

TiPSE

The **T**erritorial **D**imension of **P**overty and **S**ocial **E**xclusion in Europe

Applied Research 2013/1/24

Interim Report

ANNEX 1

Working Paper 1

Review of Concepts of Poverty and Social Exclusion

Hilary Talbot, Ali Madanipour, Mark Shucksmith

University of Newcastle

December 2012

This report presents the interim results of an Applied Research Project conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2013 Programme, partly financed by the European Regional Development.

The partnership behind the ESPON Programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU27, plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON Programme and projects can be found on www.espon.eu

The web site provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent documents produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

ISBN number -

© ESPON & Nordregio, 2012.

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorised provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1 Academic Conceptualisations	2
2 Territoriality of Poverty and Social Exclusion	11
3 Policy	14
4 Implications for Indicators.....	32
References	36
Appendix 1: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in Nordic countries.....	45
Appendix 2: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in Central European Countries (incl. Portugal).....	49
Appendix 3: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in Mediterranean countries	64
Appendix 4: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in the East European Member States.....	69

INTRODUCTION

This report is Working Paper 1 of the TIPSE (The Territorial Indicators of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Europe) project. Its aim is to review the concepts of poverty and social exclusion as evidenced by both academic and policy literature, and to draw out socioeconomic characteristics commonly associated with poverty and social exclusion to provide a theoretical basis for the search for proxy indicators in subsequent work packages of the TIPSE project.

The paper is divided into four parts. Part I explores the academic debates around the concepts of poverty, social exclusion, and a combined 'poverty and social exclusion' concept. Part II then considers conceptualisations of the territorial nature of poverty/social exclusion from an academic viewpoint. This makes a somewhat artificial distinction between the 'academic' study of Parts I and II and the analysis of policy which is undertaken in Part III. We make this point to emphasise the normative nature of studying the nature of poverty/social exclusion. Conceptualisations are embedded within societal constructions which vary between cultures and between stakeholders engaged in alleviating poverty/social exclusion, and have an implicit subtext that something ought to be done about the problem, which links them to politics and policies. That said, Part III is written separately, and expands on analyses of EU-level policy, Member State-level policy, and local level 'area' policy. Part IV discusses the implications for the development of co-variates and proxy indicators.

The authors were supported by TIPSE partners who reported poverty and social exclusion conceptualisations and policies in groups of Member States. The material in these reports was too wide-ranging for it all to be incorporated in this Working Paper, so they are attached to this report as four appendices: Nordic countries (by Christian Dymen, Mitchell Reardon and Petri Kahila, NordRegio); Central European countries (by Isabel Ramos-Lobato, ILS Dortmund); Mediterranean countries (by George Kandyl, EKKE Athens); and Eastern European countries (by Gergely Tagai, Bálint Koós, Györgyi Barta and Katalin Kovacs, Hungarian Academy of Science). We would also like to acknowledge the help received from other TIPSE partners; in particular, Sabine Weck (ILS) and Thomas Maloutas (EKKE, Athens).

1 Academic Conceptualisations

1.1 Introduction

There are numerous ways in which academics conceptualise poverty and social exclusion. These, and related terminologies, are sometimes described as 'chaotic' concepts (Samers, 1998). 'Poverty' and 'social exclusion' can be seen as two distinctive subjects of study that can be conceptualised separately. This is the approach that we initially follow in this paper, followed by a section that looks at the fuzzy nature of the boundary between the issues, how some commentators prefer to integrate them into a single 'poverty and social exclusion' concept, and why some argue forcefully for keeping them distinctive.

1.2 Poverty

Poverty research and analysis has a long history. The work of Booth and Rowntree who studied poverty in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth century is seen as seminal, with Rowntree's 1902 work seen as the first scientific study of poverty (Ruggeri Laderchi et al, 2003). Both defined poverty as being more than simply lacking financial resources: adverse living conditions were also an important feature. A lack of financial resources was accompanied by poor health and housing, a lack of education and few services (Shucksmith, 2012). After the Second World War there was political consensus across Western Europe that poverty and unemployment would be addressed by governments through economic and social policies.

Poverty is a widely-used term, but one that is given many meanings: the definition of poverty is often contested and the concept has evolved and changed over time (Pantazis et al, 2006, p.14). Misturelli and Heffernan's discourse analysis (2010) of 159 documents focusing on poverty in developing countries demonstrated how usage differed over time and between stakeholder groups, and how many different constructions of the problem were to be found under the rubric of 'poverty'. Pragmatically, Van den Bosch claims that "it cannot be defined in any way one likes" and goes on to propose the "everyday meaning of the word" as most appropriate (quoted in Veit-Wilson, 2006, p. 318). Veit- Wilson sees this customary meaning as "the enforced lack of resources demonstrably needed for respect and inclusion" (ibid, p.318). However, the UN uses a different, but also commonly accepted, definition of poverty as "a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information" (United Nations, 1995, p.57).

The difference between these two 'everyday' meanings demonstrates how normative constructions of poverty are, even in academic debate; we are urged to recognise poverty research as an "inescapably political act" (O'Connor, 2001, p.12). The UN uses an absolute definition which serves to highlight the plight of those in parts of the world where such catastrophes as famine and drought have disastrous

consequences. In these absolute terms, the UN claims poverty hardly exists in Europe. However, European governments and their people are also concerned about inequalities *within* their states and *within* Europe, and therefore use a relative definition of poverty where the norms of each society are important, hence the emphasis of many authors on the poor not only having material resources but that these should be at a level that allows them to enjoy the everyday lifestyles of the majority in their society (e.g., Veit-Wilson, 2006; Jonkaryte and Stankuniene, 2003; Trumm, 2011).

While definitions of poverty typically refer to 'a lack of resources', these are commonly operationalized in research as a lack of income or a lack of consumption. For some commentators, this reflects a belief that the "cure for this ordinary poverty is high income" (Veit-Wilson, 2006 p.319). For others the choice of income is thought to be driven by pragmatism: income data is regularly collected and analysed by governments (Levitas, 2006) and is therefore available to be used as a proxy for wider aspects of welfare and poverty (Ruggeri Laderchi et al, 2003). In some European countries, the approach is to rely more on data on those who apply to the state for social assistance (e.g., Golinowska, 2002). Relative poverty as a lack of income resource is how official statistics across Europe have operationalised an 'at-risk-of-poverty-rate', defined as an income below 60% of the national median equivalised disposable income (after social transfers). An alternative approach to identifying levels of relative poverty is to draw up benchmarks of what are perceived as basic necessities for living a normal life; in Europe these typically refer to activities such as having a week's holiday, and the quality of basic resources such as food, rather than simply whether or not a person has enough basic resources to survive. The relative poverty of individuals is then monitored against these benchmarks.

The use of relative poverty indicators by the EU obstructs comparisons between Member States and makes it hard to establish which countries have the most people in 'absolute' poverty (Jeheol-Gijsbers and Vrooman, 2007). High income countries like Luxembourg sometimes find discourses of relative poverty inappropriate; a speech by the Prime Minister (Ministere de la Famille et d l'integration, 2010) differentiated between the statistical at-risk-of poverty measure for the EU and 'real poverty', suggesting the former should be noted, but only the latter should be addressed.

The tendency to reduce poverty to income deprivation is critiqued/resisted by a number of commentators. Naude et al (2009) explain how in development studies poverty was initially associated exclusively with adequate income (or consumption) but is now understood as a multidimensional concept. Ruggeri Laderchi et al (2003) discuss a number of definitions of poverty, only one of which is the monetary approach. Within this they outline Sen's capability approach, used as the basis for the UN Human Development Index, which rejects the monetary approach's use of income as a proxy for wellbeing and instead focuses on "the freedom of individuals to live lives that are valued" (p.253). They also include the concept of social exclusion

(discussed in more detail later in this paper) in their approaches to studying poverty, particularly its focus on processes of becoming poor and how it makes a social perspective central. For Wagle (2002), the differences between income, capabilities and social exclusion approaches can be explained as the prominence of different social science disciplines: economics, social psychology, and sociology/anthropology respectively. Townsend himself, who is often held to be instrumental in how the EU conceptualises poverty (Shucksmith, 2012), in fact defines people as in poverty when their relative lack of resources means that they are “in effect, excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs and activities” (quoted in Levitas 2006, p.125) so going well beyond a narrow ‘income’ definition.

A focus on poverty and social inequality is perceived as an Anglo-Saxon pre-occupation (Jehoel-Gijsbers and Vrooman, 2007) and is sometimes associated with Marxist thought, although there is also a strong connection to Christianity, with both Rowntree and Booth having strong religious convictions. In this, poverty and inequality are seen as inevitably produced by capitalist societies: in particular, social inequality is “a spur to greater efforts on the part of wage and salary earners” (Peet, 1975 p.566) and capitalist economies need an ‘industrial reserve army’, “a pool of poor people who can be used and discarded at the capitalist’s will” (p.567). However, according to Marxist theory, the ruling class in capitalist societies also needs consumers (this is also the basis of Keynesian economics), so has a concern about how many people are poor and support the idea that some form of welfare system is in place. The concern with relative income poverty within Member States is a relatively new concept for the post-socialist countries, which historically had had a more equalised income distribution. ‘Poverty’ did exist under the old regimes, but related not to income, but to life cycle stages, such as being elderly (Vecernik, 2004).

1.3 Social Exclusion

The concept ‘social exclusion’, although having “alternative, shifting and contested meanings” (Levitas, 2006, p. 125) is indisputably associated in the literature with Durkheim’s work on how social cohesion and integration can be achieved. In this, cultural integration is important alongside the provision of material benefits (Levitas, 1996). The term ‘social exclusion’ is of recent origin (Samers, 1998), and generally attributed to French discourse from the 1960s onwards, and associated with the work of Lenoir (1974). Swiss researchers have more recently been drawing on the concepts and theories of Foucault, Luhmann, Bourdieu and Castells to develop the inclusion and exclusion concept further (Bohn, 2008; Windolf, 2001; Stichweh, 2009).

Silver (1994) identifies three paradigms of social exclusion: solidarity; specialisation; and monopoly. “In the solidarity paradigm exclusion is the breakdown of a social bond between the individual and society that is cultural and moral, rather than economically interested” (p.570). Here the focus is on the relationship between individual and society. Under the ‘specialisation’ paradigm, exclusion is caused by relationships between individuals and the scope for discrimination within the sphere of civil society. The ‘monopoly’ paradigm stresses how “powerful groups, often

displaying distinctive cultural identities and institutions, restrict the access of outsiders to valued resources” (ibid).

