exclusion. ‘Renting from a social landlord,
50
51 having two or more social housing problems, recent experience of crime, poor or very
52
53 poor health and limiting longstanding illness were all closely associated with the
54
55 experience of multiple exclusion’ (SCHARF *et al.*, 2005:83). They conclude that
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 social exclusion is a valuable way of examining disadvantage in later life which
4
5 reaches:

6
7
8 ... beyond some of the traditional concerns of social gerontologists with
9 phenomena such as poverty, deprivation and social isolation ...
10 [encompassing] issues such as older people's participation in civic society,
11 and access to services and amenities ... exclusion can be helpful when
12 addressing the specific impacts on older people of growing spatial inequalities
13 within society as a whole (SCHARF *et al.*, 2005:83).
14

15
16 The largest UK study on social exclusion to date is one which used the English
17
18 Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) (MARMOT *et al.*, 2003). BARNES *et al.*
19
20 (2006) constructed seven dimensions of social exclusion which were: social and
21
22 family relationships; cultural and leisure activities; civic activities; basic services;
23
24 neighbourhood; financial products; and material goods. They found that 29 per cent
25
26 of older people were excluded on one dimension; 13 per cent on two dimensions and
27
28 seven per cent on three or more. The seven per cent of multiply excluded older
29
30 people amounts to 1.1 million people in the older population - in other words, a
31
32 substantial number of older people whose well-being and quality of life is
33
34 considerably compromised (BARNES *et al.*, 2006).
35
36
37
38
39

40 It is important to recognise also that exclusion from a good education early in
41
42 a person's life, affects life course trajectories for occupational and income attainment
43
44 and hence material and social resources brought into old age (BARNES, 2002).
45

46
47 Although older people are unlikely to further their education or to be working and
48
49 earning income currently, greater emphasis should be given to analysing the history
50
51 and biography of how individuals' life courses play out over time and space
52
53 (GLASGOW *et al.*, 1993).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Social Exclusion among Rural Older People

Usefully applying the concept of social exclusion to older people involves recognising that exclusion from the labour force is not the primary component. A crucial element, however, is place. SCHARF *et al.* (2005) highlighted the particular relevance of the spatial dimension for disadvantage among older people living in three inner city urban areas of England. In the UK, GILBERT *et al.* (2006) undertook a longitudinal analysis which showed the persistence of poverty past retirement age and that income decreased with advancing age, placing older women in remote rural areas at particular risk of poverty in later life. PHILIP and SHUCKSMITH (2003) similarly concluded that older rural residents, particularly widows, are among the UK's poorest elderly. For rural older people, particularly those in remote areas, it is likely that their exclusion from basic services, social relations and civic activities is greater than among their counterparts in urban areas with a similar level of income. SCHARF and BARTLAM (2008), in a qualitative study, found that lack of material resources, inadequate or poor social relations, lack of access to services and amenities and disadvantages linked to rural community change (loss of local services, lack of locally affordable housing, changing local population) negatively affected older people's experiences of ageing in the countryside. In the US, the RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY TASK FORCE ON PERSISTENT RURAL POVERTY (1993) observed that, 'it is as though central cities are poverty craters surrounded by a ridge of high income beyond which lies a plain of [rural] poverty reaching to the next suburban ridge'. Poverty in the older population of the US is concentrated first in rural areas and small towns and second in inner city areas of metropolises (GLASGOW and BROWN, 1998). A comparison of poverty rates among those aged 65 and over in 2002 showed that 10 per cent were classed as being in poverty in metropolitan areas

1
2
3 compared to 11.9 per cent in nonmetropolitan areas (ECONOMIC RESEARCH
4 SERVICE, 2004).
5
6

7
8 In both the UK and the US, a clear geographical dimension to poverty levels is
9 found among older people. Poverty and social exclusion are high on average in inner
10 city neighbourhoods, especially those with high concentrations of minorities. But
11 poverty is also high in many rural areas, especially remote and rural minority
12 communities. Older residents in remote rural areas of both the UK and US have
13 *higher* poverty rates than their central city counterparts (ECONOMIC RESEARCH
14 SERVICE, 2004; PHILIP and GILBERT, 2007). Despite the level of discourse on
15 social exclusion in the UK, a dearth of work has applied the concept to rural older
16 people. We believe that since poverty is more prevalent among rural than urban older
17 residents, so too, is social exclusion likely to be greater in rural areas of both the UK
18 and the US. We explore the reasons for this in the next section. In doing so, we argue
19 that social exclusion can be a useful extension to debates and policies on poverty
20 amelioration because it explicitly acknowledges the importance of the relational and
21 spatial dimensions of poverty. We recognise, however, that poverty alleviation is an
22 important precursor to reducing social exclusion, and as a result prefer to use the term
23 ‘poverty and social exclusion.’
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Why would we expect poverty and social exclusion to be more prevalent among rural
49 than urban older residents?
50

