



Instituut voor Maatschappijwetenschappen

Session report Social Cohesion, Diversity and Inequality

**Belgian Presidency conference on Unity and Diversity:
the contribution of the social sciences and the humanities to the ERA
Bruges, October 29-30, 2001**

Session co-ordinator: Prof. Dr. Erik de Gier (SISWO)

Roger Henke & Lisa Putman

SISWO, Netherlands Institute for the Social Sciences

Plantage Muidersgracht 4

1018 TV, Amsterdam

Tel. +31-20-5270600

Fax. +31-2—6229430

lputman@siswo.uva.nl

Draft version

January 2002

Table of contents

	Page
Introduction	3
The merits of social science research	5
When trusted methodologies don't work	8
When the issue is not on the policy-agenda	10
How a new theoretical perspective can unveil the well-known	14
Exposing myths	17
Exploring complexity and dynamics	20
How to better harness the potential of social policy research	22
Annex	
Conference programma	28

Introduction

So far, European societies' development models have generally succeeded in combining economic and technological development with an acceptable degree of social and cultural cohesion. However, their social models are facing serious challenges. The globalisation process and its economic repercussions, demographic trends, the increase in immigration, persistent high rates of unemployment, and growing urban population concentrations are some of the processes gnawing away at their foundations. All European social models share the aim of safeguarding basic social provisions for every citizen. In light of the challenges special attention needs to be paid to the marginal and less favoured groups. The core theme of the second session of the conference - on *Social cohesion, diversity and inequality* – was the assessment of the impact of this erosion on marginal and less favoured groups in general and on migrants and ethnic minorities in particular.

The overall objective of the conference was to strengthen the partnership of policy-makers and social science researchers. The relationship between *social* science and public policy has always been particularly problematic. Compared with natural science, social science generally offers less certainty, its findings are strongly dependent on the contextual variability of time and place, it has to compete with personal experience in its interpretations, and - perhaps for all these reasons - its status is often challenged. The least one can say is that the social sciences have an image problem and that their proponents find it difficult to specify their contribution to the understanding and improvement of society. More critical observers question this contribution in the first place. Therefore, Luk van Langenhove, one of the plenary speakers, recommended a radical restructuring of the social sciences. He claimed that social policy research needs to re-invent its infrastructure needs, re-invent its public legitimacy, learn to deal with complexity, and re-invent its disciplinary structures, in order to fulfil its potential.

The papers presented in the second session and the discussions they elicited illustrated that van Langenhoven is both very much right but also maybe too pessimistic. Yes, his diagnosis of the structural aspects of the social sciences that are crucial for a successful partnership between research and policy and practice was borne out. And yes, these aspects are certainly in need of more attention from the academic community and from science policy if the social sciences are to deliver on their promises. But the papers bore this out, precisely by making use

of important data infrastructures, by providing a legitimate evidence-base for public policy, by unraveling the complexity of social phenomena, and by crossing disciplinary boundaries. They were a showcase of both the potential and the direction to take for policy and practice relevant research. It is not the case that we don't know what to do. It just has to be done a lot more often.

This report presents findings from the session papers that increase our understanding of the impact of various socio-economic and demographic trends on marginal and less favoured groups. Simultaneously, the stories they tell will validate the diagnosis of van Langenhoven and show the importance of:

- policy relevant evidence, be it accessible through well-managed data infrastructures or through innovative forays into as yet unknown territories,
- the production and interpretation of which is not hindered by disciplinary orthodoxies, and
- that does justice to the complex interdependencies of real world issues.

The papers of the second session were divided in two clusters. The afternoon part on October 29 focussed on migrants and ethnic minorities. Björn Gustafsson presented a paper on the position of migrants in Sweden, the unease that the current status quo generates among both migrants and native Swedes, and policy options for improving the situation. Ivan Szelenyi's paper focussed on the comparative development in poverty levels (as they were remembered by purposive samples of respondents) over more than five decades in six Central and Eastern European countries. For three of the countries a comparison between Roma and non-Roma was added, putting the general picture in perspective by highlighting the position of the most marginalised section of the population. Godfried Engbersen's paper addressed the plight of undocumented migrants in the highly developed Dutch welfare state, describing the interaction of survival strategies, including criminal ones, patterns of ethnic solidarity, and an increasingly restrictive government policy.

This part of the session underlined several important contributions of social science research to the partnership with policy and practice: solid factual descriptions and a comprehensive exploration of underlying mechanisms, innovative methodologies to uncover trends and enter the otherwise invisible into the public debate, exposing policy myths, and bringing unintended consequences of policy interventions to light.

The morning part on October 30 dealt with poverty, social exclusion and its potential remedies. Bernadette Clasquin, Nathalie Moncel and Bernard Friot studied the relationship between the traditionally dominant financial resources of the various European social models their rights' bases and more recent policy adjustments in seven European countries. The presumed relationship between being poor and being unemployed was the main subject of Lieve De Lathouwer's paper. Brendan Whelan argued for a multidimensional and dynamic perspective on poverty and social exclusion, which is at the same time an argument for longitudinal and cross-national comparison. His colleagues, Christopher T. Whelan, Richard Layte and Bertrand Maître illustrated this argument with an analysis of the relationship between poverty, multiple disadvantages and social exclusion, using European Community Household Panel (ECHP) data.

This part of the session once more drew attention to the important role of debunking myths, but it also added several issues to the list of factors influencing the partnership with policy and practice: providing new conceptual angles on our (policy) view of socio-economic reality, the confusion generated by the inevitability of conceptual perspectives being value-based, the crucial importance of the availability of cross-nationally compatible longitudinal datasets, and the need for a more cumulative social science knowledge base.

Our presentation follows the division into two clusters and concludes with some specific lessons learned on how to better harness the potential of social policy research. Based upon an analysis of what exactly is at the root of the image problem that the social sciences suffer from, the prescriptions of van Langenhoven are extended with the need to be more cumulative. The promotion of systematic research syntheses, including the further development of protocols for conducting these in methodological rigorous and transparent ways, is offered as a practical instrument to ensure more cumulative knowledge production. The report ends with a short note on the relationship between the humanities and the social sciences, as illustrated by the papers presented.

The merits of social science research

Good social science should address the following questions: what exactly is the state of affairs today and what are the relevant trends? Why is it like it is? And what can or should we do about it? With this statement, discussant Johan Fritzell emphasized a core function of social policy research: providing solid and reliable *descriptions* of reality, ever more important now

scarcity of data is not the problem, but rather their availability in massive but unreliable quantities. Social science may provide a platform for public debate by pointing out policy options, but a first and primary objective is to offer adequate descriptions and identify trends. This was poignantly illustrated by Björn Gustafsson's paper on *Sweden's recent experience of international migration – issues and studies*.

To quote from his paper: "In Sweden eleven percent of the total population belongs to the ethnic minorities. Since the arrival of the first foreigners to Sweden the composition of the ethnic population in Sweden changed. The immigrants who arrived during the 50s and the 60s entered as work migrants or as their relatives. Since the 70s refugees and their relatives came to make up a larger proportion of the new arrivals. With the change of composition of the ethnic minorities the labour market situation of the foreign-born people changed as well. Since some time joblessness among many groups of immigrants is extensive and the social situation of immigrants has become a critical issue in Sweden."