Silver’s paradigms stress a number of important facets to the concept of social exclusion: that it is *relational*, with the power in the relationship resting with the ‘included’; that the relationships exist at a number of societal levels (such as with society, with institutions, with powerful groups, with individuals); that social and cultural factors are at least as important as economic ones. Such aspects of social exclusion are articulated by many commentators (e.g. Atkinson, 1998; Samers, 1998). The emphasis placed on the *dynamics* of the process by which people/groups become excluded, rather than simply on describing the outcome is stressed by many commentators (e.g., Room, 1999; Einasto, 2002; Havasi, 2002). The *multifaceted* and cumulative nature of social exclusion is another dominant theme in definitions in the literature (e.g., Room, 1999; Beland, 2007; Trbanc, 2001; Szalai, 2002). Atkinson and Davoudi (2000) elaborate upon what Silver called the ‘solidarity’ paradigm, outlining how solidarity could be *within* groups or could be *societal* solidarity and how these two types are likely to conflict.

Conceptualisations of social exclusion stress that the power relationships are often not between individuals: ‘institutionalised discrimination’ (Mignione, 1997) is a key cause of exclusion. For Madanipour (2011, p.189), exclusion is “an institutionalized form of controlling access: to places, to activities, to resources and information”. Atkinson and Davoudi (2000, p.438) describe the breadth of what might be included as institutionalised exclusion by drawing on the work of the Irish Poverty 3 researchers and the Observatory on National Policies to Combat Social Exclusion: exclusion from the democratic and legal system; exclusion from the labour market; exclusion from the welfare system; exclusion from the family and community system. A further refinement of this analysis has been produced by Reimer (2004) and Philip and Shucksmith (2003) with the processes of social inclusion/exclusion portrayed as operating through four social systems:

1. Market relations, or private systems
2. Bureaucratic relations, or state administrative systems
3. Associative relations, i.e., collective action processes based on shared interests
4. Communal relations, based on shared identity, among family and friends networks.

These “represent four relatively coherent ways in which people organise their relationships to accomplish tasks, legitimise their actions, allocated resources, and structure their interactions. Exclusion and inclusion can occur with respect to any or all of these types of relationships, simultaneously creating both distributional and relational manifestations of the problem” (ibid, p.78). One’s sense of belonging in society, as well as one’s purchase on resources, depends on all these systems. When combined, these forms of exclusion can create an acute form of social exclusion which keeps the excluded at the very margins of the society, a

phenomenon all too often marked by a clear spatial manifestation in deprived inner city or peripheral urban areas (Madanipour, 2012a) (See Part II).

Reimer's systems draws attention to how the institutions of exclusion can be at a variety of levels (Jehoel-Gijsber and Vrooman, 2007), from the capitalist system of labour markets down to the micro-level of the family and community. People may be excluded when one or more systems that should guarantee the social integration of the individual or household breaks down or malfunctions (Berghman, 1995); Atkinson and Davoudi (2000) draw attention to the 'chain reaction' of breakdowns. The lists of social systems also highlight how institutions of the state are implicated in exclusionary processes. While some commentators perceive these as unintended consequences, for O'Brien and Penna (2008) this "is not a by-product of system malfunction, it is woven into the fabric of those institutions ... that are offered as the means to resolve the problem of exclusion" (p.89).

Discourses of social exclusion are often constructed in contrast to poverty discourses (e.g., Shucksmith and Chapman, 1998; Jehoel-Gijsber and Vrooman, 2007; Trbanc,2001; Paas, 2003) which help to make the conceptual differences clearer. While the notion of poverty is primarily distributional, the concept of social exclusion focuses primarily on relational issues (detachment from labour markets, low participation, social isolation and especially the exercise of power). It is less about the 'victims' and more about the processes which cause exclusion. It includes but goes beyond income levels or access to services such as health, education and housing. Economic, political, and cultural arena are recognised as the broad spheres of social life in which social inclusion and exclusion are manifested and, therefore can be analysed and understood (Madanipour e al, 2003).

Shucksmith and Chapman (1998) endorse Berghman's argument that:

"Poverty is an outcome, denoting an inability to share in the everyday lifestyles of the majority because of a lack of resources (often taken to be disposable income). Social exclusion is a multi-dimensional, dynamic concept which refers to a breakdown or malfunctioning of the major societal systems that should guarantee social integration of the individual or household. It implies a focus not only on 'victims' but also on the system failures" (p.230).

In a similar vein, Jehoel-Gijsber and Vrooman (2007), in their discussion of distinctions made in the literature between poverty and social exclusion, list

- Static condition vs dynamic process
- Absolute vs relative concept
- Unidimensional vs multidimensional disadvantage
- Distributional vs relational focus
- Endogenous vs exogenous agency (p.13/14).

What it is that people are excluded from is often conceptualised at a high and abstract level. For example, normal citizenship (Mignione, 1997); normal living patterns of the mainstream society (Room, 1995). Silver (1994) ponders on a more operationalisable listing, and in so doing demonstrates the range of exclusions that might occur: “a livelihood; secure, permanent employment; earnings; property, credit or land; housing; the minimal or prevailing consumption level; education, skills and cultural capital; the benefits provided by the welfare state; citizenship and equality before the law; participation in the democratic process; public goods; the nation or the dominant race; the family and sociability; humane treatment; respect, personal fulfilment, understanding” (p.541). Burchardt et al (2002) suggests that this is one way of thinking about social exclusion; the other is to focus on the relatively small groups whose problems are extreme or intractable.

However, there is no single conceptualisation of the people who are socially excluded. Apart from difficulties with agreeing on what terms like ‘normal citizenship’ mean, Silver (1994) demonstrates how those identified as excluded in French discourses has shifted over time, in particular as a response to the prominent social problems at each point in time. Those identified by Lenoir (1974), the ‘founding father’ of the French discourse, perhaps best reflects Burchardt et al’s proposed approach of thinking of small groups with intractable problems. His groups included suicidal people, multi-problem households, abused children, drug addicts, and delinquents. The conceptualisation of social exclusion as a process rather than an outcome (Madanipour et al, 2003) also mitigates against viewing people as ‘excluded’ in an absolute sense. Commentators prefer to talk about people who are ‘at risk’ of exclusion. This is usually couched in terms of identifiable social groupings which typically include significant numbers of individuals at risk of social exclusion, the risk increasing with the overlay of groupings. For example, in post-Socialist countries, the groups at risk of social exclusion often include: the Roma population, people living in small villages, people with disabilities and families with children (Trbanc, 2001; Szalai, 2002). Helping such marginalised groups out of exclusion necessitates understanding the processes of exclusion and inclusion for each separate group (ibid).

Society’s and individuals’ beliefs about the responsibility for social exclusion tend to two extremes. One view is that individuals bring it upon themselves. The ‘underclass’ approach views the excluded as deviants from the moral and cultural norms of society, [and] exhibiting a ‘dependency culture’ (Philip and Shucksmith, 2003, p.463). The alternative view highlights “the role of institutions and systems, or perhaps of more powerful individuals and groups in society” (Shucksmith et al, 2006 p.680) in causing exclusion. The former approach, in which people are blamed for their own poverty and/or social exclusion, is often associated with US writers, the latter more with European research (ibid), although this oversimplifies the situation in each continent (Shucksmith and Schafft 2012). Little empirical support has been found for underclass explanations (ibid).

1.4 Poverty and Social Exclusion

Concepts of both poverty and social exclusion, then, are very fuzzy and overlapping. Although some authors have identified distinctions between them (see Shucksmith and Chapman, 1998 and Jehoel-Gijsber and Vrooman, 2007 above), there are also those who critique these distinctions. Jehoel-Gijsber and Vrooman (2007) in their review of the literature, provide many examples of the critiques. For instance, how social exclusion is not only a dynamic process, but can be an outcome of historical developments, an end state, and how research into poverty can focus on the process of becoming poor or moving out of poverty. How poverty is often conceptualised in much broader terms than simply income poverty has already been rehearsed in the section on poverty above.

However, much of the conventional wisdom is that social exclusion is broader concept than poverty, and incorporates the material deprivations associated with poverty (see for example, Silver's list above of what people might be excluded from (Silver, 1994)). In this context, the separate concept of 'poverty' could be seen as rather redundant: it can either be subsumed under a 'social exclusion' heading, or dealt with as part of composite 'poverty and social exclusion'. In the policy circles of some parts of the EU, this would appear to be the approach taken. In Belgium, for example, a single cohesive concept has been developed (Vranken 2010) in which poverty is described as "a network of forms of social exclusion that extends over several areas of individual and collective existence. It separates the poor from the generally accepted modes of existence in society, creating a gap that poor people are unable to bridge on their own". The EU itself has produced a single concept of 'poverty and social exclusion' which again avoids the need to differentiate between the two ill-defined terms, or to resolve the lack of consensus over their relationship one with the other (Andriani and Karyampas, 2010).

However, in some Member States the distinction between poverty and social exclusion is stressed by academics (e.g., Germany and the Netherlands (Bohnke, 2001; Haussermann and Kronauer, 2009; Vrooman and Hoff, 2004). There are also a number of commentators who are insistent that they should be conceptualised separately. For example, for Beland (2007) social exclusion is "based on a horizontal, spatial metaphor" (p.127) with people moving in or out of mainstream society; poverty is based on a "vertical model of inequality ... [and people move] 'up' or 'down' the class or the income distribution structure" (Ibid). For O'Brien and Penna (2008), social inclusion/exclusion is "the extent to which individuals are (or are not) incorporated within a moral and political community" (p.85) which is totally distinct from the economic distributional issues of poverty. There is concern that "those who focus on social exclusion excessively underscore social orders and institutions, thereby downplaying the role of one's economic and individual capacities" (Wagle, 2002, p.161). Class politics are the issue for Samers (1998): "has the term social exclusion (a bourgeois term?) served to supplant a radical/working class discourse?" (p.128). For Veit-Wilson (2002), in modern states

“adequate income is the clean water of poverty policy” p.543). The identification of some people as excluded “carries an implicit notion that all but a few are included in a cohesive society undifferentiated by class or social division” (Shucksmith, 2012, p.4). Finally, literatures from post-Socialist countries suggest the need to assess them separately because the resolution of such exclusionary factors as unemployment and homelessness is so much more long term than the distributional problems of (income) poverty (Szalai, 2002).

Finally, Shucksmith (2012) notes another critique of social exclusion and poverty concepts on the grounds that these both focus on a narrow social group and fail to address wider social inequalities and the processes underlying these. His particular concern is with “a more fluid, reflexive notion of class as manifested in culture, identities, lifestyles and everyday life” (p.6).