51
52 First among the reasons that one would expect poverty and social exclusion to
53 be particularly high among older rural residents is that low-wage, low-skill jobs and
54 high un- and under-employment are more characteristic of rural than urban
55 communities. Those who spend their adult years living and working in the secondary
56 labour markets of rural areas have a greater likelihood of arriving at old age with the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cumulative disadvantage of having had low incomes throughout their adult life course
4
5 (GLASGOW *et al.*, 1993; PHILIP and SHUCKSMITH, 2003). Working-age low
6
7 income individuals are likely to experience forms of social exclusion beyond
8
9 *economic* exclusion, which are then carried into old age and perhaps even magnified
10
11 during latter stages of the life course. Some who live in a rural area during the
12
13 retirement years, however, lived in an urban area during their working years where
14
15 they had a greater probability of acquiring a good education and affluence and thus
16
17 were able to bring economic and social assets to their new communities (BROWN
18
19 and GLASGOW, 2008; GLASGOW and BROWN, 2006).
20
21
22
23

24
25 Second, rural communities often lack basic services, and older people without
26
27 the physical capability and/or the financial means to travel to urban centres risk
28
29 exclusion from services needed for a high quality of life (SCHARF and BARTLAM,
30
31 2008). The limited access to services often extends to such public services as health
32
33 care, social care, welfare, housing, transport, education and information, as well as to
34
35 commercial services such as shops, grocery stores and banks (GIARCHI, 2006). Low
36
37 income rural pensioners may not have the financial resources to acquire services from
38
39 more distant, larger communities, and they may no longer drive, own a car or have
40
41 other means of transport to the city. In rural areas of the UK, 40 per cent of people
42
43 aged over 75 do not have access to a car (DEPARTMENT FOR THE
44
45 ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS, 2004). Older individuals
46
47 frequently also have chronic illnesses and disabilities that limit their physical
48
49 capability to travel to the nearest population centre where they could obtain services.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Rural communities, with their small size populations and sparse settlement
57
58 patterns, impose constraints on older residents that may also foster exclusion from
59
60 civic engagement, a component of social exclusion identified as salient to older

1
2
3 people (SCHARF *et al.*, 2005). Small rural places have fewer community
4
5 organizations than more populous places, thus limiting the sheer number of
6
7 opportunities for civic engagement among elderly *and* non-elderly residents. On the
8
9 other hand, small communities are noted for their friendliness and hospitality, which
10
11 may facilitate older residents' involvement in local political action and the community
12
13 service organizations that do exist. Recent case studies conducted in four locales
14
15 spread across the US found that older newcomers to rural retirement communities
16
17 quickly become mainstays of volunteers in their destinations and often are also
18
19 instrumental in founding new civic and cultural organizations (BROWN and
20
21 GLASGOW, 2008). Older newcomers to rural retirement destinations, however, are
22
23 typically affluent, and this finding probably does not speak to the level of civic
24
25 engagement of low income rural older people. This is an area where more research is
26
27 needed in order to clarify the nature and extent of civic engagement among poor rural
28
29 elderly individuals and households.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Geographic mobility of young people from remote rural communities to cities
38
39 in search of better educational and job opportunities often leaves behind the older
40
41 parental generation (WENGER, 1996, PILLEMER and GLASGOW, 2000;). The
42
43 'ageing in place' that often occurs in remote rural communities results from chronic
44
45 out-migration of young people, which reduces face-to-face contact between parents
46
47 and their adult offspring. As non-kin members of informal social networks die or
48
49 move away, older people become particularly vulnerable to social isolation and
50
51 perhaps other forms of social exclusion. In particular, older rural residents in
52
53 communities characterized by high ageing in place are vulnerable to exclusion from
54
55 social relationships. A recent UK report found high levels of loneliness among older
56
57 rural residents (OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER, 2006). MORTON
58
59
60

