Background
Within the context of current academic and policy debates on social exclusion, the research reported here examines the circumstances of older people living in socially deprived areas of three English cities. The research, funded through the ESRC’s Growing Older Programme, was undertaken at Keele University. In seeking to provide new insights into the nature of inequalities within older age, the study addresses the conditions of social exclusion in deprived urban neighbourhoods, processes that contribute to social exclusion in later life, and the implications for social policy of such factors.

The focus on older people in deprived neighbourhoods is linked to contemporary public policy concerns. Since 1997, such neighbourhoods have been subject to considerable social policy intervention, linked to attempts to reduce the geographic divide between Britain’s most deprived areas and the ‘mainstream of society’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 2001). In this respect, the research seeks to examine the degree to which residence in an area of concentrated poverty might compound the impact on older people of other forms of social exclusion, and lead to a diminished quality of life.

Objectives
The research has had the following objectives:
1. To contribute to knowledge about the circumstances of older people living in areas of concentrated poverty, examining the specific characteristics of social exclusion as it affects different groups within the older population.

2. To explore ways in which older people manage their daily lives in deprived urban environments.

3. To develop research methods relevant to studying quality of life issues for older people living in deprived areas, and to contribute to the development of research techniques designed to measure poverty, social deprivation, and social exclusion.

4. To identify forms of deprivation which have yet to be addressed fully in gerontological and social policy research.

5. To examine the dynamics of social exclusion at a neighbourhood level, and the implications of this for social policy.

These objectives have been met as follows:

**Objective One:** The project has conducted a social survey of and in-depth interviews with older people living in socially deprived urban communities. The resulting datasets have been used to develop a model of social exclusion, and to examine the interactions between different sub-dimensions of exclusion. Further analysis has sought to explore the degree to which some social groups may experience a heightened risk of exclusion.

**Objective Two:** Drawing on data from the survey and in-depth interviews, the research has addressed ways in which individuals handle the multiple risks associated with living in deprived neighbourhoods, along with the survival strategies and support networks that develop. A particular focus has been the way in which older people cope with, at times intense, poverty and deprivation.

**Objective Three:** Older people's quality of life has been assessed in two different ways. First, the survey included three standard quality of life measures. Second, the project examined life quality from a more person-oriented perspective, with the in-depth interviews providing a means of enabling older people to identify themes and issues that they regarded as having the greatest impact on their quality of daily living. In addition, the research has contributed to debates about the measurement of poverty, deprivation, and social exclusion in relation to the situation of older people.

**Objective Four:** This has been met through the survey and in-depth interviews. The research confirms the enduring relevance of traditional forms of poverty and deprivation, but also highlights the importance of themes such as access to services, perceptions of the neighbourhood, and vulnerability to crime as indicators of exclusion.

**Objective Five:** The research has drawn attention to several concerns arising from current policy debates on social exclusion, and their impact on older people. Through a range of activities designed to disseminate emerging research findings, the project has already provided a major contribution to public debates and policy development in respect of older people in deprived areas.
Methods

A variety of research strategies have been employed to address the diverse ways in which the dynamic and multi-dimensional nature of social exclusion might affect the life quality of older people in deprived areas.

The first stage involved selecting geographic locations in which to conduct a programme of research. Drawing on the 1998 Index of Local Deprivation (DETR, 1998), Liverpool, Manchester and the London Borough of Newham were identified as the three most deprived English local authorities. To account for variation in relation to the spread and intensity of deprivation, the three most deprived electoral wards in each city were selected. The study areas were Clubmoor, Granby and Pirrie in Liverpool; Cheetham, Longsight and Moss Side in Manchester; and Park, Plashet and St Stephens in Newham. All were ranked amongst England’s 50 most deprived wards in 1998.

Second, in order to develop a fuller understanding of lay perspectives on such key themes as ‘social exclusion’ and ‘quality of life’, seven group discussions were conducted with older people in the study areas. These provided an opportunity to raise emerging themes from the project, and helped the researchers establish a form of words that potential participants could identify with. Transcriptions of the tape-recorded discussions informed subsequent phases of data collection.