1.5 Concluding remarks

Both poverty and social exclusion are persistent problems in European society. While some people move in and out of poverty and social exclusion, others get caught up by cumulative and cyclical interdependencies (Bradshaw, 2006) and poverty and social exclusion is passed from generation to generation (Jamet, 2007; Rodrigues et al, 1999). In some discourses, people can become socialised into what Oscar Lewis (1959) termed a ‘culture of poverty’, often associated with ‘the underclass’. This is something of a paradox in terms of exclusion: these people, it is argued, are excluded from mainstream society, but thoroughly integrated in their community/underclass.

As a pan-European project, interested in the territorial nature of poverty and social exclusion, some consideration should be given to a geography of conceptualisations. As has already been mentioned, the origins of the poverty discourse are Anglo-Saxon, and the origins of the social exclusion discourse are French. However, a review of the literature from different European countries (David, 2005) found an almost total absence of conceptual differences between Member States. Far more important to conceptualisations were the needs and agendas of the commissioning institutions, the aim of the study and the ontology of the researcher. A review of literature for Italy demonstrates the differences of approach to the definition of poverty by researchers within the same country – a monetary approach (either income or consumption) (e.g., Addabo, 2000; Brandolini et al, 2001; Franco et al, 2008). This is critiqued by other Italian academics, who use a multidimensional approach (e.g., Mendola and De Cantis, 2004; Quintano et al, 2004).

In the TIPSE project we take the view, having reviewed this literature, that poverty and social exclusion are closely related, but nevertheless are distinct phenomena. Within a policy context, at least, poverty is usually considered a relatively narrow income-based concept, which is amenable to quantification and definition according to specific benchmarks. The major issue for TIPSE is how to address the comparability issue associated with relative poverty being defined in national

contexts, and in this respect two approaches have emerged in the literature (Bradshaw and Mayhew 2011) – a respecification of the relative poverty definition, using an EU-wide benchmark based on a budget standard; and a deprivation approach based on the ability to afford a basket of ‘essentials’.

Social exclusion, on the other hand, is a multi-dimensional characteristic, defined according to context, and often assessed in more qualitative ways. Measurement is made the more difficult by the fact that social exclusion is often a process rather than simply a state at a point in time: it refers to both processes and consequent situations (EC 1992, 8). Poverty and social exclusion are not necessarily associated or co-located, since social exclusion is not always a function of low income. Finding quantifiable indicators of social exclusion as a relational and multidimensional process will therefore be a major challenge.

2 Territoriality of Poverty and Social Exclusion

That there is a spatial dimension to the distribution of poverty and social exclusion within Europe is widely accepted. Not only are there significant differences between individual Member States but also groupings of Member States highlight significant East-West contrasts (ESPON 2013 Programme, 2010). Concentrations of poverty and social exclusion are also to be found within Member States. The Fifth Cohesion Report (European Commission, 2010a) maps the regional variations in incidence of various social indicators, including material deprivation, across EU Member States. At a more localised level, “while most people in disadvantaged conditions live in major urban centres, in relative terms, they tend to be over-represented in rural and geographically isolated areas and communities. In some Member States the poverty risk in rural areas is double that of urban ones” (European Commission, 2010b, p.13).

All of the above statements about the geography of poverty and social exclusion beg the question of whether they simply signify a concentration of individual poverty and social exclusion in certain places or whether, additionally, place itself becomes an important site of exclusion. This might occur “if people are deprived in part because of where they live, and because available services and opportunities prevent them from getting out of poverty” (Stewart, 2003, p.338). Although empirical studies struggle to disentangle any neighbourhood effects from those produced by non-spatial factors (e.g., Ellen and Turner, 1997), a significant school of thought argues that ‘excluded spaces’ (Kristensen, 1997) are another dimension of social exclusion, interacting and intensifying the effects of individual social exclusion and contributing to a ‘spiral of decline’ (Atkinson and Davoudi, 2000, p441).

There is clearly spatial differentiation within Europe of the endowment of natural resources. Some parts have quality agricultural land or are rich in extractable resources. Some are water-rich (including some having problems with flooding); some have good access to the sea, and so on. Such natural assets have influenced the history of settlement patterns and industrial development. But the relationship is not simply that space drives social organisation: social processes also form and change space (ESPON 1.4.2, 2006). This produces the rich tapestry of regions and places that exist today. These can be categorised in various ways, including urban or rural, core or peripheral, which are pertinent to the arguments about the ‘spaces for the excluded’ (Sibley, 1998, p.119).

Densely-populated areas have had a larger proportion of people who are materially deprived than their less populated counterparts in the EU-15 (European Commission, 2010a). According to the Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods project, in European cities there are “the symptoms of growing social exclusion in their depressed neighbourhoods: increasing rates of long term unemployment, male joblessness, the feminisation of an increasingly casualised labour force, widening gaps in income levels, increasing disparities in education attainment, deteriorating

health and life expectancies for the poorest members of society” (Cars, 1998, p.19; Madanipour et al, 2003). ‘Urban exclusion’ (Silver, 1994) has been the focus of much research (Geddes, 2000). However, most commentators identify small scale neighbourhoods in urban areas as the sites of exclusion: ‘deprived outer suburbs’ (Silver, 1994), ‘social housing estates (Atkinson and Davoudi, 2000), ‘slum areas of large cities’ (Adaman and Keyder, 2006), for example. This raises a fundamental question about the scale at which exclusion is observed, and the extent to which it can be mapped at regional scale: this issue is returned to below. This segregation of poor and excluded people into declining parts of cities (Cars,1998; Madanipour et al, 2003) is the result of two processes (Madanipour, 2011): “a land and property market which sees space as a commodity and tends to create socio-spatial segregation through differential access to this commodity, and a town planning and design tendency to regulate and rationalize space production by the imposition of some form of order. When we look at these two processes together, the picture which emerges is a collectivization of difference, or exclusion, which can lead to enclaves for the rich and the creation of new ghettos for the poor” (p.193).

That there is also poverty in, and of, rural places in the EU is highlighted in the report on Poverty and Social Exclusion in Rural Areas (Bertolini and Peragine, 2009). The decline of these areas, again, is significant in understanding these excluded places. In some cases, places have been reliant on large scale extractive industries which once in decline leave a degraded landscape and communities “blighted by widespread unemployment, long-term sickness and poverty a decade after the collapse” (Bennett et al, 2000). In some countries, notably the UK, the land and property market and development regulation (as discussed above in the urban context) have served to perpetuate rural areas as elite spaces with hidden poverty and social exclusion (Philip and Shucksmith, 2003). In other rural areas, the decline of agriculture has led to ‘land abandonment’ and an outmigration of a significant proportion of the population. Here, the problem is that some (vulnerable) people remain trapped by their lack of opportunity and their lack of mobility (Shucksmith et al, 2011).

Some of the issues for rural places are about their remoteness from the ‘core’ of their nation; this is equally an issue for some islands and border/periphery regions. Distance from services (public and private) and lack of access is described by a number of commentators (e.g., European Commission, 2010a; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2007). And while much emphasis is placed on the potential for ICTs to bring services to remote places, the reality of the market rollout is of a rural broadband gap (European Commission, 2006a). In their study of a number of islands and border regions of the EU, Leontidou et al (2005) draw the distinction between the experience of geographic isolation and that of social or cultural exclusion from ‘the national centre’. Research subjects in some of their case study areas perceived both geographic isolation and

social and cultural exclusion; in some others they did not perceive either isolation or exclusion; in a final case it was clear that they felt a strong sense of geographic isolation without a strong sense of social and cultural isolation.

There is a significant literature that portrays excluded places (mainly urban) as 'new ghettos' (Madanipour, 2012a). This extends the arguments about the physical segregation of the excluded within cities. Such places are "avoided or viewed with apprehension" (Sibley, 1998, p.120) by outsiders. This is because a "stereotype of a despised group combines with and reinforces a negative stereotype of place" (ibid). This is suggestive of the perception of many that these places have cultural homogeneity, although Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods research found a fragmented and divided population within excluded areas (Cars, 1998; Madanipour et al, 2003). However, for Madanipour (2012a), they share features of "being different and disadvantaged, neglected, or at worst, despised" (p.288). Further, "the majority of society excludes, discriminates or disregards the individual because of the place/geography in which she lives" (Adaman and Keyder, 2006, p.128). Discourses of social exclusion are often linked to a crisis of social order in which the excluded are seen as a menace to ordinary citizens (Beland, 2007); in this way excluded places become a focus of public attention and fear. However, "state agencies are accused of withdrawing and leaving beleaguered communities to their own devices" (Geddes, 2000, p.783).

Those on the inside can be viewed as trapped within the ghetto by such stigmatisation and exclusion, or they can be portrayed as making choices to perpetuate the segregation of the ghetto, although there is little empirical evidence to support the latter position: they still have the same culture, and are part of the same mainstream society. Within this voluntary segregation discourse, the ghetto is viewed as one type of social context in which poor people "develop a shared set of beliefs, values and norms for behaviour" (Bradshaw, 2006, p.8). Such a subculture might "challenge the cultural norms and stereotypes of the dominant society" (O'Brien and Penna, 2008, p.90), or be part of a strategy of survival (Sibley, 1998). Such strategies range from the innovative and alternative to the illegal and deviant, which serve to reinforce the popular external perception of excluded places as places to be feared.

For Madanipour (2011) "The question of social exclusion and integration ... largely revolves around access. It is access to decision-making, access to resources, and access to common narratives, which enable social integration. Many of these forms of access have clear spatial manifestations, as space is the site in which these different forms of access are made possible or denied" (p. 191).

3 Policy

3.1 Introduction

Elaboration of poverty and social exclusion policies in the EU is a major exercise. As the EU has no formal 'competence' over social policy, the policies of each member state are also pivotal. Nor do policies associated with poverty and social exclusion reside in a single policy domain of the EU: they are closely associated with economic competitiveness policies and with the cohesion policies of the EU. Most poverty and social exclusion policy is reliant for implementation by the Member States. Here different approaches to the appropriate way to govern lead to different types of welfare regimes. These may influence the proportion of GDP that each country assigns to its welfare system, but this is also likely to be influenced by the comparatively low level of GDP per head available in some Member States.

Part III of the report provides an outline and critique of EU-level policies with a strong poverty and social exclusion component. It then discusses the issue of poverty and social exclusion policy at a sub-European level: emphasising the level of convergence with EU policy in some respects but also the differences in policy regimes and policy priorities both between Member States and between Member States and EU-level policy. Local policies for territorial poverty and social exclusion are then explored.

3.2 EU-level Policy

Social Policy

According to Daly (2007) EU social policy has had 3 growth spurts: the early 1970s (a social action programme); the late 1980s and early 1990s (Delors and the 'social dimension'); and the period since the Lisbon Treaty in 2000. Since Daly's analysis, the Europe 2020 agenda has been another prominent event in EU social policy development (European Commission, 2010c). The evolution of a social policy has taken place outwith the competence of a dedicated mainstream Community policy. Before 2000, the approach was via programmes and initiatives that were voluntary for member states; since 2000 the approach has been formalised as the 'Open Method of Co-ordination' (OMC) through which Member States agree priorities and indicators, but still have the power to opt out if they so wish.

