Social Cohesion in Europe

Introduction
This summary presents a bibliography of studies and publications on social cohesion in the countries of the European Union (EU). The family transformation and social cohesion project is guided by Rosell’s definition of social cohesion:

Social cohesion involves building shared values and communities of interpretation, reducing disparities in wealth and income, and generally enabling people to have a sense that they are engaged in a common enterprise, facing shared challenges and that they are members of the same community (Rosell, 1995).

The studies and publications described here largely mirror this definition. A number of projects in Europe are relevant to the project. These are, the GLOBALIFE project at the faculty of sociology, university of Bielefeld, Germany, the social exclusion and the development of European citizenship (SEDEC) Network, housed at the Political Economy Research Centre (PERC) at the university of Sheffield, UK, and the EU’s COST ACTION A15.

Two processes are central in the discourse of social cohesion in Europe: globalization and the move toward monetary and political union in Europe. Regarding the latter, the discussion revolves around the effects of the move into a monetary union and the need to harmonise social welfare programmes. The reform of social welfare in particular is pertinent in these discussions, the central question being, ‘what does the recent reform in welfare portend for social cohesion?’ This is closely intertwined with the right to work because involvement in gainful employment is treated as the major means to citizens integration into the community and society. This is the major focus of studies at PERC and COST ACTION A15.

Globalization is regarded as producing uniformity across countries. Globalization, according to Blossfeld, refers to: (1) the increasing dominance of a single, worldwide market with growing flows of capital, goods, services, labor and information across national borders; (2) the expanding global division of labor that makes national economies, national states, and multiple cultural settings increasingly independent of each other; (3) the rising tendency to set up supranational organizations and the weakening of national ones in the economy and the political sphere; and, (4) the enhancing pressure on the national economy and national state to internally adjust to accelerating changes in the international environment (Blossfeld, 2000). Studies that have been undertaken attempt to examine the effect of globalization in the transition of people into various states of life. This is the focus of the GLOBALIFE Project. Some of the questions include, for instance, the effects of globalization on young people’s transition into adult life (completing school, joining the labor force and starting a family, and how globalization affects women’s participation in the labor force and their role as mothers and wives. Just as in the case of the changes related to European integration, the main conclusion that emerges is that the processes associated with globalization will vary from country to country depending on the specific historical conditions of each.

The SEDEC Network project is described as aiming to ‘make a contribution to the search for a new European social model as a frame of reference for developing and evaluating alternative forms of
socio-economic policy concerned with social inclusion within the European Union, both at national and EU level’. Additionally, it aims to analyse and evaluate contemporary socio-economic policy and processes. The COST ACTION A 15 project is similar to the preceding one. It is social science and humanities EU Commission project which aims ‘to obtain an increased knowledge and a common European understanding of the reforms and the transformation of social protection systems in Europe in the context of globalization and European construction’.

The GLOBALIFE project examines the influence of global processes on life courses in OECD-type societies and focuses on four life course related topics: (1) the transition from youth to adulthood (leaving the educational system, entering the job market, starting own household/family, having children, etc., and the interdependence of these events); (2) changes in career mobility, forms of employment and unemployment over the life course; (3) the development of gender-specific patterns in work-family linkages; and, (4) the transition from employment to retirement, all four embedded within the process of globalization.

I European Integration and Social Cohesion


This article is in French. Bouchard says in the English summary of the article that the homelessness phenomenon signals the need for the European society to rethink its notions and ways of seeing and acting as regards citizenship. There are two areas the author considers any society concerned about the inclusion and participation of its citizens in community and institutional development should invest. The first involves teaching the exercise of citizenship, and the second the nature of social organizations and institutions in which citizenship can be exercised from childhood to adulthood, that is, teaching on the one hand and, context on the other. The author identifies two institutions that can help to preventing homelessness, the family and the school. He asserts this they can do if society rids its social policies of the double language of verbal compassion and economic and social exclusion, particularly those affecting members of society at early childhood, and those affecting children and adolescents.

2. Cousins, Christine. 1998. “Social exclusion in Europe: Paradigms of social disadvantage in Germany, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom”. Policy and Politics Vol. 26 no. 2

Cousins in this article in the journal of Policy and Politics reviews contemporary discussions of the concept of social exclusion in Europe. In particular, she examines the different paradigms of inclusion and exclusion in Germany, Spain, Sweden and the UK. These countries are chosen with respect to the debate on welfare regimes and to provide an insight into the different paradigms of social exclusion. The article mainly tries to link the literature on social exclusion with the debate on welfare regimes and labor market structures and mechanisms of social protection. The article further considers the exclusion or inclusion of women, ethnic minority groups, and other social classes in different welfare regimes by drawing on recent comparative analyses. In respect to this last consideration, the author makes reference to France where the concept of social exclusion has been most extensively developed and used. The word is now used in place of ‘poverty’ due to member states opposition to the use of
poverty. The article reviews some studies that have focused on the reasons for social exclusion. She also takes note of the ambiguity related to this term reviewing various definitions that have been used in literature. Making reference to Silver’s (1994) threefold typology of social exclusion, solidarity, specialization, and monopoly, the author notes that each is ‘grounded in a different philosophy, Republicanism, liberalism and social democracy. The specialization paradigm is, she notes, is underpinned by Anglo-American liberalism, with social exclusion under it reflecting discrimination, market failures and unenforced rights’. The monopoly paradigm on the other hand sees exclusion and poverty as a consequence of the formation of group monopolies.

Cousins then discusses where the selected countries in her analysis fall among these approaches. Policy forums in Germany and Spain are characterized as representative of a neo-organic paradigm. These are contrasted with the UK as a liberal regime informed by the specialization model. The monopoly model has, on the other hand, influenced the egalitarian social policies pursued in Scandinavian countries, particularly Sweden. Although France is not included in the current analysis, it is a representative of the solidarity paradigm.

Cousins’ discussion of social exclusion centers on only two dimensions, namely access or lack of access to the labor market and social protection. In Germany and Spain, the historical legacy of the ‘organic’ paradigm has privileged core workers in their labor market status and income maintenance. The broad model operating here is that of the male breadwinner family model, which means that, many groups including the unmarried women and women in general, those in part-time work, immigrants in unregulated employment, and the unemployed do not access many social insurance benefits received by the employed. However, a key difference between Germany on one hand, and Spain and other Southern European states is the polarized character of social protection in the latter. As Cousins observes, “for those who occupy the core sectors of the labor market there is generous social protection, but for others in the weak labor market positions there are only meager benefits. Spain provides no national minimum income” (1998:136).