1
2
3 (2004) found that *remote* rural counties in the US have higher mortality rates than
4 rural counties in close proximity to metropolitan counties, rural counties that have
5 somewhat larger places within them, or metropolitan counties. Higher mortality in
6 remote rural counties could be due to exclusion from health services, from informal
7 care networks, social relationships more generally and/or exclusion from material
8 resources. Regardless of root causes, this finding is suggestive of the spatial
9 dimensions of social exclusion and poverty.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 In both the UK and the US, scenic rural communities with ample outdoor
21 recreational opportunities have become magnets, attracting retirees who move from
22 cities to live in countryside areas. Rural retirement migration has been an important
23 trend of the last three decades in both the UK and the US. The in-movement of
24 relatively well-off retirees, however, strains local housing affordability for longer-
25 term older residents as well as young adults trying to enter the housing market
26 (BROWN and GLASGOW, 2008; GIARCHI, 2006). The increased demand for
27 houses drives up housing prices and property tax assessments, making it difficult for
28 some longer-term older residents to remain in rural retirement in-migration
29 destinations. For older people, such housing displacements come at a time in their life
30 course when they are vulnerable to multiple forms of social exclusion. Older
31 newcomers, on the other hand, quickly become involved in voluntary organizations
32 and informal networks in rural retirement destinations (GLASGOW and BROWN,
33 2006), suggesting that they have little difficulty becoming civically and socially
34 integrated. This most likely is associated with the relatively high income, good
35 health, marital status and other characteristics indicative of cumulative advantage
36 among the older in-movers.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Particular aspects of rural culture and attitudes limit the material resources of low income older residents. Rural residents, including those who are older, are less likely to take-up benefit entitlements than are persons living in urban settings (RANK and HIRSCHL, 1993; SHUCKSMITH, 2001). A pressing need exists for rural areas to provide better access to information and advice about benefit entitlements. A study conducted in urban North East England, found that a welfare rights advice service delivered in conjunction with primary medical care resulted in greater take-up of entitlements among older people (MOFFATT and SCAMBLER, 2008). Lack of knowledge of entitlements was found to be the major barrier to claiming, and this was closely connected to experiences over the life course when health and welfare programmes were delivered in a more universal manner (MOFFATT and HIGGS, 2007). Though this service was delivered in a metropolitan area, such a service for low income older rural residents would probably produce a similar result. Both SHUCKSMITH (2001), writing about the UK, and RANK and HIRSCHL (1993), writing about the US, however, have found that rural residents feel more stigmatized and less anonymous in receiving welfare benefits than do urban residents. The desire to be self-reliant is also a common attitude among rural residents (SCHARF and BARTLAM, 2008). Both factors may restrict older inhabitants' take-up of cash and other entitlement benefits.

From this discussion, it is clear that rural environments, especially remote rural communities, present a number of barriers to older people's income adequacy and social inclusion. Rural areas are diverse, however, and this discussion cannot be generalized to all rural areas. Rural areas near cities and rural places that do not have significant minority populations and those with an influx of affluent retirees are spared some barriers to the social inclusion of older people.

1
2
3
4 Will a focus on social exclusion, rather than poverty per se, be more likely to
5 contribute to poverty alleviation among rural older people?
6
7

8 The policy focus for tackling social exclusion among older people in the UK
9
10 has, in practice, revolved around reducing pensioner poverty through increasing the
11 uptake of means-tested state benefits (DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND
12 PENSIONS, 2006a). Pronounced falls occurred in the proportions of pensioners
13 below low-income thresholds, held constant in real terms (*absolute* poverty), from 32
14 per cent in 1994/95 to 12 per cent in 2005/06. The proportion living below 60 per
15 cent of median income fell during the equivalent time period from 24 per cent to 21
16 per cent (DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS, 2006c). These are
17 considerable improvements, although a substantial number, 2.2 million pensioners,
18 are living below the contemporary threshold income. The most recent evidence
19 concerning take-up of means-tested benefits in England shows significant
20 geographical differences; older people in remote rural areas are significantly less
21 likely to claim their entitlements compared with those in non-remote rural areas and
22 urban areas (STATE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE UPDATE, 2007). Given that rural
23 England is ageing faster than elsewhere, if this trend continues, it will affect a larger
24 and ever-increasing proportion of the rural population over time, thereby increasing
25 rural disadvantage.
26
27

28 In a review of the impact of specific policies aimed at reducing social
29 exclusion among older people, PHILLIPSON and SCHARF (2004:8) concluded that
30 their impact has been uneven and they have been ‘less successful in challenging
31 inequalities which are carried through into old age and which reflect the experiences
32 of particular birth cohorts and groups within these cohorts.’
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The relational and spatial dimensions of social exclusion are hard to measure,
4 and it does not seem there have been: (a) any major policies to tackle social exclusion
5 among older people that could be differentiated from other sections of the
6 population. For example, the many urban regeneration schemes show no clear
7 evidence that the needs of older people have received systematic attention. (b) A
8 number of measures have been implemented to tackle age-based discrimination, e.g.
9 National Service Framework for Older People and Better Government for Older
10 People in the UK. However, it appears that many of these initiatives are taken up by
11 well-educated, relatively well-off older people, and that the socially excluded are
12 rarely engaged (MOFFATT and HIGGS, 2007). Any attention being paid to social
13 exclusion among rural older people has been very recent, and we do not have access
14 to data that would allow an empirical evaluation of whether a focus on social
15 exclusion has occurred concomitantly with a reduction in poverty among rural older
16 people. The various forms of social exclusion faced by older people demonstrated by
17 BARNES *et al.* (2006) highlight the need for a comprehensive strategy and call for
18 the involvement of a number of different public, private and voluntary organisations.
19 The UK Government devised an initiative aiming to 'end inequalities for older
20 people' with its 'Sure Start to Later Life' report (SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT
21 FINAL REPORT, 2006). Part of this involves increasing older people's access to
22 information about community services by means of a 'single gateway.' In the
23 absence of adequate income levels and good transport infrastructure, however, it is
24 difficult to see how this initiative will improve the situation for the most vulnerable
25 and excluded older rural people any more than any previous initiatives.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58 At present, within the UK, it appears that policies for older people which are
59 framed within a social exclusion discourse amount to not much more than what would
60