Early manifestations of EU Social Policy addressed 'poverty' (e.g., early poverty programmes). Its redirection to address social exclusion is mainly attributed to the Delors presidency (from 1985 to the early 1990s) and was "born in the context of the French policy discourse" (Ferrara et al, 2002, p.228). Its first official usage by the European Commission can be traced to the second Poverty Programme in 1988 (Berghman, 1995). The Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 was a significant event in the development of EU social policy in that it provided for the EU and Member States to take action to combat social exclusion (now Article 137(2) EC) (Armstrong, 2006).

The Lisbon Strategy (2000), which integrated the EU's goals of economic growth, employment and social cohesion, and the associated changes in how social policy was to be administered (e.g., OMC, the Nice objectives, formal status for the Social Protection Committee) was the next important step change. Common EU objectives for social inclusion were agreed in December 2000 in Nice as

- Facilitate participation in employment and access by all to resources, rights, goods and services
- Prevent risk of exclusion
- Help the most vulnerable
- Mobilise all relevant bodies.

Member states were to submit National Action Plans on Inclusion (NAP/incl) and a set of common indicators – the Laeken indicators – were agreed.

However, slow progress was made towards the Lisbon targets (economic and social) and the OMC was heavily criticised (Zeitlin, 2008). After a substantial review, 2005 saw the Lisbon relaunch and changes that would 'streamline' the OMC for social inclusion. Rather than clarify and reinvigorate social policy, these changes seem to have caused confusion and perhaps demoralisation for social policymakers. The original report of the review had proposed a refocus on growth and jobs, thereby reducing the status of the social cohesion objective (ibid). The Commission's Staff Working Document (European Commission, 2006b) which made no reference to the EU's social objectives was therefore seen by many as further evidence of this downgrading and in their 2006 National Reform Plan (NRP Implementation Reports (on progress with the Lisbon targets) only 10 Member States included social cohesion/inclusion objectives among their national priorities or referred extensively to them (Zeitlin, 2008). A reconfirmation in 2008 aimed to settle this confusion and hiatus: "The European Council reconfirmed ... "the importance of the social dimension of the EU as an integral part of the Lisbon Strategy" and stressed the need further to integrate economic, employment and social policies" (European Commission, 2008, p.4).

In 2010, a new Strategy, 'EU 2020: Smart, sustainable and inclusive growth', was launched (European Commission, 2010c). Its three priorities are Smart growth, sustainable growth and inclusive growth. The last of these is about a high employment economy delivering economic, social and territorial cohesion. The main actions are around employment, skills and poverty. The headline social target is "to lift at least 20 million people out of poverty and social exclusion by 2020" (ibid). An important 'flagship initiative' of Europe 2020 to address its inclusive growth priority is the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion (European Commission, 2010b). This will "set a dynamic framework for action to ensure social and territorial cohesion such that the benefits of growth and jobs are widely shared across the European Union and people experiencing poverty and social exclusion are enabled to live in dignity and take an active part in society" (ibid, p.3). It stresses poverty

throughout the life cycle, including child poverty, and 'severe exclusion' caused by homelessness and housing exclusion, fuel poverty, financial exclusion and high indebtedness, the particular exposure to social risks for the migrant population, certain ethnic minorities and especially Roma people, and the major economic and social difficulties of people with disabilities.

At the same time, the Social Protection Committee, set up at the time of Lisbon Treaty is continuing to use the OMC approach, now as a 'streamlined' single OMC on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (inclusion, pensions, health and long-term care), and Member States report on how they are meeting the common objectives set in 2006, the first of which is of most pertinence to the TIPSE project, viz, the promotion of social cohesion, equality between men and women and equal opportunities for all through adequate, accessible, financially sustainable, adaptable and efficient social protection systems and social inclusion policies.

So what can we understand from the various stages of EU's social policy development about how poverty and social exclusion are conceptualised? There are three significant themes in policy analyses. Firstly, whether or not the changes in terminology from poverty to social exclusion (and back again?) are significant changes in conceptualisations. Secondly, about the linking of poverty and social exclusion with an economic growth agenda. Thirdly about the development of 'active inclusion' through employment as the main pathway out of exclusion.

a. Changes in terminology

There was clearly a shift in nomenclature from poverty to social exclusion in the 1990s. For some commentators, the shift to social exclusion is seen as a significant regime change. For Room (1995) it signifies a shift from the focus on distributional issues of poverty to a "focus primarily on relational issues, in other words, inadequate social participation, lack of social integration and lack of power" (p.5). Commissioned research of the European Commission (1998) produced a framework of the causal factors that lead to social exclusion (a very different list from the causes of poverty):

1. *Social*: e.g., family, labour market, neighbourhood, society (global participation);
2. *Economic*: e.g., resources (wages, social security, savings, assets, etc), market of goods and services;
3. *Institutional*: e.g., justice, education, health, political rights, bureaucracy;
4. *Territorial*: e.g., demographic (migration), accessibility (transport, communications, etc), society in general (deprived areas);
5. *Symbolic references*: e.g., identity, social visibility, self-esteem, basic abilities, interests and motivations, future prospects (p.21).

However, not all commentators agree that there was a significant conceptual shift. Levitas (2006) suggests that the rediscovery of 'the social' might be a reaction against the dominant ideology of the 1980s ... that there is no such thing as society (p.13). A number of commentators refer to the difficulties the EU had in getting

agreement for taking action on poverty to be included in the Treaty of Amsterdam: some Member States had serious reservations about the use of the word poverty (Berghman, 1995). “Social exclusion appeared to offer a less emotive, perhaps less understood and therefore less politically contentious alternative concept to poverty” (Atkinson and Davoudi, 2000, p.436).

Since that time, the terminology used has been extended to include other related terms (e.g., cohesion, integration, inclusion) and more recently there has been an increasing usage of the term ‘poverty’ or ‘poverty and social exclusion’ combined. Interestingly, the language of the Europe 2020 agenda changes: the Europe 2020 document (European Commission, 2010c) set a target of raising 20 million people out of *poverty* (p.5) and heralded the setting up of the European Platform against *poverty* (p.19); the Europe 2020 website has the target as ‘at least 20 million fewer people in or at risk of *poverty and social exclusion*’ and the European Platform is now against *poverty and social exclusion* (European Commission, 2010b). A number of commentators had previously highlighted the slippery usage of poverty and social exclusion terminologies in EU policy. Atkinson and Davoudi (2000), for example, think a clear definition of social exclusion is elusive, and that there is a tendency to use poverty as a proxy for social exclusion. As an example, in its Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion (2010b), the Commission acknowledges the multidimensional nature of social exclusion, but then bases its headline targets for combating poverty and social exclusion on a combination of three, income- and consumption-related, factors: the at-risk-of-poverty rate (after social transfers), the index of material deprivation (lacking 4+ deprivation items) and the percentage of people living in households with very low work intensity (Bradshaw and Mayhew, 2010). Ferrara et al (2002) also point to how the objectives of EU social policy are rather loose and open to interpretation, but think that this is strategic: “the OMC can be considered one of those ‘framing’ mechanisms of Europeanisation that Radaelli (2000) deems to be ‘subtle yet powerful’ insofar as they are potential channels of ‘cognitive convergence’ between domestic policymakers” (p.230) and so can be interpreted differently by each Member State.

While social exclusion is perhaps less politically contentious between Member States, O’Brien and Penna (2006) argue that it is highly contentious for those classified as ‘excluded’. “Contemporary forms of exclusion and the pursuit of particular processes of incorporation are embedded in an international political economy of domination and subordination” (p.91) with the institutions of Europe and Member States themselves being exclusionary forces. This is in part because of the history of European modernity as “the exercise of power by certain social groups and nations over others” (p.87) and by the setting up of the binary categories of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ “(irrational, regressive, alien, excluded)” (ibid). The outcome is stigmatisation of the ‘outsiders’ which has serious consequences for those who are labelled.

b. Linkage to economic growth agenda

Many commentators see Lisbon as something of a watershed in terms of the development of social policy in the EU “a crucial step in the evolution of social policy in the EU” (Ferrara et al, 2002, p.230); an “ambitious agenda” (Zeitlin, 2008). However, while there were a number of tangible manifestations of the ascendancy of social policy (e.g., Social Protection Committee, OMC, NAPs/incl), Lisbon was also the point at which the development of social policy became directly entwined with the economic growth agenda although it had always been justified as a threat to economic growth and competitiveness (Atkinson and Davoudi, 2000). For some critics, social rights appeared “as essentially subservient to economic considerations” (Veit Wilson, 2006, p. 330). This concern was exacerbated in 2005 when the Lisbon strategy was reviewed and “although the importance of the social cohesion side of the Lisbon triangle was reiterated under the Luxembourg presidency ... concerns remained that the commitment to social policy within the Lisbon strategy had been weakened” (Armstrong, 2006, p.83). For Bernhard (2006), “establishing the goal of economic growth as an issue of overriding importance deprives social inclusion of its status as an end in itself” (p.48). The more recent ‘inclusive growth’ of the Europe 2020 agenda is clearly a further iteration of the relationship of poverty and social exclusion to the economic growth agenda.

c. Active inclusion through employment

The third conceptual strand to EU social policy that commentators often refer to is that the main pathway out of poverty/exclusion is through employment. Van Oorschot (2002) identified this as a pan-European trend in the 1990s and saw this as directly linked to countries’ welfare reform programmes. Taylor-Gooby (2008) also notes this trend: “there is considerable evidence that many European countries are moving in a general common direction, away from passive and towards active measures that sharpen work incentives for those on benefits, and towards provision to integrate high-risk groups ” (p.20/21). According to Daly (2007), the Lisbon relaunch was when the term ‘active social inclusion’ was introduced, “defined to mean participation in the labour market” (p.7). While it is too early for significant commentaries on the Europe 2020 priorities, this approach is clearly a prominent feature of the current social priorities.

Criticisms are levelled at this ‘active inclusion’ approach. Integration through employment is deemed to ignore the social and multidimensional aspects of how people are excluded (Pantazis et al, 2006; Philip and Shucksmith, 2003) and the fact that people can also be ‘badly employed’: those on the margins of the labour market doing “gendered low social status,[with] low wages, precarious employment conditions and lack of career opportunities” (Soysal, 2012, p.8). Levitas (1996) also draws attention to all those for whom paid work is not necessarily an option – women, ethnic minorities and disabled people – because of their lack of (equal) opportunity in the labour market. She also demonstrates how the time spent in paid work can “simultaneously create acute problems of work-life balance, reducing the

time necessary for social participation and social support” (p.155). The shift to active inclusion can be seen as a shift from unconditional social rights which were the EU’s focus in earlier iterations of social exclusion (Jehoel-Gijbbers and Vrooman, 2007) to an emphasis on personal responsibility as a moralistic discourse (Taylor-Gooby, 2008).