In Sweden where the monopolistic paradigm of exclusion is in operation, the expansion of the public sector employment until recently has meant that women’s employment rates are higher than in the rest of Europe and that a secondary labor market (as a form of social closure and economic inequality) did not arise as in the other countries. Cousins notes that ‘the achievement of Sweden’s public policies have been citizenship rights based on universal, high-income replacement benefits with broad coverage and liberal qualifying conditions. Due to increasing inequality in the 1980s considerable policy reforms of the welfare state, both services and social security, have already been undertaken in the usual Swedish way of ensuring that these cuts in social security cut across-the-board so that no one group is disadvantaged. Although the Swedish model reinforced class identity and helped to reproduce important inter-class alliances, this was not the case for gender relations. In addition, although between 1930s and 1960s social policies reinforced separate spheres for men and women, between 1960s and 1970s women demands for equality has resulted in changes in policies that have allowed women to combine paid work with a family. As Cousins observes, ‘there are therefore greater opportunities for women to become commodified and hence also decommodified than in our other three countries’.

In the UK, both the liberal political economy and the idea of poverty emerged from the transformations
of the industrial revolution in late eighteenth century. Britain she notes has strong specialization concept of exclusion. However, it is the monopoly paradigm that has influenced action by a welfare rights movement to combat poverty with success in the 1960s and 1970s. Although labor market deregulation it was claimed would enhance employment growth, unemployment has persisted. In addition, policies have not created jobs for the unemployed. On the contrary as Cousins, quoting Deakin and Wilkinson, (1991/92), notes “the vast majority of part-time jobs are taken up by women married to men who are employed; dependants of the unemployed or the unemployed themselves are prevented from doing this kind of work by loss of benefit or the poverty trap” (1998:139). A consequence of this is an increasing polarization between ‘work-rich’ (with two or more people in work) and ‘work-poor’ (with no one at work) households. Further, ‘for those who are dependent on means-tested benefits, low-waged and insecure jobs do not provide opportunities and incentives to reenter employment. Decommodification is therefore at a minimum level of subsistence, and this in turn brings poverty and exclusion from standards of living and participation, which other members of society have been able to achieve. The development of the notion of ‘individual choice’, which has transferred responsibility to individual has served to further exclude many groups in society, thus exclusion under this paradigm results from discrimination.


This paper addresses the reasons for the changes in welfare systems, or what he terms “the rejection of the former ‘contracts’”. He says that institutions of public redistribution of the modern welfare state including taxation and social insurance have lost their ‘economic sustainability’, and/or ‘their ‘social support’. This has led to what he terms ‘crisis of the welfare state’. The coming of the ‘crisis’, he says, has seen a cutback in access to resources and an invalidation of “social contracts’ that have served social security, social integration, and some form of social justice”.

He discusses four ideal-typical patterns of giving access to resources, or patterns of access, which follows on societal and not individual access to resources first developed by Polanyi (1944). He says, however, that the patterns he describes here do not coincide with Polanyi’s who ‘defined the oikos or family householding, reciprocity, redistribution, and self-regulating and price-regulating market as patterns of integration having played a dominant role in one or another society throughout world history”. Ferge, on the other hand, analyses the four patterns of access: one-sided giving without counter-service (alms giving); reciprocity, ‘that is the giving of service or gift and normatively expected counter-service or counter-gift without calculating equivalence; citizen’s rights, which means rights to ‘social inheritance; and exchange based on the market principle. The third pattern (right to social inheritance) implies access to ‘a modicum of welfare, decent working conditions, education, health services, etc. The exchange based on the market principle refers to ‘economic activity based on freedom of property, of labor and of contract, geared by unlimited free competition, and aiming at profit maximization’.

In the first section of the paper, he describes the four patterns and the relationships that are developed between the participants, noting that the relationships may be symmetrical or asymmetrical. In the
second section he examine some social characteristics of the patterns, saying that the rationale underpinning the transaction may be economic or non-economic, while the extent of the coverage and adequacy of its provision varies by type of pattern. In section three he looks at the socially legitimating principles of the patterns while section five looks at current real-life transactions. This is where the issue of ‘messy contracts’ comes in because ‘in real life the transactions or contracts may be underpinned by several, sometimes contradictory principles’. However, he argues that because they could accommodate diverse and often conflicting purposes and interests, the messy contracts could ‘better serve complex social purposes than purer forms of access to resources’. In the fifth part he looks at the effect ‘of the neo-liberal era on the old messy contracts’. He argues that their abolition is caused by political and economic interests and not their unsustainability as it is claimed. Although the functional alternatives proposed by the neo-liberal/neo-conservative approach are the single-principle transactions of charity and pure market, they have brought back the ‘old asymmetries and blatant social dysfunctions. The latter has led to the introduction of new messy contracts to address them. In order to solve the paradox of increasing poverty and insecurity in the midst of increasing wealth, he proposes the idea of basic income as a solution. But its adoption will depend on whether the civil society will accept and fight for it. This is the focus of the last section.


In the first section the building blocks of the “European model” of social protection are briefly passed under review. The bulk of the social protection systems belongs to the field of subsidiarity. Yet the governing bodies and leading actors of the EU encourage the member countries in direct and indirect ways to strengthen their system of social protection. The case is different for the accession countries. The Accession Reports from the Community for ten applicant countries for 1999 that subsidiarity is not fully respected. There are many direct and indirect recommendations in the text that suggest to the accession countries measures contrary to the European model, such as the privatisation of pensions and health, or the cutback of already low social expenditures. The question has to be asked whether this hidden agenda is known to, and approved of all the actors of the Union. (Author’s abstract).


This book tackles the issue of the re-emergence of social integration and social exclusion both in sociological discourse and in the world of policy and politics particularly in the European Union. The starting point of the presentations in this book is David Lockwood’s essay “Social integration and systemintegration” in 1964. Lockwood says that social integration focuses on the orderly or conflictual relationships between actors, while system integration focuses on orderly or conflictual relationships between the parts, of a social system. Two chapters in the book are theory driven and address the different ideas suggested by these terms.

