

Based on this, one might predict that exclusion rates for the elderly are higher in the monetary group of dimensions, but the data does not support this. In fact, for elderly people overall (65 and older), there were no significant differences seen in basic needs, material deprivation or subjective poverty, and on the contrary, the ratio of those living in poor living environments was significantly lower than other groups. On the other hand, "omission from systems" was seen at a high rate in elderly groups. For this dimension, those in their 70s and 80 and above had significantly higher exclusion rates. Exclusion rates were also high for "social participation", but this phenomena begins to appear in the younger 50s group. Exclusion rates were low for "social relationships" for the elderly, but high for people in their 50s and 40s (not statistically significant). For working generations (20 to 64 years of age), the group with the highest risk for exclusion was the 50s group. In addition to having higher exclusion rates than other groups for "social participation" and "social relationships", rates for this group were also higher in "housing" and "subjective poverty". On the other hand, this age group had the lowest level of low income next to people in their 40s, and a contradiction between low income and exclusion can be seen here as well. These relationships between social exclusion and age can be summarized as follows. To begin with, although there is a large percentage of the elderly that fall into the low income bracket, that does not lead to exclusion rates in dimensions such as "basic needs" and "material deprivation" that are directly linked to money. The elderly, on the contrary, are at high risks for "omission from systems" and "lack of social participation". The working age groups overall had low rates of being excluded, but for people in their 50s the exclusion rates for "social relationships", "social participation", "subjective poverty", and housing were high.

Next we shall look at the relationship between household structure and social exclusion. When one examines single-person households, thought to have a deep relationship with social exclusion, it is particularly interesting that single men of working age have high rates of exclusion. Although rates of low income for this group are not substantially high, exclusion rates are higher than other groups for the four dimensions of "basic needs", "material deprivation", "social relationships", and "housing." As a combination of these factors this group is also the one with the highest rate of exclusion for three or more categories. However, while many single women of working age are excluded in terms of "housing", they have lower exclusion rates for other dimensions. For elderly single men and elderly single women ---although one must be careful in interpreting the results in part due to the small size of the sample--- the ratio of women with a lower income level is clearly higher, but for other dimensions, rates are lower than other groups. For single elderly men, exclusion rates for social

relationships and material deprivation were significantly high. It appears that the “solitary and lonely elderly person”, to the extent that can be seen from this data, is a phenomenon restricted to men.

For households with children (raising children), it was first assumed that the burden from the costs of childrearing would cause exclusion, but in all dimensions, they fell below the rates of overall society. Concerning housing and social participation in particular, the ratio of exclusion was lower than other groups.

Lastly, let us look at the data categorized by whether respondents have jobs or not. Although people who have jobs have a slightly higher ratio of feeling a subjective sense of poverty, their ratio of exclusion for other dimensions is low. Even for people with out jobs, the ratio of exclusion for homemakers and retirees is not high. But for unemployed people (other), not only is the ratio of low income high, their exclusion rate in almost all categories, i.e. “basic needs”, “material deprivations”, “housing”, “omission from systems”, and “social participation” is high.

As demonstrated above, analysis using social exclusion indicators reveals a “portrait of the vulnerable” that is different from the analyses of low-income persons using income level-based poverty indicators. Categories in terms of the profile of victims of exclusion include men, people in their 50s, single working men, and people without jobs (excluding homemakers and retirees). It is not that these people are in a state of poverty in terms of income level, but there is a strong possibility that their levels of social relationships and social participation are very low, and they also subjectively perceive their lives to be hard. Especially when it comes to single men, this also affects aspects of their basic standard of living, such as basic needs, material deprivation, and other problems for which monetary solutions are thought possible. The fact that men in their 50s account for a large percentage of the homeless and suicide victims^{vii} provides further evidence that hints at the state of social exclusion in this group.

6. Life events and social exclusion

In the “Survey of Social Life”, in addition to current standards of living, events and circumstances experienced in the past are also targets of investigation. The reason for this is to test the theory that not only are current states of social exclusion influenced by current circumstances (income, work, etc.), but social exclusion is rather a matter of the accumulation of disadvantages from the past coming to the surface. Table 6 shows whether or not there is a difference in exclusion rates at present between people who have experienced in the past four “disadvantages” obtained from survey data

(specifically, hardship in life at the age of 15, experience of involuntary unemployment [firing], experience of divorce, and illness or injury). “Hardship in life at the age of 15” concerns a question asked about living conditions at the age of 15 in which respondents were given five levels to choose from, and applies only to respondents who answered “extremely hard”, the lowest level of the five.