Few critical reviews have yet been written by policy analysts on the ‘inclusive growth’ prioritised in the Europe 2020 agenda; nor is this new agenda’s relationship to the older systems of the Social Protection Committee, the OMC and National Plans for inclusion easy to understand. In addition to its analysis above under the three conceptual issues, it is worth highlighting what is novel: the setting up of a target for the reduction of poverty (and social exclusion), and the recognition of a territorial dimension “as the “poorest people” are often concentrated in particular regions or even smaller areas (European Commission, 2010b, p. 3). Whether, in the present economic crisis, it will be possible to make headway on the target is debatable, with the final report on the First Annual Convention of the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion noting that the EU target of lifting at least 20 million people out of poverty and social exclusion by 2020 would not be reached based on current national targets (Polish Presidency and the European Commission, 2011, p.5). For the TIPSE project, the recognition of a territorial dimension in the Europe 2020 strategy’s approach to poverty/ social exclusion is the most apposite, although it leaves open the key question of the scale at which this should be addressed.

For some commentators, a search for conceptual developments within EU social policy might be something of a diversion. Atkinson and Davoudi (2000) suggest that “social exclusion may in part be seen as a form of symbolic politics” (p.436) so that politicians can be seen to be doing something about everyday problems of its people. For Veit-Wilson (2006) “it is arguable that the unrealisable symbolic assertions of rights to human dignity and social inclusion are deliberate displacements because they divert attention from the political failure to introduce remedies which are essential for either to be achieved” (p.333).

Other EU-level Policies

As can be seen by the exploration above of EU-level social policy, this is now integrated with, or in some commentators’ view subsumed by, the EU’s economic growth and competitiveness agendas. Many other EU-level policies contribute towards the poverty/social exclusion alleviation agenda, but in the context of the TIPSE project with its focus on the territorial dimensions of poverty/social exclusion, two policies stand out as worthy of brief exploration: Cohesion Policy and the ‘rural development policy’.

Put simply, “the ultimate aim of territorial cohesion is to reduce regional disparities, by making sectoral policies which have spatial impacts, and regional policy, more coherent” (Dax and Kahila, 2011, p.101). In this vein, the Fifth Cohesion Report (European Commission, 2010a) highlights the contribution that regions, and Cohesion Policy, can make to the Europe 2020 agenda (European Commission, 2010c). And what Cohesion Policy provides, through its place-based approach, is for regions to design and deliver policies which meet their own, distinctive, needs. EU Cohesion Policy considers how to promote economic competitiveness and convergence, improve well-being and reduce social exclusion, and enhance environmental sustainability (EC, 2010a). A number of funds are available to regions in order to address disparities: the Cohesion Fund, the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development and the European Fisheries Fund. All regions and Member States are eligible for Cohesion Policy support with individual programmes being tailored to their specific strengths and weaknesses. However, support is differentiated between regions, based on their level of economic development. In the past, support to specific subregional level areas has been provided through programmes such as RECHAR (for former coalmining communities), URBAN (for urban area development) and LEADER (for rural area development).

In terms of its social policy responsibilities, the aim is to improve well-being and reduce exclusion (EC, 2010a). This is a wide remit, with measures ranging from “objective ones, such as life expectancy and at-risk-of-poverty rates, to subjective ones, including perceptions of health and happiness” (p. 73). Three aspects of well-being and exclusion are identified: Life expectancy and health, living conditions, and poverty.

The EU’s Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is a major, longstanding policy of the EU. Even after many reforms it remains strongly associated with the agricultural sector and still determined at high level. However, the reforms of the late 1990s consolidated a number of extant small measures into the ‘second pillar’ of the CAP as a ‘rural development policy’ (European Council, 1999). Unlike the centralised main pillar of the CAP, each Member State was to develop a rural development plan ‘at the most appropriate geographical level’. The majority of funding available under the various programming periods is geared towards farmers, and have economic or environmental aims. However, one of the themes currently is of: ‘improving the quality of life in rural areas and encouraging diversification of the rural economy’. Under this objective, a number of measures are of particular relevance to poverty/social exclusion: encouraging the entry of women into the labour market; training young people; and upgrading local infrastructure (European Council, 2006).

Under the 2007 – 2013 programme, a further significant change took place: the LEADER projects, ‘community initiatives’ under the Structural Funds became part of Rural Development Policy as the ‘LEADER approach’ (European Council, 2006). LEADER projects, in designated areas usually at the sub-regional level, had had

local planning processes and were able to allocate their own funds; this approach was to be continued, and enhanced, within Rural Development Policy. The LEADER approach can be used, “in the context of a community-led local development strategy building on local needs and strengths, to combine all three objectives – competitiveness, environment and quality of life/diversification” (European Council, 2006, p.27).

3.3 Sub-European Social Policy

The EU has limited powers with which to counter poverty/social exclusion. It is reliant on Member States to develop their own policies and to resolve the problems of poverty/social exclusion through policy implementation. This section does not attempt to review the literature on the social policy of every individual ESPON country, rather it focuses on understanding whether the conceptual themes discerned within EU-level policy (see above) are common throughout Europe. It starts by exploring the issues and approaches around which convergence is occurring. It then analyses the literature on why differences might be found, and how this is manifested at the Member State level. It finishes by identifying how various countries make reference to the territorial nature of poverty/social exclusion of interest to the TIPSE project.

Convergence of priorities and policy approaches.

The EU's Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC) is a process under which Member States agree common objectives and common indicators. Each Member State produces regular national reports which are subject to peer review (Armstrong, 2006). Convergence of views and policy priorities between Member States would seem a logical outcome of this process, and there is some evidence of this (although, as reported in the next section, there are also reasons why differences are still apparent). Begg and Berghman (2002) point to the common problems and constraints experienced by Member States such as the ageing population. For Shucksmith (2012), the reforms of welfare states since the 1960s mean that many have “moved in varying degrees to embrace aspects of neo-liberal policy, ‘rolling back’ their welfare state provisions, marketising what remained of the public sector, and cutting social security budgets” (p.2).

Taylor-Gooby (2008) suggests that “there is considerable evidence that many European countries are moving in a general common direction, away from passive and towards active measures that sharpen work incentives for those on benefits, and towards provision to integrate high-risk groups” (p.21). There is agreement in the literature that ‘active inclusion’ has become a prominent feature of EU-level social policy, and other commentators have remarked on the convergence between Member States over this approach (e.g., Fink et al, 2010). Simply scanning each

Member State's National Strategy Report on Social Exclusion¹ reinforces this view: more than half have this listed in as the title of one of their priorities. The Report for the Netherlands makes interesting reading in this respect. Rather than simply equating 'active inclusion' with participation in the labour market, they extend this to participation through the acceptance of work, schooling and/or social worthwhile unpaid activities. Nor is it only adults who must take some responsibility for their inclusion. Children and young people are expected to contribute their bit to society.

Prioritisation of the integration of high-risk groups is Taylor-Gooby's (2008) second point. A scan of the National Strategy Reports' general overview sections and the priorities listed in part 2s, find that this is a key policy area in a number of reports. Discussion of, and policies specifically for, Roma people are evident in a number of Member States' Reports (see, for example, those of Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Romania, Slovakia). This predates, but is related to, the European Council's conclusions in 2011 on the integration of Roma people (see http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/national-strategies/index_en.htm) following proposals from the European Commission (European Commission, 2011). Some Member States target the integration of 'immigrants' or 'ethnic minorities' (e.g., Germany, Portugal, UK), sometimes with a focus on very specific groups. For example, in Italy the focus is on Roma and Sinti people. Some of the focus is on mobile groups – the homeless (Italy, Portugal), gypsies and travellers (UK). Social and cultural integration is a common approach; some countries also focus their policies on anti-discrimination measures. Germany, for example, talks of 'fighting xenophobia, anti-Semitism, racism and right-wing extremism'. Another group of excluded people that receives particular attention is the disabled (Estonia, Portugal, UK). Child poverty, the position of young people, the intergenerational transfer of poverty, and the role of education in allowing people to break out of poverty are important policy priorities for many Member States (see, for example, Ireland, Belgium, Spain, Greece, Bulgaria, Slovakia).

The importance of the mutual influence of economic and social policies in addressing poverty/social exclusion is articulated in many of the National Strategy Reports. However, this may be little more than a reiteration of EU-level policy as they are asked to comment on how their policies correspond to the overarching objectives of the OMC for social exclusion, one of which is "effective and mutual interaction between the Lisbon objectives of greater economic growth, more and better jobs and greater social cohesion, and with the EU's Sustainable Development Strategy"

¹ This, and subsequent mentions of National Strategy Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion draw on those submitted by all Member States for 2008 – 2010. Submissions of National Social Reports are due in 2012 but at the time of writing, many are not yet available on the European Commission's website and many are not written in English).

(European Commission, 2008, p.9). While this simply suggests that the rhetoric in some National Strategy Reports may echo that of the EU, the findings of *Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods* (c1998) are that “some countries, particularly those highly dependent on EU funding, are uncritically adopting the EU approach, i.e. developing national policies and programme not primarily to meet the most urgent needs ... but rather to conform with EU policies” (p.14).

Differing Welfare Regimes

“Making sure that each citizen can count on a basic floor of rights and resources for participating in society is one of the prime ‘common concerns’ of all EU member states. National (and even subnational) traditions and sensitivities regarding how to achieve this objective are, however, extremely diverse” (Ferrara et al, 2002, p.228). While addressing “fairly similar objectives, they diverged tremendously in terms of ambition and in terms of **how** they accomplished their goals” (Esping-Andersen, 1994, p.5). One aspect of the difference is the extent to which the state is seen as the appropriate institution for the delivery of social goals; for some countries, market provision, the family, or voluntary/community effort is seen as a more important and proper vehicle for this. This difference is also apparent through time: following a period from the 1940s which saw the burgeoning of many nation states’ role in terms of welfare provision (and in other aspects of national governance), there has been a more recent shift in thinking about welfare towards “notions of voluntary effort, social capital and communitarianism” (Harris, 2002, p.377). This not only denotes a shift in thinking about the appropriate role of national government vis a vis voluntary and ‘community’ effort, it is also a response to the observation that earlier efforts had failed to resolve the issue of poverty/social exclusion and that Keynesianism, upon which earlier systems were based, was called into question. In this context, neo-liberal ideologies came to the fore (Shucksmith, 2012, p.1). Such changes came later in Eastern Europe as part of the post-Soviet transition. But again, they did it differently: “a major reason has to do with institutional legacies, inherited system characteristics and the vested interests that these generate” (Esping-Andersen, 1994, p.5).

