



**Report for the European Commission  
Directorate-General for Research  
Citizens and governance in a Knowledge-based society**

**Policy Review in the area of: Social Exclusion (poverty, social stratification) and Social Security Systems linked with pensions**

**Social Exclusion and Social Security**

**by  
Dragana Avramov<sup>1</sup>**

**2006**

---

<sup>1</sup> Population and Social Policy Consultants (PSPC)  
Maria Louizasquare 33/B2  
1000 Brussels, Belgium  
Tel./fax +32 (02)2300224  
[avramov@avramov.org](mailto:avramov@avramov.org)  
[pspc@avramov.eu](mailto:pspc@avramov.eu)  
[www.avramov.org](http://www.avramov.org)



**Contents**

**Executive Summary .....3**

**Part 1: Introduction .....10**

**1.1 Setting the stage .....10**

**1.2 Selected projects ..... 10**

**Part 2: Social exclusion: the key research questions.....12**

**2.1 Concepts.....12**

**2.2 Theoretical and methodological approaches.....14**

**2.3 Clustering of project findings .....17**

**Part 3: Social exclusion: the key findings and policy insights.....17**

**3.1 Neo-liberal economy causes unemployment and social insecurity .....17**

**3.2 National welfare regimes can counter social exclusion and  
social insecurity.....20**

**3.3. Population ageing has consequences for the labour market  
and social security.....25**

**3.4 Social exclusion is lived by people in poor neighbourhoods..... ..27**

**3.5 Targeted measures are necessary to counter social exclusion.....31**

**3.6 Obstacles and dynamics of Social Europe.....35**

**3.7 Conclusions and policy lessons learned .....39**

**Part 4: Policy directions .....42**

**4.1 The policy agenda on social exclusion and inclusion .....43**

**4.2 Policy choices and challenges for social policies.....46**

**4.3 Needs for future research .....49**

**4.4 Instead of conclusions .....51**

**SELECTED REFERENCES.....52**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### **Aims of the report**

The objective of this report is to highlight lessons learned and policy implications of the key findings from 18 selected European Union funded research projects that addressed a broad variety of phenomena associated with social exclusion, poverty, social stratification, and social security systems. The report aims to be meaningful to scholars and useful to policymakers.

We first identify the projects and the overarching research questions and ways they were addressed over time and across disciplines. In part 2 we define the key concepts in use and the theoretical and methodological approaches. In part 3 we summarise in a parsimonious way the scientific findings and policy lessons drawn from the projects as they relate to social exclusion and social security. The findings are clustered around the key findings from the 18 projects. This part 3 ends with the identification of the most pertinent policy relevant lessons from the sum of findings that are an epistemic and functional contribution for prospective policy formulation and implementation. In part 4 we outline the directions in which the European Union policies have evolved and the main issues which are on the current policy agenda, as well as methods proposed to countering social exclusion, ensure sustainability of social security systems and promote social cohesion. Finally, we match the past research findings, with policy quests, and the expected demographic future to identify needs for future research in the area of social exclusion and social security.

### **The European added value of research findings**

The most striking characteristic of the reviewed projects is their diversity - diversity in theoretical and ethical approaches, methods of analysis, topical areas, and scope in terms of universality or specificity of conclusions drawn.

Social exclusion is a notion that encapsulates deprivations experienced by the poor and those people who are at risk of poverty. In recent years research has covered problems that range from unemployment to overall social disparities in life chances; from inequalities between gender to inequities between generations; and from housing stress to homelessness and substance abuse. Research addressed disadvantages that affect a broad population base and those that concern a small minority of people. The theoretical approaches ranged from the critical analysis of the organizational principles of the entire economy to the needs assessment of individuals who find themselves excluded from the opportunities accessible to the majority of the population in countries in which they live.

Ways issues were addressed in EU funded research range from heuristic and reflexive methodology, and qualitative surveys and focus group deliberations, to the analysis of nationally representative databases that encompass several tens of thousands of respondents. Some projects pursued a multi-method research approach, others, particularly the networks, focused principally on the-state-of-the-art review of literature.



Some projects explicitly reject the use of the notion of social exclusion and refer to fragilization and precarious personal and professional trajectories, or social deviance. Others refer to the notion of social exclusion and document selected aspects of deprivations such as income poverty, low educational attainment, unemployment, and/or housing stress.

Proven methodological approaches are a guarantee of objectivity in science. This does not automatically mean that social research provides uniform answers to the research and policy relevant questions. Indeed, social sciences deal with the complex interviewing of determinants that shape the social phenomena such as poverty, deprivation, inequality, or social security and come up with diverse findings and even conflicting conclusions about the possible and desirable future developments. Among the projects reviewed we find those which argue in favour of the need to change the economic system in view to increase social security, as well as projects that argue in favour of reforms of the existing social security in view to accommodate the mainstream neo-liberal economy. Some see needs for flexibility of the labour market in view to overcome partial incompatibility between paid work and family life, others argue in favour of flexibility of labour conditions to accommodate to the globalisation processes and economic competitiveness. Social research is impregnated by policy choices made both by the researchers and by the funding agencies with respect to the questions asked (and those omitted), the framework theories, and relevance given to the specific findings within the context of the complex system of social determinants of processes and features.

There are nevertheless remarkable similarities in the forward looking conclusions and recommendations that may be drawn from the analysis of the prevailing social realities and policy choices made up to date, both at the national and the European level.

The key lessons learned that are an epistemic and functional contribution for prospective policy building to alleviate poverty and promote social inclusion and social security may be summarised as follows.

- Welfare regimes matter. They provide the framework conditions that encapsulate the legal measures and redistribution of material and non material resources. They are effective in enhancing opportunities for individuals. They are effective in alleviating inequalities between social groups, in buffering disadvantages which occur over the life-course of individuals, and in compensating for disparities between generations which result from diverse historical circumstances under which successive generations worked.
- Labour market conditions and social protection are the key complementary components of individual's experience of security. The first defines access to the job market, wage levels and flexibility for employees. The latter is the social buffer against risks associated with sickness, old age, maternity, family dynamics, unemployment, and general neediness.
- Countries with strong welfare regimes are more effective in reducing poverty levels, both among those who are in the labour market in casual and part-time jobs, and people who are excluded from the mainstream labour market due to unemployment and temporal or lasting low employability. Best performing in social security within



and outside the labour market are the Scandinavian countries. Worst labour market conditions and weak social protection affect people living in Southern countries and some new Member States.

- Integration in the mainstream labour market is of primary importance for social integration of individuals and families. Housing policies have a complementary protective function, which is of particular significance when risks of unemployment or sickness materialise.
- Public regulation of labour market conditions is needed to enhance social security and wellbeing of families. It is not the removal of job protection that can lead to better balance between work and family life in general, and gainful employment and bearing and rearing children in particular.
- The so-called process of deregulation of economy in view of globalization processes is characterized by changes in the content of regulation and by emergence of new regulatory actors rather than by absence of regulation.
- The deregulation of the labour market conditions is a sign of the shift in the focus of government policies. Weakening of the preventative commitment of states in favour of the management of social exclusion associated with unemployment and precarious employment, entails the increase of public funding to contain crime and the transfer of increasing amounts of public resources to the non-for-profit, and semi-profit social businesses and non governmental organisations working with deprived people.
- There is an association between social insecurity, increase of delinquency and personal insecurity. The focus of protection on security of property and persons without due concern for social security within and outside the labour market does not contribute to the sense of security and societal cohesion.
- Poverty, inequality and social exclusion are manifested and lived by people in their neighbourhoods. The specific local context implies that most effective ways to deal with the concentration of deprivation problems through targeted programmes and services are through local networks. Whereas local actors, together with residents are best placed to shape some of the poor conditions in a neighbourhood, the broader context proves to be of paramount importance, more particularly at the level of prevention of deprivation and urban segregation. The city economy and the national welfare policy play a pivotal role. Strong welfare state systems produce small neighbourhood differences, whereas weak systems increase the disparities between neighbourhoods.
- There are wide variations both in the extent of social exclusion across countries and in the policy regimes chosen to combat it, and there has been in recent years a policy switch from attempts to provide effective generalised protection to more focused efforts designed to identify and assist those groups most at risk. Most projects are rather critical towards this policy shift as research testifies about advantages of integrated, comprehensive social inclusion policies with a strong preventative function, rather than fragmented focused reparatory measures and services.
- Targeted measures are seen as a necessary complementary component of integrated social protection. Standard systems of social protection are not sufficient to prevent exclusion of people who are weak competitors in the labour market due to multiple and overlapping problems. People with mental health problems, deviant behaviour, or



addiction require extensive and continuous social support, housing and sheltered employment.

- The notion of risk is one of the basic ideas underpinning the new approach to poverty/exclusion/stratification analysis. Risk situations are increasing due to the greater diffusion of vulnerability factors associated with the employment crisis, changes in demography - particularly in respect of family dynamics, population ageing and immigration - and new policy trends. As a result, the domains of vulnerability - from both the viewpoint of precarious income and the fragility of social ties – are potentially a greater problem than the frequency of current exclusion would suggest.
- The number of people who experience a spell of poverty over a period of five years is twice as high as the number of poor counted in any single year. Whereas there is considerable movement into and out of poverty, chances of exiting poverty reduce for people as the duration of the poverty condition increases.
- Groups most at risk of social exclusion are immigrants and unemployed youth, especially when they are descendants of foreign born parents. One-off or short term capacity building and/or integration programmes produce only modest results.
- Political decisions taken at the European level situate the role of the European institutions in social security matters around the open method of co-ordination as means of collective learning and social monitoring. The method is a step forward towards addressing the social dimension of Europe. However, it entails risks of fragmented approach to good practice and transferability without due concern for the social context under which particular policies, measures or services appear to be effective, and can result in benchmarking standards of protection and service delivery at the lowest common denominator.
- The role of the European Union in promoting economic cohesion will entail in the future its more active role in integrating social policy dimensions because a more integrated and converging economic policy may be expected to generate similar social challenges and insecurities in the Member States.

Review of selected projects shows that there is no shortage of ideas, both general and quite specific on how to increase social security for all. The projects looked at what works and what is needed to further alleviate poverty and poverty-related deprivations. It was not within their scope to address the question about the kind of economic framework conditions that are needed to maintain high standards of social protection and to expand the existing systems to better include and protect all people. Several projects, nevertheless, refer to the political choices made in the Nordic countries to stress that adaptation of the economy to the globalization processes does not have to go hand in hand with the degradation of social protection.

### **Policy directions to be revisited**

The analysis of welfare policies shows that in many countries identifying and targeting vulnerable groups, rather than further upgrading generalised protection both within and outside the labour market, has become the key aim of social reforms associated with calls for the deregulation of economy.



This policy orientation is in sharp contrast with up to date research findings from many European comparative projects. Research of social realities of European countries at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century has extensively documented that universalistic coverage of welfare regimes with their legal regulations and income redistribution better protect people who are in employment and those who are unemployed and inactive, than regimes that operate reactively by providing social assistance only to targeted groups of excluded people.

There is considerable research evidence from European comparative research that prevention of exclusion is less costly for the public than social assistance and care that is provided once deprivations take their toll on peoples' health and living circumstances. However, research also confirms that general social protection policies for preventing poverty and social exclusion are not sufficient, as is shown by the actual existence of extreme forms of exclusion even in the most generous welfare regimes. Certain people or social groups fall through the safety nets of generalised protection, or are not even taken into consideration for social protection, and consequently targeted measures prove to be necessary. These however, in order to be effective need to be complementary to rather than a replacement of strong welfare protection of all citizens.

Targeting assistance in itself is becoming increasingly ephemeral due to the fast changing features of vulnerabilization. Research documents the frequent re-combination of factors leading to the social disadvantage of individuals and certain social groups. Being unemployed, non-national, in bad health, having poor education and qualification, living in single-parent or large family, or in one-income household especially at very young or very old age, are typical risks which vary between countries according to the degree of risk and between various vulnerable groups according to the combination of risk factors. Groups at risk of social exclusion and those excluded are not homogeneous groups and meeting their needs requires diversified strategies, policies, and often client-tailored measures and services. The new social actors, in particular social businesses in the semi- or non-for-profit sectors, are continuously finding new clients and in a competitive market are urged to give proof that they are accommodating their clients' needs at better value for money than other service providers.

The social dimension of Europe builds in the 2000s around the open method of co-ordination which involves agreement by governments on common objectives and a monitoring procedure to progressively develop a framework for analysis and action. Alleviation of poverty and prevention of the social exclusion of vulnerable groups of individuals continue to be key policy objectives at the EU level. However, there is general acknowledgement that the attainment of these objectives is hindered by sluggish economic and employment growth and the growing number of people above the age of 55 who are no longer active in the labour market and draw heavily on replacement income and pensions.

### **Needs for future research on social (in)security in ageing societies**

An opinion seems to prevail among policy makers that much is already known about features and underlying causes of poverty and social exclusion at the national level and



that the focus needs to move from description and analysis to the specific problem solving.

- Research is expected to answer how the existing and proposed policies, programmes and services are or may be expected to be effective and efficient - effective in terms of achievement of the identified goals, and efficient in terms of the best quality/price relationship. This requires continuous monitoring and evaluation of inputs, outputs and outcomes as they affect socially excluded people.

Expectations of the open method of co-ordination and National Action Plans (NAP) against poverty and social exclusion regarding research relate to the quest for answers to the questions:

- How to make the process of social inclusion more effective, how to implement and identify practices that work, and how to mobilise all social actors. The impact analysis at the strategy level, programme level and action level are expected to address issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, usefulness, transferability and European added value in terms of learning, transfer of knowledge and social action.

The research community recognises that NAPs are useful tools for selected policy streamlining but they are too limited in scope. The Joint Report on Social Inclusion leaves aside the questions of the normative basis and modes of operation of the global systems of the structural policies and of the national institutions of social protection.

- The analysis of the shortcomings of the global socio-economic system, and shifts in the orientation of state intervention regarding labour market conditions, social protection and prevention of poverty, social exclusion and excessive social disparities, remain the core of social research.

Despite the fact that the policy discourse seems to give preference to the study of specific practices, services and partnerships that work in their current context:

- The analysis of how national social protection systems are organised and the impact systems have on social cohesion and the feeling of security of all citizens inherently remain central to social research.

The research agenda on pensions in ageing societies, as set by the mainstream policies is mainly focused on issues of funding and reforming the pension schemes. Reforms are expected to ensure sustainability of the social security systems but also adequacy of pensions in order to prevent poverty and social exclusion after retirement.

- In a broader research framework the question of what income people have, how healthy and active they are, and how they live at high age are linked to the analysis of the life-course chances and choices and a broad spectra of public policies that address the labour market, life-long learning, family-friendly policies, retirement, health care, social benefits, long-term care, housing and environment, gender issues, and policies for the empowerment and a more general social role for the elderly.

Recently there has been an upsurge in awareness among policy makers of the importance of demography, and in particular family dynamics and population ageing, for the economy, social security, and changing facets of social vulnerability.

- The impact of disruptive employment histories and family dissolution, on life chances in various stages of the life course, and at high age in particular, open a multitude of research questions related to social security and insecurity.
- Population ageing will continue with accelerating pace in the next decades and a growing number of people, especially women at higher age will spend an increasing



number of years living alone. Both trends will require some considerable research on societal adaptations regarding work, family life and social protection and care provisions in a life-course perspective.

- The increase in proportions and numbers of elderly people and the decrease in size of both the youth and the working age populations are relevant for the scope of state intervention measured in terms of population coverage, and for the adaptations in balancing the state commitment between large numbers of socio-economic and social protection functions.