“Illness or injury” refers to “illness or injury that required one month or more in hospital or that negatively affected academics or work.” Surprisingly, these variables, despite being events occurring in the past, have clearly greater influences on current social exclusion status than other variables (status of poverty due to current income, for example). People who experienced hardship at the age of 15 show higher exclusion rates in all categories of social exclusion than people who did not (these include all of six categories statistically significant with the exceptions of “omission from systems” and “subjective poverty”). Likewise, people who have experienced being let go from their jobs, those who have experienced divorce, and those who have experienced illness or injury, when compared to people that do not have these experiences, are excluded at high ratios in almost all dimensions (those with statistical significance are: six categories for the experience of being let go from a job, four categories for the experience of divorce, and one category for the experience of illness or injury). When these are combined, the ratios of people for whom there are three or more overlapping exclusions are: 32% for hardship at the age of 15 and the experience of being fired from job, 26% for the experience of divorce, and 19% for the experience of injury or illness, all higher than the overall sample ratio of 14%. If we are to apply the definition that exclusion in three or more categories means a high risk for social exclusion, then it is these people who are indeed the latent or potential victims of social exclusion.

<Table 6: Life events>

7. Relationships among exclusions in different dimensions

One of the reasons that social exclusion indicators are better than conventional one-dimensional poverty indicators is that they encompass phenomena in multiple dimensions. I would now like to look at how “exclusions” in these differing dimensions relate to each other. Figures 1 through 3 take examples of several dimensions of social exclusion and show how they relate. Figure 1 is a representation of how social exclusion in various dimensions is influenced by the medium of income. This model suggests that since the major factor defining social exclusion is income, it should be possible, for example, to stop exclusion through a transfer of income from the government. Also, it is

possible to a certain extent to grasp the realities of victims of exclusion using conventional methods for measuring low income. In other words, in this model low income can serve as a signpost for social exclusion in its broadest sense. Figure 2 presumes social exclusion to be a “spiral of precariousness” (Moisio 2002) and shows how disadvantages in differing dimensions link together and decline. In this model, exclusion in every dimension ultimately affects exclusion in other dimensions. For this reason, although low income can serve as a signpost for social exclusion here as well, since there are time lags until their effects are felt, and it can be assumed that there must be a certain level of accumulation of disadvantage before influence is exerted in other dimensions, the mechanism of influence is not as straightforward and simplistic as the model in Figure 1. Figure 3 is based on the assumption that social exclusions in differing dimensions each proceed independently of each other. For that reason, even if a person is economically affluent, for example, there may be cases where there is little social participation.

<Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3>

It is impossible to verify cause and effect and other relationships of the above with data that is set for a single point in time. . That being said, however, I would now like to present some data that may serve as clues. First, Table 7 shows just how many people are in a state of exclusion in multiple dimensions. A majority of people (51.0%) are not in a state of exclusion in any of the dimensions, and can be considered to be an un-excluded group. The roughly 50% remaining are in a state of exclusion in at least one dimension, but of those, 24.7%, or about half, are in a state of exclusion in only one dimension. This tells us that a state of exclusion in one dimension does not induce states of exclusion in other dimensions. When examined by dimension, of the people with low levels of income (11.6% of the sample), people who are in a state of exclusion only in the low income dimension account for 42.5%. In other words, even for people of low income, that in itself does not lead to exclusion in other dimensions. Of the people in a state of material deprivation (9.9% of the sample), however, the ratio of those only excluded in terms of material deprivation is a mere 10.4%. In other words, for almost 90% of the people, material deprivation and deprivation in other dimensions occurs simultaneously. How should this be interpreted? One conclusion that can be drawn from this is that even if people should fall into low income status, that status does have an immediate affect on exclusion in other dimensions. Conversely, it can be said that when people fall into a state of material deprivation, that means that exclusion in other

dimensions has either already occurred or that material deprivation status soon leads to exclusion in other dimensions.^{viii}

<Table 7: Rates of occurrence in multiple dimensions>

<Table 8: >

Table 9 shows the results of an examination of correlations among the dimensions. Surprisingly enough, the correlation among exclusion indicators in eight dimensions are not that high. The dimension with the strongest correlation with “basic needs” was “subjective poverty”, suggesting that, compared to other dimensions, people perceive subjective poverty when their basic needs are not fulfilled. The fact that “material deprivation” had a comparatively strong correlation with “lack of suitable living environment” is plausible when one considers that the lack of durable goods included in material deprivation and problems in living environment are both phenomena for which monetary solutions are possible over the short term. The dimensions in which there were high rates of exclusion for reasons other than economic ones (“omission from systems”, “lack of social relationships”, and “lack of social participation”) are thought to have a weak correlation with deprivations caused mainly by economic reasons in other dimensions. In fact, correlation coefficients were all low for “omission from systems” and “lack of social participation”, but “lack of social relationships” had relatively high levels of correlation with other dimensions.