Third, the research collected a range of primary data. Two main phases of data collection took place:

Phase One consisted of a questionnaire survey of older people in the three cities (Appendix Four). The purpose of the survey was to collect, first, socio-demographic data about the circumstances of older people living in deprived areas and, second, information relating to the themes of social exclusion and quality of life, including:

- Characteristics of poverty and its impact on daily life;
- Networks (including support networks) of older people;
- Patterns of support within the older population and with other social groups;
- Quality of life of older people (using standardised measures of physical and psychological well-being);
- Characteristics of social participation within deprived localities;
- Experiences of the urban environment in relation to services, crime, transportation and related issues.

Following two stages of piloting, trained interviewers conducted face-to-face interviews with 600 people aged 60 and over. Recruitment of participants occurred in two ways. A first group was randomly selected through local electoral registers using a coding classification that assigns people to age bands according to the likelihood that their first name belongs to a particular birth cohort. 501 respondents were recruited in this way (response rate - 42%). A second group was recruited from the largest minority ethnic group in each electoral ward, drawing on relevant community organisations and researchers’ local contacts. The aim was to generate a sufficiently large sample from each group to facilitate statistical analysis. Ninety-nine older people from four different minority groups (Black Caribbean, Indian, Pakistani, and
Somali) were recruited. Interviews were undertaken in the language of respondents’ choice by members of the research team, or by interviewers recruited from the relevant minority groups. Variation in the number of interviews with older people belonging to minority groups largely accounts for the different sample sizes in each study area. The number of respondents varied between 188 (Newham) and 206 (Liverpool and Manchester) in each city, and between 55 and 95 in each ward.

Phase Two comprised 130 semi-structured interviews with people aged 60 and over. Ninety interviews were undertaken with people who had previously taken part in the survey, and had consented to be contacted again. Further interviews were undertaken with 20 older Somali people in Liverpool and 20 older Pakistani people in Manchester. The in-depth interviews explored such issues as older people’s experiences of daily life, strategies for survival in urban areas, the management of household finances, and the types of social relationships in which they were engaged. The interviews allowed the research group to explore the meaning of quality of life from the perspective of older people, and to address variations in the experiences of sub-groups within the older population.

After coding, checking and cleaning, analysis of the survey data proceeded using SPSS. The in-depth interviews were transcribed, where necessary translated, checked and cleaned. Coding and analysis has been undertaken using WinMax software.

Results

Social exclusion of older people in deprived areas

An initial literature review (Scharf et al, 2001) identified at least three difficulties arising from current research on social exclusion in terms of the situation of older people:

1. The focus of exclusion debates on work and employment leaves unclear the position of those who have permanently withdrawn from their occupational roles, and underplays the exclusionary impact of retirement on many older people (Phillipson, 1998).
2. Exclusion discourse tends to emphasise the dynamic nature of social exclusion (Byrne, 1999), giving rise to the impression that the boundaries of exclusion are essentially fluid rather than rigid. For older people, the experience of exclusion may be less fluid. For example, those who lack adequate material resources may be unable to escape poverty without additional financial support from the state.
3. Neighbourhood dimensions of exclusion may represent a much more important aspect of exclusion for older people than for other age groups. On the one hand, older people tend to spend more time than younger people in their immediate neighbourhood. On the other, many older people have spent a substantial period of their lives in a particular neighbourhood, deriving a strong sense of emotional investment both in their home and in the surrounding community (Phillipson et al, 2000). Rowles (1978, p. 200) suggests that a ‘selective intensification of feelings about spaces’ might represent ‘a universal strategy employed by older people to facilitate
maintaining a sense of identity within a changing environment’.

Awareness of these limitations informed the operationalisation of an approach to measure social exclusion amongst older people in deprived areas. The approach displays overlaps with those of Burchardt et al. (1999) and Gordon et al. (2000). However, in its detail it seeks to accommodate factors judged particularly relevant to the circumstances of older people. Social exclusion is conceived as encompassing five dimensions:

- exclusion from material resources;
- exclusion from social relations;
- exclusion from civic activities;
- exclusion from basic services; and
- neighbourhood exclusion.

Each dimension has multiple components, but for ease of analysis is summarised in a single composite indicator.

**Exclusion from material resources**
The research examined the material dimension of social exclusion through measures of deprivation and poverty.