In the chapters in Part II, the authors examine the extent of social and/or system integration, and the extent to which either is threatened the pressures of globalization. David Lockwood in one of the
chapters focuses on social integration which he divides into two: civic integration, ‘the integrity of the core institutional order of citizenship at the macro-social level’, and social cohesion, ‘the strength of primary and secondary networks at the micro- and meso-social levels’. He sought to examine the impact of nonliberal capitalism on integration. He found, in regard to civic integration that although ‘political citizenship in Britain remains sound, economic citizenship has been threatened by declining trade unionism, long-term unemployment, tax evasion and black economy, while social citizenship is threatened by eroding universal rights, more selectivity and scapegoating, and rising poverty’. Gough in another of the chapters in this part provides a similar view on system integration. The last chapter in this part by Birte Siim that takes Nordic societies as a case study examines the impact of modern democratic welfare capitalism on women’s position.

The authors of essays in Part III base their arguments on Durkheimian notion of the division of labor. The editors of the volume note that the term marginalization under the Durkheimian notion of division of labor ‘denotes that postmodern societies seem to produce, not just a new and perhaps increasing division of labor, but a notable tendency to exclude to exclude rising numbers of people from work and other socially significant areas of participation’. The authors make reference to the term marginalization to discuss labor market marginalization, the ‘underclass’ debate and new policies to tackle social exclusion.


The author addresses ‘the force of new ideas in changing social policies, as illustrated by the recent calls for a turn to more ‘active’ forms of social protection’. He notes that in the recommendations and programmes of both the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the European Union (EU) these calls have figured as a key element. However, in spite of the calls, his analysis indicates that these new ideas have had little impact on actual policy practices of most Western European countries, their greater impact being felt more in policy pronouncements. He says that the basic ideas behind the calls for more active social policies are that it is better for people to work than only live on public income transfers.

In this paper he focuses on three issues: • First, what are the main ideas and assumptions behind the ‘new’ activation policies? To what extent do these ideas and assumptions represent a break with the key principles of modern welfare states? • Second, to what degree has the new welfare to work or activation discourse been followed up in practice in Western Europe? To what extent can we identify different ‘profiles’ or ‘types’ of activation strategies as they have been pursued in practice?

In discussing the first component of the first issue, he says that activation policies are claimed to be in the interest of the individual (maintains or even increases the person’s skills and qualifications hence bettering their opportunities in the labor market; prevents the negative effects of non-participation in regular gainful employment; encourage more active and systematic job-seeking; and is a means to an individual integration into their community) and society (prevents a depreciation of skills, contributes to the economic inclusion of the workless, and reduces the pressure on public budgets for income maintenance), adding that the considerations as presented as non-conflictual. However, he mentions that the relative importance of these promises is likely to vary depending on what stage of
the business cycle decision makers perceive themselves to be in. He in turn mentions two options that
governments have in the face of controlling increased costs of the social support systems: ‘tough’ or
‘softer option. The former involves a scaling down in the levels and duration of benefits or a tightening
of criteria for the right to receive financial support. The latter involves strengthening the assistance
given to the unemployed to get into work. Although, some people will see the first option as an
‘activation policy’ he says that it is the second one he will consider so.

Concerning whether the introduction of activation policies is a break with established and key
principles of modern welfare states, he says that it depends on what would consider the key
characteristics of modern welfare states, and what aspects of citizenship these characteristics are
thought to promote. Answering the question of whether there is a convergence in activation policies,
he says that contrary to expectations (mostly due to globalization and European integration) “.... the
variation in the characteristics and achievements of Western European welfare states means that a shift
towards more activist policies is likely to be experienced and assessed differently in these countries,
depending on what their starting point and frame of reference have been”. For instance, in Norway and
Sweden the income maintenance system which began in the 1940s was based on the elements of
‘welfare to work’. Although, the ‘work-oriented approach was exposed to various forms of ‘policy
erosion’ over the years what happened in the 1980s was not an invention os a new policy but a return
to the original principles underpinning the ‘welfare to work’ policy.

Turning to the second issue, he identifies several indicators to measure the extent to which a return
to activation policies has become a reality in European countries. These include changes in public
spending on ‘active’ and ‘passive’ measures, change in numbers of participants in active programs,
change in levels of benefits, duration of benefits, in eligibility criteria, in conditions for continued
receipt of benefits and in role of mean-tested assistance. He then evaluates sixteen European countries
on the basis of these criteria.

The last issue he considers is how effective the activation policies are likely to be. He mentions that
a number of studies have been done in the recent past on the effects of activation policies and can
broadly be divided into two: Macro-economic studies of the effects on the labor market as a whole,
and micro-economic studies of the effects on the labor market prospects and experiences of individual
participants in measures. In relation to the sixteen countries studied, he says that there is some
evidence that an improved overall labour market situation has resulted from the implementation of
activation policies. However, they differed in terms of policy outcomes depending on whether they
implemented a Complementary Strategy (increasing both standardized active efforts and tightening of
benefit schemes for people out of work) or Alternative Strategy (only or mainly tightening benefit
schemes for people outside work).

Concluding he says that it is not yet clear whether the proclaimed return to activist policies represents
a break with established welfare state principles, few European countries could be said to have turned
to activist policies in the 1990s, and it is not yet clear what the effects of activation policies have been
on unemployment levels and labor market participation rates. Therefore, it is better to adopt a waiting
attitude.