Interesting was the fact that even here there were weak correlations with income and other dimensions. Several reasons may be thought of for this. One is the reliability of income data. In surveys such as this in which the respondent himself or herself fills out questionnaires, the problem of reliability when it comes to income data is unavoidable. Another reason is that the current level of income is not directly linked to the current status of social exclusion. In research using UK survey data by Bradshaw & Finch (2003), it was found that people considered poor in terms of income level did not necessarily overlap with people assumed to be socially excluded. They pointed out that when prolonged poverty over two points in time or more is considered rather than at just one point in time in terms of income level, the degree of overlapping increases. To put it another way, the current standard of living or status of exclusion is based on an accumulation from the past, so the relationship between current income and consumption is not that strong.

The third reason is that there is a possibility that phenomena of social exclusion in the various dimensions are not determined by monetary restrictions such as income.

One can see suggestions of this possibility even in dimensions closely related to money, such as “basic needs” and “material deprivation”, not to mention “omission from systems” and “lack of social participation”, which can occur for reasons other than economic ones. In other words, in terms of Figures 1 through 3 discussed above, the results resemble that of the model in Figure 3.

<Table 9: Correlations among differing dimensions>

8. Conclusions that can be drawn

Quantitative analysis of social exclusion in Japan has just begun. I have here presented the preliminary results of attempts to construct indicators of social exclusion using social survey data and to measure social exclusion. There are mainly three findings gained through these attempts. First, the profile of people seen as being at a high risk for social exclusion consists of men, people in their 50s, single men, and people without jobs (excluding homemakers and retirees). The social relationships and levels of social participation of these people are particularly weak and in some cases there can be seen deprivations and states of deprivation in the dimensions of basic needs and material deprivation. Second, various forms of disadvantage experienced over the course of people’s lives are likely to be linked to current social exclusion. These forms of disadvantage include the experience of being let go from one’s job, the experience of divorce, and the experience of illness or injury, but being economically disadvantaged even at the very young age of 15 can also have an effect on whether one is currently socially excluded or not. Third, low income does not function as a signpost for social exclusion. Potential victims of social exclusion found in the first conclusion are not necessarily poor in terms of income level. In addition, the various past disadvantages mentioned in the second finding is not necessarily related to a current status of low income. Furthermore, there is only a weak relationship between low income and social exclusion in other dimensions.

It is safe to say that these findings have reconfirmed the notion that social exclusion is a phenomenon that is separate from conventionally discussed poverty in terms of income level. Social exclusion may occur as a result of the accumulation of disadvantages from the past without passing through the medium of income. And those disadvantages can begin accumulating as early as the age of 15, before people reach the age for higher education. This indicates that Japanese society is currently far from being a society in which “second chances”, a catchphrase of the current administration,

are possible. As researchers one task of ours is to clarify the mechanisms or routes by which forms of disadvantage from the past affect social exclusion in the present. It is essential to go through that process first before we can propose policies that make social inclusion possible.

Acknowledgements:

This paper is the result of major additions and revisions to Abe (2007) and Abe (forthcoming). In the course of drafting this paper I received valuable comments from the editors Professor Fukuhara and Professor Uzuhashi. I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep thanks.

【参考文献】

- 阿部彩(2002)「貧困から社会的排除へ：指標の開発と現状」『海外社会保障研究』Vol.141,pp.67-80. 2002.12.25.
- 阿部彩(2006)「相対的剥奪の実態と分析：日本のマイクロデータを用いた実証研究」社会政策学会編『社会政策における福祉と就労（社会政策学会誌第16号）』法律文化社、pp.251-275.
- 阿部彩（2007）「日本における社会的排除指標の構築と計測の試み」日本ソーシャルインクルージョン推進会議編（2007）、pp. 203-224.
- 阿部彩(近刊)「我が国の社会的排除の現状と分析」厚生労働科学研究費補助金政策科学推進研究事業「日本の社会保障制度における社会的包摂（ソーシャル・インクルージョン）効果の研究」平成18年度報告書.
- 岩田正美・西澤晃彦(2005)『貧困と社会的排除』ミネルヴァ書房.
- 厚生労働省(2003)「社会生活に関する基本調査」.
- 日本ソーシャルインクルージョン推進会議編（2007）『ソーシャル・インクルージョン：格差社会の処方箋』中央法規.
- 濱本知寿香（2005）「収入からみた貧困の分布とダイナミクス-パネル調査にみる貧困変動」岩田正美・西澤晃彦（2005）『貧困と社会的排除』ミネルヴァ書房.
- 平岡公一編（2001）『高齢期と社会的不平等』東京大学出版社.
- 樋口美雄・岩田正美（1999）『パネルデータからみた現代女性』東洋経済新報社.
- Boarini, Romina & Mira d'Ercole, Marco (2006) "Measures of Material Deprivation in OECD Countries," OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No.37 (DELSA/ELSA/WP1(2006)8).
- Townsend, P. (1979), *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Allen Lane and Penguin Books.
- Townsend et al(1999) *Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain Questionnaire*, Townsend Center for International Poverty Research, University of Bristol.
- Apospori, Eleni and Jane Millar (eds) (2003), *The Dynamics of Social Exclusion in*