In relation to deprivation, the research built on the work of Evandrou (2000), whose ‘index of multiple deprivation’ comprises seven items considered especially important to older people (for example central heating, use of a telephone, access to a car) (Appendix Two). The measure categorises people according to the degree of deprivation faced, ranging from no deprivation (where a person is not disadvantaged on any of the seven characteristics) to high deprivation (disadvantaged on at least five characteristics).

The research found high levels of deprivation among respondents (Table 1). The majority were classed as experiencing medium levels of deprivation, being disadvantaged on either three or four of the seven characteristics. Deprivation was especially pronounced for 3 per cent of respondents who fell into the category of high deprivation. Just 3 per cent were not disadvantaged on any of the characteristics, while 37 per cent experienced low levels of deprivation. Disadvantage was spread unevenly across the sample, with a heightened risk of multiple deprivation faced by older women, respondents aged 75 and over, those living alone, and older Pakistani and Somali people.

Comparison of these findings with General Household Survey data reported by Evandrou (2000) suggests that older people in deprived communities experience a disproportionate and intense degree of multiple deprivation. In Evandrou’s study, the bulk of white respondents were clustered towards the lower end of the deprivation spectrum. The research reported here reverses this, with almost three-fifths disadvantaged on at least three deprivation characteristics.

In relation to poverty, the research followed Gordon et al. (2000) by identifying as poor those respondents who said they were unable to afford what the majority of
British people view as basic necessities. The research drew on the results of a national survey of the adult population, which highlighted items and social activities regarded by 50 per cent or more of people as being necessities of daily living (Gordon et al, 2000). Respondents in this study were presented with a similar list of 26 ‘socially perceived necessities’. They were asked to identify items that they didn’t have or activities that they didn’t do, and to state whether they lacked the items because they didn’t want them or couldn’t afford them. As in the national survey, people lacking two or more items because they couldn’t afford them were judged to be in poverty.

This research found 45 per cent of respondents to be living in poverty (Table 2). Forty per cent lacked none of the 26 items on the list of necessities for reasons of affordability, while a further 15 per cent lacked just one item. Some older people lacked and could not afford a substantial number of necessities, suggesting an intense degree of poverty. Seven per cent of respondents were unable to afford and were going without 11 or more of the items on the list. Taking only the 19 material items from the list of necessities, and adopting the same poverty threshold (lacking two or more items on the grounds of affordability), identifies 41 per cent of people as living in material poverty (Table 3).

The experience of poverty varied significantly according to respondents’ ethnic background. Older people of Indian origin and those describing themselves as white were least likely to be in poverty. But for older people of Black Caribbean, Pakistani or Somali origin, poverty was particularly pronounced. More than three-quarters of older Somali people (77%) and two-thirds of older Pakistani people (67%) were in poverty.

Adopting the same poverty threshold, the national survey classified 21 per cent of older people as poor (Patsios, 2001). In comparison, this study found 45 per cent of older people in the three deprived areas to be in poverty. In other words, older people living in deprived areas of England appear to be at least twice as likely to experience poverty as those in Britain as a whole.

- The chosen indicator of exclusion from material resources counts as materially excluded those who are both in material poverty and experiencing medium to high levels of deprivation. This applied to 31 per cent of respondents (Table 4).

Exclusion from social relations
Indicators of social isolation, loneliness and non-participation in common social activities were chosen to reflect different forms of exclusion from informal social relations.

A social isolation measure was developed, drawing on individuals’ availability of and the frequency of contacts with family, friends and neighbours (Appendix Two). According to this measure, 44 per cent of respondents were not isolated on any of the three index items, and 36 per cent experienced isolation on just one item. The remaining one-fifth were judged to be socially isolated (isolated on two or three items) (Table 3).
Loneliness was measured using the 11-item De Jong Gierveld Loneliness Scale (de Jong Gierveld & Kamphuis, 1985). Adopting the cut-off points suggested by the scale’s authors as a measure of the intensity of loneliness (de Jong Gierveld & van Tilburg, 1999), 40 per cent of respondents were found to be not lonely (lonely on fewer than 3 of the 11 scale-items), while 44 per cent could be described as moderately lonely. Sixteen per cent of those interviewed experienced either severe or very severe loneliness (lonely on 9 or more scale-items). Comparison with other studies that have used the same measurement instrument (de Jong Gierveld & van Tilburg, 1999), and with research using different measures (Victor et al, 2000), suggests that older people in deprived areas experience a heightened risk of loneliness.