1
2
3 have occurred within a poverty discourse. Clearly, a reduction in older people's
4
5 poverty levels is to be welcomed, although current UK initiatives do not embrace all
6
7 older people living in poverty, particularly those at greatest risk, such as rural older
8
9 women. What most scholars do agree on is that the most significant difference for
10
11 poorer older people are policies that have increased their incomes (BREWER et al.,
12
13 2007). Specifically in relation to rural older people, SCHARF and BARTLAM
14
15 (2008) highlight the importance of concentrating on tackling poverty, particularly in
16
17 the context of an ageing rural population and current UK trends of rising rural poverty
18
19 (COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES (2008). Despite the existence of a
20
21 social exclusion discourse within UK policy circles, it appears that this has not been
22
23 fully translated into policies which incorporate relational and spatial dimensions that
24
25 are notably different from those which existed hitherto. To a large extent, this is
26
27 probably due to the difficulties of measuring the more relational aspects of social
28
29 exclusion. The lack of a policy focus on the spatial aspects, however, may be due to
30
31 the overwhelmingly urban emphasis the social exclusion debate has had. With a few
32
33 notable exceptions, it is only recently that empirical work has highlighted the less
34
35 pleasant aspects of growing old in rural areas of the UK, and framed them within a
36
37 social exclusion discourse. It remains to be seen whether future UK policies fall more
38
39 within a social exclusion framework, and, if so, how this affects the lives of rural
40
41 older people.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Why has the social exclusion discourse not permeated academic, political and policy
53
54 discourses on poverty in the US?

55
56 Social exclusion is about rights of the poor and about being excluded from
57
58 important social relationships, and as such it does not simply privilege material
59
60 resources. In the UK and the EU, isolation from several institutional realms, whether

1
2
3 it is civic engagement or access to goods and services, is seen as intrinsically
4
5 important in and of itself, regardless of whether it leads to reduced income poverty.
6
7

8 The social exclusion concept provides added value for discussing
9
10 disadvantage in language that many more policy makers may sign up for
11
12 (MICKLEWRIGHT, 2002), but it has not yet permeated US discourse in academic,
13
14 political or policy circles. There are a number of possible reasons for this. First, the
15
16 more individualistic values characteristic of the US diminish social solidarity and
17
18 citizenship and promote the view that 'poverty is the result of individual inadequacies,
19
20 that poverty lies outside the mainstream American experience' (RANK 2005: 6).
21
22

23
24 This may explain why US society has historically largely stigmatized means-tested
25
26 welfare benefits (GILENS, 1999), but the UK evidence indicates that means-tested
27
28 benefits are also stigmatised, at least in the eyes of some older people who fail to
29
30 claim them, although perhaps to a lesser degree than in wider US society. The only
31
32 progressive programs to gain widespread support among the American public are
33
34 Social Security and Medicare, and many policy analysts believe that is because the
35
36 programs provide universal or almost universal coverage for older people. The
37
38 structural causes of poverty have been long debated in the US, however, and some
39
40 antipoverty policies expressly acknowledge this and utilise a social justice approach
41
42 (RICHARDSON JR. and LONDON, 2007).
43
44
45
46
47

48 Most of the policies directed at moving people out of poverty (US) and
49
50 tackling social exclusion (UK) centre on employment. WEBER (2007) has argued
51
52 that such policies are 'place blind' and do not take account of the unique
53
54 characteristics of rural areas and rural poverty. In the US, older and disabled *low*
55
56 *income* individuals are eligible to receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI)
57
58 benefits without consideration of employment status. SSI benefits are part of and
59
60

1
2
3 administered by the Social Security Administration, and they represent a particularly
4 progressive aspect of the Social Security System. SSI benefit levels are low,
5
6 however. BINSTOCK (1983), in a seminal piece, argued that older people in the US
7
8 around the mid-twentieth century became defined as the 'deserving poor.' That
9
10 resulted in their being provided Social Security and Medicare benefits and thus a
11
12 better social safety net than other age groups in the population. BINSTOCK (1983)
13
14 further argued that older people by the late twentieth century had become scapegoats
15
16 for those who support retrenchment in welfare state programmes. Conservative
17
18 political pundits began to dub older people 'greedy geezers.'

