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ABSTRACT

Whereas the underlying idea behind the term ‘social exclusion’ is not radically new, neither country nor scholar has identified a formal ‘exclusion threshold’, like the poverty line. The current study tries both to provide more theoretical ground for the approach of social exclusion and help to extend the practical use of the approach. It explores the scope for the analysis of social exclusion across a range of existing indicators sets in order to examine the possibility of using the concept of social exclusion in contexts other than the European conditions in which it has been originally championed.

In order to achieve its objectives, the study pursues the traditional narrative approach. The included review encompasses both theoretical literature and empirical findings of different sources. As a starting point, the development of social exclusion issues that cover both conceptual underpinning and policy emphasis has been revised since efforts of Chicago School until Europe 2020 Strategy. The study then conceptualizes the term ‘social exclusion’ and recapitulates its components in the context of developing countries into seven suggested elements. This research constructs- for the first time- an indicative general overarching framework that goes beyond identify disadvantaged groups to encompass actors, determinants, mechanisms (how, through what and by whom social exclusion happens), and different patterns of social exclusion. Within a broader perspective, the study handles social exclusion as a subsystem comprises of inputs, intervening processes, and outputs. It thus bridges the gap of earlier research contributions that confine the phenomenon only in excluded groups, but neglect the core nature of social exclusion as a dynamic process. Inspired by the principles-based approach, the study suggests four domains should be included in any criteria measure social exclusion in developing countries. The study ends with some recommendations to in the way forward for promoting measures of social exclusion in developing countries.
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INTRODUCTION

Social exclusion research has a long history, but its influence on policy remains hostage to political priorities and ideology either in developing or developed countries. This can partly be explained by acknowledged limitations of defining social exclusion as low-income and measuring it using an income poverty threshold (Eurostat 2005; Saunders and Adelman 2006). Nevertheless, the concept of poverty itself cannot be satisfactory if it does not take adequate note of the disadvantages that arise from being excluded from shared opportunities enjoyed by others. Another explanation of such limited influence of social exclusion research comes from the improper management to social exclusion as a static phenomenon by focus on the excluded
The present study draws on Sen’s argument and places social exclusion within the broader perspective of poverty as capability deprivation (Sen 2000). The conceptual linkage provides both more theoretical underpinning for the approach of social exclusion and helps to extend the practical use of the approach in the context of developing countries. The study responds also to the call of many literatures that the analysis of social exclusion has to take adequate consideration of the fact that the developing world which is being interpreted and examined in terms of social exclusion is itself changing often quite rapidly (Atkinson 2003; Estivill 2003; Lister 2004). The further research recommended by Levitas et al. (2007) to employ a range of strategies to best estimate and/or track multidimensional exclusion represents another motive for this study.

Building upon those drivers, the current study explores the scope for the analysis of social exclusion across a range of existing indicators sets. The study first establishes what is meant by social exclusion and thus in broad terms what the relevant dimensions of ‘exclusion’ might be. It then tries to construct one stone towards an indicative social exclusion matrix by identifying the principal domains, dimensions, and indicators of such a problematic issue. Accordingly, the current study is expected to serve as an entry point into a broader analysis aimed at measuring the processes and dynamics of social exclusion in developing countries. It thus provides a unique opportunity, not only to compare the extent of social exclusion across such models of nations, but also it establishes a base for compare different trajectories of change over time. Developing countries have different patterns of welfare states in terms of levels of spending, types and coverage of state provision, and philosophies of state involvement in welfare. They, therefore, represent different economic and social conditions in respect of levels of poverty and wealth, demographic patterns, institutional arrangements, values and social attitudes. There are also differences in the types of households most at risk of poverty, and the circumstances in which poor people live. Understanding these complexities requires an approach that goes beyond income to include a wider range of indicators of multi-dimensional disadvantage.