Non-participation in common social activities is an indicator derived from the poverty measure outlined above (Gordon et al, 2000: 59f.). It encompasses seven activities perceived as necessities by a majority of the adult population. Almost two-thirds of respondents (65%) were not excluded from any of these activities on the grounds of lack of affordability, and 18 per cent were excluded from just one activity. However, 17 per cent lacked and could not afford to participate in two or more common activities.

- The summary indicator of exclusion from social relations judges as excluded those who experienced medium or high levels of social isolation, were (very) severely lonely, or were unable to participate in two or more common activities on the grounds of lack of income. This applied to 41 per cent of respondents (Table 4).

Exclusion from civic activities
Two measures assessed the degree to which older people were engaged in civic activities. First, respondents were asked whether they attended religious meetings or meetings of community groups. Forty-two per cent attended religious meetings at least once a year, and 33 per cent attended meetings of community groups. However, almost half of respondents (47%) never attended either type of meeting (Table 3).

Second, respondents were presented with a list of 11 civic activities, and asked whether they had undertaken these in the previous three years. The most commonly observed activity was voting, with 68 per cent having voted in the previous general election and 66 per cent in the last local election. Seventy-six per cent of respondents had undertaken at least one type of civic activity in the stated period. The remaining 24 per cent had not participated in any of the listed activities.

- Respondents who did not participate in meetings of religious or community groups and who did not take part in any type of civic activity in the three years preceding interview were judged to be excluded from civic activities. In all, 15 per cent of older people were excluded on this indicator (Table 4).

Exclusion from basic services
Access to basic services becomes increasingly important in later life, especially for people with restricted mobility or poor health. The research sought information about
respondents’ access to and use of a range of services within and beyond the home.

In the home, while the overwhelming majority of older people had access to basic utilities (gas, electricity, water and telephone), a significant minority cut back on using these services in order to make ends meet. Respondents were asked whether in the previous five years they had used less water, gas or electricity or had used the telephone less often in order to save money. While 76 per cent had not cut back on any of the services, 14 per cent had used less of three or four basic services (Table 3).

Beyond the home, an indicator of service exclusion was derived from the non-usage in the previous year of three key services selected from a longer list of services and amenities. These were a post office, a chemist, and a bus service. Overall, 72 per cent of respondents had used all of these services at least once in the previous year and 18 per cent had used two of the services. The remaining 10 per cent had failed to use at least two of the key services.

- The 24 per cent of respondents who had used less of three or four services in the home in order to save money, or who had not used two or more key services outside the home were subsequently judged to be service excluded (Table 4).

Neighbourhood exclusion

Neighbourhood exclusion reflects the distinctive contribution of environmental factors to social exclusion, providing an indirect measure of the neighbourhood’s impact on respondents’ self-identities. The research addressed this dimension by examining individuals’ perceptions of their neighbourhoods, and their feelings of security in the neighbourhood.

In separate questions, respondents were asked whether there was anything that they liked or disliked about their neighbourhood. Just under one-fifth (18%) expressed only dislikes about the neighbourhood. Another question asked people how satisfied they were with their neighbourhood. One in ten respondents were very dissatisfied with their neighbourhood. Thirteen per cent of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement ‘this neighbourhood is a good place to grow old in’. Combining responses to these items, 10 per cent of respondents expressed very negative views about their neighbourhood on at least two of the three questions (Table 3).

The degree to which older people feel secure when leaving the home after dark provides a further indicator of neighbourhood exclusion. Those who regard their neighbourhood as unsafe or a place where they might be vulnerable to crime may be restricted in their ability to participate in important social roles. Just 7 per cent of respondents suggested that they would feel ‘very safe’ when leaving the home after dark. By contrast, 44 per cent reported that they would feel very unsafe.

- The composite indicator of neighbourhood exclusion counts as excluded those individuals who expressed negative views about the neighbourhood in relation to at least two of the three questions outlined above, and who also reported that they would feel very unsafe in their neighbourhood after dark. This applied to 21 per cent of respondents (Table 4).
The experience of multiple exclusion
This research suggests that significant numbers of older people in deprived urban areas are prone to different dimensions of social exclusion. Exclusion from social relations was the most common of the five types of exclusion identified, affecting around two-fifths of older people. Just under one-third experienced exclusion from material resources. Nearly a quarter were excluded from basic services, and just over a fifth experienced neighbourhood exclusion. Around one-in-seven were excluded from participation in civic activities.