Population ageing is determined by dejuvenation due to persistent low fertility and greying due to increasing longevity. Fertility levels are below generational replacement throughout the Union. They are, however, generally higher in advanced welfare regimes than in countries with weak protection of working parents and mothers in particular. The number of desired children is currently higher than the number of children women have in almost all low fertility countries.

- What both women and men need and expect from the state in order to realize the family size they desire are questions that need to be addressed in research and policy deliberations. Awareness and experience of the high financial and opportunity costs of children are associated at the individual level with deprivation, dissatisfaction and sense of insecurity of individuals and families. Non-realization of desired family size is associated at the societal level with very low fertility levels and related acceleration of population ageing.
- Demographic implications of risks associated with insecurity and social exclusion with respect to family dynamics and gender relations within family and broader society, and migration and integration of migrants, are research domains increasingly relevant for social inclusion and intergenerational equity and solidarity.

There is ample research evidence that states have up to date managed rather badly immigration and integration of legal immigrants.

- Needs for integration of immigrants in the mainstream labour market and society at large, as well as social security of migrants who themselves age in an ageing environment is a large research field of policy relevance.

Combining needs for research stemming from policy priorities set at the European level by the Member States and needs for basic research is both a challenge and a research topic in its own right.

- There is need for the development of comparative research methodologies in view of overcoming limitations embedded in national research traditions regarding theoretical frameworks, use of notions and concepts of poverty, social exclusion and social stratification, and institutional research settings.
- Last but not least good data are an essential tool for analysing and understanding social phenomena and a prerequisite for informed policy choices. Cross sectional data provide much information on the current situation of people and data on stocks are useful to policy makers for setting up or adapting policies and services. Longitudinal data are essential for monitoring changes experienced by individuals over time in view to capture personal histories and the dynamic social and historical context which impinges on the well-being of people in their life-course.



## Part 1: Introduction

### 1.1 Setting the stage

The objective of this report is to highlight lessons learned and policy implications of the key findings from selected European Union funded research projects that addressed a broad variety of phenomena associated with social exclusion, poverty, social stratification, and social security systems. The 18 projects from which main findings and policy insight are drawn have been selected by the European Commission to illustrate the significance of the spectre of research issues addressed over the past ten years or so.

This report aims to be meaningful to scholars and useful to policymakers. We first identify the projects and the overarching research questions and ways they were addressed over time and across disciplines. In part 2 we define the key concepts in use and the theoretical and methodological approaches. In part 3 we summarise in a parsimonious way the scientific findings and policy lessons drawn from the projects as they relate to social exclusion and social security. The findings are clustered around the key findings from the 18 projects. This part 3 ends with the identification of the most pertinent policy relevant lessons from the sum of findings that are an epistemic and functional contribution for prospective policy formulation and implementation. In part 4 we outline the directions in which the European Union policies have evolved and the main issues which are on the current policy agenda, as well as methods proposed to countering social exclusion, ensure sustainability of social security systems and promote social cohesion. Finally, we match the past research findings, with policy quests, and the expected demographic future to identify needs for future research in the area of social exclusion and social security.

### 1.2 Selected projects

The 18 projects selected for policy review were launched between 1998 and 2001 under the themes social exclusion and social integration of the **Targeted socio-economic research** (TSER); and, social cohesion, migration and welfare, societal trends and structural changes, and employment and changes in work of the **Key action Improving the socio-economic knowledge base**.

The project titles presented in the chronological order in which they were launched, are:

- *Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU*
- *Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion*
- *New forms of public management of deviance in Europe*
- *Between integration and exclusion: A comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context*
- *Income maintenance and earnings situation: a comparative bottom up European study*
- *The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration*



- *European network to develop policy relevant models and socio-economic analyses of drug use, consequences and interventions*
- *Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU*
- *European network of economic policy research institutes*
- *Between work and welfare: improving return to work strategies for long term absent employees*
- *Public participation and the pension policy process: the citizen and pension reform*
- *Households, work and flexibility*
- *The dynamics of social change in Europe*
- *The housing dimension of welfare reform*
- *The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe,*
- *Social innovation, governance and community building*
- *Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration*
- *Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection : social cohesion under challenge of globalization and new information and communication technologies*

Typically research project reviewed under this report focused on the analysis of: youth unemployment, enterprise education for youngsters, social deviance, deprived neighbourhoods and neighbourhood governance, beneficiaries of welfare and low paid workers, drug misuse, the future role of the European Union in combating social exclusion, economic policy, long term absent employees, pension reforms, local innovative development, housing, work and household balance, and challenges of globalization for social cohesion.

In view of the central theme of this policy review, namely social exclusion, poverty and social stratification, we drew on the findings and policy implications of individual projects from the perspective of their contribution to the social inclusion and social security discourse. Most projects conceptualized their research for this specific policy area. Several projects, however, addressed a broader range of research domains and questions, some of which are not central for the social exclusion and thus have not been dwelled upon in this review.

The two instruments, research projects and networks, have different aims and methods of work. Whereas projects as a rule aim to go beyond the desk review of the-state-of-the-art literature and use of existing statistics, networks aim at bringing researchers together to reflect on topical issues and available data, and possibly lay grounds for future common research projects.

Methods of research in reviewed project vary from heuristic approach and reflexive methodology, to the analysis of statistically representative data pertaining to tens of thousands of respondents collated by international organizations, and national statistics encompassing the entire population, or large population sub-groups. New data sources range from those collated through semi-structured interviews encompassing several hundred respondents to narratives of few selected individuals. Methods of networking are



workshops and conferences at which solicited state-of-the-art topical papers are presented and discussed.

Whereas aim and methods differ, both project and networks identify issues that need to be brought to the policy fore or be better addressed by the policy makers, and further researched.

## **Part 2: Social exclusion: the key research question**

### **2.1 Concepts**

Social exclusion is a notion that encapsulates deprivations experienced by the poor and those people who are at risk of poverty. Whereas there is a long-standing tradition of poverty research that relates to inadequate material and non-material resources available to an individual, since the early 1990s social research has moved beyond the analysis focused primarily on distributional aspects of deprivation and now includes relational aspects such as inadequate social participation, lack of social integration and lack of power. Much attention is given to the study of excessive disparities in life chances of individuals and social groups. In recent years EU funded research on social exclusion has addressed problems that range from unemployment to overall social disparities; from inequalities between gender to inequities between generations; and from homelessness to substance abuse. Research addressed disadvantages that affect a broad population base and those that concern a small minority of people. The theoretical approaches ranged from the critical analysis of the organizational principles of the entire economy to the needs assessment of individuals who find themselves excluded from the opportunities accessible to the majority of the population in countries in which they live.

Research on social exclusion and social security has been by default social policy oriented, be it via the theoretical framework underpinning research hypotheses or the explicit research aims to produce knowledge-based recommendations on how to make things better for specific population groups.

Concepts, prevalence and incidence are the core research questions addressed by researchers. They allow identifying what the problem is, how big it is and what is the dynamics of exclusion associated with various, as a rule overlapping deprivations. Research undertaken up to date on social exclusion and social (in)security may be clustered along three main axes: conceptual analysis, contextual analysis, and applied topical research.

The focused on concepts and notions associated with deprivations and insecurity gained centrality in several EU funded projects and became more than a standard part of the early research phases in any project. The quest for clarity of notions in use was associated with doubts about the usefulness of the ‘consequentialist’ approach that was gaining ground at the EU level in dealing with social problems. How can we rationally deduce that social exclusion results from specific causes when the term in use means different



things to different stakeholders? In an international context what are we measuring, comparing, mainstreaming, and identifying as good and transferable practice if there is no clarity on what exactly we are talking about?

This quest for clarity followed the conceptual confusion about what policy makers and different stakeholders were talking about in the mid-1990s when they referred to social exclusion. Notions of social exclusion, exclusion from employment, poverty, precariousness, excessive social disparities, social vulnerability, marginalisation, social deviance - just to name some of the most frequently used terms - appeared in many policy documents that proposed to combat various forms of deprivations as interchangeable notions. In international comparative research it also appeared that the conceptualization of social exclusion was both culture-rooted and steered by temporal fluctuations in the mainstream research policy climate in various countries. There was much concern in the research community over the measurement and comparison of phenomena that may in reality be un-comparable.

Critical focus on concepts and production of glossaries was particularly developed in projects: *“New forms of public management of deviance in Europe”*, *“Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU”*, and *“Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection: social protection challenged by globalization and new information and communication technologies”*. The project *“New forms of public management of deviance in Europe”* rejects one-fit-all definition of social exclusion and pursues country-specific conceptualizations of social deviance. The project that looked at *“Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU”* also concluded that there are marked differences between countries in the way social exclusion is perceived, its incidence measured, and ways in which it affects various social groups. The project addressed social exclusion as a multidimensional process of deprivation, associated with a progressive dissociation from social networks, resulting in the isolation of individuals and groups from the mainstream of opportunities that society has to offer. The project *“Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU”* built its research agenda around the notion of precariousness, rather than exclusion, in view to capture the process of fragilization and precarious personal and professional trajectories.

In the 2000s the notion in frequent use in policy deliberations and legislation is that of social cohesion. The same perplexities regarding what exactly are we promoting when we cannot agree on what social cohesion is are often brought to the fore in research. Is social cohesion understood as harmony, or unstable balance between different power groups? Is it sense of belonging? Is it social solidarity expressed through sharing of costs of public measures, services and policies, or lack of social conflict and violence in the streets? For the *“Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection: social protection challenged by globalization and new information and communication technologies”* social cohesion symbolically stands for unity in nation states. The researchers worked with the concept of social cohesion as an unstable balance between different forces and actors within any single state. The key actors are identified as trade



unions, employers, professional associations, and the state. Researchers gathered under the project “*The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe*” could not come to an agreement what social cohesion is. The consortium agreed to shift the focus from the study of processes that underpin social cohesion towards the analysis of processes which undermine it. They agreed that poverty, inequality and demographic changes undermine social cohesion.

The notions of social exclusion and social cohesion are often considered by researchers as part of the political constructs which lack a clear definition and are thus adaptable to a variety of situations and are measured by indicators which mean different things in different cultural contexts. However, the syntheses of concepts used in the 18 EU funded projects on social exclusion and social security, and the broader body of knowledge generated over the past decade, allows us to formulate the following research-based definitions.

*Social exclusion* is a condition of deprivation that is manifested through the generalised disadvantages facing individuals and social groups due to the accumulation of social handicaps. It is experienced by people as the overlapping of objective deprivation associated with income poverty, with subjective dissatisfaction with their life chances due to a lack of means and limited access or poor participation in several of the most important domains of human activity: education, work, family and informal networks, the consumption of goods and services, communication, community and general public institutions, political life, leisure and recreation. Exclusion is, as a rule, associated with social stigmatisation, an element of blame and isolation, which translate into low self-esteem, the feeling of not belonging and not having been given a chance to be part of society.

*Social cohesion* relates to the social ties established through economic, cultural, political and civil institutions, and organisations and family and informal networks. Access to resources accessible to the majority of the population, the opportunity and ability to make use of public institutions, and family and informal networks are the pillars of social cohesion in contemporary society. The erosion of one or more of these pillars - due to insufficient material and non-material means available to individuals or social groups, social barriers which prevent particular population sub-groups from accessing employment or other activities, legal or administrative obstacles to access to welfare benefits and social institutions for care and support in situations of vulnerability are all factors associated with deprivation of individuals and groups, and have shown to undermine social cohesion.

## **2.2. Theoretical and methodological approaches**

The projects reviewed in this report can tentatively be grouped around the breath of the scope of the research questions which were addressed. There are three main research paradigms that reflect three points of view: projects that addressed system flaws both from the perspective of the labour market conditions and social protection systems; project that mapped social problems and countries according to their performance in



dealing with them; and topical projects that addressed specific social groups or age-groups at risk of deprivation.

The reviewed projects on social exclusion and social security carried out between the mid-1990s when social exclusion came to the research and policy fore and the mid-2000s indicate that there has been a general shift from what is generally referred to in research as the Kantian deontological approach of categorical imperative which aims at maintaining a horizon of universality, to more emphasis on utilitarianism and focused specific problem-solving.

The approach of categorical imperative is pursued in projects that addressed social deviance, youth unemployment, and crisis of social cohesion through the critical analysis of the mainstream economic systems and related public policy choices. These projects identified system flaws as causes for deprivations and cautioned against false comparison at the international level of social phenomena that are non-comparable. They delivered glossaries or definitions of the key concepts used in a variety of national settings in which economic convergence is occurring. The projects that addressed innovative development in governance and the future role of the EU through a critical assessment of its past achievements and limitations also follow the path of universality. In the EU funded research the analysis of system flaws was frequently linked to the macro level approach and the examination of the economic, social and historical contexts under which the neo-liberal economy was gaining grounds and interweaving with social policy adaptations and reforms in the 1990s. Critical theory approaches were particularly pursued in the research projects that dealt with: *“New forms of public management of deviance in Europe”*, *“Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU”*, *“Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection : social cohesion challenged by the globalization and new information and communication technologies”*, *“Social innovation, governance and community building”*, *“The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe”*, and *“Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU”*.

Mapping of social problems resulted in the identification of the spatial dimension of social exclusion. Issues addressed are the urban and neighbourhood contexts of deprivations, economic policy regarding labour market, enlargement and migration, and population ageing, flexibility of working conditions and household chores, welfare and very low paid work, and the housing dimension of welfare reforms. The focus on the contextual analysis aimed to contribute to the understanding of the historical and social circumstances under which social issues are perceived as social problems and ways they are dealt with in social practices of different Member States. Central are similarities and differences, patterning of countries, and mapping of performance. This approach was characteristic for projects such as: *“The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration”*, *“Between integration and exclusion: a comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context”*, *“Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration”*, *“European network of economic policy research institutes”*, *“The dynamics of social change in Europe”*, *“Households, work and*



*flexibility*”, “*Income maintenance and earnings situation: a comparative bottom up European study*”, and “*The housing dimension of welfare reform*”. Two approaches may be distinguished in these research agendas: the critical system analysis and social and behavioural studies. In the first approach the historical embedding of institutions and capacity for adaptation and reform is studied in the cross-national perspective under the critical assessment of the overarching impact of the economy and globalization process. In the latter the focus is on the role of the group context on actions and attitudes of individuals and the comparable assessment of performance, or the so-called social monitoring.

Projects that primarily looked at how to make things better for specific groups at risk of social exclusion produced propositions that concern teenagers and enterprise education, long-term absent employees, citizens’ deliberations about pension reforms, and drug misuse. The applied topical research aimed to understand and meet specific social and policy demands, and propose how to make things better for specific vulnerable groups. Utilitarian-driven this paradigm builds around notions of usefulness, effectiveness and efficiency of specific policies, measures and services. Involvement of lay people in research as contributing stakeholders, and in particular dialog with people affected by specific deprivations is part of the utilitarian ethics and methods of applied policy-driven research. Identification of good practice and transferable lessons are the central policy oriented research paradigm. Applied topical approach is characteristic for projects such as: “*Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion*”, “*Between work and welfare: improving return to work strategies for long term absent employees*”, “*Public participation and the pension policy process: the citizen and pension reform*” and “*European network to develop policy relevant models and socio-economic analyses of drug use, consequences and interventions*”.

Obviously there is some overlapping in problem identification and research issues between projects that focused on framework causes of exclusion and system-rooted limitations to amelioration, those that focused principally on the mapping of issues and countries, and those that addressed specific target groups. By way of example, the critical analysis of the neo-liberal economy builds on the example of youth unemployment. The housing dimension of welfare reforms deals also with needs of homeless people - but this is not its primary focus. The project on drug use addressed also the cost-effectiveness for society at large, and not only for injecting drug users, of interventions to contain hepatitis B and C and HIV.