He describes the situation as "critical" because both immigrants themselves and native-born Swedes are equally dissatisfied. The average standard of living of migrants is lower than that of native-born Swedes and the associated relatively large expenditures for transfers to immigrants and their relatively small income tax contributions turns immigrants on average into a burden to the public sector.

None of the elements of this general picture of the Swedish situation with regard to migrants and their position would have been possible without solid descriptive research providing the facts. Before we are in any position to contemplate the impact of anything on anything else, we need reliable facts on (the changes in) the status quo. But as soon as the facts enter public debate, it tends to be "forgotten" that they are first and foremost the output of research. This is an important factor in the current image problem of social policy research.

Adequate descriptions often indicate where one might search for underlying *mechanisms and causes*. Descriptions are a first and crucial step towards addressing the follow-up question of "why is it like it is?" Again Gustafsson's presentation can be used as an example: "The extent of the problem is very much related to the origin of the immigrants. People who originate from the other Nordic countries or from several countries in Europe perform relatively well

on the Swedish labour market. That's quite different for people who come from countries in the Middle East, Bosnia-Herzegovina or the North East of Africa of whom a great part is unemployed and depend on governmental programmes.”

If origin is a relevant factor, several underlying mechanisms may be postulated. Gustafsson's paper proceeded in the systematic way that is characteristic of scientific argument: it reflects upon the possible mechanisms from *both* the supply and the demand side¹. On the supply-side, human capital and thus education come to mind as an underlying causal factor.

However, his paper showed that the average gap in educational attainment between foreign-born and native-born in Sweden is not substantial. So intervention possibilities at this end are not very promising. The demand-side on the other hand seems to offer a tangible causal trajectory: the paper argued for a dominant role of discrimination in explaining the poor labour market performance of many recent immigrants. The policy question then becomes how employers can be prevented from discriminating against immigrants when immigrants apply for a job. Positive discrimination of immigrants might help. But the argument against such proposals is that it would be difficult to forcefully implement such legislation.

The above example shows that the causal or process perspective is intrinsically connected to thinking about *policy options*. At this stage, social science research and policy directly meet, but by now we have left the scientific arena and enter the turf of politics. Politics are about values and interests as much as about facts. Here, the role research has to play is to point out options and their possible consequences. To wind up the Gustafsson example, his analysis of the options goes beyond demand and supply thinking. It includes reflecting upon the possible role of immigrant admission policy: “Low employment-rates among recent immigrants can be avoided if Sweden only admits people who already have jobs.” But he concludes that the support for such a restrictive policy among policy-makers and the Swedish public at large would be very low.

¹ In the discussion it was pointed out that such comprehensive treatment of an issue is a distinctive added value of research input into public debate. In this particular case, political opinion is usually biased towards either supply- or demand-side factors. However, from academics one may expect an attitude of critical distance from their subject that enables systematic and comprehensive exploration.

Gustafsson gave his personal evaluation of the different options, stating that they involve different measures to the same problem, part-solutions that create other problems in turn, and argues for a combination of interventions. It is here that policy *research* turns into policy *advice* and competes with lots of other actors trying to get themselves heard in the political arena. However, that social policy research is no privileged voice in this arena in no way discredits its importance to policy. Without its reliable descriptions, its analysis of underlying mechanisms, and its chart of possibilities for intervention, the quality of public debate would be seriously compromised.

When trusted methodologies don't work

Another paper, that of Ivan Szelenyi on *Poverty under post-communist capitalism – the effects of class and ethnicity in a cross-national comparison* directed our attention to the issue of what to do with realities that the conventional toolbox of the social scientist is inadequate for. As is immediately evident from the title of his paper, the reality that he wants to map is very much a pressing policy issue. Poverty is high on the agenda in Central and Eastern Europe and at the international level. However, decision-makers lack knowledge about the long-term trends, and social policy research lacks the conventional longitudinal household survey type of data infrastructure to provide this understanding. Obviously, we have information about the poverty levels in the post-communist period, but as the impact of poverty involves processes of social and historical comparison, these *data*, covering only a decade, are difficult to translate into policy-relevant *knowledge*. On top of that, existing data do not allow for a specific focus on what is evidently the region's most marginalised group, the Roma. Szelenyi's paper illustrated that if the conventional toolbox is inadequate it is still possible to produce solid policy relevant insights into the state of the world and its underlying mechanisms.

He interviewed people in six countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Romania and Russia) to study how they experienced poverty during a period covering three different regimes: the Stalinist (pre 1949), the communist, and the post-communist. As poverty is very much a survival issue in these countries, his questions probed memories and current experiences like going to bed hungry and having an extra pair of shoes.

His findings showed that the recollections of poverty during Stalinism vary across different countries. In Hungary people suffered least from poverty. Russia before 1949 was the poorest

country of all. Poles and Slovaks remember the pre 1949 times in rather similar ways, as do Bulgarians and Romanians. In some countries the Stalinist epoch is recalled in very negative terms, and in all countries the following epoch of communism is remembered in more positive terms. Cross-national comparison showed declining country-differences in poverty levels between 1949 and 1988, although they did not disappear altogether. During post-communist times countries enter divergent trajectories. Initially, people in all countries experience a similar deterioration of their living standards in comparison with 1988. But by 2000 things have changed. The countries that have implemented liberal reforms in more rigorous ways (Hungary, Poland and Slovakia) scored better than Bulgaria, Romania and Russia, countries that progress much more slowly towards a liberal model of capitalism (in Szelenyi's terms: neo-patrimonial countries). The gap in experienced poverty among these clusters of countries increases substantially. These differences cannot be reduced to just pre-existing economic conditions but they are clearly also related to the post-communist trajectories followed by the respective countries. As Szelenyi phrased it: a clearcut illustration that *policy does matter*.

It is important to keep in mind here what Szelenyi's approach adds to the existing evidence. The divergent post-communist trajectories as such might be discernable in hard representative household survey data. The real significance of his results is to be found in the *longterm* historical profile of pre 1949 differences, parallel developments during communism in all countries, and divergence along lines of liberal economic reform enthusiasm over the last decade.

Szelenyi also wanted to find out if poverty is experienced differently across different population groups (Roma and non-Roma). For the countries that allowed for an over-sampling of the Roma population (Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania) he compared their recollections with those of their non-Roma compatriots. It turned out that Roma also report a reduction in their poverty levels for the communist epoch, but the improvement is much less dramatic than the one reported by non-Roma. And, opposed to the general post-1989 trend, the conditions for Roma deteriorated and the gap between Roma and non-Roma increased, in Hungary even more so than in Bulgaria and Romania. A telling token of the importance of ethnicity in this transition process is that the differences between Roma and non-Roma are almost as large as the cross-country differences. Overall, Bulgaria scored much poorer than Hungary, but Roma in Hungary are even worse off than non-Roma Bulgarians.