A number of commentators have attempted to capture the characteristics of these different ‘welfare regimes’. The work of Esping-Andersen since 1990 is seminal in this respect. His initial work identifies three distinct models in western welfare states (not just in Europe):

- The ‘social democratic welfare state’ based mainly on the “harmonization of egalitarian ideals with growth and full employment; the optimization of employment and the minimization of welfare dependence” (Esping-Andersen, 1994, p.10); although more recently there was some need for reform, the “basic principles of the universal, egalitarian welfare state” (p.12) have only been marginally adjusted.
- The ‘neo-liberal welfare state’ which assumes that through work, people pay into personal pension plans (and healthcare plans in USA), and provides

“greater labour market and wage flexibility through seeking to reduce the burden of social costs and taxation, and eroding the ... minimum wage” (p.13). The negative consequence of this have been deepening inequality, an increasing low wage phenomenon and rising poverty rates – including an “alarming rise of child poverty” (p.15) – but with some evidence of a positive outcome of better employment growth.

- The continental Europe (or conservative-corporatist) model where “a small, predominantly male, “insider” workforce enjoying high wages, expensive social rights and strong job security contrasts with a swelling population of “outsiders” depending either on the male breadwinner’s pay or on welfare state transfers” (p.16). Social services are poorly developed: the family (or the voluntary sector) typically provide care, not the state. A consequence of this model is high labour costs, employment inflexibilities and ‘catastrophic’ levels of long-term youth unemployment.

In terms of European countries, Esping-Andersen links the Nordic countries to the social democratic welfare state, and the UK and Ireland to the neo-liberal model. The continental Europe model applies to the western Europe member states, such as Germany, France and Italy. Post-socialist Member States are seen as transitioning to these three models. In later papers, Esping-Anderson revised his framework to distinguish between northern and southern continental European regimes and to recognise the distinct characteristics of post-Soviet welfare regimes.

Fenger (2007) outlines how this work “has been the subject of both extensive praise and extensive criticisms” (p.2). One line of criticism is about whether typology building is a scholarly activity at all; the other that is relevant to this project is about whether Esping-Andersen’s categorisations reflect differences between European countries, with numerous ‘clustering’ studies creating their own categorisations. In discussing these studies, Fenger (ibid) concludes that it is surprising how persistent Esping-Andersen’s three original types are. However, what is common in Western Europe clustering is to further differentiate the ‘continental Europe’ type by identifying the ‘Latin Rim’ or ‘Southern Europe’ distinction (e.g., Arts and Gelissen, 2002, Ferrara, 1996); the Southern Europe regime is based more on family and family connections while in the continental Europe regime the state has a more established role.

Fenger (2007) proceeds to undertake his own cluster analysis of welfare state types, mainly in Europe, which shows a clear distinction between the post-Socialist states of Europe and those of Western Europe: “the differences between the group of post-communist countries and the traditional Western welfare states are bigger than the differences between the countries within any of these groups” (p.26), ie, than the differences between Esping-Andersen’s three models. What accounts for this is that “the level of trust, the level of social programmes and social situation in the post-communist countries are considerably lower than in the other countries” (p.25). For Western countries he identifies the three types of Esping-Andersen, with the Latin grouping being a clear subset of the ‘conservative-corporatist’ model. The post-

socialist countries do not form one category in his typology, but three. Overall, his is a six-way typology:

1. Conservative-corporatist type (Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, The Netherlands and Spain) with a distinct southern Europe subtype
2. Social-Democratic type (Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden)
3. Liberal type (New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States)
4. Former-USSR type (Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia and Ukraine)
5. Post-communist European type (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia)
6. Developing welfare states type (Georgia, Romania and Moldova)

Levitas (2006) draws up a different categorisation based on the different discourses of nation states about exclusion. "In the first, RED or redistributive discourse ... the central problem is that the poor lack resources – not just money, but also access to collectively provided services; poverty remains at the core. Dominant in European discourse in the mid-nineties was a different model, concerned with social integration (hence SID) in which social exclusion was primarily construed as labour market exclusion or lack of paid work ... long-term unemployment and the consequences of economic restructuring were key concerns. ... Also detectable was a third discourse, MUD or moral underclass discourse, focusing on the imputed behavioural or moral deficiencies of 'problem' groups (p.125). Ferrara et al (2002) suggest that the priority a Member State will afford to social cohesion varies between them. The factors influencing this prioritisation "include the 'visibility' of the problem, the existence of policy structures geared to it, the strength of non-governmental organisations, the influence of advocacy coalitions, the attitudes of political actors and so on" (p.237).

Following these reviews, and building on Esping Andersen's work, we have adopted a typology of welfare regimes that would acknowledge the different histories and traditions and takes into account the major transitions that have occurred in Eastern Europe. This typology would consist of the following five types:

- Universalistic
- Liberal
- Corporatist-Statist
- Familialistic
- Post-Socialist/Transitory

The commentators discussed so far have set up arguments about why Member States might have different approaches, one from another. What we turn to now is the literature and evidence about how individual, or small groups of, Member States have different welfare regimes and policy priorities.

Differing Policy Priorities

The change in language in EU social policy in the 1990s from a poverty discourse to a social exclusion discourse was thought conceptually significant by some authors. The former was seen as an Anglo Saxon concept; the latter as emanating from French discourse. Recent studies of UK social policy suggest that policy is not

narrowly focused on poverty. There are a number of co-present discourses: the redistribution discourse, the social integration discourse and the moral underclass discourse (Levitas, 2006, p.192). Beland (2007) describes how the UK's 'social inclusion' policy "helps to shift policy attention away from broad forms of income inequality" through an agenda "rooted in the assumption that the citizen's capacity to participate in social and economic life is a better measure of social justice" (p.133). And 'Social Justice' is the title of the UK government's 2012 social policy (HM Government, 2012). The French policies of social exclusion have evolved over time, in part to reflect the prominent issues in French society (Silver, 1994). Early discourses were of extreme groups (Lenoir, 1974) such as 'suicidal people' and 'drug addicts'. By the mid 1980s, exclusion "referred not only to the rise in long-term and recurrent unemployment, but also to the growing instability of social bonds: family instability, single-member households, social isolation, and the decline of class solidarity" (Silver, 1994, p.533). A later nuance of meaning was to associate exclusion with immigration. Shucksmith et al (2006) see two strands to French concerns with social exclusion: "social exclusion as administrative exclusion by the state or labour market exclusion through late capitalist restructuring" (p.679). The fight against poverty appears to be a key component of the social policy in France (Damon, 2008). It would appear from this discussion that to search Member State policy documents for the distinction between 'poverty' and 'social exclusion' would be a fruitless task.

The extent of the problem of poverty/social exclusion that each country has to address is significantly different. The European Quality of Life Survey (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2007) asked households about their ability to make ends meet. Difficulties were experienced in 2% of households in Norway as opposed to 41% in Bulgaria. The resources that could be made available by the state to address this problem are also very different, with those experiencing the most problems more likely to have few resources available with which to respond. So, for example, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in Bulgaria is 38% of the EU average according to their National Strategy Report, and that in Romania is 41%. While some of the differences discussed above about the different welfare regimes also influence the proportion of GDP allocated for 'social expenditure', using 2007 Eurostat ESSPROS data provides interesting contrasts between those well above (27.8% and above) the EU average of 25.7% and those well below (less than 14.1%). The former are Denmark, Germany, France, Netherlands, Austria and Sweden; the latter are Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia and Romania. Mediterranean countries have significantly increased their social spending since the 1980s, such that the gap between them and the highest spenders has been reduced. However, the economic slowdown/crisis in these countries, and in many other parts of Europe, raise new questions about the funding of welfare expenditures. This theme was raised in a number of the 2008 National Strategy Reports (e.g., Italy, Spain, Greece).

The 2010 draft Joint Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion (European Council, 2010) is focused exclusively on the impact of the recession on poverty and social exclusion: “The crisis has highlighted great diversity within the EU. Its scope, magnitude and effects vary as does the capacity of national welfare systems to provide adequate protection” (p.2). While admitting that the extent of the impact was still unfolding, it provides some interesting statistical contrasts between Member States. It elaborates on the differences in social situation at the start of the crisis in terms of the 2008 at-risk-of-poverty rates in individual Member States which ranged from 9% to 26% of the population. In terms of different effects of the crisis, it quotes changes in unemployment rates. In one country this rose from 2.7% to 3.9% while in another it rose from 6% to 20.9% (no dates given).

Some aspects of Esping-Andersen’s model of welfare regimes (and derivations from it) have resonance in the literature of policy commentators on specific Member States or a grouping of Member States. For the Nordic countries, the universalism aspect of the model is particularly pertinent (see Vabo et al, 2011; Niemela, 2008; Olafsdottir, 2007; Borgeraas et al, 2010). Work by Rothstein (2002) on the Swedish welfare system found that universalism was an important distinctive feature; however, this system struggles to be sustainable given limited government finances, the need to restructure the welfare system and critiques about government intrusion into the private sphere of people’s lives. In Finland, the universalistic welfare state is already shifting towards selectivism (Kuivalainen and Niemela, 2010).

The role of the family, that featured strongly in the conservative-corporatist model, continues to be important in understanding the functioning of southern European welfare systems. It is its relationship with clientelism that is of particular interest to commentators (e.g., Allen et al, 2004; Castles and Ferrara, 1996, Ferrara, 1996). Rather than a universalistic and depersonalised approach, clientelism relies on personal and informal linkages, with family networks being particularly important. Those within the right networks have access to services, political power, and preferential access to labour markets. Much is done informally, such in the unprotected part of the dual labour market, with weak state institutions being vulnerable to pressure and manipulation. The family, though, still provides an important safety net for those who might otherwise be poor or excluded. For example, studies by Wall et al (2001) and Bruto da Costa et al (2003) show how informal networks of support and mutual acknowledgement have developed based on kinship and neighbourhood relationships.

Rather than there being simply a strong state role or a reliance on the family, a number of National Strategy Reports refer to the importance of the voluntary sector. For some, this is a statement of fact (e.g., Austria, Latvia); Malta refers to the importance of voluntary and religious organisations. Some are ‘encouraging’ the voluntary sector (e.g., Finland), or finding they have an ‘increasing reliance on’ them (e.g., Hungary).