Drawing these findings together, a considerable proportion of older people were found to experience at least one form of social exclusion. The study population divides into three categories (Table 5):

- The first group, comprising 30 per cent of respondents, were not excluded on any of the five domains.
- A second group, representing 31 per cent of the sample, experienced exclusion on a single domain.
- The final group was numerically the largest, comprising almost two-fifths of respondents (39%) who were prone to the cumulative impact of multiple forms of exclusion.

The experience of multiple exclusion was significantly linked to age and ethnicity. People aged 75 and over were more likely to be multiply excluded than those aged 60-74 years. Respondents of Indian and Black Caribbean origin were much less likely to experience exclusion than Somali and Pakistani older people. Four out of five Somali respondents (80%) and just over half of Pakistani respondents (52%) were excluded on two or more domains. By contrast, multiple exclusion did not vary significantly according to gender. In relation to geography, vulnerability to exclusion varied significantly between electoral wards. Multiple exclusion was most pronounced in Granby, where just 15 per cent of respondents were not excluded on any of the five domains, and 54 per cent were prone to at least two types of exclusion. This contrasts with Pirrie, where 52 per cent of respondents were not excluded on any domain, and 14 per cent experienced multiple exclusion.

The complex nature of social exclusion is reflected in analysis of the relationships between its constituent domains (Table 6). Of respondents who were excluded on the material dimension, 58 per cent were also excluded from social relations, 20 per cent from civic activities, and 33 per cent from basic services. Such findings underline the important role of poverty and deprivation in limiting older people’s ability to fulfil key social roles. Exclusion from social relations was further related to exclusion from basic services and neighbourhood exclusion. In this regard, there is evidence of a neighbourhood impact on individuals’ ability to engage in social roles. Older people who feel cut off from their surroundings are more likely to experience limitations in their informal relationships than those who perceive their neighbourhood more favourably. Exclusion from civic activities and neighbourhood exclusion were most likely to be independent of other forms of exclusion.
Social exclusion and quality of life
A focus of this research has been to explore interactions between social exclusion and quality of life for older people living in socially deprived urban areas. Having shown that older people in such neighbourhoods are prone to different types of exclusion, and that many are vulnerable to multiple forms of exclusion, the question arises of the degree to which this impacts upon quality of life. Elsewhere the research has shown that a close relationship exists between three widely used standard measures of quality of life, and that a single-item measure which invites respondents to assess their own quality of life can offer an effective means of measuring subjective well-being (Smith et al, 2003). Cross-tabulation of the summary social exclusion and life quality variables shows that older people who rate their quality of life as good or very good are significantly less likely to experience social exclusion than those rating their life quality as poor or very poor (Table 7). Put another way, the research suggests that the condition of social exclusion acts to reduce older people’s quality of life.

Policy implications
These findings present an important challenge to policy makers (Scharf et al, 2002). There is a need for contemporary urban and social policy to consider the position of older people in deprived areas in terms of their potential vulnerability to poverty and social exclusion. The urgent task facing policy-makers is to develop appropriate policies that take account of the multiple risks faced by older people in deprived neighbourhoods and to address their specific needs. Policies that succeed in reducing social exclusion in its different forms have the potential to enhance significantly older people’s quality of life.

Activities
The research has been presented at several international conferences, including the IAG World Congress of Gerontology (2001), annual conferences of the Gerontological Society of America (2001, 2002) and the Canadian Association on Gerontology (2002). In the UK, the research has featured at annual conferences of the British Society of Gerontology (1999 to 2002), the British Geriatrics Society (2002), the British Sociological Association (2002) and the British Psychological Society (2002). Findings arising from the research will be presented at future conferences, including the IAG European Congress of Gerontology (2003) and the British Society of Gerontology (2003).