Obviously, using a retrospective methodology on a relatively small and non-representative sample is far from ideal in terms of the reliability of the evidence it generates. These problems were explicitly addressed during the discussion. Ivan Szelenyi did not deny them but used his replies to sharpen our understanding of what he intended the study to be. Not flawed conventional research but an alternative approach: “I know it is retrospective research but the story was so strong that it had to be told. Retrospective stories can tell us something about the past. I felt obliged to tell the story. I know it is the history of the survivors and that every history is about the present and not about the past.” And: “The critique on the numbers is valid. There is always some sort of inaccuracy because hunger is a subjective variable. And it is true that people who were hungry years ago have a greater opportunity of being death in 2000. But the study should be seen as a project on *collective memory* rather than one of determining actual poverty levels.”

What he made amply clear was that a project on collective memory can show decision-makers real trends, both of the impact of different economic trajectories on poverty experiences and of strong ethnic undercurrents in the way poverty affects transition economies. And these trends would have been much less visible otherwise. It was Szelenyi’s refusal to accept defeat when faced with the absence of hard data in combination with his audacity in willing to risk strong criticism from his peers for going beyond conventional methodology that was the more general lesson learned. And, against a background of a generally very tight purse for social science research, the implicit message for decision-makers was that funding policies should make room for the unconventional and risky and ensure that their understandable and legitimate bias in favour of the trusted and conventional does not rule out innovation.

When the issue is not on the policy-agenda

Szelenyi showed the policy relevance of social science by creating an evidence base where there was none. In his case, when the subject figures prominently on the policy agenda, partnership with policy is not difficult to envision. However, social policy research is not always in such a position of potential interest for its message, especially when lack of information on a phenomenon coincides with it *not* being on the policy agenda. Godfried Engbersen’s paper *Panopticon Europe and the Criminalisation of Undocumented Immigrants* was an illuminating example of what social science can mean under such circumstances. It would not be fair to suggest that illegal or undocumented immigrants did not figure in Dutch public debate at all. However, near complete lack of data on their numbers, location, position,

and survival strategies, in combination with a hesitation within mainstream politics to debate the impact of their presence in fear of strengthening ethnocentric tendencies among ethnic Dutch, have prevented the administration from really confronting present realities.

With respect to the one aspect that *did* receive attention in both the media and the political debate, the link between (illegal) immigrants and criminality, his research plays the role of providing facts to a debate that used to be ruled by the ideologically convenient and contrasting myths of exaggeration and denial. Like in Szelenyi's case, the facts were not easy to get at. The conventional data infrastructure for such a topic, police statistics, is a very unreliable source for the new groups of immigrants in the Netherlands, asylum seekers, temporary immigrants and undocumented or illegal immigrants. But by clever data manipulation he could gain some insight into comparative patterns of apprehension. By combining the possibilities of this database with interviews in Rotterdam (170 illegal immigrants) and a participatory ethnographic field study in that city his team was able to not only detect patterns, but also describe underlying mechanisms and the impact of recent policy interventions.

Analysis of his database showed that most illegal immigrants are not apprehended for criminal activities. If arrested nearly half of the illegal immigrants in Rotterdam were apprehended for illegal residence, jokingly labelled "tautological crime" during the discussion. And an additional 13 per cent was arrested for misdemeanours such as illegal labour or fare dodging. The data clearly show that illegal immigrants are *less* involved in crime than a comparable group of legal residents, the only exception being drug-related crimes. This analysis was corroborated in the interviews that equally led Engbersen to conclude that the majority of illegal immigrants refrain from criminal activities. Only the use of false or forged documents (considered unavoidable by the respondents), which again can be considered a "tautological" offence, was widespread.

More important even than the bare facts was the understanding of undocumented existence within the Dutch welfare state that his multi-method approach generated. The trigger here was the finding that the kind of criminal activities committed varied with the country of origin of the illegal migrants. Interviews and fieldwork enabled the analysis of criminal activities in terms of migrants' possible survival strategies. The more illegal immigrants are able to acquire a relatively secure societal position *despite* their illegal status, the less their

involvement in criminal activities. For acquiring such a position they are dependent upon their network of relatives or have to rely on the larger social network of their ethnic community. Also, the ease of access to the labour market and the tolerance and help of streetlevel bureaucrats from various public or semi-public institutions are important. The research unearthed distinct ethnic differences in the extent to which illegal immigrants are incorporated and helped by their communities. Turks can rely on what Engbersen et.al. call “communal sharing”: within the extended group of relatives substantial mutual support is the rule. Moroccans on the other hand cannot fall back on relatives. They have to rely on so-called “bounded solidarity”, a much less personal relation based on being compatriots in which incidental favours are granted, or they are dependent upon (extremely exploitative) market relations.

In most cases the mechanisms described, the streetlevel attitude of legal authorities and the support by legal relatives and (il)legal countrymen, provide a buffer that enables undocumented migrants to survive without having to resort to criminal means. However, both support mechanisms are subject to corrosion. On the one hand, “Fortress Europe is turning into a Panopticon Europe, in which not the guarding of physical borders is central, but far more the guarding of public institutions and labour markets by means of advanced identification and control systems”. Because control is not accompanied by effective expulsion this “formal policy is primarily a symbolic towards an insoluble social problem”, but it *does* force undocumented migrants further underground. On the other side, “due to the problems concomitant with sustained support, members of ethnic communities have adapted a more critical attitude towards illegal immigrants and more often refuse to provide guarantees for their journey to, and stay in, the Netherlands.” This also encourages illegal immigrants to go further underground.

Even more unanticipated are the interaction effects of (the changes in) both support mechanisms.

First of all the restrictive policy has a negative effect on the self-regulating capacity of certain ethnic groups to support illegal immigrants. The weakening of informal support systems contributes to a further informalisation and criminalisation of life strategies. Also, the current measures contribute to the marginalisation of undocumented immigrants and the weakening of patterns of solidarity within ethnic communities. But the policy of marginalisation does not

automatically lead to the exit of illegal immigrants from Dutch territory. Most of them stay on, populating a societal twilight zone, and their presence can be expected to have serious longterm effects on public safety, public health and the life chances of young children: “The unanticipated effects of Panopticon Europe raises the main issue of a growing unbalance between the effects of severe enforcement of internal controls and the problem governments wanted to attack in the first place.”

In the Dutch context, the work of Engbersen c.s. has been important in enabling policy-makers at national and local levels to face the existence of larger numbers of undocumented migrants within their borders and reflect upon policy options with some understanding of how these might effect important underlying mechanisms. It is a telling example of how research can influence agenda-setting. Again, crucial steps were not admitting defeat in the absence of reliable data and a willingness to stand up to those that equate policy relevance with the output from hard-nosed datafactories. The literally invisible human margins of our societies are dependent upon the appreciation by policy and practice of such qualities in research for the effectiveness, efficiency and fairness of the policies that affect them.

An important caveat that was brought up during the discussion following Engbersen’s presentation, is that the reality he depicted is very much related to its institutional context of a highly developed Dutch welfare state. The “story” therefore holds for similar (Nordic) welfare states but for example does not apply to Southern Europe. Here the relative size of the informal economy is much larger, being part of that economy has no identity stigma attached to it, and policy interventions like large-scale regularisations or amnesties of illegals are politically feasible. In terms of scientific understanding as well as of policy options, the limitations of research projects within one (national) context are very real and widely recognized. Which is not to say that the obvious antidote - cross-national comparison - is unproblematic, not in conducting it, but even less so in getting it funded. It is no exaggeration to credit the EC and its Framework Programmes with being the major European if not worldwide sponsor, in terms of money and otherwise, of cross-national studies. All papers in the second part of this session - focussing on poverty, social exclusion and its potential remedies - were cross-nationally comparative and illustrated its enormous potential and thus the importance of its Framework Programmes sponsorship.