19
20
21
22
23
24
25 A second reason why social exclusion discourse is not used within the US may
26
27 relate to the institutional entrenchment of the concept of poverty within academic,
28
29 political and policy arenas within the US. Major budgetary items in the US are
30
31 allocated on the basis of 'poverty' levels, which are identified at both individual and
32
33 regional levels (ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, 2004). The identification of
34
35 poverty is therefore crucial and has significant budgetary and political ramifications.
36
37 Sizable research funding is apportioned based on the conceptualisation, definition and
38
39 measurement of poverty, making it unlikely that, at present, a social exclusion
40
41 discourse will be adopted. In a similar, but probably less deeply entrenched fashion,
42
43 budgetary allocations at local, regional, central UK government and the EU level are
44
45 couched in terms of tackling social exclusion or its corollary, developing social
46
47 inclusion (DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS, 2006d).
48
49
50
51

52
53 Given that social exclusion has not been introduced into discussions of
54
55 deprivation in the US, we have no evidence to suggest whether a focus on 'social
56
57 exclusion' would make discussions of disadvantage more palatable. Nonetheless,
58
59 introducing social exclusion into language on poverty and low income in the US
60

1
2
3 would focus the debate on a broader and important set of issues. It is worth noting
4
5 that the Older Americans Act (OAA), which was originally passed by the US
6
7 Congress in 1965 and has been reauthorized several times since, resulting in the
8
9 establishment of the Administration on Aging, an agency of the US Department of
10
11 Health and Human Services (NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY FORUM, 2008). This
12
13 federal government program provides grants to State Agencies on Aging which, in
14
15 turn, provide money to Area Agencies on Aging (AAA's). AAA's are local
16
17 government entities that provide community-based services to older Americans.
18
19 Services provided by AAA's include supportive services such as transport,
20
21 information and referral, senior centres (which offer some opportunities for older
22
23 people to socialize with their peers), home care and legal assistance. Nutrition
24
25 services, including congregate and meals-on-wheels programs, are provided through
26
27 OAA funding as well and are designed to reduce hunger and food insecurity, promote
28
29 socialization among older people and provide meals to homebound elderly. Family
30
31 caregiver support and disease prevention and health promotion are other services
32
33 funded by OAA legislation. The programs authorized through the Older Americans
34
35 Act address some components identified in discourses on social exclusion. Moreover,
36
37 OAA programs are especially targeted to the most economically vulnerable older
38
39 Americans, but regardless of income older US citizens can access OAA services. The
40
41 major problem with OAA programs is that, from the beginning, they have been only
42
43 modestly funded. It is unlikely that OAA programs have eliminated older rural and
44
45 urban individuals' risks of social exclusion, but program outputs could be recast using
46
47 a social exclusion perspective and assessed for their effectiveness in reducing social
48
49 exclusion.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Summary and conclusions

Extending the social exclusion debate in the UK to older people highlights particular relational and spatial elements that, if acted upon, could form the basis of policies that have the potential to benefit rural older people. In applying the concept of social exclusion to older people in the UK, we have shown why we might expect poverty and social exclusion to be higher among older rural than urban residents. Research in the US has demonstrated that poverty rates *are* higher among older rural than urban residents (GLASGOW et al., 1993), but 'social exclusion' discourses largely have not entered discussions of poverty and social disadvantage in the US, regardless of age group or geographic location. We have argued that although social exclusion encompasses a wider range of determinants of well being among older people, the UK policies aimed at tackling social exclusion have largely had an impact on reducing poverty levels. We have suggested that the institutional entrenchment of the poverty discourse in the US makes it unlikely that the US will adopt a social exclusion discourse. The dynamic processes surrounding poverty and social exclusion, however, could be better understood and problems better addressed in the UK and US, if researchers would tease out how reductions in social exclusion contribute to an increase in income and how increases in income obviate aspects of social exclusion among older people. The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) (MARMOT et al., 2003) is at least partially comparable to the US Health and Retirement Survey (HRS), a longitudinal study of health, retirement and ageing (HEERINGA and CONNOR (1995). Although both datasets are publicly available, the government agencies that sponsor and administer each country's survey could take steps to facilitate greater use of the two data sets for internationally comparative studies. This would help researchers on both sides of the Atlantic to gain a better

1
2
3 understanding of the dynamics of poverty and social exclusion in the two countries. It
4
5 remains to be seen, however, whether a focus on social exclusion will result in more
6
7
8 effective policies to address poverty reduction among rural older people.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge the comments of three anonymous reviewers.