An overarching analysis of the dynamics of social exclusion in developing countries, has not yet been attempted, nor is such an analysis the purpose of this paper. Nevertheless, the range of studies so far, and analysis by international bodies (ESCWA 2011, 2008, 2007; UNDP 2013), point to significant marginalization in developing countries. While the study tries to gauge the possible scope and usefulness of indicators of social exclusion in developing countries, it does not imply to develop a single set of indicators to be used in definite type of countries. This is because the choice of indicators depends on the country context and on the purpose for which the indicators are to be employed. The study ends to develop a scope for mutual learning since the fight against poverty and social exclusion is a common global challenge, despite the differences in circumstances and in levels of living.
Research approach


In addition to theoretical literature, the included review covers findings from qualitative and quantitative research, and non-research sources in order to identify the relevant domains and indicators of social exclusion. This includes works of EU policy on social exclusion; Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) in Britain; Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics of Egypt (CAPMAS); Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) in Egypt; Europe 2020 Strategy; The Social Development Division (SDD) of ESCWA; UNDP; Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix (BSEM); British Household Panel Survey (BHPS); Nice Criteria for the National Inclusion Plans 2001; EU Lisbon Summit 2000; Millennium Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion of Britain (PSE Survey).

Limited by time and resources, the review has not covered all of the potentially relevant literature especially of the non-English literature. Since the notion of “social exclusion”—in its modern form—has had a distinctly European origin, the included literature emanates largely from the northern hemisphere.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Historical Development of social exclusion issues in the Twentieth Century

Presented in figure 1 are the different at hands efforts of individuals and/or institutions undertaken in the framework of social exclusion since the commencement of twentieth century. It is worth to note that such efforts cover ranges of research perspective as well as policy emphasis. Nevertheless, it is too difficult but valueless to disconnect between the two perspectives of research and policy since they are two sides of the same coin. However, detailed description for growing attention of social exclusion paradigms is well documented by Gordon and Townsend 2000; O’Kelly 2007; Pantazis et al. 2006; Whelan and Maître 2006.
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Definition of social exclusion

Social exclusion is definitely not an unproblematic concept. The literature on social exclusion is, obviously, not for the abstemious. Different aspects of the term 'Social Exclusion' have been discussed, extended, used, or criticized by several authors (Silver, 2007). However, it is not the purpose here to brush under the carpet awfully difficult question of this – and other types. But the point at issue here is the need for conceptualizing the term in the context of developing countries. This paper ends with a scrutinized but comprehensive definition that: "Social exclusion is a multidimensional process that happens actively or passively and prevent individuals or groups from their rights to full or partial participation in social, economic, political, or cultural activities in the community where they live and affects the quality of people’s life and the cohesion of society." In particular, this paper recapitulates the components of the notion of social exclusion in the following seven elements:

1. Social exclusion is a process, not only the condition reflecting the outcome of that process. As a process, exclusion is inherently dynamic, taking temporal matters into account. Maintaining social exclusion as a ‘process’ rather than a ‘state’ helps in being constructively precise in deciding its relationship to poverty;

2. Exclusion is a multidimensional process where aspects of social disadvantages such as lack of regular and equal access to education, health care, social care, proper housing intersect. Causes for exclusion also go beyond material poverty and encompass a wide range of reasons why individuals or groups might be excluded. Briefly, one can be socially excluded in a multitude of ways, for a multitude of reasons;

3. The referred distinction between active and passive exclusion can be relevant for causal analysis as well as for policy response. Active exclusion is the direct and intended result of policy or discriminatory action. Passive exclusion comes about through social processes in which there is no deliberate attempt to exclude. Both active and passive exclusions may be important, but they are not important in the same way;

4. The definition refers to individuals and/or groups. This includes children, young people, working-age adults, lone parents, sick or disabled people, retired people. Definite areas are sometimes subject to exclusion i.e., rural or remote areas in many countries;

5. Exclusion should be from definite right of individual's original rights. It is not an absolute prevention processes. Drawing on this argument, if somebody was been prevented of definite impersonal right, this individual is no longer excluded;

6. It involves all manifestations of capabilities deprivation which determine the social integration of a person in society. Capabilities are the alternative combinations of functionings a person is feasibly able to achieve;

7. Social exclusion affects the quality of people’s life and the cohesion of society. Quality of life contains domains of health and well-being, living environment, and crime, harm and criminalization, among others. Social cohesion faces many difficult problems in a society that is firmly divided.
between a majority of people with comfortable jobs and a minority—a large minority—of unemployed, wretched, and aggrieved human beings.