How a new theoretical perspective can unveil the well-known

The papers of Szelenyi and Engbersen both illustrated the potential of social science to create an evidence-base for social policy through the use of innovative *methodological* tools.

Another variant of the information generating capacity of social policy research is to be found in its *conceptual* apparatus. The paper of Bernadette Clasquin, Nathalie Moncel and Bernard Friot, *A theoretical framework to analyse the nature of financing employment and social protection in Europe*, is an illuminating example of what a new conceptual perspective can do.

The typology of (European) social models of Esping-Andersen is so well-known, that it does not need further elaboration. It still inspires countless scientific analyses but is equally used by the policy-world as a context for benchmarking good practice in all kinds of areas. By highlighting certain aspects of the institutional architecture of welfare states it enables researchers and policy-makers to compare across borders and attain a better understanding of how societies work and how interventions might affect them. The use of the Esping-Andersen typology has become so common place that it is often forgotten that it was created as a conceptual instrument rather than presented as an established fact. Although there is continuous debate about the correct typing of various countries, the underlying decommodification perspective is much less debated. And this is unfortunate because the strength of a conceptual lense is at the same time its weakness: it sheds light on what was invisible and/or misunderstood before by analytically separating foreground from background, with the inevitable consequence of hiding and/or distorting what disappears into the background. Luckily, the dynamics of social science are a good guarantee against the potential destructive myopic effects of this process. Science never stops producing new lenses.

The Clasquin et.al. paper presents such a new lense. A new lense means the possibility to rethink trends in the development of socio-economic policies in various member states in terms of consequences that would otherwise be not be focussed upon. Are these consequences really that marginal and not worth more attention? Should core premisses underlying the current policy changes be reconsidered? If that is not important input for policy and public debate, what is?

Bernadette Clasquin, Nathalie Moncel and Bernard Friot co-ordinated a TSER project aiming to develop a truly comparative framework, i.e. not related to any particular type of social model, for understanding the relationship between social exclusion and employment. Seven empirical cases, France, Great-Britain, Italy, Portugal, Spain, The Netherlands and Germany, were described in terms of transformations in employment, i.e wages, working conditions and related social rights.

They chose the nature of the financial resources that pay for social protection as their “neutral” comparative category. The crucial question for defining social models is how these resources are being “socialised”². Two major modes are identified: through wages or through taxation. These modes define a dichotomy of models: a continental model and an Anglo-Nordic model, the former being based on socialisation through wages, the latter through taxation.

Beyond this dichotomy their analytical framework relates the different modes of socialisation to different dominant forms of social rights, and is used to understand changes in the modes of socialisation in relation to changes in the entitlements in terms of social rights. Analytically they postulate three broad forms of linkages that are defined as ideal types of the socialisation of resources and that sustain three distinct types of social rights:

- Tax on income – universal entitlement – services in kind - citizen rights
- Social insurance – employment entitlement – wage equivalent - employment rights
- Compulsory contribution (saving) – ownership entitlement – wage substitute - property rights

These three types don’t describe any particular societal arrangement of resource flows. All countries have *mixed* forms of one kind or another. But these neutral types enable the comparison of different European countries without national biases. In the classic Anglo-Saxon model, resource flows are mainly based on income tax and sustain a universal entitlement to benefits. Labour relations are embedded within a framework of universal citizenship rights. Tax-financed entitlements are provided in the form of free public services (e.g.health) and complemented by a national insurance system (for pensions, invalidity

² This term is being used in a specific technical sense referring to the institutional channels other than market exchanges or state-regulated market exchanges.

benefits, etc.). The continental model is based on wage deducted social insurance contributions and is linked with wage-earner workers rights.

One specific conceptual eye-opener that this framework offers vis-a-vis the Esping-Andersen treatment of differences between welfare regimes is that labour relations are given a conceptual centre-stage position in line with their historical significance. Historically, the emergence of the dominant configuration of different countries was closely linked to the arrangement of labour relations. The development trajectories of various European welfare states was crucially influenced by the mechanisms arrived at by employers and employees to regulate their mutual dependency. In the Esping-Andersen perspective, political questions of equity and redistribution and the quantitative level of socialised resources and their macro-economic effects (balanced budgets, etc.) take precedence over the relation of social rights to the nature of resource flows. The argument here is not that one is more important than the other, it is that each perspective creates areas that receive more and less attention. From a policy perspective, having an optimal repertoire of options presupposes a comprehensive picture of *all* areas.

Now, what does this mean for the understanding of the impact of the major socio-economic changes during the last two decades. Where the Esping-Andersen typology might see a trend towards more balanced budgets and enhanced employment growth, the framework presented in this paper identifies an erosion of the “traditionally dominant” social rights in the various countries, with the attendant creation of new social classes: “On the one hand, increases in targeted benefits due to a shift of public social expenditures towards mean-tested assistance tends to define a category of benefit recipients relying on circumscribed social inclusion rights. On the other hand, the growth of personal savings complementary to, or substituting for social deductions creates a category of profit-sharers relying on property rights.” All in all, in the continental model of the wage earner, employment based rights are eroded, by a shift towards fiscal resources that tend to replace a part of the social contributions and of direct wages on the one hand and by an increase in saving based resources and a strengthening of the contributivity principle for entitlements on the other. The main feature in the Anglo-Nordic model is a shrinking of public insurance and the associated universal social rights based on citizenship. Also, professional regimes tend to be detached from labour relations through the implementation of compulsory savings schemes that are related to financial markets.

Erosion of traditionally dominant social rights as such does not yet mean much as this goes hand in hand with the strengthening of other social rights. The crucial issue to address is in how far the new balance (all existing systems have always been mixes of the ideal types) has created new forms of inclusion and exclusion. Analysing this issue from the perspective of the nature of resource flows focusses the attention on the importance of understanding the regulation of atypical forms of employment and the strategies supporting their reforms. Atypical forms of employment have become increasingly “normalised” and current active labourmarket policies tend to generalise them across wider parts of the employment stock. This has resulted in changes in the structure of financing labour (in order to diminish labour costs) and has destabilised the existing configurations of labour regulation.

A last telling example of what a different conceptual perspective may mean is best illustrated with a quote from the Clasquin et.al. paper: “...the question of a common minimum wage at a European level for instance has to be studied according to the different roles played by such an instrument in each country; obviously, the minimum wage doesn’t have the same significance in France and in the UK and governments don’t use it in the same way for reforming social protection”.