7. Lind, Jens and Iver H. Moller (eds.).1999. Inclusion and exclusion: Unemployment and non-
This book is about inclusion and exclusion in the context of employment. It has three sections. Section one focuses on the theme “Freedom from work or freedom through work?” Section two looks at “Perspectives on new forms of differentiation and inclusion”, while part three focuses on the European experience with its one article examining convergence across countries and particularities within countries in social inclusion and exclusion through work. The book’s main content is about unemployment and non-standard employment and policies aiming to reduce the social exclusion caused among other things, by labor market marginalization in four European countries, Denmark, the UK, the Netherlands and Portugal. The countries, to some extent, represent the different types of welfare state regime in Europe: a Scandinavian model, social-democratic model; a liberal, Anglo-Saxon model; a corporate, ‘Bismarckian’ model; and a southern ‘variant’. According to the editors, the analyses in the book intend to provide a thorough insight into the variety of issues attendant in the recent labor market developments and a related overview of the major schemes and programs to combat social exclusion. It is the case that the variety of issues and policies point to the existence of national and regional specificities. However, commonality of traits in labor market developments and accompanying modes of social integration also exist. Although a major issue in this transformation of the labor markets is the marginalization it spawns, there is also need to focus on measures which ‘activate’ the unemployed instead of just paying them benefits. There are three ways to see the social implications of the latter. One way of viewing it is that the unemployed and marginalized are provided with assistance from the welfare state in order to be re-included in working life. Another way to see it is that this ‘workfare policy’ is a disciplinary and punitive measure to maintain commitment to the work ethic. Further, they note that the South European unemployed have a reason to be happy not being targets of this policy. A final alternative viewpoint, which is more radical, compared to the ‘workfare policy’ is some sort of ‘freedom from work’ in terms of citizen’s income or basic income scheme. A related strategy is to improve the quality of working life, through ‘freedom at work’.


The author argues that what is normally forgotten in the debate about the future of welfare is the fact that welfare state in advanced industrialized countries represents an immense achievement of the twentieth century. This achievement mainly involves the positioning of social rights alongside legal, civil and political rights. She argues that this in part explains why institutions of welfare state are invested with much emotion, they embody historical struggles, political victories and national identity and as a result make change difficult to contemplate. In this article the author argues that future policies need to take account of the economic and social changes and policy transformations, discussing them in the context of a global and more flexible labor market and more substantially mixed economy of welfare, and how these can be shaped for greater social justice.

In particular the article discusses the challenges, building blocks for reform and policy issues. She identifies several major challenges to advanced welfare states. The first is the global economy which has brought in its wake high unemployment, economic inactivity in Europe, and strong pressures to
deregulate and create flexible labor markets with sharp rises in wage dispersion, part-time, temporary and casual employment particularly in the UK and USA. The second is the changes in family patterns particularly the growth of lone parenthood and ageing of the population which have placed new and unanticipated (by their founders) burdens on welfare states. Third, more heterogeneous societies, greater individualization and choice have brought new expectations and demands of welfare state that was shaped by notions of uniformity and homogeneity. The final challenge that she identifies is the reluctant recognition on the center-left of some of the side-effects of welfare provisions, among them the effect of means-tested benefits on work incentives and fraud, and the impact of long term reliance on income support for individual and community capacities to generate themselves. These changes have created new risks which the Beveridge’s ‘cradle to grave’ welfare state cannot address, and have resulted in welfare assistance being concentrated during people’s ‘active’ lives instead of at the beginning and the end of the lifecycle.

She mentions three options to this challenge. First, maintain the Conservative agenda allowing some parts of state provision to wither away without addressing the distributional consequences of doing so. A second, path is to move further down the road of a residual welfare, quite an administratively costly undertaking. A third option is what she calls the ‘traditional left agenda’ which involves reverting to raising personal taxation to increase spending on traditional areas of welfare state. However, in this article she explores a fourth option based on the premise that the neo-liberal welfare state has failed, neither generating stable economic growth nor benefitting the poorest from the ‘trickle down’ effect. The option she proposes, in her words, aims to reshape the welfare state to cope with the new challenges. In discussing the building the blocks for reform, she mentions attempts made to evolve new principles and policies of welfare pointing out that in spite their different emphases they represent a consensus on the importance of joining the economic and social spheres, the role of social investment, an integrated approach to learning, renewing skills over the lifecourse; they broadly reject means-testing and instead propose measures to smooth the path from benefits to work. The building blocks for reform which she discusses include the economic and social, equality, reciprocity, participation and democracy, and universalism. An important observation she makes on relationship between the economic and the social is that despite the ‘congruence between social inclusion and high levels of economic performance, there will be some areas of welfare that do not promote economic growth’. As an example, the needs of the disabled, older pensioners and those permanently outside the labor market all carry economic growth. On policy issues, the author asserts that they are developed within two particular constraints; the continuation of a flexible labor market and limited manoeuvr for increasing public spending. She discusses a number of priorities which embody some key themes drawn from work undertaken by the Institute for Public Policy Research and Institute for Fiscal Studies. These include welfare to work (job creation, increasing income differentials between being out of work and in work, transitions into work, labor market contact, creation of flexible work patterns and education and training), reinventing universalism(means/affluence tests and feasibility of creating universal strategies in the private sector), and finance.


The SEDEC network means ‘social exclusion and the development of European citizenship’. The
network is concerned with the developing connection between social exclusion problems and social inclusionary policies to address them, and with citizenship and social rights in European societies both at national and European levels. Specifically, the project focused on problems of work, income and recognition among young people, the development of inclusionary and activating policies to address these problems in the period of the 1990s and also to a limited extent ethnicity/migration aspects of contemporary social inclusion programs and policies in Europe. This research report is based on a research on ‘comparative social inclusion policies’ (CSIP) conducted in twelve European states: UK, Denmark, Netherlands, Portugal, Austria, Spain, Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, Sweden, and Finland. This report summarizes the various components of the work carried out by the network.

The CSIP project has three main themes, namely the reform of mainstream social inclusion policies in the work and welfare regimes across Europe; the development of ‘complementary’ social inclusion policies; and the problem of migrant workers and related exclusionary problems. The authors note that mainstream systems tend to prioritize employment above everything else, and it is considered the means to inclusion and social citizenship. Additionally, the citizenship right to positive recognition is also interpreted through the lens of the right to access to the status of being an employee. The project examines the changes in the labor market and how these relate to social inclusion and exclusion. The aspect of complementary social inclusion policies looks at the actual and potential links between, on the one hand, the formal work and welfare systems and their market and employment-oriented interpretations of the social rights of citizenship, and on the other, the broader interpretations of work to include non-market oriented activities in voluntary and community sectors and informal economic activities such as undeclared work and work in household and family contexts. In this context, the ‘right to work’ as employment does not carry notions of a right to income and recognition with it. This is particularly true of women’s work in a family context.

The project considers work that is complementary to employment and the policies that engender and reward this work in comparable levels to employment, and note that such policies have been developing across European states in recent years representing a distinctive dimension of the more general process of work and welfare reform. Studying mainstream and complementary policies can take two forms. First, the nature, delivery and effectiveness of particular programs and schemes, including the experiences of the clients in the schemes, with a view to policy-evaluation. Second, they can be studied in an open-ended way, from the perspective of the experiences and needs of the people involved in complementary work.