The choice of theoretical approach is closely linked to the choice of the key tools and methods of analysis. By way of example the methodology of the project “*New forms of public management of deviance in Europe*” pursues the heuristic approach sensitive to different social and national historical contexts. It builds on the ethnographic field study in the four countries (France, Belgium, Germany, and Greece) about the social regulation of youth precariousness. Each research team chose their own country specific problem to be addressed, the target population they identified as deviant, and their own theoretical approach to analyse the selected problem. Reflexive comparative methodology was applied for the definition of notions, concepts, tools of analysis, and the elaboration of a



glossary. A project that focused on mapping countries regarding work and family life balance “*Households, work and flexibility*” carried out a comparative survey in 8 countries (the UK, the Netherlands, Sweden, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania). The framework conditions in different countries were described via selected contextual data but the project focused primarily on compiling and analysing an international comparable database with information on some 10000 respondents aged between 18 and 65. The project entitled “*Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion*” looked at what young people aged between 14 and 19 actually get out of a specific enterprise education programme, namely the ‘Think Industry’ model that was tested in 11 location sites in 3 countries (the United Kingdom, Hungary and Israel).

## **2.3. Clustering of project findings**

Due to the broad variety of issues addressed in EU funded research under the umbrella topics of social exclusion and social security it is not feasible to cluster projects in view of a syntheses according to the similarity of topical areas of research such as poverty, unemployment, employment insecurity, gender inequity, housing stress, or target groups such as youth, elderly, women, immigrants, low-skilled, mentally challenged, alcohol and drug addicts, or homeless. It is not possible to cluster projects along a scale or measurable thresholds of deprivation such as at risk, excluded, very excluded, as it is frequently done for income poverty measurements.

The projects reviewed in this report can tentatively be grouped around the breath of the scope of the research findings that stem from the different ways research questions were asked. They encapsulate forward looking approaches of projects from which either the implicit policy lessons may be drawn and/or the research-based recommendations explicitly formulated by the researchers in view to advise policy makers.

## **Part 3: Social exclusion: the key findings and policy insights**

### **3.1 Neo-liberal economy causes unemployment and social insecurity**

#### **3.1.1. Main findings**

Social insecurity in Europe is determined by the neo-liberal economy which inherently causes unemployment and precariousness of employment. Findings from three project that addressed different facets of social exclusion associated with unemployment and precarious jobs, namely “*New forms of public management of deviance in Europe*”, “*Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU*”, and “*Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection: social protection challenged by globalization and new information and communication technologies*” allow to draw the general conclusion that under the prevailing economic model policies to address unemployment, precarious employment and quasi-employment are partial remedies to structurally induced social vulnerability.



The project that dealt with the public management of deviance in Europe shows that there has been a shift of state intervention from social protection and prevention of small delinquency to surveillance and repression. The general conclusion drawn from research is that the states' focus on penal policies is not a response to a real problem but a symbolic political act. The underlying causes for the shift towards penal management of deviant behaviour are the economic competition between sub-regions, the political competition for voters, and the media exploitation of different and non-related dramatic events in a society that reinforce the feeling of insecurity. Political, juridical, socio-pedagogic and police strategies are generally used as a screen to cover up the shortcomings of the global system.

Palliative measures are set in place to buffer social precariousness caused by structural unemployment. The unemployed are increasingly depicted as unemployable while young adults are frequently pushed into quasi-employment. Disengagement of the state institutions in the management of poverty is characterised by the transfer of responsibilities and public resources to the new social actors: NGOs, non-for-profit organisations, and the emerging lucrative private social service sector. All these stakeholders are providing social services, on the one hand, and reproducing clients, on the other hand. While the overall allocation of resources for social management of poverty is decreasing, more public funding is fuelled into maintaining public order.

The social work is pervaded by the quest for the maintenance of public order. New actors of public security, the police, the judiciary and the social services, are pushed towards dysfunctional partnerships. New employees are recruited among the long-term unemployed and those on benefits, and whilst being themselves in precarious employment, they are expected to monitor, control and report to the authorities deviant behaviour of those who are unemployed.

*“Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU”* also finds that geo-political and temporal differences in the slowing down of economic growth, increase of inequalities and employment precariousness, form the basis of the historical progression of the indicators of social pathologies.

The project finds that the European employment strategy is inadequate because it combats social exclusion and precariousness with the means of the neo-liberal economic policy and instruments of the modern management methods. This strategy is considered to have the potentiality to substantially contribute to de-politicize the political. The new turn is seen as the devaluation of the classical political discourse. The European employment strategy is characterised by increased pressures to lower the social spending and to increase the flexibilization of the labour market. This is resulting in an increasing precariousness of the living and working conditions of an ever increasing proportion of the European work force and in an accelerated vulnerabilization of the least favoured social groups. It is argued that under the disguise of a transnational employment strategy, the social-liberal European state contributes to the production of social problems that it



pretends to resolve. The authors conclude that the European employment strategy does not seek to combat significantly youth precariousness, but rather to favour flexibilization of the labour market in which young people are pushed to accept the conditions of access to a strongly deregulated job market. The contours of a hybrid European welfare culture are emerging. The seemingly paradoxical label ‘social-liberal’ appears fitting as traditional elements of socio-political inclusion are mixed with elements of a neo-liberal radicalisation of a market society and penalisation of precariousness under the pretext of ensuring public security.

The key findings of the *Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection: social protection challenged by globalization and new information and communication technologies* may be summarized as follows. In the European Union countries, in candidate countries and in China there has been growing diversification of employment statuses and increase of those types of employment that give less and less protection to the employees. There is an association between social insecurity, increase of delinquency and personal insecurity. The so-called process of deregulation of economy is characterized by changes in the content of regulation rather than by absence of regulation. Since no market can function without regulations new centres of power are taking over competences of states. World Trade Organization is given as illustration of this transformation which is characterized by lack of transparency and democracy.

Three dimensions of general convergence at the national level are observed. Firstly, there are changes with respect to roles and responsibilities of different actors, namely governments (public authorities), enterprises and employees. Over past 20 years a balance with respect to risks and responsibilities of each of the three actors has been eroding. Secondly, there is a decline in security guaranteed to employees, both within and outside the labour market. This is associated with more or less implicit renunciation of public authorities to fight against niches in the labour market where there is no protection or poor protection, and there is even involvement of the state in creating such spaces. Thirdly, there is a trend to reduce social security to politics of security characterized by the limitation of the role of the state to the protection of property and personal security. The general conclusion is that there has been a decline in responsibility of the state and employers at the detriment of employees which in many instances results in increasing difficulty of workers to draw material security from their work.

### 3.1.2 The policy insights

The three projects are a sharp critique of a runaway globalization, and the ongoing changes in the organization of public policies and social programmes. Neo-liberal economy is identified as the cause of unemployment, insecurity of the employed and new forms of poverty. The policy lessons imply that the normative basis of the system needs to be changed. The key policy propositions that stems from these projects are that the organizing principles of the economy and the labour market policies should be first to be revisited. Insecurity of jobs and poor quality of jobs are central issues to be tackled. Particular policy concern should be given to migrants who are more often than others working in non regulated niches of the labour market.



The apparent disengagement of the state that delegates much of the social protection against poverty and social exclusion to the new social actors should be seen as a transformation and not as the weakening of the state functions. The state is actually becoming more and more involved in the penal management of deviant behaviour. This policy shift and the practice of zero tolerance need to be critically reviewed in terms of their rationale, effectiveness and value for money. The competition between social actors, which is both ideological and economic in nature because they are competing between each other for the specific segments of the market, is resulting in the perpetuation of the culture of 'clientilism' that needs to be disbanded.

Deregulation of economy is not associated with less regulation but rather with changes in types of regulations. These need to be transparent. The delegation of competences of the state to other actors, whether it takes the form of privatization or empowerment of employers and transnational organizations in regulatory matters, stems from the political choices and governmental decisions. There is need for transparency and legitimization of transnational institutions which are ever more in charge of regulation of the markets. Emergence of regulatory powers which appear to operate independently from the state can create feelings of frustration, disempowerment, and helplessness which all undermine democratic institutions and by default threaten social cohesion.

There is need to set limits to deregulation both with respect to economy and social matters. Experience of Nordic countries shows that the degradation of social protection is not inevitable – consequently there are margins within which governments can operate within each state to counter real or hypothetical challenges of globalization and to preserve and reinforce social cohesion.

## **3.2. National welfare regimes can counter social exclusion and social insecurity**

### **3.2.1 Main findings**

Welfare regime refers to a system of public regulation that aims at assuring the well being of individuals and securing social cohesion by preventing or buffering excessive social disparities in life chances. By means of legal measures and the redistribution of resources, different welfare regimes provide different levels of public assistance to individual over the life course, and ensure solidarity between social groups and between generations. The significant differences between countries with regard to key indicators on income inequality, income poverty, working conditions and housing integration and their close association with the differences across welfare systems, suggest that welfare regimes are very important. Several projects assessed the role of welfare regimes as an explanation for the distribution of life chances of people. The general finding is that welfare regimes impact both on the occurrence and prevalence of deprivation in a country, and on chances individuals have for exiting the conditions of social exclusion.



The project “*The dynamics of social change in Europe*” finds a causal link between social policy of a country and the well-being and patterns of behaviour of people. The activities of the state as regulator and provider impinge: on economic activity through fiscal regulations and monetary policy; on family through legal norms pertaining to marriage and divorce; on employment and earnings through regulations of working conditions, job security, and minimum wage; on the distribution of income through taxes and social security benefits; and direct effect on living standards through provision of free or subsidized cultural, educational, medical and other services. In terms of poverty and inequality the Scandinavian redistributive tax and benefit systems produces less inequality, lower levels of poverty and deprivation, compared to countries where redistribution is not a primary objective in social policy matters as is the case in the liberal (UK and Ireland) and residual welfare regimes (Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece). The effect of the social policy emerges even more strongly when longitudinal data are analysed for multiple short spells, or single longer spells, of poverty. Poverty (measured as a household income which is less than 60 percent of the national median) is experienced by up to twice as many people over a five year period than in any single year. Whereas transitions into and out of poverty are significant in terms of numbers of people affected there appears to be a polarization between the persistently poor and the never poor. Namely, those who were poor in one year had a much higher risk of being poor in subsequent years. This polarization is less frequent in social-democratic and employment-centred corporalist regimes which are more effective in reducing the duration and the impact of persistent poverty on people’s lives than the liberal and residual regimes.

The project “*Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU*” finds that individuals at risk of social exclusion are best protected in Scandinavian countries or the Netherlands, while they are worst off in the Southern European countries. When common profiling criteria are used to identify people at risk of social exclusion, immigrants form the group that is underserved by all welfare systems. The unifying theme in varied reform efforts is oriented mainly towards new employment norms and is captured in the expression ‘*flexicurity*’. The term relates to the mutually reinforcing relationship between flexibilization of the employment and the protection afforded by safeguarding social security. This project tentatively concludes that the Nordic regime manages to promote both flexibility of employment relations and social security, the Anglo-Saxon regime is weak on the social security part, and the Central European does not perform particularly well as regards flexibility, whereas the traditional regime prevalent in Southern Europe delivers the worst combination.

“*Households, work and flexibility*” analysed the kinds of regulations and policies governing flexible work; patterns of work and household behaviour; and the impact of different patterns of work upon household organization; variations between and within countries according to gender, generation, socio-economic status and work cultures and values, and compares the impact of changing working patterns in Western and Eastern Europe. The meaning and the take up of flexibility varies across countries as national policies encourage and control flexibility and security. In some countries (Sweden and the Netherlands) there is an attempt to promote flexibility of hours without having



precarious jobs. In Sweden both men and women are more likely to work full time and to resort to flexibility as temporal choice over various stages in life. In the Netherlands part time work is more gendered as this form of management of flexibility affects large numbers of women. In the UK men, especially fathers, work very long hours and women are more likely to work part time albeit in precarious or casual jobs without contracts. In the Czech Republic there has been an upsurge in self-employment, in Hungary high numbers of people have irregular working schedule and in Slovenia there is a high incidence of the combination of different kinds of flexibility. In Bulgaria disappearance of large numbers of regular jobs was associated with widespread practice of precarious employment, and in Romania the combination of insecure jobs and a return to subsistence farming is observed.

*“The housing dimension of welfare reform”* project finds that the more extensive welfare regimes are in terms of social rights, the higher the standards of living and the lower the risks of exclusion across the population in general as well as specific social groups. The protective function of housing integration with regard to the risk of poverty is complementary rather than central, the integration in the labour market being of primary importance. With respect to housing four groups of state housing policies were identified. Housing policies favouring universal coverage of support measures to facilitate access to housing and placing a high value on private ownership are characteristic for Belgium and Germany. Housing policies favouring universal coverage, yet with a strong commitment to publicly funded or co-funded social housing – are found in Austria and Denmark. Housing policies favouring partial coverage of the population and placing a high value on private ownership – Italy and Ireland are in this group. Finally, there are housing policies favouring partial coverage and with a commitment to supporting measures only for those in need, which includes support for social housing as one policy measure accessible only to the poor. The effects of national housing policy choices are such that all housing features that measure housing integration and housing exclusion in countries under consideration (Belgium, Germany, Denmark, Italy, and Ireland) show quite strong between-country variation with the lowest integration recorded in Italy and the highest in Denmark. Housing integration is said to materialise when no problems are faced with regard to affordability, the housing standard is high and crowding is not experienced. In Denmark about 85 per cent of the population are integrated, thus the project identifies Denmark as the country with the shortest ‘ladder’ of housing integration. The integration rates in Austria and Germany are only slightly behind that of Denmark. Further down on the pathway to integration are Ireland and Belgium where affordability problems are more visible, coinciding to a substantial degree with crowding or inadequate quality. At an overall integration rate of only 39 per cent in Italy, housing problems are visible in all domains. In Italy four per cent of the population is at extreme risk of non-integration in all domains.

The project *“The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe”* pursued the welfare state regime approach to map countries along poverty and social inequality parameters and the extent to which the housing systems manage to minimise the housing costs of vulnerable groups. The findings are that the liberal and the southern welfare regimes of the United Kingdom and Spain show good performance with



respect to containing the housing costs of vulnerable groups whereas at the same time they show bad results in regard to the extent of poverty and social inequality. The housing systems of these two countries have an important compensational function for the poor. In Sweden, the Netherlands, and France the housing systems *per se* have been enfolded by the transformation of the welfare regimes and are performing rather poorly as one of the instruments of social cohesion. Austria is identified as a special case as it managed to keep the total level of housing costs low and thus the project concludes that the housing policy is not eroding social cohesion.

Looking at social exclusion from the sub-national perspective, “*The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration*” research finds that the neighbourhood impact on social exclusion and integration is determined by the nature and organization of the welfare state. The welfare regime is of fundamental importance for the patterns of neighbourhood difference. Strong welfare state systems produce small neighbourhood differences, whereas weak systems increase the disparities between neighbourhoods. The underlying structure of the city economy and the pattern of change within that economy influences the neighbourhood processes. Location and housing market structure of neighbourhoods are less likely to be the key to differences between neighbourhoods than factors associated with their dynamics in fields such as demographic change, particularities of migration patterns and local policy interventions. The most consistent theme in the new policy approaches emerging in different cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Brussels, Antwerp, Berlin, Hamburg, London, Birmingham, Milan, Naples, and Paris) is the emphasis on better policy co-ordination and integration; considerable emphasis on the neighbourhood level; and transfer of the employment policy from the national level to the municipalities with quest for adaptation of general strategies to local circumstance in view to reach specific target groups more effectively. The housing dimension is rarely the central element in the new policies emerging in recent years, but it remains an important element in some cities. A major element in the policy discourse related to neighbourhoods with a concentration of problems is developing stronger resident and community involvement and targeting of particular risk groups.