The priorities of Member states in their National Strategy Reports have definite similarities: for example, active inclusion through employment, reducing the poverty/social exclusion of particularly vulnerable groups and issues surrounding child poverty. However, there were some priorities and issues that stood out for their difference. What follows does not attempt to be a comprehensive analysis of all the Member State priorities that did not show convergence as indicated above; rather it serves to give a flavour of the different aspects of poverty/social exclusion that exist across Europe and of the different approaches of Member States to resolving the problem.

In Poland's report, a government programme to develop 'higher trust and pride' is described. It aims to improve social confidence in civic and public organisations. The need for this type of programme in some countries of Europe is reflected in the European Quality of Life Survey (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2007) which asked how much people trusted government institutions. Member States scoring highest were trusted more than twice as much as those with the lowest scores. The lowest scores were in post-Socialist countries, with Italy, Portugal and the UK also being well below the median point.

Malta's report emphasises its geography. It is a small island with limited natural resources and land that emphasises environmental and climatic concerns in its policies. It is also positioned such that 'irregular migrants/asylum seekers' regularly arrive by boat. Here the issue does not seem to be a problem of how to integrate them into mainstream society; it is how to accommodate them, given the island's limited physical, economic and social resources. Malta calls for mutual responsibility by all Member States for this influx of immigrants seeking European citizenship.

A key priority for Slovenia is to address the slow and poorly interlinked modernisation of systems and institutions for social protection. There is a lack of decision-making, and sometimes little political consensus over proposals for improvement. A more efficient social state should be a prerequisite for, and a consequence of, balanced economic and environmental development.

The Portuguese report stresses, as do many other reports, the declining population of their country. Their policy priorities include supporting fertility and children, and supporting the reconciliation of work and personal/family life. Denmark's report includes statistics that demonstrate how many people move in and out of poverty. In Iceland a key issue is the high drop out rate of students from secondary schools. A key priority for the Netherlands, which only stands out as novel because it was written in 2008, is 'addressing over-indebtedness – including preventing where possible the abuse of the financially weak'.

Territorial poverty/social exclusion policies

The Fifth Cohesion Reports' section on improving well-being and reducing exclusion identifies trends and disparities between regions (European Commission, 2010a). These include large disparities in health risks; in the growth in the number of older

people; in access to basic services; and in at-risk-of-poverty rates. Some disparities are between urban and rural regions. “Access to services, such as primary and secondary education, primary health care and banking services was typically considered more difficult in thinly populated areas, especially in the less developed Member States ... densely populated areas consistently had a larger share of their population that reported problems relating to crime and population” (p. 117). In Member States with relatively low levels of material deprivation, regional deprivation occurs predominantly in urban areas; however, in the New Member States, most materially deprived people live in rural areas.

Disparities, and growing disparities, between regions are emphasised in some National Strategy Reports (e.g., Czech Republic, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, France, Romania). Some provide spatial aspects of the analysis of their socio-economic condition: for example, Slovakia for wage difference and unemployment; UK for immigration; and Greece for hospital beds. The key priorities of some Member States have a significant spatial element: ‘Reducing territorial and housing disadvantage (Hungary); ‘poor access to services, especially in some regions and rural areas’ (Lithuania); improving living conditions in more vulnerable territories and habitats’ (Portugal); and ‘social and professional integration of young people, especially those living in cities and those belong to ‘visible’ minorities’ (France).

Rural disadvantage is raised in a number of National Strategy Reports. In Lithuania, poor access to services is stressed; in Bulgaria it is healthcare that is difficult to access; in Poland the focus is on the high levels of poverty in rural areas. The Portuguese report explains how “rural areas are more vulnerable, facing a greater isolation, a reduction in productive investment, an ageing population and conditions of exclusion ... a more elderly population comprising peasants ... perpetuating the link between poverty and the surrounding underdevelopment”.

Cities, or areas of cities, are identified in a number of National Strategy Reports, and in Member State based literatures as sites of poverty/social exclusion and/or as sites for policy attention. In France, the area-based approach ‘Politique de la Ville’ (Glasze and Weber, 2010) focuses on a range of aspects such as housing, quality of life, employment and economic development, education, citizenship, crime prevention and healthcare (Secretariat General du CIV, 2010). The Germany ‘Social City’ programme is aimed at counteracting exclusion in deprived urban neighbourhoods and improving their living conditions (BMVBS, 2008). The programme focuses on a range of measures, but with a clear understanding that the primary route to inclusion is through employment (BMAS, 2008). The ‘Projets urbains’ is the Swiss area-based initiative which consists of an integrated approach combining physical renewal, migration and safety (Bundesamt fur Raumentwicklung ARE, 2012). Collaboration between cities may take place through the Open Method of Coordination and sharing experience (Madanipour,2003). However, one of the

key complaints of city authorities is that they are expected to address the problems of social exclusion and poverty, which are created by larger scale processes beyond their control, and also without their presence at the forums where decisions are made about these processes.

Territorial exclusion is often at a small scale, for example a 'neighbourhood' (e.g., The Netherlands), 'a slum area' (e.g., Turkey), 'micro region' (e.g., Hungary), 'suburbia' (e.g., Germany) or 'a settlement' (e.g., Lithuania), rather than at the scale of a city or a region. It is common for the policies to address not only socio-economic factors such as poor health, unemployment, low levels of education, but also 'hard infrastructure' developments, such as housing and upgrading the neighbourhood and local environment (e.g., Germany's Social City programme, Hungary's programme for the most disadvantaged micro regions, and France's Zones Urbaines Sensibles). Participation by local people is also often a feature of these programmes, such as with the Netherlands' Priority Neighbourhoods where half the issues were identified by the residents' opinions (the other half by official statistics), and the Social City programme in Germany which "works on the premise of area-based, socio-spatial action and active resident participation" (BMVBS, 2008, p.5).

The example of the slum areas of large cities in Turkey sheds more light on the processes of spatial manifestation of social exclusion. The combined effects of economic, political and cultural exclusion often finds a spatial dimension in the clusters of disadvantaged populations (Madanipour, 2011). One aspect is of how "the majority of society excludes, discriminates or disregards the individual because of the place/geography in which she lives. ... The second component ... occurs because of the poor quality and quantity of the public services provided in the geography" (Adaman and Keyder, 2006, p.128). In this case, the place was populated to a significant extent by internal migrants fleeing armed conflict. In Slovakia, a major concern in the National Strategy Report was for Romani communities living highly excluded lives in settlements. The discrimination and stigmatisation of Romani people and the places they live has reached serious levels in some countries: Kostadinova (2011) describes 'racial hostilities', and 'anti-Roma hate speech', and how recently "Roma have been the target of violent racist attacks in Italy, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. A mob recently forced Romanian Roma out of their homes in Belfast. The Roma sought refuge in a church and were later deported to Romania, despite concerns that they would face human rights violations there" (p.165).

The poor public services identified in the study of Turkish slum areas (Adaman and Keyder, 2006) is reiterated in the National Strategy Report for Cyprus, where regional educational inequalities are being addressed. A wider issue facing rural areas is the lack of local facilities, such as a food store, post office, banking facilities, and public transport. In the European Quality of Life Survey (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2007), such facilities were all less available in rural areas; across the EU27, banking facilities and public transport were

lower than in urban areas by 20 percentage points and 15 percentage points respectively. The differences were particularly significant for the candidate countries (Turkey, Croatia and Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): the likelihood of a food store was 48 percentage points lower; of a post office 33 percentage points lower; of banking facilities, 46 percentage points lower; and of public transport, 18 percentage points lower.

A final point on which Member States differed markedly over territorial poverty/social exclusion was in its governance. Many National Strategy Reports raised issues about the role of national policy, given the responsibilities for aspects of welfare that rested with lower tiers of government. Germany stresses the role of the Lander, the Czech Republic that housing supply is a municipal jurisdiction, Spain the autonomous regions have an exclusive role in delivering social/health care; Belgium that social policy is developed and delivered at both the federal and local government levels, and so on. Slovakia is in the process of improving governance at the central, regional and local level and Bulgaria is decentralising social services from state to local level. The Italian National Strategy Report explains how institutional reforms in 2001 redistributed responsibilities for social policies from the national to regional and local level. This created a significant lack of uniformity; measures are now in place for greater co-ordination across Italy. Improving governance arrangements at the neighbourhood level is found to be one of the pathways to addressing poverty and social exclusion (Madanipour, 2012b).

4 Implications for Indicators

4.1 The State of the Art...

Poverty/social exclusion is a very elusive and contested concept, and is therefore difficult to operationalize into a set of agreed indicators. Even EU-level policy appears to shift, for example, between a focus on social exclusion and a focus on poverty, and between emphasising its institutional and power-related nature and the personal responsibility apparent in 'active inclusion'. However, the Open Method of Co-ordination (OMC) on Social Exclusion developed the common 'Laeken Indicators' in 2001, which have been constantly revised by the indicators subgroup of the Social Protection Committee (Beil et al, 2011) and later 'streamlined' as a result of the Lisbon review in 2006. The 2009 update (European Commission, 2009) provides an interesting range of indicators. These are predominantly income and labour market status related, but include a number on health, education, material deprivation, housing. They certainly go beyond the narrow 'income deprivation' definition of poverty, by including wider notions of material deprivation and through the use of education indicators address aspects of Sen's capabilities approach. They have also developed indicators related to the persistence of poverty/social exclusion and of how some households become jobless. However, these still focus on income and consumption factors and access to services, rather than on the broader spheres of social life, including political and cultural arenas, in which social inclusion and exclusion are manifested and can be analysed and understood (Madanipour et al, 2003). For example, a number of commonly cited aspects are not directly captured, including:

- The multi-dimensional, compounded nature of exclusion
- The relational nature of social exclusion
- The power relations exerted by institutionalised exclusion, in a practical sense of legal rights, voting rights, etc but also in a more insidious discriminatory, exclusionary, sense

Some studies have attempted to develop and use indicators of a lack of social integration. In Germany, indicators include perceptions of security in the home area, the extent of personal contact, and feelings of loneliness (Bohnke, 2001). Bask (2009) developed a list of co-variates for his study of Sweden which included experiences of threats or violence, and extent of personal relationships. Levitas (2006) used five different sets of information to address aspects of social participation and sociability:

- Non-participation in common social activities
- The extent and quality of social networks and the extent of social isolation
- Support available on a routine basis and in times of crisis
- Disengagement from political and civic activity
- Confinement resulting from disability, fear of crime or other factors (p.138)

Burchardt et al (2002) suggest that another way forward could be to focus on the groups which are at particular risk of social exclusion rather than trying to quantify the

extent of detachment from mainstream society. Children, young people, the elder, the physically disabled, ethnic, cultural and gender groups may all suffer from varying degrees of vulnerability. When combined with income/consumption poverty, their vulnerability is multiplied and exacerbated such that they are unable to cope with the pressures of poverty and social exclusion. For some commentators, the focus is on groups already in an extreme state of exclusion. These might include: suicidal people and drug addicts (Lenoir, 1974); homeless people and unofficial migrants (Nicaise et al, 2009); lone parents and disabled people (Lisboa et al, 2010); and Roma people across Europe and other ethnic minorities suffering from stigmatisation. The crucial point in identifying indicators of social exclusion is to go beyond income and consumption measures to include multidimensional aspects of social exclusion and if possible to seek to illuminate the underlying dynamic processes.