As part of the Growing Older Programme, the research team has participated in regular Programme meetings, and engaged in related activities, including:

- Meetings of a sub-group of projects with interests in ethnicity and old age;
- Symposia at key conferences;
- Publication of short contributions in Programme Newsletters;

The research team has pursued academic collaborations. For example, data sharing and joint analysis has been discussed with researchers linked to the Rowntree Foundation’s ‘Survey of Poverty and Social Exclusion’, and the questionnaire
developed by the project has informed the work of researchers conducting a survey of pensioner poverty in Wales.

Further activities have been aimed at non-specialist research users. Initial findings have been communicated to older people who participated in the research (through a newsletter), and to organisations that have assisted the research (through briefings and newsletters). An article was published in the practitioner journal ‘Community Care’. Participation in events such as a Help the Aged ‘SeniorSafety’ conference has been accompanied by the briefing of representatives from voluntary and public sector organisations on issues arising from the research. Relevant organisations include the National Audit Office, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, National Pensioners Convention, Anchor Housing Trust, Care and Repair, and the Better Government for Older People programme. Such activities are likely to continue beyond the award period. Further dissemination to policy makers and practitioners will occur through links with Help the Aged (for example, through its ‘Age Today’ newsletters).

**Outputs**
The major output during the award period has been the publication by Help the Aged of a report summarising key features of the research (Scharf et al, 2002). In addition, the research has generated articles in peer-reviewed journals (Education and Ageing, Quality in Ageing), with further papers currently under review at the Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences, the Canadian Journal on Aging and Sociological Research Online. Other papers are planned for Ageing and Society (potential special issue on environmental aspects of ageing edited by Sheila Peace), the Journal of Social Policy, and Social Policy and Society. A book proposal is currently under review at Open University Press, a chapter is to be published in a collection edited by Chris Phillipson et al. and further chapters arising from the research will be included in books edited by Alan Walker and by Hans Werner-Wahl et al.

**Impacts**
The research has already had a variety of impacts. Collaboration with Help the Aged has ensured that research findings have reached a wide audience. In particular, the launch of the report ‘Growing Older in Socially Deprived Areas’ (Scharf et al, 2002) met with considerable media interest. The research featured on major national and regional television and radio channels, and was widely reported in the press. It also figured in Granada’s Sunday Supplement programme, with the principal award holder taking part in a live panel debate. Barbara Roche, Minister for Social Exclusion, speaking on the theme of older people and urban regeneration at Help the Aged’s Annual Lecture in 2003, highlighted the ‘invaluable’ nature of the research (Roche, 2003). The research has helped Help the Aged shape its ‘Stop Pensioner Poverty Now’ campaign, and has contributed to the organisation’s work relating to fear of crime.

Other impacts have been of a more practical nature. The research team has facilitated co-operation between community groups in the study areas and Help the Aged. Starting in Manchester and moving into Liverpool, Help the Aged are now working with the Pakistani and Somali communities to improve the living conditions of older people belonging to particularly disadvantaged minorities. This involves, for
example, the provision of direct services to reduce older people’s vulnerability to crime.

Future Research Priorities
This research has generated two major datasets. Analysis of data arising from the social survey (n=600) has been a priority during the award period. However, future analyses will increasingly draw upon data from the in-depth interviews with 130 older people. These data will be used to develop further three important aspects of the study:

• In relation to key themes such as poverty and social exclusion, in-depth interview data will be used to refine the models that have been developed from survey data. In addition, analysis of older people’s detailed accounts of daily routines and mobility patterns will address the ways in which life quality in old age is influenced by aspects of the urban environment.

• In relation to the major themes of social exclusion and quality of life, the research has identified, at times, considerable variation between geographically proximate neighbourhoods. Future analyses will explore in greater depth potential reasons for such geographic differences. This will be undertaken within the context of the proposed book with Open University Press.

• In relation to the urban environment, attention will focus on ways in which older people perceive neighbourhood change. Here the research will examine older people’s views of the impact of public policy on their residential neighbourhood.