Similarly, “*Between integration and exclusion: a comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context*”, clustered the seven cities (London, Dublin, Lisbon, Helsinki, Toulouse, Turin, and Umea) into groups showing different degrees of social inequality. This variation is found to correspond to the type of national welfare regime. The project finds that levels and forms of social precariousness in individual cities and ways urban households in various European cities cope with precariousness corresponds to the welfare regimes conceptualised in the broad sense that encapsulate labour market conditions and social protection. Consequently causes for social precariousness may be attributed to the system deficiencies at the macro level, whereas dealing with consequences of these requires also system adaptation at neighbourhood level. A comparative overview of the seven poor neighbourhoods showed that precariousness varies across and within neighbourhoods, and leads to the creation of nested spaces, which encompass different levels of core and extended neighbourhood. The reduction in inequalities between households, rather than social mixing policies *per se*, proved to be the best protection against neighbourhood disadvantage. Although the



project supports the finding of numerous studies that the best safeguard against social exclusion is gainful employment, some cities show that it is not so much employment on its own, as the combined effect of employment and social protection that provides the best defence against social exclusion. Four groups showed particular precariousness with respect to the labour market: young people without previous labour market experiences, adults with physical and mental disabilities, ethnic minorities, and women with caring obligations for children or elderly relatives.

### 3.2.2 Policy insight

The poverty prevalence, duration of poverty, effects of persistent poverty, as well as types of deprivations are strongly associated with policy choices made by the state with respect to welfare-regimes. Best performing in social security within and outside the labour market are the Scandinavian countries. Worst labour market conditions and weak social protection affect people living in Southern countries and some new Member States.

The overall research findings suggest that national social policy must continue to invest in basic social infrastructures, like housing, education and health, and to support an inclusive labour market and the provision of jobs. The protective function of housing integration with regard to the risk of poverty is complementary rather than central, the integration in the labour market being of primary importance.

Women's lives are particularly shaped by welfare state provisions – in terms of their working lives, partial incompatibility between paid work and caring responsibilities, and the economic impact that this implies in later life as is shown by the project *“The dynamics of social change in Europe”*. In view of the fact that nearly two thirds of non-standard work across EU-15 is done by women, the access to work-related benefits, wage levels and child-care services are of great importance for attachment to labour market, gender equity and life long social security of women.

Flexibility of work is an objective that takes a prominent place in policy discourses. As a rule it implies flexibilization of jobs and adaptations of individuals to the new working conditions. The project *“Households, work and flexibility”* addresses flexibility is an umbrella concept that encapsulates the country contexts of labour market regulations and individuals' sense of security and insecurity. In terms of policy outcomes and their impact on peoples' life there are good and bad flexibilities. The project argues in favour of the good flexibility which entails enhancement of employee's opportunity and capacity for choice and its key success factor is protection of flexible jobs and flexible workers. Policies to encourage part-time work appear to appeal as flexible options in countries with higher salary levels, whereas part-time jobs are not desired by men and women in countries where flexibility goes hand in hand with low income and low level, if any, social protection. There are strong advantages of regulated flexibility where flexibility of hours does not have to be associated with having precarious jobs. Flexibility could be introduced without worsening employment conditions also by increasing options for choice across a working day, working week, and year and over the life course. The key conclusion of the project is that it is not the removal of job protection and labour market



regulation that promotes both flexibility and work-life balance but it is rather the regulation that can lead to improved flexibility which is coupled with security.

Local policies aimed at dealing with deprivation problems within specific neighbourhoods have to take into account the specific local context of the neighbourhood, but also include the city economy, the neighbourhoods' historical development and current change and adaptation, and its links to the national welfare policy. It is generally observed that the strength of local networks is decreasing in terms of extensiveness and in terms of intensity of support among immigrants and single-mothers and long-term unemployed alike. Consequently there is greater reliance on labour market and public transfer payments in the event of unemployment. The importance of the advanced welfare systems in mitigating the extent of neighbourhood difference and affecting the dynamics of neighbourhoods is corroborated particularly in the project "*The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration*". A strong welfare state system is the most effective way of limiting the extent to which spatial concentrations of disadvantages add to exclusionary processes. The importance of the advanced welfare systems in mitigating the extent of neighbourhood difference and affecting the dynamics of neighbourhoods is strongly underpinned by this research.

It is not only income poverty that required policy response as deprivation is found among the non-poor, more particularly with respect to social isolation and living in high crime areas as is shown by the project "*The dynamics of social change in Europe*".

### **3.3 Population ageing has consequences for the labour market and social security**

#### 3.3.1 Main findings

Pressure on the welfare systems will increase due to the multiple effects of population ageing. The burden on social security is due first and foremost to the impact population ageing as a demographic process has on the pension systems. The rise in longevity leads to longer periods spent in retirement, undermining the sustainability and viability of current pension schemes, and requiring scaling down early retirement plans and increasing the statutory retirement age.

With respect to consequences of population ageing and policy choices related to pensions, the "*European network of economic policy research institutes*" finds that the funded defined benefit systems share many characteristics of the pay-as-you-go systems and will in no way be automatically protected against the consequences of ageing. To deal with ageing, domestic policies are needed and in a number of countries the government budget may encounter a certain sustainability gap. The only feature of the possible new regime that appears to have a relevant impact on the equilibrium tax rate is an increase in the retirement age. The frequently advanced argument that the ageing process will lead to a lowering of unemployment is to be seriously questioned. The current early retirement schemes must be replaced by more flexible schemes containing incentives to stay in the job. Population ageing will also lead to the ageing of the labour force, which in turn will influence aggregate productivity, wage levels, unemployment



and participation rates. Generational accounting has to take into account family structure and the intra-generational distribution of taxes and benefits. The Network reports also on some overall expansion of morbidity in proportion to total life expectancy. Increasing conflicts of interest may be expected between retired/nearly retired and the workers.

Pension reform processes in the past 10-15 years have introduced diversity in both pension systems, and pension policy-making. Pension systems reforms have expanded the institutions and mechanisms for providing old age income. Efforts have been done to reduce expenditure and increase revenues and in all countries reforms have expanded private sector pension provisions. With respect to policy-making, changes in pension policy communities have spread out the scope of political conflict. Both the media as well as financial interests have made successful inroads into established pension policy communities. New policy actors have turned pension knowledge orthodoxy into heterodoxy, resulting in an increasing overt policy conflict about pension reform (intergenerational equity, social stability, more equal and just pension system). Although pension policy communities have become more open and pluralist, this had not necessarily implied an increase in democratic accountability. The increased policy conflict has left pension reform policy processes less linear, more complex, and increasingly messy argues the project *“Public participation and the pension policy process: the citizen and pension reform”*. This project goes beyond identification of problem issues and proposes ways to encouraged citizens to actively participate in shaping their future with respect to retirement. The project suggests that the focus group format encouraged citizens to express their views, preferences and fears about pension reform. It promoted a process of brainstorming in which participants pooled their cognitive and reflexive capacities. Participants formulated not only creative but also credible attempts at dealing with perceived issues and problems of pension reform.

### 3.3.2 Policy insight

From the economic point of view it appears that the most effective ways to counter the negative effect of population ageing on the overall social security systems is to curb early retirement schemes and to raise the statutory age at retirement. The *“European network of economic policy research institutes”* suggests that the influx of migrants is likely to remain small in proportion to the labour force in the EU and can only modestly contribute to the intergenerational consistency of public pension systems. In terms of the obstacles to the implementation of reforms the Network suggests that the selfish behaviour of older generations with respect to early retirement may be expected to change only under drastic circumstances, namely via a significant reductions in social benefit levels, which would push elderly individuals back into labour.

The project *“Public participation and the pension policy process: the citizen and pension reform”* provides a policy insight from quite a different angle. More ideational diversity has been synonymous with increasing scientific uncertainty and increasing policy conflicts. The policy lesson to be drawn is that the introduction of competition and plurality into pension policy-making essentially remains a contest between policy elites and pensions experts and has not fundamentally increased democratic participation either



via parliaments or citizens themselves. The project suggests that citizens are well suited to participate in complex policy discussions, in terms of general policy preferences and cognitive capacities. However, effective citizen participation can never rely on a single process or procedure such as focus group discussions tested under this project because it gives rise to a rather limited process of public reasoning. It was rare for participants to completely transcend their self-interest. The implication for policy formulation is that no single deliberative procedure can produce both the epistemic and normative benefits of deliberation within a feasible expenditure of resources. Increasing democratic legitimacy requires several different types of public participation processes in conjunction with each other as well as with existing policy processes and democratic institutions. Recommendations emerging from the project conclusions are summarised as follows: carefully design the citizen participation processes; do not expect individual citizen participation processes to resolve long-standing policy conflicts; active, dynamic but also reflective moderation is a crucial element of any public participation process; individual citizen participation processes alone cannot confer political legitimacy on policy processes, but have to be integrated in a context of a sustained and comprehensive process of democratisation.

### **3.4. Social exclusion is lived by people in poor neighbourhoods**

#### 3.4.1 Main findings

Social exclusion is manifested and lived by people in their neighbourhoods. Consequently the most consistent theme in the new policy approaches emerging in different countries is the emphasis on better policy co-ordination and integration at the neighbourhood level. We observe a transfer of the employment policy from the national level to the municipalities with quest for adaptation of general strategies to local circumstance in view to reach specific target groups more effectively. The housing dimension remains an important element in tackling urban segregation in some cities. Several projects find that a major element in the policy discourse related to neighbourhoods with a concentration of problems is developing stronger resident and community involvement and targeting of particular risk groups.

The emergence of a wide range of socially innovative activities in local area has to be considered in the context of wider political economic transformations. The project *Social innovation, governance and community building* suggests that all local initiatives arose out of a sense of failure of the state on the one hand and failure of the market on the other in the provision of a series of essential services.

Whereas poor neighbourhoods and urban segregation are underpinned by the economic framework conditions and national welfare regimes, the implementation of policy guidelines to combat social exclusion and social insecurity requires mobilization of actors at regional, urban and neighbourhood levels as is shown by projects “*The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration*”, “*Between integration and exclusion: a comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context*” and “*Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration*”.



The analysis of the trajectories and strategies of individuals in the risk groups such as unemployed immigrants, single mothers on benefit and native-male long-term unemployed, shows that their life course trajectories are often characterized by early traumatic experiences, such as abuse or major trouble as a child, leaving home very early, drug abuse, and childbirth at a very young age. Breakdown events such as loss of a partner or of a job appeared also to be important. Biographical cumulative disadvantages were also present and may be the source of passive attitudes towards activation. Even in situations where labour market opportunities are favourable, some people from the different risk groups showed weak labour market orientations. Several explanations are suggested by the project “*The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration*”: higher incidences of illnesses or disabilities, long unemployment, and priority for raising children among single mothers. The project finds that the strength of local networks is decreasing the cities under consideration (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Brussels, Antwerp, Berlin, Hamburg, London, Birmingham, Milan, Naples, and Paris) in terms of extensiveness and in terms of intensity of support among immigrants and single-mothers and long-term unemployed alike. Consequently there is greater reliance on labour market and public transfer payments in the event of unemployment.

Spatial segregation gives rise to poverty black spots in urban areas primarily as a consequence of social inequalities between households and only in a secondary manner as a consequence of the spatial distribution of households, is one of the key finding of the project “*Between integration and exclusion: a comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context*” that leads to an important policy lesson. Namely, the reduction in inequalities between households, rather than social mixing policies *per se* proved to be the best protection against neighbourhood disadvantage. Distinctions of reputation and symbolic status between different areas are present in all the cities studied (London, Dublin, Lisbon, Helsinki, Toulouse, Turin, and Umea) and are largely impervious to egalitarian social policy. Notwithstanding the fact that spatial inequalities between neighbourhoods ultimately derive from social inequalities between households, disadvantaged neighbourhoods do exist and some supporting role can be played by anti-exclusion policies targeted at the collective character of such neighbourhoods. Four groups showed particular precariousness with respect to the labour market: young people without previous labour market experiences, adults with physical and mental disabilities, ethnic minorities, and women with caring obligations for children or elderly relatives.

On the basis of the different configurations of the sub-systems that contribute to the welfare of households, namely state, market and family, three different welfare systems are identified in the project “*Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration*”: clientelist/familial (Greece, Portugal and Italy), mechanistic/individualistic (Germany, Ireland and UK) and consensual/solidaristic (Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden). These systems create a broad framework structure which enhances or constraints opportunities within neighbourhood governance systems. The most deprived neighbourhoods in the nine countries do not have the same kind of population. Ethnicity and age are the most important aspects that shape the social reality of deprived



neighbourhoods. They bring about different interests, different ideas of social participation, different social networks and different social distance and access to institutions of mainstream society. Four types of neighbourhoods are discerned: working class neighbourhoods with a homogeneous or long-term migrant population, facing the threat of social change (Dublin, Turin, Thessalonica, and Newcastle); dichotomised neighbourhoods with a sizeable migrant population searching for a social balance (Cascais); ethnic concentration areas in transition (Wuppertal, Athens, Helsingør, Amsterdam, Stockholm); and settled ethnic neighbourhoods with an ethnically mixed character without one ethnic group dominating social life in the neighbourhood. (Lisson Green in London). Age differences according to ethnicity can deepen the confrontations between residents. In Amsterdam, London and Wuppertal most of the young people in the area belong to an ethnic minority, while many of the elderly are autochthons living in the neighbourhood for decades. Young people are hardly involved in neighbourhood governance, whereas neighbourhood forums, if existent, are dominated by elderly natives.

The particular relevance of findings of this project lies with the fact that all the neighbourhoods studied are or have been targets of state or European funded initiatives and programmes to improve the living conditions in the area and that this project identified obstacles they encountered to the effective implementation. Together with new investments and subsidies the programmes brought also new actors into the neighbourhood governance. The project identified obstacles to the effective capacity building. The first group of barriers to increasing neighbourhood participation are rooted in the social dynamics among residents. Firstly, poverty is an obstacle as residents struggle to make end meet and limit participation only to the few issues related to insecurity and daily nuisances. Secondly, there is exclusivity of informal groups drawn from fairly narrowly defined in-group members and exclusion of those perceived as out-group. Thirdly, selectivity is a barrier as individuals who have more time and know how the system operates form a hard core group of activists. Fourthly, there is opacity as non-indigenous ethnic groups and young people are frequently left out of neighbourhood processes. Finally, there is a mutual hostility due most frequently to ethnic and linguistic differences. The second set of barriers is rooted in formal organisations. Namely, the political obstacles occur due to bad relations between residents and local politicians; and hostility or inadequacy of professionals in service delivery who do not encourage participation in the neighbourhoods. Conflicts among residents are derivative of the problems of diverse populations living together under difficult circumstances. Vandalism and criminality by some youth gangs cause conflict and insecurity and stigmatisation of the neighbourhood. Mistrust and antagonism between residents and local public authorities is a significant reason for poor prevention and management of conflicts. With respect to exclusion from participation in neighbourhood formal and informal forums two groups are most at risk: immigrants and youth. In the ethnically differentiated neighbourhoods, differences in participation vary greatly across ethnic background, education and ideas about the future. The youth are a neglected category both in terms of participation and articulation and representation of their interests.



## 3.4.2 Policy insight

Research shows that local policies aimed at dealing with deprivation problems within poor neighbourhoods have to take into account the specific local context of the neighbourhood, but also include the city economy, the neighbourhoods' historical development and current change and adaptation, and its links to the national welfare policy.

Although projects supports the finding of numerous studies that the best safeguard against social exclusion is gainful employment, some cities show that it is not so much employment on its own, as the combined effect of employment and social protection that provides the best defence against social exclusion. The importance of market processes is emphasized in the project "*The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration*", not only in terms of inclusion of individuals in paid work in general, but also of development of neighbourhood services and facilities, local retail shops, and accessibility of the price of commodities. In addition to social networks, influences of public policy and services such as transport, local educational and leisure facilities, street cleaning and neighbourhood maintenance are of importance. Issues around cultural diversity and ethnicity require much attention.