**An indicative overarching analysis of social exclusion dynamics**

Despite many methodological attempts aimed at measuring cumulative aspects of disadvantage, no country or scholar has identified a formal 'exclusion thresholds', like the poverty line (Silver, 2007). Following Sen’s approach, social exclusion has been placed here within the broader perspective of poverty as capability deprivation. Such a paper’s orientation asserted by the argument that the perspective of social exclusion reinforces rather than competes with the understanding of poverty as capability deprivation (Sen, 2000). The current study presents - for the first time - an indicative general overarching framework that goes beyond identify disadvantaged groups to encompass actors, determinants, mechanisms (how, through what and by whom social exclusion happens), and different patterns of social exclusion. Within a broader perspective, the study handles social exclusion as a subsystem comprises of inputs, intervening processes, and outputs. It thus bridges the gap of earlier research contributions that confine the phenomenon only in investigating the excluded groups, but neglect the inherent nature of social exclusion that it is a dynamic process.

As shown in figure 1, components of the suggested framework of social exclusion are organized in three-pillar structure. Both actors and determinants of social exclusion represent the first component – consisting of seven elements covering the broad fields that have been considered the most important actors of social exclusion – and eight elements of underlying attributes – intended to determine the nature of social exclusion and shape its outcomes.

The second pillar of this framework refers to the intervening processes of social exclusion system. It encompasses three processes by which people become excluded. It is worth to note that the three mechanisms spell out particular patterns of exclusion, but they cannot cause them to happen. Specifically, it is social actors who “make up institutions, the collectivities they form and interactions between them. (Kabeer 2000).

Outputs of social exclusion represent the third pillar of suggested framework. It is expressed by three aspects of blocked components of human life, patterns of social exclusion, and types of excluded categories. Within that context, social relations and organizational barriers block the followings: (a) attainment of livelihoods; (b) human development; and (c) equal citizenship. Exclusion appears in five main manifestations that form critical issues especially in developing countries and widely associated with poverty and insecurity. The last aspect of social exclusion outcomes points to four groups at risk of social exclusion. This last aspect is the main concern of the majority of earlier empirical studies of social exclusion (ESCWA 2007).
Fig1
**The assessment of domains of social exclusion**

This study inspired by the principles-based approach concerning the construction of social inclusion indicators (Atkinson and Marlier 2010). Through investigated empirical studies, measures of each dimension of social exclusion aforementioned in figure 1 have been checked out against five principles of principles-based approach. The following section discusses the principles that apply to each indicator of social exclusion:

- An indicator should identify the essence of the problem and have an agreed normative interpretation, herein referred to as “meaningfulness.”
- An indicator should be robust and statistically validated, herein referred to as “robustness.”
- An indicator should be interpretable in an international context, herein referred to as “interpretability.”
- An indicator should reflect the direction of change and be susceptible to revision as improved methods become available, herein referred to as “consistency.”
- The measurement of an indicator should not impose too large a burden on countries, on enterprises nor on citizens, and should have availability of time series and/or cross-section data, herein referred to as “operationality.”

The yielded table 2 shows to what extent each dimension fits for purpose of assessing social exclusion in developing countries. According to this paper's authorship, which draws upon scrutinized revision of available literature, four referred domains of social exclusion suggested framework fit the score 'strong' in the all five principles against which domains checked out. These domains are: open unemployment, which measures Exclusion from labour market; education and health care as measures of Exclusion from goods and services; physical security, which measures Exclusion from security. On the contrary, two domains may be classified as non-fit measures of social exclusion in the context of developing countries. These are low-skilled domain, which is a measure of exclusion within the labour market; and dignity and identity – a measure of exclusion from human rights. However, the majority of domains range between strong and weak scores of the investigated principles.