The migrant workers and exclusion problems aspect of the project is seen as important for a number of reasons. Studying migrant experiences can provide strategically important perspectives on citizenship rights in general and rights to work, income and recognition in particular; it can allow for important insights to be gathered for national and EU policy-making about the adequacy of mainstream and also complementary work and welfare systems and related social inclusion policies; and can reveal fundamental ethnic and nationalistic (mono-) cultural assumptions underpinning the operation of Europe’s welfare states.

There are four broad findings of this study:
1. European countries have been attempting to adapt their mainstream social inclusion policies in response to common socio-economic changes across Europe in ways that are broadly comparable,
mainly from ‘passive’ to ‘active’ types;
2. Programs varied greatly between countries and welfare regimes;
3. Few mainstream social inclusion policies made much systematic or positive use of atypical, flexible forms of employment and informal economic activity;
4. The more successful program appeared to be those which aimed to address people as citizens and as bearers of social rights and responsibilities, and that these tended to be found most in countries typically associated with the ‘social democratic’ model.

In terms of policy concepts in the field of social inclusion, the study found and concluded that:
1. the standard (Epsing-Andersen) paradigm for comparative analysis of social models needs review if it is to retain its usefulness for guiding policy development in contemporary Europe;
2. institutional design and constitutional frameworks need to be considered in analyzing social models;
3. citizenship-oriented and ‘personal social capital’ concepts and principles relating to the forms, frames, and processes of social inclusion need to be considered when assessing and developing social inclusion policies.

They make a number of recommendations for developing social inclusion through activation policies:
1. The ‘reach’, ‘take-up’ and ‘drop-out’ problems of existing social activation programs need to be monitored and diagnosed;
2. To address these problems and to improve these programs such measures as benefit incentives, benefit-conditional interviews and a clearly communicated commitment to client-oriented services should be developed;
3. Innovative negotiated and client oriented ‘Community Enterprise Employment’ options need to be developed as part of programs aimed simultaneously at the activation of unemployed individuals and also at the social capital-building needs existing in their immediate environments;
4. Tax credit approaches, initially aimed at improving the income and consumption resources of the unemployed and people in low income and insecure employment, need to be developed in the direction of a citizen’s basic income.

They identify the problems of postwar welfare systems as reproduction of poverty, welfare stigmatization, and welfare dependency. However, there is need also to consider the political challenges of feminism and multiculturalism and also gender and ethnic assumptions built into them. They note that the welfare states tended to take for granted the traditionalistic obligations of women to perform unpaid or informal family and caring work. This tends to reproduce women’s traditional relative exclusion from the range of citizenship rights available for men. They therefore assert that on the basis of these lines of criticism even the claims of the most well resourced and comprehensive of the postwar European social models to have successfully delivered universal social rights to work, income and recognition are questionable. Due to the influence of the new politico-economic conditions and dynamics of the contemporary EU integration process particularly in the 1990s, and in the face of these common problems and issues, most of the European societies are currently attempting to reform their mainstream welfare and labor traditional market systems in diverse ways.

The book focuses on contemporary dynamics and debates around Europe on social exclusion and citizenship. The contributors see exclusion and citizenship as multidimensional processes. Social exclusion is placed in the context of economic welfare and culture, and the authors analyze it as involving concrete problems of unemployment, unequal access to social rights (economic welfare aspect) and ethnic discrimination (cultural aspect). These issues are related to contemporary debates about national as opposed to EU-level citizenship rights and identities. The authors present a balanced review and assessment of the conditions and possibilities for progressive citizenship oriented social reform and social policy in Europe over the medium term, exploring both the positive and negative aspects of European integration. This book has four sections addressing these issues. Section one titled “restructuring citizenship in the European Union” critically assesses citizenship and exclusion in the face of the development of the EU. Section two looks at economic exclusion and citizenship with the articles assessing how economic changes result in economic exclusion, and social integration. The articles in section three consider social policy relating to social and economic exclusion and citizenship. Two articles in this section are worth noting: the first considers whether flexible employment and benefits entrench social exclusion and inequality; while the second looks at local policies and promotion of participation in an urban setting. Section four focuses on socio-cultural exclusion and citizenship with a specific emphasis on identity and immigration.


This article as the author states is premised on recent debate revolving around the issue of whether social protection is harmful to economic performance. In particular she considers this issue by looking at one form of social protection, maternal and parental leave programs in Sweden. The paper presents an overview of the maternal and parental leave programs and benefits of the EU and former EFTA-countries and compares these programs with the Swedish one. In addition, the paper also reviews and summarizes research findings on the use of benefits by Swedish mothers and fathers and on the effects of the program on work incentives, child spacing and wage growth.


In this article, Szreter discusses the concept of social capital in the context of the new political ideology, the Third Way, of Britain’s New Labor government. The author presents three structural elements that the Third Way will need as a solid backbone for it to become an effective and lasting political program. However, in this article, he focuses on the need for a more fully elaborated ideology, which convincingly argues and demonstrates in greater detail how specified moral principles and priorities can be practically related to the workings of the ‘real world’. Thus, the author sees social capital as offering critical assistance to the putative ‘Third Way’ by providing it with its own distinctive political economy. Further, he contends the New Labor can acquire its own new, rigorous and practical analysis if it successfully integrates the concept of social capital into its understanding of the workings of the market economy. He sees this is as a means of achieving
acceptance from the businesspeople as it corresponds to their own current practice. He sees the concept of social capital as one that needs to be integrated into the established, analytical categories already used by mainstream economists as it ‘gives us a much superior understanding of the way in which real market economies, real businesses and real competition function today and for the foreseeable future’.

He asserts that the concept also challenges the trickle-down theory of wealth distribution of the neo-liberal dispensation by ‘drawing attention to the anti-democratic political costs and ultimately to the economic inefficiencies in a market society which permits relative wealth, income and status inequality to divide its citizens from each other’. This he adds compromises their capacity to communicate and associate with each other, leading to obvious signs of social pathology such as high rates of serious and violent crime, low levels of mutual trust between citizens in public places, electoral apathy and low voter turnout, low quality and low quantity in the provision of public services, and shortfalls in life expectancy. In the ultimate even the wealthy are affected by the resulting social exclusion.