The methods to overcome social barriers to participation in governance in deprived neighbourhoods include working directly with residents, enhancing service delivery, implementing physical renewal programmes, and capacity building through focusing on individual circumstances in view of improving the quality of resident's lives. Capacity building for increasing the social capital and network building in view of pursuing common objectives are among the key success factors.

The policy focus should be on developing and exchanging experience in managing change in urban neighbourhoods rather than suggesting policy packages deemed to be suitable for all deprived neighbourhoods or for particular categories of neighbourhoods. Governments should be prudent in advocating and trying to implement best practices which perhaps were successful elsewhere. Differentiated and context-sensitive types of intervention produce the best results.

Much emphasis has been put by the EU on finding good practice examples, which can be transferred across different countries. The project "*Between integration and exclusion: a comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context*" shows that a degree of success needs to be assessed in their current context of approaches, methods and practices. The requirements of transferability need to be clearly identified. The adequacy of the action or service needs to be assessed at the local level but also within the broader institutional setting and the underpinning ethical principles. An important dimension of empirical insight into activities and services is also through learning of the broad range of experiences on what has been tried but failed, what obstacles were encountered, and what mistakes are to be avoided. In view to capture the broad range of experiences, transferable lessons, rather than good practice is considered



to be more useful conceptualisation of transferability and benchmarking. This conceptualization is useful both for integrating transferability issues in the research process and for policy actors to assess the feasibility of importing practices that have shown a degree of success in their current context in another social reality of deprived neighbourhoods.

The same project proposes a list of detailed policy recommendations concerning urban policy, housing, childcare, schools, social benefits, health care and, last but not least, access to the labour market. The key policy recommendations relate to urban segregation, access to services, labour and wage level. Urban spatial segregation should be addressed through provision of social housing, rent control, mixing of public and private housing, and funding of a smaller number of larger areas. It is suggested to combine community area-based projects with generally accessible individual economic and educational welfare support and labour market activities. As for housing: increasing the stock of social housing; rent control in social as well as in private housing; access to social housing on a means tested basis; and proper maintenance and management of social housing estates, are considered as desirable ways forward. Access to services entails good and universal childcare facilities; good schools with educational initiatives adapted to the specific area problems; adequate administrative services in the domain of social benefits; and locally available and accessible free health services. Access to labour market requires tighter regulation of equal access to the job market; family-friendly work schedules; locally based job creation schemes; free vocational training and study grants beyond the poverty level to individuals without upper secondary education; establishment of a universal state organised social security system. Wage level should be addressed via the establishment of a European Union citizen social wage: guaranteed minimum social wage; introduction of advance-payment schemes of maintenance; simplification of administration of welfare benefits; and active information about social rights.

In a nutshell, the policy lesson is: only integrated policy approaches to urban and neighbourhood poverty and segregation which are furthermore culture-sensitive can make a real difference.

### **3.5. Targeted measures are necessary to counter social exclusion**

#### 3.5.1 Main findings

Standard systems of social protection are not sufficient to prevent exclusion of people who are weak competitors in the labour market due to multiple and overlapping problems. Targeted measures are seen as a necessary complementary component of integrated social protection, and not as a replacement of universal social protection. They may be temporal programmes aimed at capacity building for employment during transition stages, such as in early adulthood, or re-integration into work of long-term absent employees who stopped working due to a temporal illness. For people with mental health problems, deviant behaviour, or addiction, extensive and continuous social support, housing and sheltered employment is indispensable.



Several projects identify groups particularly precariousness with respect to the labour market, namely: young people without skills, long-term absentees from work, adults with physical and mental disabilities or substance abuse, immigrants, and women with caring obligations for children or elderly relatives. Only a few among selected projects dealt specifically with one specific groups for which targeted measures are believed to be necessary.

*“Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU”* project suggests that excluded people suffer not simply from a lack of income or employment, but from a deeper lack of capability. The project finds that the employment policy regimes that favour activation by means of ambitious and efficiently implemented capability enhancement do help to pull out of welfare traps certain groups that are excluded from the labour market, albeit not all who are affected by the multiple dimensions of social exclusion.

*“Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion”* project finds that the youngsters aged between 14 and 19 who made the greatest gains from enterprise education are those who were most at risk of social exclusion at the outset of the implementation of the enterprise programme. However, youngsters did not improve their financial literacy, did not improve their behaviour at school and when comparing themselves with others still thought of themselves as not being able to work as well as their peers. What all youngsters actually got out of the implemented enterprise education programme included enhancement of inter-personal skills and development of task related skills rather than particular skills for businesses. Criteria for effective enterprise education proposed by this project to the research community for corroboration are: width of values allowing the whole community to be involved; adequate preparation of teachers and students and clear learning objectives; adequate support to staff; wide ranging criteria of effectiveness; support to youngsters during implementation; a balanced range of expected student outcomes; specific processes, communications and structures are needed by schools to develop a co-ordinated and coherent strategy for progress in learning; and teacher behaviour that exemplifies good practice.

*“Between work and welfare: improving return to work strategies for long term absent employees”* shows that administrative arrangements often give the impression of being comprehensive systems relevant to workers, but that the study of the actual practice identifies as critical problems lack of co-operation between existing responses, ineffective interventions, risk of the benefit trap, weakening of links with the workplace and, often lack of appropriate services. The project contributes to the understanding of the costs of long-term absence for the public through the provision of health care, welfare and other services, cost for employers, and for the individual affected both in terms of financial loss and individual’s health and general wellbeing.

The assessment of the capacities of people living in deprived neighbourhood under the *“Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration”* is that the capacities of the residents are not perceived and they are not well used or valued, by officials as well as by the residents themselves. In view of the diversity of neighbourhood social realities



and a variety of backgrounds of inhabitants of deprived neighbourhoods, policy responses require tailored approaches to both valorisation and capacity development, conceptualization of renewal programmes more particularly in rethinking the roles of various organisations and the structure of local arrangements and enhancing co-ordination in service delivery, and removal of obstacles to change.

*“The housing dimension of welfare reform”* looked at the effectiveness of services or programmes targeted at homeless people. The conclusion is that the success of social services or programmes entailing a housing element cannot be measured as a dichotomous variable and social integration turns out to be itself a relative measure, especially insofar as marginalized persons or persons in need are concerned. About every second client of such programmes does not achieve this full form of social integration within a year and continues to be in need of support, some for a longer period of time or for ever. Those requiring extensive or continuous social support are usually persons who additionally face health problems or a serious form of addiction (alcoholism or drugs) or whose family situation restrains them from becoming fully integrated into the labour market (for instance, single mothers).

The case studies undertaken under this project have revealed that social services running programmes targeting the socially excluded have over the years developed an evaluation culture. However most have not succeeded in systematising or routinizing related procedures. Seen from this perspective, the over-reliance of many of these social services on key resource persons (usually their directors) is at the same time a strength and a weakness. It is strength because social programmes necessitate the personal commitment of individuals to ensure their successful operation. It is a weakness because this over-reliance sometimes also means that not adequate attention is given to routine procedures that ‘outlive’ so-to-speak the personal commitment of specific individuals thus also ensuring that expertise is transferred top-down also to middle-management or lower levels of staff. Standards of service delivery for supported accommodation in collective environment are a necessary framework for the operation of services that are drawing more and more heavily on public funding and need to be made accountable to their clients, the paid and voluntary staff they engage, and society at large.

Example of needs for targeting specific policies may be drawn from the project *“The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe”*. Namely, the project finds that housing systems are not tailored to meet the changing needs of new family forms and elderly people. The lack of attractive and affordable smaller flats is seen as one of the main causes for involuntary insufficient occupation of accommodation by the elderly who as single persons or couples continue living in family housing. This is considered by the research team as a waste of residential accommodation on a giant scale.

*“European network to develop policy relevant models and socio-economic analyses of drug use, consequences and interventions”* showed how scenarios could be developed to estimate the potential impact of harm reduction programmes that reduce the average duration of drug misuse, and prevention programmes that reduce the proportion of the population using drugs. Regarding cost-effectiveness of interventions the main



achievement is the identification of the information needed to ultimately construct cost-effective scenarios for different interventions related to some infectious diseases, namely hepatitis B and C and HIV, among injecting drug users.

### 3.5.2 Policy insight

Social programmes targeting persons facing social exclusion in various formats are an important extension of contemporary welfare policy. They are indispensable especially as remedial actions for addressing the needs of those persons who fall into the ‘poverty trap’ associated with weak competitiveness in the labour market and/or face serious mental or health problems or life crises that lead to the loss of resources and homelessness.

Integrated activities directed at capacity building of people at risk or those who find themselves excluded are necessary. The project “*Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion*” shows that information alone is not effective as support to young people at risk of social exclusion. They need to be helped to develop self-esteem, motivation, a positive life view, and social skills. That this is possible is confirmed by the project “*Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion*” since significant impact of enterprise education was achieved in the affective domain. It resulted in the raising of expectations of youngsters, confidence and positive perception of self. Whereas their actual behaviour at school did not improve and acquisition of particular skills for businesses was not achieved, personal and inter-personal skills and task related skills that are useful in work are enhanced. The lesson learned is that the prerequisites for entrepreneurship (social skill learning) as well as specific professional skills need to be supported to help young people at risk of social exclusion to get progressively involved in decision making that affects their move to independence and move away from being at risk of social exclusion.

Young people do not move towards independence if subject to one-off or short-term programs that are focused on knowledge transfer only. Moving away from being at risk of social exclusion is a complex transition for youngsters that require a comprehensive input by adults and the pedagogic processes that is appropriately modelled for disadvantaged youth. Attitudes and aspirations proved to be easier to change than behaviour among young adults at risk of social exclusion. One academic year is not enough to ‘de-programme’ and ‘re-programme’ youngsters’ behaviour. Not only prolongation of the programme but also ways to involve family and other social networks needs to be explored.

The most critical requirement to achieve more effective return to work outcomes of those who fall out of work due to a temporal illness is the need for an integrated labour, social security and health approach to early reintegration as shown by the project “*Between work and welfare: improving return to work strategies for long term absent employees*”. Strong government leadership could improve cooperation between agencies and between clients and providers. There is a need for a high quality service infrastructure and an awareness raising programme. A strong in-company rehabilitation policy with joint labour management support is regarded as the foundation of an effective system. On the



basis of an overview of expert perspective, an employer perspective and systematization of frequently asked questions by individuals who find themselves to be long-term absentees the project produced a number of practical deliverables. They are targeted at different audiences, and aimed at providing a multilevel and comprehensive response to the issue of long-term absence. The Easy Access Guide is for people recently experiencing illness or injury, which might jeopardise their employment. The Return Protocol is a learning tool for employing organisations wishing to improve their response to long-term absence. The Training Programme Specification for Professionals in Managing LTA is aimed at company level professionals for enhancing work site responses to LTA. Policy Guidelines are targeted at key stakeholders (including EU DG's) that can influence the policymaking process regarding return to work.

In view of the diversity of neighbourhood social realities and a variety of backgrounds of inhabitants of deprived neighbourhoods, the project "*Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration*" suggests that integrated policy responses are required with tailored approaches to both valorisation and capacity development, conceptualization of renewal programmes more particularly in rethinking the roles of various organisations and the structure of local arrangements and enhancing co-ordination in service delivery, and removal of obstacles to change.

Whereas there is clear evidence that some population groups can benefit from specific targeting and that measures and services set in place to match specific needs should be integrated, rather than fragmented one-off activities, there is also a clear policy message that targeting should not replace universal protection. The "*Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection: social protection challenged by globalization and new information and communication technologies*" draws a clear conclusion with respect to inequality, poverty and targeting: countries that target social benefits only to low income groups are countries that spend least and at the same time are countries with greatest inequalities and highest poverty prevalence.

## **3.6 Obstacles and dynamics of Social Europe**

### **3.6.1 Main findings**

Obstacles to the progress towards the construction of the Social Europe are attributed in several projects to choices which national governments made at the European level. The general obstacles are identified as unemployment and precariousness of employment which are inherent features of the neo-liberal economy, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the country-specific history of the development of collective norms, which are embedded in nation states, social institutions, and public policy choices.

The European employment strategy is criticized because of its guiding principles of increasing employability and flexibility of the human capital, and consistent and uncritical resorting to benchmarking and best practice as instruments of political evaluation and regulation. Social and labour rights are replaced by a transnational labour market based on neo-liberal principles and the philosophy of workfare. These choices do



not contribute to the fight against exclusion of particularly vulnerable groups but are in fact closely interwoven with the neo-liberal agenda of the European economic policy as suggested by the project “*Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU*”.

The project “*The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe*” finds that the European Union which does not have a formal housing mandate directly weakened the ability of the national housing systems to secure social cohesion. This erosion occurred through the economic and political framework conditions which were created in recent decades on a European level. Both the economic and the political basis of the housing policy were undermined by the Maastricht monetary-political convergence criteria which resulted in the withdrawal of financial resources for the building of new social housing for rent and for subsidising the existing public housing. The overreaching consequence of the framework conditions is an increase in housing segregation, especially in urban agglomerations, and the weakening of social cohesion.

On another issue for which EU has only limited direct policy competence, the rehabilitation and reintegration of long-term absentees, the project “*Between work and welfare: improving return to work strategies for long term absent employees*” argues that within the framework of the employment policy, quality of work and quality of life policies, public health policies, and health and safety policies, as well as through cross cutting policies EU can and should promote better national policy and practice.

Enlargement process is also seen as a challenge to the construction of Social Europe. Co-ordination of social policies as an issue in European integration policy discourse moved away from the concept of harmonisation launched in the late 1950s as shown by the project “*Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU*”. With each wave of enlargement, full harmonisation of actual social provisions increasingly came to be regarded as impossible and unnecessary. Furthermore, the EU has developed very little formal competence in social policy matters and from a strictly legal point of view can promote social cohesion only as means to promote economic cohesion. Major social policy initiatives today develop around the concept of convergence of objectives and policies and common criteria to monitor progress.

With respect to the economic policy framework and enlargement “*European network of economic policy research institutes*” finds that the labour market asymmetries within the EU continue to exist and substantial obstacles remain to the ‘Europeanization’ of wage formation. Whereas low labour mobility has many causes, increased flexibility in the housing market might contribute to an increase in labour mobility. Research indicated that the labour mobility into the EU appears to be considerably higher than mobility between EU member states. The project concluded that the migration between the old member states and the Eastern then accession countries may be expected to be considerably higher than migration following the Southern enlargement. Nevertheless, the frequently expressed fears of social dumping are exaggerated. The enlargement is likely to have, at least temporarily, a negative impact on some of the present beneficiaries of the Structural Funds. The increase in income differentials resulting from the EU



enlargement could be expected to increase the incentives for migration, on the one hand. On the other hand, unemployment differentials would appear to have only modest impact on flows of migration.

With respect to the EU policy discourse on innovation and active involvement of civil society initiatives at the local level, direct or indirect support from the European Union is generally seen by researchers as important. Some considerable obstacles are however, identified both with respect to the lengthy and complex administrative procedures and the fact that obtaining EU support depends crucially on fostering good relationships with the local or national state which makes oppositional strategies more difficult to pursue. In addition, innovative dynamics are often confronted regularly with bureaucratic conditions that prevent innovations to be implemented or experimented with as is shown by the project “*Social innovation, governance and community building*”.