For Peer Review Only

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- ATKINSON A. B. (1998) Social Exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment., in
ATKINSON A. B. and HILLS J. (Eds) *Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity*.
London School of Economics CASE Paper 4 London.
- BARDASI E., JENKINS S. and RIGG J. (2002) Retirement and the income of older
people: A British Perspective, *Ageing & Society* **22**, 131-59.
- BARNES M. (2002) Social exclusion and the life course, in BARNES M., HEADY
C., MIDDLETON S., MILLAR J., PAPADOPOULOS F., ROOM G. and
TSAKLOGLOU P. (Eds) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe.*, pp. 1-23. Edward
Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- BARNES M. (2005) *Social Exclusion in Great Britain. An Empirical Investigation
and Comparison with the EU*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- BARNES M., A. B., COX K., LESSOF C. and WALKER A. (2006) The Social
Exclusion of Older People: Evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing
(ELSA). Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London.
- BINSTOCK R. H. (1983) The aged as scapegoat., *The Gerontologist* **23**, 136-43.
- BREWER M., BROWNE J., EMMERSON C., GOODMAN A., MURIEL A. and
TETLOW G. (2007) *Pensioner poverty over the next decade: what role for tax and
benefit reform?* Institute for Fiscal Studies, London.
- BROWN D.L. and GLASGOW N. (2008) *Rural Retirement Migration*. Springer,
Dordrecht.
- BURCHARDT T., LE GRAND J. and PIACHAUD D. (2002) Introduction, in HILLS
J., LE GRAND, J, PIACHAUD D. (Ed) *Understanding Social Exclusion*, pp. 1-12.
Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- BYRNE D. (2005) *Social Exclusion*. Open University Press, Berkshire.

1
2
3 CHANDOLA T., FERRIE J., SACKER A. and MARMOT M. (2007) Social
4
5 inequalities in self reported health in early old age: follow-up of prospective cohort
6
7 study., *BMJ Online First* doi:10.1136/bmj.39167.439792.55, published 27 April
8
9 2007. [Accessed 6th May 2007].

10
11
12 CLOKE P., GOODWIN M., MILBOURNE P., THOMAS C. (1995) Deprivation,
13
14 Poverty and Marginalisation in Rural Lifestyles in England and Wales. *Journal of*
15
16 *Rural Studies* **11** (4) 351-365.

17
18
19 COMMISSION FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES (2008) 10th State of the Countryside
20
21 Report. <http://www.ruralcommunities.gov.uk> [Accessed 11th September 2008].

22
23
24 DEPARTMENT FOR THE ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS
25
26 (2004) Rural Strategy. London, DEFRA.

27
28
29 DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (2004) Pensioner income series
30
31 2002/3. DWP Pensions Analysis Division, London.

32
33
34 DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (2006a) Income related benefits:
35
36 Estimates of take-up in 2003-2004. DWP Information Directorate, London.

37
38
39 DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (2006b) Low-Income Dynamics
40
41 1991-2004 (Great Britain). DWP Information Directorate, London.

42
43
44 DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (2006c) Households Below Average
45
46 Income. DWP Information Directorate, London.

47
48
49 DEPARTMENT FOR WORK AND PENSIONS (2006d) National Report on
50
51 Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion.

52
53 <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/publications/dwp/2006/socialprotection/> [Accessed 28th April
54
55 2008].

1
2
3 ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE (2004) Rural Poverty at a Glance. United States
4
5 Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Research Report, No. 100,
6
7 Washington D.C.

8
9
10 EVANDROU M. and FALKINGHAM J. (2005) A secure retirement for all? Older
11
12 people and New Labour, in HILLS J. and STEWART K. (Eds) *A more equal society?*
13
14 *New Labour, poverty, inequality and exclusion.*, pp. 167-87. The Policy Press, Bristol.

15
16
17 GENDELL M. (2006) Full-time work rises among U.S. elderly. *Population*
18
19 *Reference Bureau*

20
21
22 <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2006/FullTimeWorkAmongElderlyIncreases.aspx>.

23
24
25 [Accessed 6th May 2007]

26
27 GIARCHI G. G. (2006) Older people "on the edge" in the countryside of Europe.
28
29 *Social Policy and Administration* **40**, 705-21.

30
31 GILBERT A., PHILIP L. and SHUCKSMITH M. (2006) Rich and Poor in the
32
33 Countryside, in LOWE P. and SPEAKMAN L. (Eds) *The Ageing Countryside. The*
34
35 *Growing Older Population of Rural England*, pp. 69-93. Age Concern England,
36
37 London.