He notes that what produces social capital is not the existence of civic institutions or networks of personal contact in society ‘but their functioning in certain ways, including important ‘details’ of the ways in which their participants communicate with each another’. This agrees with his definition of social capital that, it ‘flows from the endowment of mutually respecting and trusting relationships which enable a group to pursue their shared goals more effectively than would otherwise be possible’. The state can play a role in enabling the development of social capital, through deployment of resources to empower individuals disadvantaged (socially excluded) through no fault of their own, and through locally-devolved form of state functioning (as participatory, local self-government in active partnership and responsive negotiation with local communities and businesses).

Voluntary associations, according to Szreter, exist wherever liberal market societies and economies function and have a potential for generating both gains and losses. Therefore, politicians and economists need to recognize that ‘it is a society which seeks to minimize social exclusion and which maximizes its endowment of weak ties, allied to a plethora of ‘bridges’ between its different institutions, voluntary associations, businesses, and local communities, which will benefit to the greatest degree from the phenomenon of social capital’.

The author links social capital and the new political economy and places it within the context of information exchange in the economy. He notes that a proper understanding of the workings of the market-oriented economy requires the recognition of four analytical categories: biophysical capital, financial capital, human capital and social capital. The latter is defined from a normative economics viewpoint as ‘that general set of relationships which minimizes the transaction costs of information across the whole economy. It is possible he notes that a section of the population can use and control information resulting in less generally beneficial, more socially and economic divisive effects. The New Right view of the economy, he says, ‘has no room for the promotion of friendship, trust, fellow-feeling with other citizens who are strangers, local networks of cooperation and voluntary associations among employers and employees in communities specializing in certain goods or services’. Individual consumers or ‘firms’ in this economy viewed as independent, unconnected, sovereign, rational decision-makers.
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Among the policies he identifies the labor government has initiated which could promote the development of social capital include, policies backing minimum wage, supporting the rationale of welfare to work, promoting lifelong learning and training in the workplace, backing regional devolution, and directly-elected city mayors. He suggests that the extension of nursery and after school care, and more radical policies with regard to issues of education and equality would also serve to improve inclusion. He identifies two sources of influence on the formation of social capital and possibilities for communicative competence of the population, which is necessary for economic efficiency. These are income and wealth distribution and the national education system. The education system in particular simultaneously produces human capital (economic product) and social capital. He faults the highly selective and thoroughly divisive British education system for producing the most elitist and class-based societies of all liberal democracies.


New Labour's 'Third Way' in welfare derives its intellectual underpinning from 'risk society' theory as developed in the UK by Anthony Giddens. The theory suggests that the crucial social changes affecting citizens of modern societies are globalisation, the post-traditional social order and social reflexivity. These changes lead people to question state authority and competence, and to wish to take greater responsibility for meeting their own needs. Applied to welfare, the approach calls for a diminution in the role of government, greater proactivity by citizens and subsidiarity in relation to community groups and also the private sector. It buttresses Third Way calls for 'no rights without responsibility' and 'equality of opportunity, not equality of outcome'. This paper reports qualitative and quantitative research which indicates that the risks of modern social life are experienced differently by different social groups. 'Risk Society' theories, conversely, assume value consensus. They understand social change to have a common impact across society, leading to a common response. This directs attention away from the different needs and aspirations of the most vulnerable groups at a time of sharp increase in inequality. The 'Risk Society' thesis is class ideology (in a traditional sense) masquerading as social theory: it serves the interests of those already privileged in a more flexible society by obscuring the needs and aspirations of the more vulnerable, who already bear most of the burdens of social change, and justifying policies that suit those who are already advantaged. It provides insecure foundations for a democratic socialist 'Third Way' in welfare. (Author’s Abstract)


Recent interdisciplinary work suggests that social capital, or the extent to which citizens are willing to cooperate with each other on the basis of interpersonal trust, plays an important role in explaining both the efficiency of political institutions, and the economic performance of contemporary societies (Putnam, 1993, 1995; Fukuyama, 1995; Coleman 1988, 1990). The mechanisms by which civic values
influence socio-economic performance are several: if widespread levels of citizen trust exist in society, this serves to reduce transaction costs in the market economy, it helps to minimizes the deadweight burdens of enforcing and policing agreements, and holds down the diseconomies of fraud and theft (Putnam, 1993: 83-116; Fukuyama, 1995: 149-255; Coleman, 1990:91-116). Thus, it can be argued that trust greatly facilitates economic and social relationships (Author’s introduction).


This theoretical book contains presentations made at the 1997 European Sociological Association 3rd International Conference. The theme of the conference, chosen to reflect the changing patterns of social inclusions and exclusions of the past century, was *20th Century Europe: Inclusions/Exclusions*. The papers appearing in this book were presented by plenary speakers but were substantially revised to reflect the insights resulting from the conference. The issues explored at the conference included gender, ethnicity, class and age and how they contributed to the restructuring of European societies and the role of sociology in the understanding of inclusionary and exclusionary changes. The book is divided into three parts. Part one has four chapters organized around the theme ‘Framing inclusions and identities in Europe: theoretical perspectives on citizenship and belonging”. The four chapters in part two deal with how exclusions and inclusions are manifested in work and welfare. Part three contains two chapters presented under the theme “inclusions and exclusions beyond the nation state: Europe and the world”.