### 3.6.2 Policy insight

It is legitimate and useful to resort to the open method of co-ordination as means of policy integration and learning at the transnational level. This conclusion stems from the forward looking approach regarding the EU level policy formation of the project “*Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU*”. This project suggests that there is much scope to capitalise on the collective learning through discussion and dissemination of best practices in enhancing the capability of individuals and families to avoid or exit the condition of social exclusion and for evaluating the quality of social integration attained.

However, this and other projects suggest that the open method of co-ordination is not a sufficient tool to inject dynamism to the social integration process. The changes in the macroeconomic environment in the European Union associated with the deepening of the economic integration and the move to the single currency have an impact on the prospects for addressing employment relations, social security and dealing with social exclusion also at the European level. As economic policy becomes more integrated, especially with the European monetary union, leading to common and possibly also new problems in the social arena, in particular with respect to labour market insecurities, arguments for some form of integration of social policy acquire greater force. There is a good case for looking at the EU level to play a more active role in social policy formulation and implementation in view to increase social security and wellbeing of its citizens.

Several projects articulate the need for more investment into social policy. The project “*Income maintenance and earnings situation: a comparative bottom up European study*” proposes quite specific comprehensive measures to be implemented at national and European level. Instead of diminishing or stabilizing the contributions to the state budget, they should be extended in order to cover the increasing social needs. The coverage of social needs should be considered as a fundamental social right. Not only the social minima should be increased, but the devalorization of work and decrease of salary costs should be disbanded. The perverse effects of the different forms of fixed financial aids



should be avoided. The employment directives of the Luxembourg Summit of 1997 should be abolished. The “participation paradigm” should be abandoned. The provision of subsidies for creating precarious jobs should be abolished. A minimum European salary norm should be adopted. A minimum income norm for the retired and for the social minima in general should be adopted. The precarious employment statutes should be sanctioned. A social ascending dynamics should be developed for moving from mass unemployment and precariousness to a fulfilment of welfare. Employment flexibility (contracts, duration, and salary) should be complemented by a social sovereignty about labour contents, employment hours and conditions. A charter for the socially insured or benefit recipients should be established. Democratisation of the social security institutions is needed. Marketization of the professional training should be avoided. Access to professional training should be independent of the statute of the applicant, but dependent upon his previous qualifications and current capabilities. Establishment of coherent local, regional, national and European policies on the basis of democratic and transparent decisions is needed. Consideration of the totality of the social rights as subjective rights is necessary. The project concludes that the subsidiarity principle often results in the convergence towards minimum standards at the European level. They argue in favour of the development of European indicators, normatively effective, socially relevant, politically validated and statistically verifiable.

By contrast the “*European network of economic policy research institutes*” largely argues in favour of the capacity of the economic systems to auto regulate. With the ongoing economic integration in Europe, the desirability and consequences of systems competition become more important. The introduction of the principle of mutual recognition in the EU has led to significant results in the area of free circulation of goods, persons, capital and services. The final result would be according to the Network an *a posteriori* harmonisation of the economic, social and regulatory systems, with an increase of wellbeing and employment. Regarding migration and EU enlargement the economic policy institutes argue that there is no need to maintain obstacles to internal migration within the EU after the Eastern enlargement, since the latter is expected to be of a modest and largely temporary nature.

In order to permit local civil society to pursue socially innovative activities the project “*Social innovation, governance and community building*” argues that higher level policy frameworks need to provide a facilitating context. It is necessary to recognize contingency and particularity, and avoid formulaic ‘good practice’ approaches; allow space for redundancy, ambiguity, invention and failure which all may contribute to learning and generate civil society initiatives; facilitate civil society groups in their efforts to make linkages and develop initiatives rather than controlling and shaping them; tolerate and respect the variety of ways in which activism in civil society is manifest, and keep an eye for potential oppressions and exclusions; help to develop a good community awareness of the various networks within and between government and civil society, and assess any state programme for its impact in building on, expanding, using and misusing the capacity of these networks before initiating a project programme with a community participation or empowerment dimension; encourage rich and varied debates about issues, to create a strategic understanding and knowledge base of both governance processes and



the wider, multi-scalar social, economic and environmental dynamics which shape both problem issues and the possibility of innovative responses; encourage a recognition of social identity with places as well as with social groups, with identity understood as a multiple, open and revisable concept, as a way to build a force for maintaining an integrated agenda of interventions in local area development; encourage experiments with small initiatives and be cautious of grandiose and flagship big developments; avoid counter-productive over-management of any programme or project; expect and encourage conflict and challenge, as a sign of engagement and of the potential for innovation.

### **3.7 Conclusions and policy lessons learned**

The most striking characteristic of the reviewed projects is their diversity - diversity in theoretical and ethical approaches, methods of analysis, topical areas, and scope in terms of universality or specificity of conclusions drawn.

The credibility of scientific research is underpinned by a broad variety of proven methodological approaches which when correctly applied are a guarantee for the reliability of findings. Ways issues were addressed in EU funded research range from heuristic and reflexive methodology, and qualitative surveys and focus group deliberations, to the analysis of nationally representative databases that encompass several tens of thousands of respondents. Some projects pursued a multi-method research approach, others, particularly the networks, focused principally on the-state-of-the-art review of literature.

Some projects explicitly reject the use of the notion of social exclusion and refer to fragilization and precarious personal and professional trajectories, or social deviance. Others refer to the notion of social exclusion and document selected aspects of deprivations such as income poverty, low educational attainment, unemployment, and/or housing stress.

Research aims at objectivity, but in a complex set of social determinants social research does come up with diverse findings and even conflicting conclusions. Among the projects reviewed we find those which argue in favour of the need to change the economic system in view to increase social security, as well as projects that argue in favour of reforms of the existing social security in view to accommodate the mainstream neo-liberal economy. Some see needs for flexibility of the labour market in view to overcome partial incompatibility between paid work and family life, others argue in favour of flexibility of labour conditions to accommodate to the globalisation processes and economic competitiveness. Social research is impregnated by policy choices made both by the researchers and by the funding agencies with respect to the questions asked (and those omitted), the framework theories (be it medium or small scale social theories), and relevance given to the specific findings within the context of the complex system of social determinants of processes and features.



There are nevertheless remarkable similarities in the forward looking conclusions and recommendations that may be drawn from the analysis of the prevailing social realities and policy choices made up to date, both at the national and the European level.

The key lessons learned that are an epistemic and functional contribution for prospective policy building to alleviate poverty and promote social inclusion and social security may be summarised as follows.

- Welfare regimes matter. They provide the framework conditions that encapsulate the legal measures and redistribution of material and non material resources. They are effective in enhancing opportunities for individuals. They are effective in alleviating inequalities between social groups, in buffering disadvantages which occur over the life-course of individuals, and in compensating for disparities between generations which result from diverse historical circumstances under which successive generations worked.
- Labour market conditions and social protection are the key complementary components of individual's experience of security. The first defines access to the job market, wage levels and flexibility for employees. The latter is the social buffer against risks associated with sickness, old age, maternity, family dynamics, unemployment, and general neediness.
- Countries with strong welfare regimes are more effective in reducing poverty levels, both among those who are in the labour market in casual and part-time jobs, and people who are excluded from the mainstream labour market due to unemployment and temporal or lasting low employability. Best performing in social security within and outside the labour market are the Scandinavian countries. Worst labour market conditions and weak social protection affect people living in Southern countries and some new Member States.
- Integration in the mainstream labour market is of primary importance for social integration of individuals and families. Housing policies have a complementary protective function, which is of particular significance when risks of unemployment or sickness materialise.
- Public regulation is needed to enhance social security. It is not the removal of job protection that can lead to better balance between work and family life in general, and gainful employment and bearing and rearing children in particular.
- The so-called process of deregulation of economy in view of globalization processes is characterized by changes in the content of regulation and by emerging new regulatory actors rather than by absence of regulation.
- The deregulation of the labour market conditions is a sign of the shift in the focus of government policies. Weakening of the preventative commitment of states in favour of the management of social exclusion associated with unemployment and precarious employment, entails the increase of public funding to contain crime and the transfer of increasing amounts of public resources to the non-for-profit, and semi-profit social businesses and non governmental organisations working with deprived people.
- There is an association between social insecurity, increase of delinquency and personal insecurity. The focus of protection on security of property and persons without due concern for social security within and outside the labour market does not contribute to the sense of security and societal cohesion.



- Poverty, inequality and social exclusion are manifested and lived by people in their neighbourhoods. The specific local context implies that most effective ways to deal with the concentration of deprivation problems through targeted programmes and services are through local networks. Whereas local actors, together with residents are best placed to shape some of the poor conditions in a neighbourhood, the broader context proves to be of paramount importance, more particularly at the level of prevention of deprivation and urban segregation. The city economy and the national welfare policy play a pivotal role. Strong welfare state systems produce small neighbourhood differences, whereas weak systems increase the disparities between neighbourhoods.
- There are wide variations both in the extent of social exclusion across countries and in the policy regimes chosen to combat it, and that there has been a policy switch from attempts to provide generalised protection to more focused efforts designed to identify and assist those groups most at risk. Most projects are rather critical towards this policy shift as research testifies about advantages of integrated, comprehensive social inclusion policies with a strong preventative dimension, rather than fragmented focused reparatory measures and services.
- Targeted measures are seen as a necessary complementary component of integrated social protection. Standard systems of social protection are not sufficient to prevent exclusion of people who are weak competitors in the labour market due to multiple and overlapping problems. People with mental health problems, deviant behaviour, or addiction require extensive and continuous social support, housing and sheltered employment.
- The notion of risk is one of the basic ideas underpinning the new approach to poverty/exclusion/stratification analysis. Risk situations are increasing due to the greater diffusion of vulnerability factors associated with the employment crisis, changes in demography - particularly in respect of family dynamics, population ageing and immigration - and new policy trends. As a result, the domains of vulnerability - from both the viewpoint of precarious income and the fragility of social ties - are potentially a greater problem than the frequency of current exclusion would suggest.
- The number of people who experience a spell of poverty over a period of five years is twice as high as the number of poor counted in any single year. Whereas there is considerable movement into and out of poverty, chances of exiting poverty reduces for people as the duration of the poverty condition increases.
- Groups most at risk of social exclusion are immigrants and unemployed youth, especially when they are descendants of foreign born parents. One-off or short term capacity building and/or integration programmes produce only modest results.
- Political decisions taken at the European level situate the role of the European institutions in social security matters around the open method of co-ordination as means of collective learning and social monitoring. The method is a step forward towards addressing the social dimension of Europe. However, it entails risks of fragmented approach to good practice and transferability without due concern for the social context under which particular policies, measures or services appear to be effective, and can result in benchmarking standards of protection and service delivery at the lowest common denominator.



- The role of the European Union in promoting economic cohesion will entail in the future its more active role in integrating social policy dimensions because a more integrated and converging economic policy may be expected to generate similar social challenges and insecurities in the Member States.

A recurrent theme in several projects that analysed the social reality of the 1990s and early 2000s is the critique of the normative principles of the neo-liberal economy which structurally produces and reproduces unemployment and insecurity. The state is not weakening, they argue - it is merely turning toward law and order, which in itself is eroded by unemployment and social precariousness. The tasks of dealing with socially deprived and excluded people are delegated to the new social actors such as the judiciary, police, NGOs and social businesses. These policy choices need to be critically re-examined in terms of their rationale, costs and benefits and long term outcomes for clients and public at large.

Some projects are critical towards the European employment strategy. Some point a finger at the European Union for undermining social cohesion, and specifically at the monetary-political convergence criteria set out in the Maastricht Treaty.

Review of selected projects shows that there is no shortage of ideas, both general and quite specific on how to increase social security for all. The projects looked at what works and what is needed to further alleviate poverty and poverty-related deprivations. It was not within their scope to address the question about the kind of economic framework conditions that are needed to maintain high standards of social protection and to expand the existing systems to better include and protect all people. Several projects, nevertheless, refer to the political choices made in the Nordic countries to stress that adaptation of the economy to the globalization processes does not have to go hand in hand with the degradation of social protection.

## **Part 4: Policy directions**

Since the 1990s a strong impetus to social exclusion research had come from the European Union through Community funded research. The research community had grasped the opportunities to capitalize on the national research and to pursue added value of international comparison of differences and similarities in causes, consequences, policies and practices that work and those that are producing and reproducing problems and clients. To what extent has this research contributed to the articulation of the aspirational principles at the European Union level, and implementation of these principles at the national level are questions that we will address in part 3.

In order to confront the research findings with standard setting at the European level we will identify and describe the policy context and the key objectives and monitoring mechanisms set up at the European Union level to promote social inclusion and reduce excessive social disparities.



Then we will look at how research findings on social exclusion, poverty, social stratification and social security systems linked with pension pitch into the policy development and we will identify possible discrepancies between research findings and the scope of policy choices made up to date at the European level.

Finally, we will identify the key social challenges, research questions and needs for future research in view of the pursuit of objectives of the European social model on which Member States have agreed up to date.

## **4.1 The policy agenda on social exclusion and inclusion**

The policy discourse suggests that alleviation of poverty and prevention of social exclusion of vulnerable groups of individuals continue to be key policy objectives within the EU.

The European social policy agenda as it relates to combating social exclusion builds on the understanding of the multidimensional nature of deprivation that has been acknowledged by the Council of Ministers of the European Union already in 1984. The Council refers to the poor as: “persons, families and groups of persons whose resources (material, cultural and social) are so limited as to exclude them from the minimum acceptable way of life in the Member State in which they live”. The poverty threshold established is the minimum acceptable well being in the reference society. It is in the setting of the social policy agenda at the European level that the notion of social exclusion got a prominent place in the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s. The notion of social exclusion was used extensively in the broad range of activities and programmes funded by the European Community. Instrumental to that effect were: the Green Book (1993), the White Book (1994) and the European Social Fund (1994-1999; 2000-2006).

A clear distinction between the notions of poverty and social exclusion does not exist in the European policy discourse. There is, however, general agreement that policies need to address effectively phenomena that are in many respects similar but not identical. The knowledge-base produced under the EU funded projects and social research in general has, nevertheless, largely been built into the policy understanding of different phenomena that are undermining social cohesion.

Poverty generally refers to deprivation due to inadequate financial or material resources. The relative nature of deprivation is measured against the minimum level of income and some basic services and facilities accessible to the majority of the population in a given country. Social exclusion is generally defined as a process whereby individuals and certain social groups are denied access to minimum resources, opportunities and rights. While both poverty and social exclusion entail multiple disadvantages the latter notion puts greater emphasis on the obstacles to fuller social participation, in particular denial of access to social rights and adequate support services, and discrimination. Socially excluded people experience multiple and overlapping material and non-material deprivation associated with low income, unemployment, casual employment, poor qualification, high level of dependence on public benefits, disempowerment, weak social



participation, discrimination, feelings of low self-esteem, and dissatisfaction with ones life chances.

Social stratification concerns unequal distribution of resources such as wealth, income, education, power and prestige. Research underpins the community policies for social cohesion by documenting how excessive social disparities can undermine social ties due to inequalities in opportunities for people to access economic, cultural, political and civil institutions, and partake in social mobility. It is generally recognised that social disparities are a standard feature of all human societies and that they are partly embedded in human variability and partly reinforced by culture. The weight of various aspects of 'nature' versus 'nurture' is an issue of inconclusive research and passionate philosophical debates in the scientific and policy communities. However, there is a general policy consensus that excessive social disparities in life chances between social groups, gender and generations are a matter for concern. Enhancement of skills and opportunities as well as removal of barriers to equal opportunities has a prominent place both in research and in the policy discourse in the European Union in particular with respect to gender and intergenerational solidarity.

The European Union has progressively built the core standard-setting principles for inclusive society in its institutional framework. The notions of social inclusion and cohesion have been enshrined in the fundamental normative documents of the European Union at the Council Summits in Amsterdam, Lisbon and Nice.