38
39
40
41 GILENS M. (1999) *Why Americans Hate Welfare: Race, Media and the Politics of*
42
43 *Anti-Poverty Policy*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

44
45
46 GLASGOW N. and BROWN D. L. (1998) Older, rural and poor, in COWARD R. T.
47
48 and KROUT J. A. (Eds) *Aging in Rural Settings*, pp. 187-207. Springer, New York.

49
50
51 GLASGOW N. and BROWN D. L. (2006). Social integration among older in-
52
53 migrants in nonmetropolitan destination counties: Establishing new ties, in KANDEL
54
55 W.A. and BROWN D.L. (Eds) *Population Change and Rural Society*, pp. 177-96.
56
57
58 Springer, Dordrecht.

1
2
3 GLASGOW N., HOLDEN K., MCLAUGHLIN D. and ROWLES G. (1993). The
4 rural elderly and poverty, in Rural Sociological Society Task Force on Persistent
5 Rural Poverty. (Ed) *Persistent Poverty in Rural America*, pp. 259-91. Westview Press,
6 Boulder.
7

8
9
10
11
12 GLENNERSTER H. (2002) United States Poverty Studies and Poverty Measurement:
13 The Past Twenty-Five Years. *Social Service Review* **76**, 83-107.
14

15
16
17 GORDON D. and PANTAZIS C. (Eds) (1997) *Breadline Britain*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
18

19
20 NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY FORUM (2008) The basics: Older Americans Act,
21 George Washington University. <http://www.nhpf.org>.
22

23
24 [Accessed 12th September 2008]
25

26
27 HEERINGA S.G. and CONNOR J.H. (1995) Technical description of the health and
28 retirement survey sample design. Institute for Social research, University of
29 Michigan, Ann Arbor.
30

31
32
33 HIGGS P., HYDE M., ARBER S., BLANE D., BREEZE E., NAZROO J. and
34 WIGGINS D. (2005) Dimensions of the Inequalities in Quality of Life in Older Age.,
35 in WALKER A. (Ed) *Understanding Quality of Life in Old Age*, pp. 27-48. Open
36 University Press, Maidenhead.
37

38
39 HILLS J. (2002) Does a Focus on 'Social Exclusion' Change the Policy Response?, in
40 HILLS J., LE GRAND, J, and PIACHAUD D. (Eds) *Understanding Social Exclusion*,
41 pp. 226-43. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
42

43
44
45 KAWACHI I., KENNEDY B. P. and WILKINSON R. (1999) *The Society and*
46 *Population Health Reader: Income Inequality and Health*. New Press, New York.
47

48
49
50
51 LEVITAS R. (1998) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*.
52 Macmillan, Basingstoke.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 LEVITAS R. (2006) The concept and measurement of social exclusion, in
4
5 PANTAZIS C., GORDON D. and LEVITAS R. (Eds) *Poverty and Social Exclusion*
6
7 *in Britain*, pp. 123-60. The Policy Press, Bristol.
8
9
10 LOWE P. and SPEAKMAN L. (Eds) (2006) *The Ageing Countryside. The Growing*
11
12 *Older Population of Rural England*. Age Concern England, London.
13
14
15 MACK J. and LANSLEY S. (1985) *Poor Britain*. Allen and Unwin, London.
16
17
18 MARMOT M, BANKS J, BLUNDELL R, LESSOF C, NAZROO J (Eds) *Health,*
19
20 *Wealth and Lifestyle of the Older Population in England*. The 2002 English
21
22 Longitudinal Study of Ageing. London, The Institute for Fiscal Studies.
23
24
25 MICKLEWRIGHT J. (2002) Social Exclusion and Children: A European view for a
26
27 US debate. CASE paper 51, London School of Economics, London.
28
29
30 MOFFATT S. and HIGGS (2007) Charity or entitlement? Generational habitus and
31
32 the welfare state among older people in North East England. *Social Policy and*
33
34 *Administration* 41, 5: 449-464.
35
36
37 MOFFATT S. and SCAMBLER G. (2008) Can welfare-rights advice targeted at older
38
39 people reduce social exclusion? *Ageing and Society*, 28: 875-899.
40
41
42 MORTON L. W. (2004) Spatial patterns of rural mortality, in GLASGOW N.,
43
44 MORTON L. W. and JOHNSON N. E. (Eds) *Critical Issues in Rural Health*, pp. 37-
45
46 45. Blackwell Publishing, Ames.
47
48
49 OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER (2006) *A Sure Start to Later Life:*
50
51 *Ending inequalities for older people*. Crown Copyright, London.
52
53
54 PANTAZIS C., GORDON D. and LEVITAS R. (Eds) (2006) *Poverty and Social*
55
56 *Exclusion in Britain. The millennium survey*. The Policy Press, Bristol.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 PATSIOS D. (2006) Pensioners, poverty and social exclusion., in PANTAZIS C.,
4
5 GORDON D. and LEVITAS R. (Eds) *Poverty and social exclusion in Britain. The*
6
7 *millenium survey.*, pp. 431-58. The Policy Press, Bristol.
- 8
9
10 PHILIP L. and SHUCKSMITH M. (2003) Conceptualising social exclusion,
11
12 *European Planning Studies* **11**, 461-80.
- 13
14
15 PHILIP L. J. and GILBERT A. (2007) Low Income amongst the Older Population in
16
17 Great Britain: A Rural/Non-rural Perspective on Income Levels and Dynamics,
18
19 *Regional Studies* **41**, 735-45.
- 20
21
22 PHILLIPSON C. and SCHARF T. (2004) The impact of government policy on social
23
24 exclusion among older people. Social Exclusion Unit, London.
- 25
26
27 PILLEMER K. and GLASGOW N. (2000) Social integration and aging: Background
28
29 and trends, in PILLEMER K., MOEN P., WETHERINGTON E. and GLASGOW N.
30
31 (Eds) *Social Intregration in the Second Half of Life*, pp. 19-47. John Hopkins
32
33 University Press, Baltimore.
- 34
35
36 RANK M. and HIRSCHL T. (1993) The link between welfare participation and
37
38 population density, *Demography* **30**, 607-22.
- 39
40
41 RANK M. R. and HIRSCHL T. A. (1999) The Likelihood of Poverty across the
42
43 American Adult Life Span, *Social Work* **44**, 201-16.
- 44
45
46 RANK M. R. (2005) *One Nation, Underprivileged: Why American Poverty Affects Us*
47
48 *All*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 49
50
51 RICHARDSON JR. J. A. and LONDON J. K. (2007) Rural Community
52
53 Transformation: A Social Justice Approach to Funding Rural Community
54
55 Transformation, *Community Development: The Journal of the Community*
56
57 *Development Society*, **38**, pp. 92-107.
- 58
59
60