Exposing myths

New insights are not only to be found through the use of new conceptual lenses, as illustrated by the example of Clasquin et.al. Apart from this round-about way of turning taken-for-granted assumptions into open questions again, the core premisses underlying current policy responses to the socio-economic and demographic challenges can also be questioned *directly*. This is what was done by the other papers in the session’s second part. Obviously, when they are questioned common assumptions regularly turn out to be very much justified. All the better, because then the interventions based on them have good chances of being effective. And an important function of social policy research to provide the factual evidence if this is the case. Unfortunately, this is not always the case and sometimes the assumptions turn out to be policy myths. We would argue that in such cases the contribution social science has to make is even more important. Underpinning the confidence of decision-makers is relevant, preventing defective ideas about social realities from determining interventions, or offering alternatives in case they already do so, is even more relevant. The study of Engbersen et.al. already illustrated this. And the papers of Lieve De Lathouwer, Brendan Whelan and

Christopher Whelan et.al were all, in their own way, variations of the “exposing myths” theme, and directed our attention to the crucial importance of proper European data infrastructures to facilitate research in playing this crucial societal role.

In her paper *Challenges on poverty and unemployment for the European social model* Lieve De Lathouwer wonders if the active welfare state really reduces poverty and increases social inclusion. Is the basic assumption of a direct negative relationship between work and poverty really as straightforward as assumed in both national and European level policy-making? This assumption is based on the common sense observation that those in work have a lower poverty risk than the non-working. So one would expect poverty to drop, as more jobs become available. Yet existing research shows that the relationship between work and poverty is not as linear as it seems. Understanding relationships presupposes comparison, and De Lathouwer, like Szelenyi, makes both longitudinal and cross-national comparisons to underpin her case. International comparison suggests that despite low employment rates the continental countries have a low poverty rate, while the Anglo-Saxon countries combine high employment performances with relatively high poverty rates. Only the Scandinavian countries succeed in combining high (subsidised) employment with low poverty rate. Recent national longitudinal studies also show that job growth does not necessarily imply less poverty.

It is worth stressing here that having the possibility, i.e. the data available, to make *both* kinds of comparison considerably strengthens the evidence base for the conclusion. The ideal-type data infrastructure allows for both comparisons, and Europe has some very productive examples, e.g. the ECHP and the Eurobarometer. Given the need for representativity and repeated measurement and thus the very costly nature of such data, sincere policy interest in their availability is crucial for their existence. It is in the nature of the game that the research community is never satisfied with what (policy) funders are willing to pay for. However, that future European level household panels are going to allow for *less* analytic possibilities than the current ECHP seems difficult to justify.

De Lathouwer made use of a whole battery of different datasources. This enabled her to look at various aspects of the postulated relationship between work and poverty and to corroborate findings across different kinds of data. One interesting example would be the policy assumption of a direct relationship between the generosity of benefits and the willingness to work on the part of the unemployed. In this case, both econometric research and

Eurobarometer opinion data fail to show a strong connection between unemployment and the level of income protection.

De Lathouwer's paper goes beyond exposing myths and looks for possible explanations underlying the apparent paradox between job growth and rising poverty. One lies in reduced social protection for those who, despite the increase in employment, do not succeed in entering the labour market. For the Scandinavian and Benelux countries the generosity of their social security system is identified as the main reason why the poverty among their non-working population is comparatively low. The other side of this relationship is evident in the Anglo-Saxon countries where the generosity of income protection was reduced in order to save money. The resulting, more limited (and less expensive) social protection is the cause of the exceptionally high poverty risks among groups with few labour market opportunities. A more extensive welfare state thus correlates with less and with less persistent poverty.

Another explanation is to be found in the fact that mostly households with already at least one person in work, as opposed to households with no working adult at all, benefited from job creation. Also, job growth mainly consisted of higher not lower skilled jobs. Still another relevant observation is that activation policies – cost-cutting of social security was accompanied, both in Anglo-Saxon and in continental countries, by a shift from protection to activation aims – are no antidote against poverty as such. Getting a job only alleviates poverty under the conditions of adequate wages and adequate job quality, i.e. attention to learning opportunities, autonomy, variation and contacts, job security and the availability of services supporting labour supply e.g. childcare facilities, good public transport.

De Lathouwer, like Gustafsson before her, crossed the bridge from policy research to policy advice. In light of their wish to activate recipients she concludes that the main challenge for continental countries is to combat structural underemployment without abandoning their most important merit, i.e. a relatively low degree of inequality and poverty. And she recommends implementing in-work benefits for low-wage earners that augment the net-reward of low paid work. The effectiveness of these benefits in fighting poverty would increase if they were combined with other provisions such as affordable and accessible childcare provisions, labour mediation and job application training. But she stressed that in order to combine employment goals with the fight against poverty a safety-net and adequate means to provide social protection for those who, in spite of all activation strategies, remain excluded from work,

remain important conditions: “Social security needs to continue to play a role in the active welfare-state as one of the principal instruments for poverty prevention.”

Exploring complexity and dynamics

De Lathouwer’s argument relied on a piecing together of many sources of information. One of these was the ECHP, a prime example of a longitudinal cross-national datsource. The last two papers, Brendan Whelan’s *Social exclusion: overview, policies and research*, and Christopher T. Whelan, Richard Layte en Bertrand Maître’s *What is the Scale of Multiple Deprivation in the European Union?* are illuminating examples of what research can do with such a datsource.

Brendan Whelan explicitly focussed on the advantages of having such a datsource although he illustrated his arguments with the Irish data that are part of the European data collection. First of all he argued that from a policy perspective it is more important to know how people do experience their poverty (relative deprivation) than to know how many people are poor according to their income. To be able to determine deprivation one’s measurements have to be *multi-dimensional*, generating information about the possession of household necessities, the presence of debts, etc. Secondly, he argued that a static picture of poverty doesn’t give the policy world many clues about what to aim at. Only an understanding of the *dynamic* process of how people move into and out of situations of relative deprivation provides a solid basis for potentially succesful policy interventions. How else to determine if one should target attitudes (“culture of poverty”) or situational factors, intervene at local level or through general provisions (the tax system, etc.)? Both arguments also intersect: relative deprivation is not a static concept because people’s standard of comparison changes over time. Thirdly he stressed the importance of the cross-national perspective. In line with the De Lathouwer argument, the combination of longitudinal and cross-national comparison is a lot stronger than either of them on its own.

However, cross-national comparison is not an easy road to take. Although the scientific exploration of social issues may be expected to be less value and interest driven than policy debate, in the last resort also scientific analyses are value-based. They might and should be explicit about the assumptions underlying their analysis but they cannot escape making assumptions, if only by what they focus on. Whelan used the example that where sociologists see social protection, macro-economists tend to see rigidity, inflexibility and euro-sclerosis.

He also pointed out that although ECPH type data infrastructures are the royal road towards multi-dimensional dynamic analysis they are not an answer to everything that is of relevance to research and policy. First of all, particular disadvantaged groups are not captured by its samples, be it because of their relatively small numbers or because they are administratively invisible, e.g. the homeless; secondly, the spatial dimension is lacking while problem accumulation areas are a major issue for understanding of and intervening in the social, and last but not least, real understanding of processes cannot do without (additional) in-depth qualitative research. Therefore, apart from strongly promoting the need to strengthen European micro-data infrastructure his presentation also included a plea for the creation of evidence bases out of a *mix of qualitative and quantitative research*.