The Amsterdam Treaty that became effective in 1999 contributed significantly to the forging of social Europe by incorporating the Social Protocol in the Treaty itself. The social policy provisions include under Article 136 and 137 the fight against social exclusion.

The European Council of Lisbon in March 2000 recognised that the extent of poverty and social exclusion was unacceptable. The Lisbon Council set a new strategic goal for the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century for EU to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion. Member States agreed to significantly reduce poverty and social exclusion by 2010.

The new social policy agenda encompasses issues of economic reform, employment and social cohesion. The multiple aims are to be achieved *inter alia* through modernising the European social model by investing in people and combating social exclusion. The development of an active welfare state is strongly emphasized. The eradication of poverty is identified as a general objective and the Council agreed that setting adequate targets was to be made, not in some distant future, but within the same year.

In December 2000 the European Council announced at the Nice Summit a set of aspirational principles to be pursued in an inclusive society for all. Four key objectives are set: to facilitate participation in employment and access by all to resources, rights, goods and services; to prevent social exclusion; to help the most vulnerable; and, to



mobilise all relevant bodies. It also agreed on the working method. The approach to the common framework is defined as the open method of co-ordination. This implies that the policy making regarding the national action plan to combat social exclusion will remain on national level but that policy co-operation and dialogue will be pursued to assist national governments in devising such policies. The open method of co-ordination builds on the agreement on common objectives and its key tools for monitoring progress and setting examples of good practice are National Action Plans against poverty and social exclusion, Joint Reports on Social Exclusion, and common indicators for the monitoring of social progress. The second component of the open method of co-ordination is the community action programmes that are to be developed in view to encourage co-operation between Member States to combat social exclusion.

In the framework of the objectives for inclusive society the consideration for the interweaving between social situation and demography takes a prominent place. One of the dimensions of population dynamics addressed is population ageing that requires policy and institutional adaptations and ageing of individuals as a chronological development that entails needs for care and brings about various dimensions of risks for social exclusion of people as they age. Population ageing has implications for the economy, governance, good practice in public policy, social rights of all citizens and intergenerational solidarity. Indeed, public interest in ageing in welfare states relates to labour market policies, life-long learning policies, retirement policies, health care policies, social benefits policies, long-term care policies, housing and environment policies, gender policies, and policies for the empowerment and a more general social role for the elderly.

The Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee (2001) is a proposal to formalise European Union co-operation specifically on pensions. The common goals are adequacy of pensions, financial sustainability and adaptation of pensions to a changing society. It is by ensuring the adequacy of pensions that poverty and social exclusion after retirement are to be prevented. The working method would include the preparation of national strategy reports in which Member States would present their reform plans and measures, involve all relevant actors in the process, and the Commission and the Council would jointly analyse the national strategies.

It is generally recognised within European Union institutions that the way to pursue the general objectives of the European social model requires a multi-dimensional approach and mobilisation of policies in all key domains of economy, social protection and governance. The general requirements are associated with the economic growth, employment growth and sound public finance. The more specific relate to fostering of quality employment and employability, building of active welfare state capable of activating the unemployed and economically inactive and providing minimum income, adequate pensions and health care.

The Open Method of Co-ordination on social inclusion launched in 2000 and the Open Method of Co-ordination on pensions launched in 2002 as well as the co-operative



exchange on health and long-term care for the elderly, are conceptualised as part of the overall economic growth, employment growth and sound public finance underpinned by the Broad Economic Policy Guidelines and the European Employment Strategy.

In quite specific terms the National Action Plans for Social Inclusion (NAPs) set the policy agenda and a challenge for research. Member States have agreed to give particular attention in the 2003-2005 period to six key priorities: active labour market measures; adequate and accessible social protection combined with work incentives; access to decent housing, quality health and lifelong learning; smooth transition from school to work; ending child poverty; and reducing poverty of immigrants and ethnic minorities. Mainstreaming of gender issues is a horizontal activity related to all key priorities. The analysis of regional and local variations in poverty and social exclusion, its causes and exit strategies are given a prominent place on the agenda. The Commission Services Document on the implementation of the NAP Inclusion 2003-2005 are due in December 2005. Member States and the Commission have agreed that, from 2006 social inclusion, pension and health care services should be brought together in a new streamlined process.

The communication from the Commission (March, 2005) the Green Paper 'Confronting demographic challenge: a new solidarity between generations' stresses that the Community must take demographic changes into account for modernizing social protection systems, especially pensions, and for improving the quality of jobs available to elderly people.

## **4.2 Policy choices and future challenges for social security**

The standard setting principles identified at the European level reflect a long history of the development of welfare states in Europe.

The national social security systems build on the identification of public interests and civic and social rights many of which originated in Europe. The oldest policy instruments relate to health and hygiene as domains of general public interest - the newest to the income replacement paid out to people who are able and willing to work but cannot access paid labour, those who do not earn a sufficient work-related income and people no longer entitled to unemployment benefits. This newest instrument of social protection, the so-called general non-contributory minimum income, has been integrated into the basic legislation of many European countries since the 1970s. As opposed to the traditional poor-relief as a discretionary assistance, the contemporary welfare allowances are based on the principle of universalism enshrined in the legislation. This implies that all citizens are eligible to receive sufficient means to meet their basic requirements and that the government has a legal duty to supply financial resources on the basis of uniform standard rates determined at the national or regional level.

Social policies aim to reduce deprivations and excessive disparities in life chances by redistributing the cost of risk situations over the life course of individuals, as well as between population sub-groups and generations. The standard instruments of social protection address today a broad range of risks associated with sickness, old age,



maternity, family dynamics, unemployment and general neediness, by means of income transfers and social services.

Research has contributed to the high awareness that there are considerable historical differences between Member States regarding public policies and the relationship between economic growth, labour law and the social protection system. The history of the national development of welfare regimes is embedded in social structures and is reflected in social processes, which orient the setting of priorities for policy targeting. There are between-country differences in the incidence of poverty and social exclusion, the duration of deprivation among vulnerable categories of persons, the quality of services for the needy, and the opportunities made available to people to exit deprivation.

There is considerable variation in the forms of state involvement in poverty alleviation, choice of priority areas and preferential rating of target groups, as well as in the amounts of public resources invested in social reintegration. There is evidence that poverty risks for certain groups, such as young adults or elderly people, for example, are higher than for the rest of the population in most, but not in all countries. There is much evidence that some countries are performing better in the overall social protection than others and that this effectiveness has to do as much with good governance as with the business climate.

The European Union has continuously reiterated its adherence to the principle of subsidiarity in social protection matters in general and for combating social exclusion in particular. It is first and foremost the responsibility of Member States to devise appropriate response to the social needs and to develop social protection systems and social policies relevant for the country. While acknowledging diversity there has also been a continuous pursuit of internal coherence through reaching of an agreement on a set of common objectives and working methods to achieve them. The need for adaptation and reform in view of the development of the global economy and accelerated ageing of European populations is being shaped within the framework of the European social cohesion model the basic principles of which may be summarised in a cohesion paradigm: enabling people to be more integrated and helping groups to become more co-operative. Competition and risk interplay with social inclusiveness and co-operation.

The social dimension of Europe is defined in terms of overreaching objectives. The multitude of ways of achieving them is yet to be explored. Up to date the open method of co-ordination as a new form of regulation is limited to agreement by governments on non-binding common objectives, and social monitoring of progress in selected domains of protection.

Alleviation of poverty and prevention of social exclusion of vulnerable categories of persons continue to be important policy issues. The key policy challenges to the preservation and further development of social protection instruments are associated with the large numbers of unemployed and inactive people of working age who are drawing heavily on publicly funded benefits, and demographic ageing that absorbs considerable resources for pensions, health care, and long-term care of elderly people and in particular the oldest old, those above the age of 80.



Whereas history of the welfare regimes is still deeply rooted in social institutions and priority choices made at the national level, the future brings about much communality in major challenges.

It is generally known that difficulties in funding social protection and redistributing public resources in an equitable manner may be expected to aggravate in the next two decades or so. On the one hand, national and regional governments are responsible for securing an enabling framework for the unemployed and inactive vulnerable groups of working age to gain access to employment or replacement income. On the other hand, policies need to accommodate to the clear trend towards lower labour force participation of persons aged 55 and more that has persisted over many years, and to partially change this tendency in the future.

Relatively high and persistent unemployment and the expected decrease in the size of the labour force due to population ageing challenge the financial viability of public pension systems predominantly funded on a pay-as-you-go basis. Member States are looking for appropriate funding arrangements to overcome the rising imbalance between the numbers of the contributors to the social protection functions, in particular pensions, and the overall number of beneficiaries. The new Member States that joined the union in 2004 are also undergoing accelerated population ageing and in addition larger proportions of their population, particularly the elderly, have poor access to some basic services and facilities and live on low income.

All European countries, be it advanced market economies or countries in transition, share the main features of the demographic future. Europe has the highest percentage of old people in its total population and will continue to be the oldest region in the world. In the next fifteen years the European population will enter into a new phase of population ageing characterised not only by the increase in proportions and numbers of elderly people but also by the decrease in size of both the youth and the working age populations. Ageing will also be reflected in changes in the relative weights of broad age groups. Implications that require policy response relate to the funding of pensions but also to the overall competitiveness of the European ageing labour force matched against the population increase in the developing countries that will mainly affect younger age groups and consequently lead to a huge demand for jobs.

The analysis of welfare policies shows that in many countries identifying and targeting vulnerable groups, rather than further upgrading generalised protection both within and outside the labour market, has become the key aim of social reforms associated with calls for deregulation of economy.

This policy orientation is in sharp contrast with up to date research findings which virtually all converge around the conclusion that universalistic welfare schemes appear to provide a broad range of advantages over targeted measures. Strong welfare regimes perform better in preventing poverty and social exclusion and lifting people out of poverty once they find themselves in casual employment, unemployment or inactivity.



Research of social realities of European countries at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century have extensively documented that universalistic coverage of generous welfare regimes with their legal regulations and income redistribution protect people who are in employment and those who are unemployed and inactive better than regimes that operate reactively by providing social assistance only to targeted groups of excluded people.

There is considerable research evidence that prevention of exclusion is less costly for the public than social assistance and care that is provided once deprivations take their toll on peoples' health and living circumstances. However, research also confirms that general social protection policies for preventing poverty and social exclusion which are of fundamental importance are not sufficient, as is shown by the actual existence of extreme forms of exclusion even in the most generous welfare regimes. Certain people or social groups fall through the safety nets of generalised protection, or are not even taken into consideration for social protection, and consequently targeted measures prove to be necessary. These however, in order to be effective need to be complementary to rather than a replacement of strong welfare protection of all citizens.

Targeting in itself is becoming increasingly ephemeral due to the fast changing features of vulnerabilization. Research documents the frequent re-combination of factors leading to the social disadvantage of individuals and certain social groups. Being unemployed, non-national, in bad health, having poor education and qualification, living in single-parent or large family, or in one-income household especially at very young or very old age, are typical risks which vary between countries according to the degree of risk and between various vulnerable groups according to the combination of risk factors. Groups at risk of social exclusion and those excluded are not homogeneous groups and meeting their needs requires diversified strategies, policies, and often client-tailored measures and services. The new social actors, in particular social businesses in the semi-or non-for-profit sectors, are continuously finding new clients and are urged to give proof that they are accommodating their clients needs at better value for money than other service providers.

Research shows that policies targeted at specific groups, be it unemployed youth in general or homeless youth in particular, risk to turn a blind eye to causes if they are only looking for palliate measures to alleviate temporarily hardships.

### **4.3 Needs for future research**

An opinion seems to prevail among policy makers that much is already known about features and underlying causes of poverty and social exclusion at the national level and that the focus needs to move from description and analysis to the specific problem solving.

- Research is expected to answer how the existing and proposed policies, programmes and services are or may be expected to be effective and efficient - effective in terms of achievement of the identified goals, and efficient in terms of the best quality/price relationship. This requires continuous monitoring and evaluation of inputs, outputs and outcomes as they affect socially excluded people.



Expectations of the open method of co-ordination and NAPs regarding research relate to the quest for answers to the questions:

- How to make the process of social inclusion more effective, how to implement and identify practices that work, and how to mobilise all social actors. The impact analysis at the strategy level, programme level and action level are expected to address issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, usefulness, transferability and European added value in terms of learning, transfer of knowledge and social action.

The research community recognises that NAPs are useful tools for selected policy streamlining but they are too limited in scope. The Joint Report on Social Inclusion leaves aside the questions of the normative basis and modes of operation of the global systems of the structural policies and of the national institutions of social protection.

- The analysis of the shortcomings of the global socio-economic system, and shifts in the orientation of state intervention regarding labour market conditions, social protection and prevention of poverty, social exclusion and excessive social disparities, remain the core of social research.

Despite the fact that the policy discourse seems to give preference to the study of specific practices, services and partnerships that work in their current context:

- The analysis of how national social protection systems are organised and the impact systems have on social cohesion and the feeling of security of all citizens inherently remain central to social research.

The research agenda on pensions in ageing societies, as set by the mainstream policies is mainly focused on issues of funding and reforming the pension schemes. Reforms are expected to ensure adequacy of pensions in order to prevent poverty and social exclusion after retirement.

- In a broader research framework the question of what income people have, how healthy and active they are, and how they live at high age are linked to the analysis of the life-course chances and choices and a broad spectra of public policies that address the labour market, life-long learning, family-friendly policies, retirement, health care, social benefits, long-term care, housing and environment, gender issues, and policies for the empowerment and a more general social role for the elderly.

Recently there has been an upsurge in awareness among policy makers of the impact of demographic dynamics, and in particular family dynamics and population ageing, for the economy, social security, and changing facets of social vulnerability.

- The impact of disruptive employment histories and family dissolution, on life chances in various stages of the life course, and at high age in particular open a multitude of research questions related to social security and insecurity.
- Population ageing will continue with accelerating pace in the next decades and a growing number of people, especially women at higher age will spend an increasing number of years living alone. Both trends will require some considerable research on societal adaptations regarding work, family life and social protection in a life-course perspective.
- The increase in proportions and numbers of elderly people and the decrease in size of both the youth and the working age populations are relevant for the scope of state intervention measured in terms of population coverage, and for the adaptations in balancing the state commitment between large numbers of socio-economic and social protection functions.



Population ageing is determined by dejuvenation due to persistent low fertility and greying due to increased longevity. Fertility levels are below generational replacement throughout the Union. They are, however, higher in advanced welfare regimes than in countries with weak protection of working parents in general and mothers in particular. The number of desired children is currently higher than the number of children women have in almost all low fertility countries.

- What both men and women need and expect from the state in order to realize the family size they desire are questions that need to be addressed in research and policy deliberations. Awareness and experience of the high financial and opportunity costs of children are associated at the individual level with deprivation, dissatisfaction and sense of insecurity of individuals and families. Non-realization of desired family size is associated at the societal level with very low fertility levels and related acceleration of population ageing.
- Demographic implications of risks associated with insecurity and social exclusion with respect to family dynamics and gender relations within family and broader society, and migration and integration of migrants, are research domains increasingly relevant for social inclusion and intergenerational equity and solidarity.

There is ample research evidence that states have up to date managed rather badly immigration and integration of legal immigrants.

- Needs for integration of immigrants in the mainstream labour market and society at large, as well as social security of migrants who themselves age in an ageing environment is a large research field of policy relevance.

Combining needs for research stemming from policy priorities set at the European level by the Member States and needs for basic research is both a challenge and a research topic in its own right.