1
2
3 RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL TASK FORCE ON PERSISTENT RURAL POVERTY4
5 (1993) *Persistent Poverty in Rural America*. Westview Press, Boulder.6
7
8 SCHARF T., PHILLIPSON G. and SMITH A. E. (2005) Social exclusion of older
9
10 people in deprived urban communities of England, *European Journal of Ageing* **2**, 76-
11
12 87.13
14
15 SCHARF T. and BARTLAM B. (2008) Ageing and social exclusion in rural
16
17 communities, in KEATING, N. (ED) *Rural Ageing. A good place to grow old?*, pp
18
19 97-108. The Policy Press, Bristol.20
21
22 SCHILLER B. R. (2004) *The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination*. Prentice
23
24 Hall, New Jersey.25
26
27 SEN A. (1992) *Inequality Re-examined*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.28
29
30 SHUCKSMITH M. (2001) History meets biography: Processes of change and social
31
32 exclusion in rural areas, *Exclusion Zones: Inadequate Resources and Civil Rights in*
33
34 *Rural Areas*, Belfast.35
36
37 SILVER H. (1995) Reconceptualising social disadvantage: three paradigms of social
38
39 exclusion, in RODGERS G., GORE C. and FIGUEIREDO J. B. (Eds) *Social*
40
41 *exclusion: Rhetoric, reality, responses*. International Labour Organisation, Geneva.42
43
44 SNIPP M., HORTON H. D., JENSEN L., NAGEL J. and ROCHIN R. (1993)
45
46 Persistent poverty and racial and ethnic minorities, in Rural Sociological Society Task
47
48 Force On Persistent Rural Poverty. (Ed) *Persistent Poverty in Rural America*, pp.
49
50 173-99. Westview Press, Boulder.51
52
53 SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT FINAL REPORT (2006) A Sure Start to Later Life:
54
55 Ending Inequalities for Older People. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 STATE OF THE COUNTRYSIDE UPDATE (2007) Pension Credit take-up in rural
4 areas: SOC Update 4. Commission for Rural Communities.
5

6
7
8 <http://www.ruralcommunities.gov.uk/items/3261> [Accessed 28th April 2008]
9

10 TOWNSEND P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. Harmondsworth, London.
11

12 VEIT-WILSON J. (1998) *Setting Adequacy Standards*. Policy Press, Bristol.
13

14
15 WALKER A. and WALKER C. (Eds) (1997) *Britain Divided*. Child Poverty Action
16 Group, London.
17

18
19 WENGER G. C. (1996) Social networks and gerontology, *Reviews in Clinical*
20 *Gerontology* **6**, 285-93.
21
22

23
24 WILSON W. J. (1990) *The Truly Disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and*
25 *public policy*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60