Brendan Whelan's general argument for cross-national multi-dimensional dynamic analysis was beautifully illustrated by the paper of his colleagues Christopher Whelan, Richard Layte and Bertrand Maître that targetted the specific policy assumption of a wide prevalence of multiple deprivation. This idea that poverty seldom comes alone proved to be a policy myth. A closely related and equally prevalent assumption, about the strong relationship between multiple deprivation and *persistent* poverty, also proved erroneous. The ECHP offered them the opportunity to connect questions relating to income poverty persistence to those relating to multiple or overlapping disadvantage and establish the extent of overlap at the level of the individual (as opposed to statistical correlations between variables) between persistent and multi-dimensional poverty and social isolation.

Their findings show that somewhere between four out of ten and two-thirds of those poor in 1993 remained in poverty in the following two years. These individuals clearly constitute prime candidates for exposure to multiple disadvantages. However, "even in case of life-style deprivation, where we might expect relationships to be most straightforward, the observed pattern does not conform to one of systematic multiple disadvantage". Extending the analysis to incorporate housing and environmental dimensions even reduces the numbers of multiply deprived among the persistently poor to negligible levels. Focussing on social exclusion lead to similar conclusions. It appeared to be influenced more by cross-national cultural variations than by persistent income poverty. In line with conclusions drawn by Portes for US poor inner city areas

they argue that many factors other than persistent income poverty play a role in determining deprivation and these factors will vary across dimensions.

Correct understanding of the relationships between persistent poverty, multiple deprivation and social isolation is very policy relevant because understandings become policy theories and determine policy action repertoires. The assumption of strong relationships between the three phenomena maps the arena for policy intervention as one of a clearcut cleavage between an excluded minority and a comfortable majority. Such a map precludes serious policy attention to the poverty, deprivation and exclusion problems of numerous “majority” individuals. Therefore, the policy intervention strategies that are formulated in reaction to such an understanding cannot be but very partial solutions. They are bound to focus on specific groups and neighborhoods only and neglect looking at general and much more expensive issues affecting broad class and status groups, e.g the operation of the taxation and welfare system, access to education and employment, etc.

But, as the last discussant, Maria Baganha, pointed out, the various papers presented in the second part of the session only provided a start for thinking about better solutions. All of them addressed the issues of poverty, social exclusion and its potential remedies within a European perspective. They showed that data infrastructures like the ECHP greatly facilitate the exploration of important policy questions at this level. But, they also illustrated that we’re still far from really knowing which road to take to best solve the urgent problems we face. It is clear that various European social models are based on different assumptions, be these models defined in terms of rights, in terms of decommodification or whatever else. It is also clear that we can only afford diversity if we have unity, in other words, we need to harmonise. But to what extent? And along the lines of what model? The evidence base that European research can offer at present does not provide an answer to that. It may be crossing the line between the research and the political arena to expect that it ever will.

How to better harness the potential of social policy research

However, the work presented in both parts of this session aptly illustrated that the *least* a search for answers in partnership will deliver is solutions that are based on more reliable evidence and do justice to the complex interdependancies of our societies. Each paper delivered on its promise of offering policy relevant conclusions. And collectively the papers

supported van Langenhoven's diagnosis of the image problem and the validity of all of his "re-invent the social sciences" prescriptions:

- The need to create and make more use of (longitudinal and cross-nationally comparative) data infrastructures;
- The need to create a more solid and legitimate evidence-base for public policy;
- The need to deal more successfully with complexity, and
- The need to cross-disciplinary boundaries

The crucial question now is if it is realistic to expect that improvements with regard to these four aspects are actually going to result in a positive public image of the social sciences. The papers presented show that the research community is well aware of their importance and tries to live up to them. One may argue that much more research along those lines is needed. Sure, there is always room for improvement. But we also have to face up to the uncomfortable truths that the unknown is often most appreciated when left as it is and policy myths are survival artists pur sang. Regularly, even when it does live up to all of the above, social policy research receives no credit or even gets flak from its policy partners.

So van Langenhoven's diagnosis doesn't seem to capture *all* that is wrong. He mentions legitimacy being a problem but defines this as depending upon making the world more intelligible and contributing to problem-solving and policy-making. We would suggest that the first of these two aspects is problematic. But, isn't that what policy-makers and the public in general expect from research: uncovering the unknown, understanding the inexplicable, doing away with myths? Yes it is, but there is something fundamentally flawed with this conception of what the social sciences are for. Obviously van Langenhoven is correct in identifying underachievement with respect to making "discoveries" as a cause of the negative public image. From this perspective, a lot or even most of the research output produced is indeed disappointing. It only confirms what we already know, thought or guessed to be the case. Also in this conference and in this session many if not most of the results confirmed pre-existing notions rather than being totally unexpected findings.

But what does this actually tell us? It tells us that, in as far as research conclusions are in line with public knowledge and policy theory, chances are that this is the case because the existing corpus of social policy research constitutes such a convincing evidence-base that it has

already entered common sense. However, because social reality is always moving the evidence-base has to be updated continuously. If the updates produce findings that seem to state the obvious, the gut reaction might be to belittle them, but, in fact, the outcome is important evidence because it means that current policies are as well founded as they can be. And to the extent that the reigning common sense and policy wisdom is not (co-)determined by previous research, it is *all the more* important that it is given a more solid footing. Social science input does not distinguish itself from other information sources – e.g. investigative journalism - feeding into public debate, policy-making and political decisions by being aimed at making the world more intelligible. All the other sources try to do that too, and often in a much more digestible and catchy way. It distinguishes itself by its scientific toolbox that is still our best bet for generating *intersubjectively verifiable knowledge*. So what is missing from van Langenhoven’s diagnosis is a prescription for bringing about a better or more realistic public appreciation of what social science is actually about.

A better diagnosis of the public image problem is not the same as getting rid of it. And its existence is certainly very worrisome. Especially because research, social science and humanities research even more so than its commercially more easily exploitable natural and biological counterparts, is very much dependent upon public resources. Did we learn anything on how to increase respect for the unique contribution that the social sciences can offer? Sure, the session had some reproachful remarks about the receptivity of the worlds of policy and practice. In light of the difficulties that exposers of myths sometimes encounter in getting their message heard, these sentiments are understandable. But these sentiments can hardly be called productive, as they provide no basis for intervention. Fortunately, apart from the customary “put the blame on the others”, researchers also made some self-reflexive remarks about corners of their own stables that are in urgent need of cleaning. These *were* productive because they point towards actual possibilities for improvement.

The most important was an off-hand remark by Christopher Whelan about research continuously reinventing the wheel. Although having ECHP data to work with made analysis easier and more solid, the outcome only confirmed doubts and results formulated nearly two decades ago. In other words, that the recognition of only very modest relations between low income and social exclusion is not yet accepted (policy) wisdom is not only due to lacking data or ineffective dissemination channels between research and policy, but also to *weak mechanisms for facilitating the cumulative growth of social research knowledge*.

We would argue that a major cause for this state of affairs is that the research community has a bias towards primary research (a bias that is shared by the potential users and funders of research from the worlds of policy and practice). Research questions, policy problems and practice dilemma's to which research evidence could contribute valuable input tend to be translated into *new* research, without a prior effort to *synthesize existing knowledge*. This means that social science has not been very good let alone very active in applying its distinguishing qualities of transparent and methodologically rigorous datagathering and analysis to its own corpus. A telling sign is that methodological work on agreed upon protocols for research syntheses across disciplinary and methodological borders has only very recently started.