- There is need for the development of comparative research methodologies in view of overcoming limitations embedded in national research traditions regarding theoretical frameworks, use of notions and concepts of poverty, social exclusion and social stratification, and institutional research settings.
- Last but not least good data are an essential tool for analysing and understanding social phenomena and a prerequisite for informed policy choices. Cross sectional data provide much information on the current situation of people and data on stocks are useful to policy makers for setting up or adapting policies and services. Longitudinal data are essential for monitoring changes experienced by individuals over time in view to capture personal histories and the dynamic social and historical context which impinges on the well-being of people in their life-course.

## 4.4 Instead of conclusions

The Spring European Council (2005) confirmed that social cohesion remains an integral part of the Lisbon objectives and that the “Social Agenda forms part of the overall policy thrust following the re-launch of the Lisbon Agenda”. However, it is generally recognised in policy circles that the attainment of these objectives is hindered by sluggish economic and employment growth and the growing number of over-55s excluded from the work



force. Under prevailing conditions of galloping globalization and population ageing difficult choices must be made.

The scope of challenges for social security and social cohesion is strongly dependent on the directions in which policy choices will be made about labour market conditions, about the interweaving of flexibility of work with the security of people, about ways to tackle youth unemployment and activate older workers, especially inactive women, and the extent to which people who are temporarily or permanently weak competitors in the mainstream labour market will be protected from poverty and generalized deprivation. Population ageing is inevitable but social insecurity is not destiny. Policy choices are reversible.

## SELECTED REFERENCES

**Final project reports from Targeted socio-economic research (TSER) and the Key action Improving the socio-economic knowledge base**

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/index_en.htm)

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/index\\_en.cfm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/index_en.cfm)

<http://www.cordis.lu/improving/socio-economic/home.htm>

<http://improving-ser.jrc.it/default/>

<http://europa.eu.int/comm/tser1.htm>

## Reviewed projects on Social Exclusion and Social Security

### **Project No. SOE2-CT-98-3067**

**Project title : Evaluation comparé de la mise en œuvre d'une politique européenne de lutte contre la précarité des jeunes dans les pays-membres de l'UE (Comparative evaluation of the implementation of the European policy against youth precariousness in the Member States of the EU),**

Project coordinator: Zentrum für Europäische Gesellschaftsforschung e.V., Konstanz, Germany

Project partners: Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Centre de Sociologie Européenne, France; Confédération Générale des travailleurs de Grèce, Institut de Travail, Greece; Université Libre de Bruxelles, Groupe d'étude sur l'Ethnicité, le Racisme, les Migrations et l'Exclusion, Belgium

Start date: 1 November 1998

Duration: 41 months

### **Project No. SOE2-CT- 98-3068**

**Project title: Enterprise and its transfer to combat social exclusion**

Project co-ordinator: Institute of Education, University of London, UK

Project partners: University of Warwick, UK; Faculty of Special Education, Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest, Hungary; Association for Industry Community Relations, Tel Aviv, Israel; University of Valencia, Spain



Start date: 1 December 1998

Duration 36 months

**Project No. SOE2-CT-98-3069**

**Project title: Les nouvelles formes de gestion publique de la déviance en Europe (New forms of public management of deviance in Europe)**

Project co-ordinator: Centre de sociologie de l'éducation et de la culture, Paris, France

Project partners: Centre d'études sociologiques, Facultés Universitaires Saint Louis, Bruxelles, Belgium; Zentrum für Europäische Gesellschaftsforschungen, Konstanz, Germany; Centre de recherche de la société grecque de l'académie d'Athènes, Grece; Erasmus Universiteit, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; Collège de France, Centre de sociologie européenne, Paris, France; Université Libre de Bruxelles, Ecole des sciences criminologiques « Leon Cornil », Bruxelles, Belgium

Start date: 1 December 1998

Duration: 36 months

**Project No. SOE2-CT-98-3070**

**Project title: Between integration and exclusion: a comparative study in local dynamics of precarity and resistance to exclusion in urban context**

Project coordinator: CNRS et Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, CEMS, Paris, France

Project partners: Department of Social Sciences, Roskilde University, Denmark; Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, Ireland; Policy Support Unit, GLA, London, United Kingdom; Dipartimento di Scienze Sociali, Università di Torino, Turin, Italy; Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal; STAKES, Helsinki, Finland

Start date: 1 November 1998

Duration 36 months

**Project No. SOE2-CT-98-3071**

**Project title: Minima sociaux et condition salariale 'l'Europe vu d'en bas' (Income maintenance and earnings situation: a comparative bottom up European study)**

Project coordinator: CNRS – Paris I, France

Project partners: CNRS URA 2048 – Laboratoire Georges Friedmann/CNAM, France; Interuniversitair Instituut voor Studie van de Arbeid – VUB, Belgium; Centre de Sociologie du Travail, de l'Emploi et de la Formation - TEF, Belgium; Regeneration Strategies – Greater London Enterprise Ltd., UK; Universität Heidelberg – Teol. Fak. Sozialethik, Germany

Start date: 01/12/98

Duration: 37 months

**Project No. SOE2-CT-98-3072**

**Project title: The spatial dimension of urban social exclusion and integration**

Project Coordinator: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Project Partners: Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany; King's College London, London, UK; Elaborando S.C.R.L. Milan, Italy; Universiteit Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands; Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Heverlee, Belgium; Georg-August

# PSPC



Universität Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany; Università degli Studi di Napoli, Naples, Italy, University of Birmingham, UK; INED Institut National d'Etudes Demographiques, Paris, France; Universitaire Faculteiten St. Ignatius Antwerpen, Antwerp, Belgium

Starting date: 1999

Duration: 30 months

## **Project No. SOE2-CT- 98- 3075**

**Project title: European network to develop policy relevant models and socio-economic analyses of drug use, consequences and interventions**

Project co-ordinator: EMCDDA, Epidemiology Department, Lisbon, Portugal

Project partners: IFT – Institute for Therapy Research, Munich, Germany; University of Glasgow, Centre for Drug Misuse Research, Glasgow, United Kingdom; University of Keele, Department of Medicines Management, Staffordshire, United Kingdom; University of York, Centre for Health Economics, York, United Kingdom; University of Rome – Tor Vergata, Dipartimento di Matematica, Rome, Italy; National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Division for Health Services Research, Bilthoven, The Netherlands

Start date: 1 December 1998

Duration: 36 months

## **Project No. SOE2-CT-98-3080**

**Project title: Social exclusion and social protection – the future role for the EU**

Project coordinator: South Bank University, London, UK

Project partners: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium; Centre for Economic Research and Environmental Strategy, CERES, Greece; Kobenhavns Universitet, Institute of Political Science, Denmark; Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France; University of Helsinki, Finland

Start date: 01/02/99

Duration: 29 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-1999-00004**

**Project title: European network of economic policy research institutes**

Project Coordinator: Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS), Brussels, Belgium

Project partners: CEPII, Paris, France; CPB, The Hague, The Netherlands; DIW, Berlin, Germany; FEDEA, Madrid, Spain; ISAE Rome, Italy; IUI, Stockholm, Sweden; NIESR London, United Kingdom; NOBE, Lodz, Poland

Start date: 1 March 2000

Duration: 36 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-1999-00011**

**Project title: Between work and welfare: improving return to work strategies for long term absent employees**

Project coordinator: Work Research Centre Dublin, Ireland

Project partners: University College, Dublin, Ireland; University of Linz, Austria;

# PSPC



Social Insurance Institution, Turku, Finland; Fortum Occupational Health Services, Finland; University of Heidelberg, Germany; University of Cassino, Italy; University of Maastricht, Netherlands

Start date: 1 March 2000

Duration: 24 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-1999-00023**

### **Project title: Public participation and the pension policy process: the citizen and pension reform**

Project coordinator: ICCR, Vienna, Austria

Project partners: SERLL, UK; Symlog de France, France; IIASA, Austria; LOS, Norway; IriDiSS, Italy; PONT INFO Ltd. Poland

Starting date: February 2000

Duration: 27 Months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-1999-00030**

### **Project title: Households, work and flexibility**

Project coordinator: Institute for Advance Studies, Vienna, Austria

Project partners: University of Hertfordshire, UK; University of Umea, Sweden; Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Czech Republic; State University of Plovdiv, Bulgaria; Stoas Foundation, The Netherlands; Sicenter Center za Socialne indikatorje, Slovenia; TARKI Social Research Centre, Hungary; Institute for the Study of the quality of life Academia Romana, Romania

Start date: 1 April 2000

Duration: 36 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-1999-00032**

### **Project title: The dynamics of social change in Europe**

Project coordinator: Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, United Kingdom

Project partners: German Institute for Economic Research, Germany; Economic and Social Research Institute, Dublin, Ireland; Centre for Labour Market and Social Research, University of Aarhus, Denmark; Institute for Social and Socio-economic Research, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands; Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Start date: March 2000

Duration: 42 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-1999-00038**

### **Project title: The housing dimension of welfare reform**

Project coordinator: Interdisciplinary Centre for Comparative Research in the Social Sciences (ICCR), Vienna, Austria

Project partners: Population and Social Policy Consultants (PSPC), Brussels, Belgium; Association for Innovative Social Research and Social Planning (GISS), Bremen, Germany; Danish National Institute for Social Research (SFI) Copenhagen, Denmark; Dipartimento di Scienze del Territorio (DST) University of Milan, Milan, Italy; Homeless



Initiative, Dublin, Ireland; Department of Social Work, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland

Starting date: 2002

Duration: 36 months

## **HPSE-CT-2001-00060**

### **The importance of housing systems in safeguarding social cohesion in Europe**

Coordinator: Srz Stadt-und Regionalforschung GMBH, Vienna, Austria

Project partners: Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands; University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK; Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques, Paris, France; University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

Start date: 1 September 2001

Duration: 36 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT2001-00070**

### **Project title: Social innovation, governance and community building**

Project Coordinator: IFRESI-CNRS, Lille, France

Project Partners: Oxford University, Oxford UK; Humboldt University Berlin, Germany; University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne UK; Università degli Studi di Pavia, Pavia, Italy; ITER Srl, Naples, Italy; Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, Vienna, Austria; University of Wales Cardiff, Cardiff, UK.

Start date: 1 September 2001

Duration: 40 months

## **Project No. HPSE CT-2001-00080**

### **Project title: Neighbourhood governance – capacity for social integration**

Coordinator: Kungliga Tekniska Hogskolan, Stockholm, Sweden

Partners: SBI-Statens Byggeforskningsinstitut, Hoershelm, Denmark; Institut fuer Landes – und Stadtentwicklungsforschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Dortmund, Germany; University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece; SERC – Social Economical Research Consultancy, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland; Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, Venice, Italy; Centro de Estudos Territorias, Lisbon, Portugal; University of Westminster, London, UK; University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK

Starting date: 1 September 2001

Duration: 30 months

## **Project No. HPSE-CT-2001-50013**

### **Project title: Réseau thématique sur emploi, chômage et protection sociale: la cohésion sociale au défi de la mondialisation et des NTIC (Thematic network on employment, unemployment and social protection: social protection challenged by globalization and new information and communication technologies)**

Coordinator: Fondation Maison des Sciences de l'homme, Paris, France

Project partners: Centre d'études de l'emploi, Université FUDAN de Shanghai, Shanghai, China ; Centre d'Etudes de l'Emploi, Noisy-le-grand, France ; Centre de Sociologie de l'université de Pékin, Beijing, China ; School of European Studies, Cardiff University,



Cardiff, United Kingdom; Institut de recherches économiques et sociaux, Noisy-le-grand, France; Laboratoire Georges Friedman/CNRS, Paris, France; Centre de Sociologie du travail, de l'emploi et de la formation, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium; Institut de prognostication et de développement socio-économique, Université d'économie Nationale et mondiale, Sofia, Bulgaria; WSI in der Hans Böckler Stiftung, Dusseldorf, Germany

Start date: 1 September 2001

Duration: 40 months

## European Commission documents

[http://www.europa.eu.int/com/employment\\_social/social\\_inclusion/index\\_en.htm](http://www.europa.eu.int/com/employment_social/social_inclusion/index_en.htm)

[http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment\\_social/news/2005/apr/com\\_2005\\_141\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/news/2005/apr/com_2005_141_en.pdf)

[http://europa.eu.int/growthandjobs/pdf/SEC2005\\_622\\_en.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/growthandjobs/pdf/SEC2005_622_en.pdf)

Commission of the European Communities (2005), Green Paper “*Confronting demographic change: a new solidarity between the generations*”. Brussels: Communication from the Commission.

Commission of the European Communities (2005), Commission Staff Working Paper “*Working together for growth and jobs. Next steps in implementing the revised Lisbon Strategy*”

Commission of the European Communities (2004), *Third report on economic and social cohesion*. Brussels 18.02.2004. COM (2004)107 final. Commission Communication.

Commission of the European Communities (2003), *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Joint Report on Social Inclusion: summarising the results of the examination of the National Action Plans for Social Inclusion (2003-2005)*. Brussels: 12.12.2003 COM (2003)773 final.

European Commission (2003), *Key action. Improving the socio-economic knowledge base. Synopses of the key action projects funded as a result of the third call for proposals (1999-2002)*. Brussels: Directorate-General for Research. Citizens and governance in a Knowledge-based society.

Commission of the European Communities (2002), *Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Report Requested by Stockholm European Council: Increasing Labour Force Participation and Promoting Active Ageing*. Brussels: Com(2002) 9 final.

Commission of the European Communities (2001), *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on an open method of coordination for the community immigration policy*. COM (2001) 387. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

European Commission (2001), *Targeted socio-economic research (TSER) Project synopses 1994-1998*. Brussels: DG-XII. Science Research and Development.



- Commission of the European Communities (2000), *The Future Evolution of Social Protection from a Long-Term Point of View: Safe and Sustainable Pensions*. COM(2000)622 final. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- European Commission (2000) *Social Policy Agenda*. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, Directorate General for Employment and Social Affairs. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Commission of the European Communities (1999), *Communication from the Commission: Towards a Europe for All Ages. Promoting Prosperity and Intergenerational Solidarity*. Brussels: Com (1999) 221 final.
- European Commission (1996), *Social Europe, the Outlook on Supplementary Pensions, in the Context of Demographic, Economic and Social Change*. Directorate General for Employment and Social Affairs, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities: Luxembourg

## General literature

- Atkinson, T. et al. (2002), *Social Indicators. The EU and Social Inclusion*. Oxford University Press
- Avramov, D. (2002), *People, demography and social exclusion*. Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg
- Avramov, D. (1999), *Coping with homelessness: issues to be tackled and best practices in Europe*. Ashgate: Aldershot, Brookfield USA, Singapore, Sydney
- Avramov, D., M. Maskova (2003), *Active ageing in Europe*. Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg
- Avramov, D., R. Cliquet (2005), *Integrated Policies on Gender Relations, Ageing and Migration in Europe*. CBGS/Garant: Brussels
- Beck, U. (1992), *Risk-society*. London: Sage
- Berthoud, R. (2004), *Patterns of Poverty across Europe*. Bristol: The Policy Press
- Bouget, D. H. Noguez (1993), *Evaluation des politiques de lutte contre les exclusions sociales*, *Revue française des Affaires sociales*, Centre d'économie des besoins sociaux (CEBS), Faculté des Sciences économiques de Nantes
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1997) *Welfare States at the End of the Century, The Impact of the Labour Markets, Family and Demographic Change*. Paris: OECD Publications
- Esping-Andersen, G. ed. (1996) *Welfare States in Transition, National Adaptations in Global Economies*. SAGE Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi
- Gallie, D. S. Paugam (2000), *Welfare Regimes and the Experience of Unemployment in Europe*, Oxford University Press
- Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in Late Modern Age*. Polity Press : Oxford
- Höhn, C. (2005), *Demographic challenges for social cohesion: a review and analysis of the work of the European Population Committee 2001-2004*. Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg
- Paugam, S. ed. (1996), *L'exclusion : l'état des savoirs*. Paris : La Découverte