- Europe: Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*, Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.
- Barnes, M., Heady, C., Middleton, S., Millar, J., Papadopoulos, F. and Tsakloglou, P. (eds) (2002), *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe*, Cheltenham, U.K. and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Bradshaw, et al. (2000) "The Relationship between Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain," Paper prepared for the 26th General Conference of the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth, Cracow, Poland, 27 Aug.-2.Sep. 2000.
- Bradshaw, Jonathan & Finch, Naomi (2003) "Overlaps in Dimensions of Poverty," *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol.32,4, pp.513-525.
- Burchardt, Tania, Le Grand, Julian, & David Piachaud (1999) "Social Exclusion in Britain 1991-1995," *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol.33, No.3, Sep. 1999, pp.227-244.
- Gordon et al. (2000a) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Moisio, Pasi (2002), "The Nature of Social Exclusion – Spiral of Precariousness or Statistical Category?," in Muffels, Tsakloglou, and Mayes (2002), pp.170-183.
- Muffels, Rund, Tsakloglou, Panos, and David Mayes (eds) (2002), *Social Exclusion IN European Welfare States*, Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.
- Van Praag, Bernard, Theo Goedhart & Arie Kapteyn (1980) "The Poverty Line –A Pilot Survey in Europe," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol.62, Issue 3, pp.461-465.
- 1968 の最初の文献を探すこと。
- Tsakloglou, Panos & Papadopoulos, Fotis (2002) "Poverty, material deprivation and multi-dimensional disadvantage during four life stages: evidence from the ECHP," in Barnes et al. (2002).
- Tsakloglou, Panos & Papadopoulos, Fotis (2002) "Identifying Population Groups at High Risk of Social Exclusion: Evidence from the ECHP," in Muffels, Tsakloglou and Mayes (2002), pp.135-169.
- Tsakloglou, Panos (2003), 'The risk of multidimensional disadvantage and social exclusion during four life stages in a dynamic perspective', in Apospori and Millar (2003), pp.17-40.
- Whelan, Christopher, Layte, Richard, Maitre, Bertrand and Brian Nolan. (2002), 'Income Deprivation Approaches to the Measurement of Poverty in the European Union,' in Muffels, Tsakloglou, and Mayes (2002), pp.183-201.

ⁱ As for previous examples of research constituting attempts to measure social exclusion in Japan, one should mention Abe (2006), which employed a relative deprivation indicator, or part of a social exclusion indicator, Hiraoka (2001, ed.), and as a study dealing with items in multiple dimensions, including social relationships, a survey by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (2003).

ⁱⁱ This survey was conducted as part of "Research into the effects of social inclusion i

n Japan's social security system" (chief researcher: Aya Abe), funded by a grant-in-aid for scientific research (Political Science Promotion Research Project) from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare.

iii The deficiency rate was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Deficiency rate} = \frac{\text{All deficiencies} - \text{Deficiencies by preference}}{\text{Sample size} - \text{No. of missing values}}$$

iv For these items, the connection with economic reasons was designed into the questionnaire questions themselves, e.g. "due to economic reasons" or "economically can't ...". There may be some cases like, for example, one cannot buy necessary clothes because one's size is not available on the market, but it is assumed in almost all of these items that deprivations can be resolved with money (for example, purchasing custom-made clothes instead of finished products). In the UK Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey (PSE survey) as well, almost all questions were of the form "can't afford to..." (Townsend et al. 1999).

v Just as both concepts of absolute poverty and relative poverty are used in measurements of poverty, it is also possible to define social exclusion indicators in absolute terms. In order to do so, one only has to use items universally deemed necessary for the bare minimum standard of living over different times and different areas when creating the indicator. In practice, however, the selection of those items is arbitrary and quite difficult.

vi There are cases where the bottom 20% of the indicator is referred to as a "risk group" (Tsakoglou & Papadopoulos 2002).

vii The suicide rate for men in their 50s is 59.6 for men in their early 50s and 64.6 for men in their late 50s (per population of 100,000), higher than other age groups (Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare's *Vital Statistics*). Concerning the homeless, for example, according to Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare's *Nationwide survey of homelessness*, people in their 50s account for 45.2%.

viii The direction of cause and effect, i.e. whether exclusion in other dimensions was caused by material deprivation or the reverse, cannot be determined with just the data at hand.