However, this start is very promising indeed. Because it is not yet widely known we are going to dwell on it a little. After an earlier first wave of interest in the policy and practice relevance of the social sciences petered out in the mid-1980ies (often referred to as the “knowledge utilisation” or KU-debate), the issue recently re-emerged under the label of “Evidence Based Policy” (EBP) in the Anglosaxon world. The introduction of elements of competition, privatisation and accountability - under the banner of “New Public Management”- has effected a utilitarian (re)turn in science policy. Simultaneously, an increasingly pragmatic turn in public policy – “what matters is what works” - has increased the need for evidence of “what works”. Both trends endorse and amplify the urgency of making better use of social science research as input for policy and practice.

Apart from rekindling interest in the kinds of solutions that were common currency two decades ago - a concentration of research funds on policy relevant issues in national research council programming and renewed enthusiasm for issues of dissemination – EBP is characterised by a core focus on the preparation and maintainance of *research syntheses*. This largely researcher-driven “movement” for syntheses as the major instrument for creating “evidence” promotes the adoption of a by now well-established practice in the worlds of medicine and criminology to the broad field of social policy. The prototypical example is the systematic review based on a meta-analysis (in its restricted technical sense) of controlled clinical trials. However, what really matters and what distinguish it from KU-originated “bridging” devices are its attention to *systematisation*. This refers to:

- *Methodological rigour* with respect to the *search* for primary research, the appraisal of its quality in terms of its validity (relevance to what one is seeking to understand/decide, representativeness of the population concerned) and reliability, and the protocols followed to synthesize a meta-analytic conclusion from the studies reviewed;
- *Explicitness* of the above procedures.

The expectation that this may become an interesting instrument for facilitating the cumulation of social science is based on the way that the medical role model has worked out. In the field of clinical research the basic attitude has become that “embarking on new research without first preparing systematic...reviews...is indefensible, on both scientific and ethical grounds”³. In practice this leads for example to a UK Medical Research Council requirement for grant applicants to “give reference to any relevant systematic review(s) and discuss the need for your trial in the light of the(se) review(s). If you believe that no relevant previous trials have been done, give details of your search strategy for existing trials”⁴.

As said before, in the broader field of social policy, work has only just started but the development seems very promising. Not only because the promises of research syntheses as such but also because, by having the strong methodological focus it has, it sort of automatically brings the distinguishing characteristics of the social sciences vis-a-vis other information sources to the limelight. This is not only important from the perspective of improving their public image, but also for internal reasons. One might argue that the failure of the social sciences to display their distinguishing characteristics is partly due to an internal neglect of the importance of methodological rigour and transparency. Too much non-rigorous and non-transparent studies pass on into the public domain without peer criticism functioning as an effective hurdle. This might be very difficult to prevent given the way the media and the political arena work, but some measure of self-criticism might nevertheless be appropriate. More attention to methodology in general might increase chances that more and more effective self-criticism will develop in the near future.

The described approach is not envisioned to offer the final and definite cure for the negative public image of the social sciences. However, it does add something substantial to the

³ ESF policy Briefing 13, May 2001, *Controlled clinical trials*, p.3

existing prescriptions, as summarised by van Langenhoven. And it shares an important element with the other prescriptions: however important it might be for the policy relevance of the social sciences, it is equally relevant from a science-internal viewpoint. Better data infrastructures, better approaches to deal with complexity, better methodologies for synthesising research..., these all make for more problem-solving potential *and* for better science. And real self-interest is still a major change-factor. That is why these prescriptions are promising. All stakeholders have something important to gain.

A last word on the role of the *humanities* seems an appropriate way to conclude this session report. All the papers presented were social science studies. What can they possibly teach us about the potential contribution of the humanities? For one, they taught that the boundaries between these “worlds” or “fields” or whatever else one may call these, are very permeable. In most papers comparisons over time were made in order to unravel social mechanisms underlying socio-economic trends. Most papers argued for making use of qualitative information in addition to quantitative data, in order to really understand these mechanisms. One could say that the importance of a historical perspective could hardly be promoted more explicitly. Also, the issue of conceptual lenses and the necessity to scrutinize their (psycho)logical structure was a more or less explicit theme in several papers. Here, the affinities with philosophical analysis and legal theory are obvious. For both examples, comparison over time and conceptual analysis, it seems clear that the more explicitly these affinities are recognised, the more explicitly historical, philosophical and legal expertise is actually used, the more solid and thus policy relevant the conclusions can be. In other words, the papers showed by example that social science is in a better position to perform some of its key functions by ignoring the “boundaries” with the humanities and actively collaborate with historians, philosophers, lawyers and others.

⁴ See: Chalmers, I. (2001) Using systematic reviews and registers of ongoing trials for scientific and ethical trial design, monitoring, and reporting. In: Egger, M. et.al. *Systematic Reviews in Health Care: Meta-Analysis in Context*. 2nd edition. London: BMJ Books, pp.429-443.

ANNEX

Unity and diversity: The contribution of the social sciences and the humanities to the ERA
Bruges, October 29-30, 2001

PROGRAMME

Sunday, October 28

- Arrival of participants
- Registration desk open at the conference centre (from 15h00 until 20h00)

Monday, October 29

- 08h30: registration desk open at the conference centre
- 09h30 - 12h15: opening plenary session
- 12h15 - 14h00: lunch
- 14h00 - 18h00: parallel sessions 1-4
- Session 1: Governance, citizenship and civil society
- Session 2: Social cohesion, diversity and inequality
- Session 3: Social and cultural change: the impact on well-being
- Session 4: Science, technology and social change: the role of foresight
- 19h30: conference dinner

Tuesday, October 30

- 09h00 - 11h00: continuation of the parallel sessions 1-4
- 11h00 - 11h30: coffee break
- 11h30 - 12h45: closing plenary session, first part
- 12h45 - 14h30: lunch
- 14h30 - 16h30: closing plenary session, second part

Plenary sessions

Chair: Bea Cantillon, Dominique Willems and Jean François Marchipont

Research in the social sciences and the humanities in Europe is currently often carried out within national contexts; at the same time, interdisciplinary cooperation between different social sciences and humanities fields can still be improved upon a lot. The establishment of a European research infrastructure in the social sciences and humanities is an absolute prerequisite for the establishment of the European Research Area (ERA) within these fields and for the mobilisation of the research community to respond to European challenges. The recognition of the intrinsic value of social sciences and humanities research as a source of policy-relevant, evidence-based knowledge necessitates a thorough discussion on a number of cross-cutting aspects, such as:

- the need for infrastructures to improve the accessibility of data for comparative analysis (transnational, interdisciplinary, etc.);
- the need for commonly understood interdisciplinary terminology;
- methodologies for comparative analysis;
- the establishment of communication and interaction between the scientific community (bottom-up, curiosity-driven), decision makers (policy-oriented; need for informed choices) and society
- the need for networking research groups in the social sciences and the humanities across the ERA.