**Study recommendations**

Results of this study imply that the way forward for promoting social exclusion measures for developing countries may best be conducted through the followings:

- It is recommended to focus on the processes of exclusion along with the focus on excluded groups themselves.
- Of particular importance is the study of linkage between exclusions in different spheres of inter-individual and interfamily interactions, involving both overlap and causal linkages.
- To embed social exclusion in the wider perspective of capability deprivation.
To establish a searchable meta-database on social exclusion to document both theoretical underpinnings for the approach of social exclusion and relevant survey data sources, question items and associated information in the context of developing countries (for example, sampling methods, coverage etc).

- Quantitative indicators of social exclusion need to be accompanied by qualitative evidence, which explores significant components of human experience that cannot be readily reduced to a simple scale.
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نحو تحليل شامل للإقصاء الاجتماعي في البلدان النامية

عبد الصمد محمد علي

قسم الاجتماع الرفيق - كلية الزراعة - جامعة اسوط

بمجرد أن تكون دولة ما أو بحث بشأن من تجديد "الإقصاء الاجتماعي" سيظهر فجأة مرادا وبحلول الدراسة الحالية، إن تكون إشارة إلى توضيح أو تحسين التطور المتعلق بهذا المفهوم. إذا انخفضت الدراسة من نطاق تحليل الإقصاء الاجتماعي عبر مجموعة من مؤشرات القضية، هذه الدراسة في محاولة استخدام مفهوم الإقصاء الاجتماعي، في سياق آخر من خارج السياق الأوروبي الذي انتشر عن تقييم الإقصاء.

وبغية تحقيق أهدافها، تتم الدراسة على المنهج السردي التقليدي. إذ يتصل الاستعراض المستخدم بها على كل من الأدوات النظرية بالإضافة إلى النتائج الإمبريالية من معايير مختلفة. وكذلك أن الدراسة قد تكون تحليل قضايا الإقصاء الاجتماعي التي تغطي كل من الأسس المعاصرة والتراكب على جانب السياسات مثلا من جهة مدرس شيكاغو وصولاً إلى الاستراتيجية الأوروبية لعام 2007. ثم يستمدها لتعريف "الإقصاء الاجتماعي" وتجد مكوناته في سياق البلدان النامية في سياق عناصر معايرة. وتتناسب هذه الدراسة بأنها تبني - للمرة الأولى - إطاراً استراتيجياً عاماً سامعاً تتجاوز تعريف القنوات المعروفة ليتضمن الجهات الفاعلة والمحافدات والأديان (كيف، من خلال سلسلة، وعلى يد من بعض الإفصاح الاجتماعي) ك كما يتضمن الأمثلة المختلفة للإقصاء الاجتماعي. وحسن تواصل إفصاح ما، تحليل الدراسة الإفصاح الاجتماعي كظام

فروع المنهاج، والعملات، والخريجات. وبناء عليه فإن الدراسة الملاذية تتعلق—the agencies which أسهمت بها

بما يلي: أن الأدوات السابقة - تركز أكثر على حصر القنوات المقصدة إجماعا، في حين

نعمل لتحليل الأدوات الأساسية للإقصاء الاجتماعي كعملية ديناميكية. وفي استخدامها للسماح للفحص على المبادئ

- تتوفر الدراسة أربعة مقالات تتعلق أن تدرج في أياً من القيادات قياس

Principles-based Approach

الإقصاء الاجتماعي في البلدان النامية. وأخيراً تنتهي الدراسة على بعض التوصيات المقدمة مما نحو تحسين

مقايض الإفصاح الاجتماعي في البلدان النامية.

قناة تتحكيم البحث

أ/د / محمد جمال الدين راشد

كلية الزراعة - جامعة اسوط

أ/د / محمد السيد الإمام

كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنصورة
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Table 2. The assessment of domains of social exclusion in developing countries (suggested viewpoint)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure/Indicator</th>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Meaningfulness</th>
<th>Robustness</th>
<th>Interpretability</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Operationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from labour market</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1 Open unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2 Exclusion within the labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.1 Insecure jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.2 Ill-paid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.3 Low-skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from goods and services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1 Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2 Health care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3 Decent housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4 Consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1 Physical security</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2 Security of livelihood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3 Protection against contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from human rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1 Equality before the law</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2 Freedom of organization and expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3 Dignity and identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4 Social participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>