Two chapters in part one are noteworthy, chapter three titled recombinant citizenship and chapter five which explores new frontiers for identity and citizenship in planetary society. Rainer Baubock in chapter three notes that although since World War II (following on T.H. Marshall’s famous lectures) a citizen has been assumed to be of nation state and of one nation state only, ‘today, no theory of citizenship can afford to ignore the bewildering complexities of multiple and ambiguous memberships. He asserts that immigration from non-European origins, European Union citizenship and movements for self-determination have greatly undermined the correspondence between state borders and boundaries of citizenship. Alberto Melucci in chapter five examines ‘new forms of inequalities which prevent each individual from accessing and utilizing the tools that one needs to construct a specific self’. He argues that today’s democracy require conditions for enhancing the recognition and autonomy of individual and collective signifying daily processes. Further, that although ‘contemporary societies based on information allocate specific resources to individuals, who use them to become autonomous subjects of action’; they extend their control over deep-lying sources of action and construction of its meaning for the purpose of maintaining themselves. He defines inclusion and exclusion, not in material terms but in the sense of possibilities of becoming a person. He notes that ‘becoming a person is a matter of capacities, rights and responsibilities which are unequally shared’. The central issue of power and conflict in today’s information-driven society is who the actors are who decide the language used to name reality and choosing the codes to organize it. Thus, the new inequalities, Melucci says concern disparities in access to the means by which the meaning of action is defined, individual and collective identity constructed, and native culture safeguarded. Using poverty as an example, he says that it has become an issue which concerns the definition itself f rights and the notion of ‘humanity’ and of ‘being human’.
In chapter six (part II), Mayer tackles the issue of life course patterns in the context of the interdependence of global and national social changes. He notes (in light of the collapse of socialist states in succession from 1989) that ‘Western advanced societies are both subjects to and agents of broadly similar, global socio-economic developments’. Two implications arise from this thesis. First, the socio-economic changes facing the developed societies are essentially of the same kind. Second, the underlying cause and mechanism of these changes is the increasing international market competition and resulting loss of national regulatory power. He mentions ten social changes common to all advanced societies four of which relate to governments, and the labor market and corporate world separately. The other two relate to society (spread of information technology and mass media culture) and women (their increasing participation in education, training, employment and career). However, he notes that major institutional, structural and cultural differences in these countries, based on century old historical foundations means that each would be expected to ‘change on their own different tracks for a long time to come’. He mentions eight such national characteristics that will influence the direction of change in each country. The paradox he talks about here relates to the incompatibility of two beliefs: the uniformity of global change on one hand, and on the other, highly stable national diversity. He then uses the competing hypotheses of global social change and national path dependencies as background to examine patterns of the life course in modern societies. The patterns of life course he examines are specific forms of educational pathways, employment biographies and family trajectories.

In chapter nine Machado and Vilrocx examine how inequality and exclusion could be tackled to engender active citizenship participation. Their primary goal is to connect new ideas of citizenship with new meanings of work in the context of the latest socio-economic trends in European welfare states. They start by noting that Western societies have experienced great developments ‘in the achievements of equally guaranteed civil and social rights in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’. However, economical and structural changes in these societies in recent decades have challenged the idea of what it means to be a citizen. They advocate for a ‘shift from equality of opportunity to equality of participation, directly linked to the principle of active citizenship participation’ to achieve social integration. They see being a citizen then as ‘being able to participate fully in the local community and society’ and not just as entitlement to citizenship rights by way of waged employment’. They advocate for participation in other forms of work encouraged through a more social approach (participating in community groups) as one such way of achieving integration. Thus their definition of exclusion extends to include not only ‘exclusion from resources’, but also exclusion from ‘social participation’.

Bornschier in the final chapter addresses the topic European processes and the state of the European Union’. He starts by saying that inclusion and exclusion is an issue that has long history in European modernity, and that these two sides of European modernity are present in Europe’s recent institutional innovation.


This paper examines the recent developments in welfare states after a decade stagnation, crisis and defensive strategies. The paper is organized around three issues in relation to current theories of
welfare state change: status quo, dimension of change (crucial indicators of change) and fundamental changes (need to distinguish everyday policy change from fundamental changes that reveal how change in fiscal austerity and social and economic circumstances affect the direction in development of welfare states) . They use the Dutch case as an example of welfare state change. The authors say that two approaches dominate in the debate about change in welfare states: sociological, which is largely reflexive and speculative, and political science, which is ‘predominantly historical-institutionalist in approach’. The latter is ‘based on empirical research of actual processes of welfare state change’.

Globalization and Social Cohesion in Europe


The paper examines how the globalization process affects patterns of early careers of new entrants in the Italian labor market. Early careers as impacted by globalization are studied as an indirect effect, mediated by two interrelated structural changes that have characterized the labor market of OECD countries in the last 20 years: an increase in employment flexibility (i.e., a reduction in permanent employment and a diffusion of fixed-term contracts, training contracts and semi-independent forms of employment such as collaborators and consultants), and a parallel decrease in manufacturing employment. The empirical analysis focuses on the consequences of these structural changes for early careers, and it is divided into three parts. The first focuses on the relationship between class and flexibility in the employment contract at entry in the labor market. The second part of the analysis takes a dynamic perspective and considers question whether individuals who belong to a certain occupational class are more able to make the transition from flexible to permanent employment. The last part examines the risk of falling into unemployment, by considering the question of whether individuals who belong to a certain occupational class more at risk of experiencing unemployment. Two hypotheses are tested in this analysis: the hypothesis of an "individualization of social inequality" (Beck, Giddens) and the opposite hypothesis of a persistence of social class in filtering the macro changes brought about by the globalization process (Breen, Goldthorpe). The results point to an overall worsening of early career prospects for the youngest cohort that has been more exposed to the structural changes induced by the globalization process. When compared to the cohort that entered the labor market between 1966 and 1977 (years in which labor market regulation was very strong), the cohort of entrants after 1984 has experienced: 1) lower chances of achieving a long-term employment contract at entry into the labor market; 2) lower chances of transforming fixed-term contracts into permanent ones; and, 3) higher chances of experiencing unemployment. He notes that there are no hints of an individualization of inequality in Italy, at least in the first phase of employment careers. What emerges instead is that social class has become even more important in sheltering individuals from flexibility and unemployment than in the past.


A major thesis in contemporary sociology and economy is that global competition and the diffusion of information and communication technologies affect the employment strategies of firms and organizations and therewith the working lives of employees. Subcontracting, flexible work schedules,
part-time work and fixed-term contracts are ways by which firms try to become more flexible in responding to the demands of the market. Such forms of precarious employment tend to be introduced mainly to new labor market entrants. This is true, in particular, for insider-outsider labor markets like Germany. However, whether the labor market entrance process has become more difficult for new cohorts is highly dependent on the type of economy and the educational and occupational training system in a given country. In their paper the authors first try to understand how the globalization process affects employment arrangements by making them more insecure. Further, they ask which groups might be most prone to be hit by these insecurities. Second, they sketch the relevant features of the institutional setting in Germany and changes therein since the 1980s. They use this information to develop hypotheses on which groups of labor market entrants are most likely to bear the risk of precarious positions (fixed-term jobs) and unemployment (after first job entry). Third, based on the German Socioeconomic Panel (GSOEP), empirical analyses are conducted for the labor market entrance cohorts of 1985 to 1998 (East Germany: 1990-1998) to test their hypotheses. The results show that receiving a fixed-term position and becoming unemployed are rather clearly structured by occupational qualification and class, though with some peculiarities. Not only low-skilled persons, but also those with a university degree are likely to have fixed-term positions at entry into the labor market. Moreover, apprenticeship graduates seem to be less well shielded against unemployment once they have entered the labor market. In comparison to West Germans unemployment risks are higher for labor market entrants from migrant families and from East Germany. (Authors’ abstract).