Opening plenary session

October 29, 2001

Chair: Dominique Willems

Dirk VAN MECHELEN Minister of the Government of Flanders for Finance, Budget, Innovation, Media and Town and Country Planning: Opening of the conference by the Belgian EU Presidency

Achilleas MITSOS Director-General, European Commission, DG Research: The way ahead for the social sciences and the humanities in a changing Europe: the view from DG Research

Helga NOWOTNY: Challenges for the social sciences and the humanities within the ERA, in particular for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe

Duncan GALLIE: Social challenges to the research agenda

Luk VAN LANGENHOVE: Re-thinking the social sciences: initiatives from multilateral organisations

Maria RODRIGUES: Policy relevance of the social sciences

Closing plenary session

October 30, 2001

First part

Chair: Jean François Marchipont

Sonia P. RIEKMAN: Report on parallel session 1

Lisa PUTMAN: Report on parallel session 2

James WICKHAM: Report on parallel session 3

Rémi BARRÉ: Report on parallel session 4

Second part

Chair: Bea Cantillon

Helen WALLACE: Responsive and responsible governance

Brendan WHELAN: Social exclusion: overview, policies and research

Goran THERBORN

Thierry GAUDIN: Governance and the change in the technical system

Jean François MARCHIPONT European Commission, DG Research: Concluding remarks from the Commission's point of view

Freddy COLSON Ministry of Flanders, Science and Innovation administration: Concluding remarks from the Belgian EU Presidency's point of view

Parallel session 1: Governance, citizenship and civil society

Chair: Salvador Giner

Rapporteur: Sonia P. Riekman

The answer to the question “Who governs?” is no longer easy: governance is not only a matter for governments. At the same time, the answer to “to whom governance is accountable” is also not obvious: new forms of civil society participation are emerging, as well as new forms of citizenship (e.g. European citizenship, the only supranational form of citizenship ever established), and representative institutions are reflecting on their own role. The relations between public authorities and the private sector, as well as between them and citizens, are a crucial element of new governance arrangements. At the same time, governance is increasingly 'multi-level', with articulation of responsibilities between local, regional, national, European and global institutions and other governance “actors”.

Session 1A: Civil society, representative institutions and governance

October 29, 2001

Klaus EDER: The new Europe - a polity of citizens? Citizenship and the issue of the collective identity of a civil society

Anna TRIANDEFYLLIDOU: The transformation of immigration policy implementation in the context of European citizenship and the “marketisation” of civil society

Manuel PEREZ-YRUELA: Corporatism and civil society

Andreas MAURER: Civil society and modes of economic governance – towards a new European governance?

Session 1B: Civil society and citizenship

October 30, 2001

Richard SINNOTT: It couldn't happen here ? Support for integration and orientations to participation in the member states in the light of the Irish Nice referendum

Andras SAJO: E-democracy and representative government

Jacqueline HEINEN: Gender and (local) governance

Emil KIRCHNER: Public opinion and democratic channels in EU foreign and security policy

Parallel session 2: Social cohesion, diversity and inequality

Chair: Erik de Gier

Rapporteur: Lisa Putman

So far, European societies' development models have succeeded to combine (with different degrees of success) economic and technological development with a certain degree of social and cultural cohesion. Globalisation processes and economic development, current demographic trends, increase of immigrants, persistence of high rates of unemployment, large urban population concentration are some of the factors challenging the foundations of the European social models. The impact on marginal and less favoured groups (including ethnic minorities) must be assessed.

Session 2A

October 29, 2001

Ivan SZELENYI: Poverty and ethnicity in transnational societies

Godfried ENGBERSEN: Asylum seekers, temporary immigrants and undocumented or illegal immigrants

Bjorn GUSTAFSSON: Sweden's recent experience of international migration

Johan FRITZELL Discussant

Session 2B

October 30, 2001

Brendan WHELAN: Social exclusion: overview, policies and research

Lieve DE LATHOUWER: Challenges on poverty and unemployment for the European social model

Bernard FRIOT, Nathalie MONCEL & Bernadette CLASQUIN: A theoretical framework to analyse the nature of financing employment and social protection in Europe

Christopher T. WHELAN, Richard LAYTE & Bertrand MAÎTRE: What is the scale of multiple deprivation in the European Union ?

Maria BAGANHA Discussant

Parallel session 3: Social and cultural change: the impact on well-being

Chair: Dominique Willems

Rapporteur: James Wickham

The “quality of life” concept, used so far in EU-funded research, has mainly addressed life sciences issues (e.g. aspects of food quality, health, environment etc.), but insufficient systematic attention has been given to factors that affect individuals’ and societies’ well-being. The aim of this session is to help determine the interactions (both within countries and across borders) between current societal and cultural trends and individuals’ well-being (or quality of life). Attention will also be devoted to the role of media in shaping individuals’ behaviour and attitudes in this context.

Session 3A

October 29, 2001

Els WITTE: European integration and cultural identities: the role of historical research

Rao BALAGANGHADARA: Provincialising Europe? The post-colonial challenge and the European well-being in the 21st century

Els DE BENS: Changing media – Changing Europe

Mihai NADIN: Vive la différence! Quality of life in an integrated world

Michalis LIANOS: The governance of meaning: providing a manageable world for European citizens

Ursula HUWS: Who’s waiting? The contestation of time in service delivery and its implications for the quality of life

Freddy DEVEN: Taking stock of parental leave: a story about gender and time

Roger JOWELL: The case of European-wide social indicators of subjective well-being

Thomas BOJE Discussant

Session 3B

October 30, 2001

Steffen LEHNDORFF: “At your service at any time ?” Work-life balance as a political challenge

Gerard VALENDUC: ICTs, flexible working and quality of life

Juliet WEBSTER: The repercussions of work: achieving social sustainability in the workplace and beyond

Thomas BOJE Discussant

Parallel session 4: Science, technology and social change: the role of foresight

Chair: Luk Van Langenhove

Rapporteur: Rémi Barré

This session will focus on the need for stakeholders to participate in the public debate about science and technology. In this context, the role of foresight studies will be discussed as an instrument to mobilise broad sections of all parties interested in research, to give collective thought to priorities and thus to prompt discussion. Answering to the growing need for stakeholders' involvement in research policies, foresight is becoming a major issue at national and European level. It reflects the move towards new governance models in this field of policy as in others where collective participative processes are designed, used and appropriated by all stakeholders involved. National and European research policies are more and more designed in the context of the economic, social and political developments of our societies and of the building of Europe in a more general way. The promotion of a European Research Area implies also sharing knowledge about the possible trajectories of science and technology development in a horizon from five to twenty years. The contribution that social sciences research can make to the design, implementation and evaluation of foresight processes is a key issue here. A short presentation of the results of studies, funded by the TSER programme, the key action "Improving the socio-economic knowledge base" and STRATA, as well as related nationally funded research programmes, followed by a discussion, allows to take stock of the state of the art and to identify issues and approaches for future research programmes.

Session 4A

October 29, 2001

Yannis CALOGHIROU

Joyce TAIT: New modes of governance in Europe: science strategies, social interactions and foresight

Hans VAN GINKEL: Hitting a moving target: on foresight, technology and social change

Robby BERLOZNIK: From technology assessment to sustainable technology assessment

John GRIN

Session 4B

October 30, 2001

Stefan KUHLMAN: Foresight and distributed intelligence for research policy

Pal TAMAS

J. CORREIA JESUINO: The precautionary principle: the role of social sciences