The study also raises issues for further research, of which two may be highlighted. First, the type of analysis undertaken here could usefully be extended to other types of geographic location (such as affluent neighbourhoods or rural areas). Environmental influences on quality of life in older age appear significant and require more understanding than currently exists. Second, the study identified some groups as particularly vulnerable to forms of exclusion. In this respect, further research on older people of Somali and Pakistani origin should be prioritised.
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Appendix Two

Measurement Tools

Index of Multiple Deprivation

A person scores 1 for each of the following characteristics:
- Lives in a household without central heating
- Lives in a household without a phone
- Lives in a household without a car
- Lives in local authority or housing association rented accommodation
- Lives in a household with more than one person per room
- Lives in a household where the head of the household receives income support
- Individual has no formal qualifications

No deprivation: Score 0, not disadvantaged on any of these characteristics.
Low deprivation: Score 1-2, disadvantaged on one or two characteristics only.
Medium deprivation: Score 3-4, disadvantaged on three or four characteristics.
High deprivation: Score 5 or more, disadvantaged on at least five characteristics.

Source: Adapted from Evandrou (2000)

Index of Social Isolation

A person scores 1 for each of the following characteristics:
- Has no relatives or children OR Sees a child or other relative less than once a week
- Has no friends in neighbourhood OR Has a chat or does something with a friend less than once a week
- Has a chat or does something with a neighbour less than once a week

No isolation: Score 0, not isolated on any of these characteristics.
Low isolation: Score 1, isolated on one characteristic only.
Medium isolation: Score 2, isolated on two characteristics.
High isolation: Score 3 isolated on all three characteristics.
### Appendix Three

#### Statistical Tables

**Table 1: Experience of multiple deprivation for ‘white’ older people in deprived areas of England and in Great Britain (in %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deprived areas 2001</th>
<th>Great Britain 1991-96 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No deprivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low deprivation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium deprivation</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High deprivation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (n=416)</td>
<td>100 (n=28,080)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Evandrou (2000)

**Table 2: Comparison of poverty rates for older people in socially deprived areas and the UK as a whole (in %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents unable to afford basic necessities</th>
<th>Deprived areas 2001</th>
<th>United Kingdom 1999 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in poverty (lacking 0-1 items)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In poverty (lacking 2 or more items)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 (n=580)</td>
<td>100 (n=405)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Patsios (2001)
Table 3: Proportion of older people (aged 60 and over) excluded on different domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of social exclusion</th>
<th>Indicator of exclusion</th>
<th>% of respondents ‘socially excluded’ on indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from material resources</strong></td>
<td>In material poverty (lacks 2 or more socially perceived necessities on grounds of affordability)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple deprivation (deprived on 3 or more characteristics)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from social relations</strong></td>
<td>Social isolation (isolated on 2 or more characteristics)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loneliness (severely or very severely lonely)</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unable to participate in 2 or more common activities</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion from civic activities</strong></td>
<td>Non-participation in civic activities</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never attends meetings of religious or community organisations</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service exclusion</strong></td>
<td>Has cut back on use of at least 3 of 5 basic services</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used 2 or more of 3 key services beyond the home</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood exclusion</strong></td>
<td>Expresses negative views about the neighbourhood</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would feel very unsafe when out alone after dark</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Proportion of older people (aged 60 and over) experiencing exclusion on different domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain of social exclusion</th>
<th>Composite indicator of exclusion</th>
<th>% of respondents excluded on domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from material resources</td>
<td>In material poverty and multiply deprived</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from social relations</td>
<td>Socially isolated or (very) severely lonely or unable to participate common social activities</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from civic activities</td>
<td>Non-participation in civic activities and never attends meetings of religious or community organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service exclusion</td>
<td>Has cut back on use of basic services or has not used key services beyond the home</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood exclusion</td>
<td>Expresses negative views about the neighbourhood and feels very unsafe when out alone after dark</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Older people (aged 60 and over) experiencing multiple forms of exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not excluded</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded on one domain</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded on two or more domains</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6: The relationship between different domains of social exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% also excluded in relation to:</th>
<th>Material resources</th>
<th>Social relations</th>
<th>Civic activities</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material resources</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>43**</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relations</td>
<td>58**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58**</td>
<td>55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic activities</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>33**</td>
<td>34**</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28**</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p>0.05; ** p>0.005

### Table 7: Relationship between quality of life and the experience of multiple forms of exclusion for older people (aged 60 and over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-reported quality of life</th>
<th>Not excluded</th>
<th>Excluded on one domain</th>
<th>Excluded on two or more domains</th>
<th>(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither good nor poor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>