This paper describes the effects of globalization on the life course of people in various countries and formulates some open research and policy questions. In particular, it considers the relationship between the globalization process with country-specific institutions. Although globalization is regarded as a uniformity-producing process, the author attempts to show that the process will not lead to more similarity among modern societies in the near future.


The paper focuses on the impact of the globalization process on the transition to adulthood in Great Britain taking into account the role of nation-specific institutions. Great Britain can be seen as an example of the so-called 'liberal welfare states' characterized by passive labor market policies, moderate support for the underprivileged, and relatively small public sector employment. Due to the decentralized industrial relation system, the comparatively high labor market flexibility and quite weak labor unions, individuals are increasingly exposed to uncertainties and flexibilities resulting from expanding global markets. With the increase in uncertainties, it becomes harder for young adults to plan their life course, making long-term, self-binding decisions less appealing. Using the British Household Panel Study and applying discrete-time transition models, it is studied to what extent Britons are confronted with increasing uncertainties at entry into the labor market, and whether this has an impact
on their partnership formation and entry into parenthood. The results of our empirical analysis reveal that the school-to-work transition is becoming increasingly uncertain. We find some evidence that individuals experiencing economic uncertainty and/or temporal uncertainty postpone entry into cohabitation and that they are more reluctant to transform cohabitation into marriage. Furthermore, our results show that with increasing uncertainty a postponement of first parenthood becomes more likely. (Author’s abstract).


This article looks at the transition of Dutch youth to adulthood within in the context of globalization. The analysis uses two data sets, one constructed by pooling data from seven retrospective life history surveys conducted among persons born between 1903 and 1970 and the other, the Panel Study of Social Integration in the Netherlands (PSIN), to examine the educational and labor market positions of young adults and the impact of globalization on entry into family roles among young adults.

The author notes that due to its location, Netherlands has always depended on international trade. This suggests that not much has changed even after four centuries of relying on international trade. He mentions that although globalization includes four different aspects, i.e., economic, network and political globalization and globalization as a discourse, only the first two are particular to Netherlands.

He discusses the institutional context within which the youth experience transition into adulthood. These are the educational, labor and welfare systems. The educational system has experienced great expansion. He says that the Dutch educational system is characterized by two parallel tracks, a general and vocational one. Due to the ‘rather theoretical nature of the vocational track, shifts from one track to the other are quite common’. However, echoing Blossfeld (2002), he says that ‘the high theoretical nature of this system has the advantage that young adults who enter the labor market are well-equipped with general skills that allow them to be flexible on the labor market, but the disadvantage of few job-specific skills’. In the case of the labor market, he mentions that it is characterized by a high level of employment security it offers which enables workers less able to adjust to changes in the labor market conditions. The labor market is also characterized by very low female participation. The welfare system in Netherlands is characterized as a ‘conservative’ regime. This means that ‘it is mainly committed to protecting people who drop out of the labor market- the unemployed, disabled, pensioners- from serious declines in their standards of living’. The system is also committed to the traditional division of labor in the family that makes wives dependent on their husbands, and as a consequence is that fiscal arrangements have always favored one-earner over dual-earner families.

He tested three hypotheses: under conditions of globalization, the proportion of young adults in precarious labor market positions is likely to increase; that such (in precarious labor market position) young persons postpone family formation as compared to those in secure labor market positions and a corollary, higher educated women should be postponing family formation because of the potential conflict between their career and motherhood; and young adults perceptions of insecurity will influence their transition to adulthood.

The analysis showed that cohorts born in the 1960s experienced marked increase in the incidence of
unemployment and temporary employment. He argues that since in the times of globalization employers try to enhance their flexibility by reducing the proportion of permanent staff through offering only temporal contracts to new job entrants, young people delay entry into the labor market by prolonging their stay in the educational system.

The second hypothesis was also partially supported. The results show that young adults who hold part-time jobs, temporary jobs and jobs outside the service class postpone family formation. This was also true for the unemployed and students. A striking finding that was observed concerns women, unemployed and part-time employed women become mothers sooner than women with secure economic prospects. Both higher educated men and women postpone family formation because of the potential conflict between their career and parenthood. He argues that this ‘results from processes of assortative mating and/or from the fact that higher educated males and females may value individualization more highly and therefore postpone the far-reaching commitments of family life.

Using the level of youth unemployment in Dutch society as an indicator of the perceived economic climate he found that it only decreased the likelihood of opting for marriage at the start of the first marriage and the rate of entry into parenthood for females. He concludes that although the Dutch generous social benefit system might be able to partially buffer the impact of globalization, it seems incapable of eradicating the consequences completely.


This contribution to the first GLOBALIFE workshop (2001) examines how instances of certainty and uncertainty influence transitions to adulthood in Sweden. The Swedish welfare state is known for its capacity to counteract uncertainty by mitigating essential transitions during individuals’ life courses. Nevertheless, also young people in Sweden seem to have responded to growing global uncertainty through delaying their entry into adulthood. As regards labour market opportunities, people in younger birth cohorts tend to need more time than do those in older cohorts to attain jobs matching their educational qualifications. Young people’s union formation patterns do not follow a general trend of postponement, however. Rather, people in younger cohorts enter into their first co-residential union earlier than did those in older cohorts, presumably since non-marital unions have become an equivalent to marriage, both in principle and in practice. As regards people’s entry into parenthood, our analyses show that certainty in terms of labour market attachment and educational level acts as a strong incentive for men’s and women’s decision to have a first child. The strong connection between labor market-related resources and childbirth should be seen in light of the fact that the Swedish parental leave system’s generosity hinges heavily upon to what extent parents have been active in the labor market before childbirth. (Author’s abstract).
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