Turning to developing territorial indicators of poverty/social exclusion, all the problems discussed above remain, normally compounded by the lack of available data at lower spatial scales. The OMC has a single 'regional disparities' indicator, defined on the basis of variation in employment rates. This is very minimalistic: Atkinson et al (2002), in their report as part of the consultation process, recommended that all the main indicators should have regional breakdowns. Although not required, a number of National Strategy Reports did provide regional breakdowns of some of their data.

For many manifestations of concentrations of poverty/social exclusion, though, regional level indicators are not very appropriate: it is micro-level data that would be needed, which could be captured via a two-tier methodology. Regional indicators could be misleading: at such a scale, high concentrations of wealth could exist alongside extremes of poverty, and regional level statistics would obscure the local problems by averaging across the territory. A key question is about the most appropriate scale of mapping: should this be at the scale of the individual, the household, the neighbourhood, the city (or rural area) or the region? This should provide the meaningful mapping of poverty/social exclusion occurrence, and the identification of hotspots. However, this still would not provide insights into the tricky question of the extent to which places themselves can become stigmatised and excluded and so further exclude the marginalised people who live there.

For the TIPSE project, a key consideration is the scale at which poverty and social exclusion are measured and mapped. While they tend to be concentrated in relatively small areas of cities or in parts of rural areas, they are not confined to these concentrations. Furthermore, larger-scale areas almost always show a mix of wealth and poverty. The national and regional level reports and data may produce a spatial map of poverty and social exclusion, but only as a proportion of the area as a whole. The spatial distribution of poverty and social exclusion at the more detailed levels within urban and rural areas, therefore, may remain hidden from larger scale surveys.

4.2 Towards indicators for poverty and social exclusion

On the basis of the review of the academic and policy literature, the availability of data, and the specific frameworks of the project, we have identified four domains and a number of indicators. Our review of theories and concepts have shown that that poverty and social exclusion are multi-dimensional and relational. Therefore, they should be studied in a multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral analysis, in which economic, social and political aspects of vulnerability and exclusion are all taken together into account, and how their compounded effect may find expression in spatial concentrations of disadvantage and vulnerability. This approach would provide a way of going beyond over-emphasis on a single consideration, which is often economic, and beyond being limited to a single sector, which would provide only a narrow view of the phenomenon. On this basis, and on the basis of the availability of data, the following four overlapping and interdependent domains are identified, and each split into further sections. The combination of these four domains, which capture economic, social, and political forms of vulnerability and their spatial manifestation in a social environment, would provide a basis for the regional mapping of social exclusion. Depending on the availability of data, a regional level of data analysis will be conducted, which would be supplemented by a more detailed level of analysis in the case studies, where particular spatial concentrations of disadvantage and vulnerability would be made more detectable.

The four domains refer to earning a living, access to basic services, social environment, and political participation. Strong performance on several subsets of these domains would show a level of possible or existing social inclusion, while weak performance on several of these subsets indicate an existing condition or being at risk of social exclusion.

1. Earning a living

Income earned by tax payers

Employment

Employed

Unemployed

Inactive

Long term unemployed

Jobless households

2. Access to basic services

Health

Access to primary health

Healthy life expectancy

Education

Access

pre-school

primary school

cultural house/library

Attainment

Less than Primary education (below ISCED level 1.)

Primary education (ISCED level 1.)

Tertiary education (ISCED level 5-6)

Housing

Tenure status of households

Dwelling units by type of building

Density standards

Type of living quarters

Amenities

Transport and Communication

Post Office

Broadband Internet

Transport

No of passenger cars

3. Social environment

Age

Ethnic composition

Immigrants

Crime and safety

Municipal income from property taxes

Municipal spending on social assistance

4. Political participation

Citizenship

Voters

Civic engagement

NGOs

Members of NGOs

References

- Adaman, F. and Keyder, C (2006), *Poverty and Social Exclusion in the Slum areas of Large Cities in Turkey*, (http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/2006/study_turkey_en.pdf/)
- Addabbo, T. (2000) Poverty Dynamics: Analysis of Household Incomes in Italy, *Labour* 14 (1) p.119-144
- Allen, J., Barlow, J., Leal, J., Maloutas, T. and Padovani, L. (2004) *Housing and Welfare in Southern Europe*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Andriani, L, and Karyampas, D. (2010) Social Capital, Poverty and Social Exclusion in Italy, *Birkbeck Working Papers in Economics and Finance, No. 1005*, London: University of London
- Armstrong, K. (2006) The 'Europeanisation' of Social Exclusion: British Adaptation to EU Co-ordination, *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 8 (1) p.79-100
- Arts, W. and Gelissen, J. (2002) Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism or More? *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12 (2) p.137-158
- Atkinson, A. (1998) Social Exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment in Atkinson, A. and Hills, J. (eds) *Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity*, CASE Paper 4, London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion
- Atkinson, R. and Davoudi, S. (2000) The Concept of Social Exclusion in the European Union: Context, Development and Possibilities, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 38 (3) p.427-48
- Atkinson, T., Cantillon, B., Marlier, E. and Nolan, B. (2002) *Social Indicators: the EU and Social Inclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Bask, M. (2009) Increasing Inequality in Social Exclusion Occurrence: the Case of Sweden During 1979-2003, *Social Indicators Research*, 97 (3) p.299-323
- Begg, I. and Berghman, J. (2002) Introduction: EU Social (Exclusion) Policy Revisted? *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12 (3) p.179 – 194
- Beil, S., Kolb, P. and Munnich, R (2011) *Policy Use of Laeken Indicators*, Paper to the NTTS conference, Brussels
- Beland, D. (2007) The Social Exclusion Discourse: Ideas and Policy Change, *Policy and Politics* 35 (1) p.123-39
- Bennett, K., Beynon, H. and Hudson, R. (2000) *Coalfields Regeneration: Dealing with the Consequences of Industrial Decline*. Policy Press: Bristol
- Berghman, J. (1995) Social Exclusion in Europe: Policy Context and Analytical Framework, in Room, G. (ed) *Beyond the Threshold*, Bristol: Policy Press

Bernhard, S. (2006) The European Paradigm of Social Exclusion, *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 2 (1), p.41-57

Bertolini, P. and Peragine, V. (2009) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Rural Areas*, Report to Directorate General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities

BMAS (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales) (2008) *Life Situations in Germany. The German Federal Government's 3rd Report on Poverty and Wealth. Executive Summary*, ([www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Publikationen/forschungsprojekt-a333-dritter-armuts-und-reichtumsbericht-englisch_kurzfassung.pdf? blob=publicationFile](http://www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Publikationen/forschungsprojekt-a333-dritter-armuts-und-reichtumsbericht-englisch_kurzfassung.pdf?blob=publicationFile))

BMVBS (Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung) (2008) *Status Report: The Programme 'Social City' (Soziale Stadt) Summary*, (www.sozialestadt.de/en/veroeffentlichungen/statusbericht-kurzfassung_en.pdf)

Bohn, C. (2008) Inklusion und Exklusion: Theorien und Befunde. Von der Ausgrenzung aus der Gemeinschaft zur Inkludierenden Exklusion. *Soziale Systeme* 14 (2) p.171 – 190

Bohnke, P. (2001) *Nothing Left to Lose? Poverty and Social Exclusion in Comparison: Empirical Evident on Germany*, Berlin: Social Science Research Centre Berlin (WZB) (<http://skylia.wz-berlin.de/pdf/2001/iii01-402.pdf>)

Borgeraas, E. and Dahl, E. (2010) Low Income and Poverty Lines in Norway: A Comparison of three Concepts, *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 19 (1) p.73-83

Bradshaw, T. (2006) *Theories of Poverty and Anti-Poverty Programs in Community Development*, RPRC Working Paper No. 06-05 (www.rprconline.org)

Bradshaw, J. and Mayhew, E. (2010) *The Measurement of Extreme Poverty in the European Union*, Report for the Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, Brussels: European Commission

Brandolini, A., Cipollone, P. and Sestito, P. (2001) Earnings Dispersion, Low Pay and Household Poverty in Italy, 1977-1998, *Temi di Discussione, No. 427*, Roma: Banca d'Italia

Bruto Da Costa, A., Cardoso, A., Baptista, I. and Perista, P. (2003) The Dynamics of Income Poverty and Social Exclusion in Portugal, in Apospori, E. and Millar, J. (eds) *The Dynamics of Social Exclusion in Europe. Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*, Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing

Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung ARE (2012) *Infobrief Programm Projets Urbains* (www.are.admin.ch/themen/agglomeration/00630/02258/index.html?lang=de)

- Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (2002) Degrees of Exclusion: Developing a Dynamic, Multidimensional Measure, in Hills, J., Le Grand, J. and Piachaud, D. (eds) *Understanding Social Exclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Cars, G. (1998), *Social Exclusion in European Neighbourhoods – Processes, Experiences and Responses – Final Report*, European Commission TSER Contract SOE2-CT97-3057.
- Castles, F. and Ferrara, M. (1996) Home Ownership and the Welfare State: Is Southern Europe Different? *Southern European Society and Politics*, 1 (2) p.163-185
- Daly, M. (2007) Whither EU Social Policy? An Account and Assessment of Developments in the Lisbon Social Inclusion Process, *Journal of Social Policy*, 37 (1) p.1-19
- David, I. (2005) Country Practices in Compiling Poverty Statistics, in Morduch, J. (ed) *Handbook of Poverty Statistics*, United Nations Statistics Division
- Dax, T. and Kahila, P. (2011) Policy Perspective – The Evolution of EU Rural Policy, in Copus, A. and Hornstrom, L. (eds) *The New Rural Europe: Towards Rural Cohesion Policy*, Stockholm: Nordregio
- Einasto, M. (2002) Income and Deprivation Poverty, 1994 and 1999, in Kutsar, D. (ed) *Living Conditions in Estonia Five Years Later*, Tartu: Tartu University Press
- Ellen, I. and Turner, M. (1997) Does Neighbourhood Matter? Assessing Recent Evidence, *Housing & Policy Debate* 8 (4) p.833-866
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1994) *After the Golden Age: the Future of the Welfare State in the New Global Order*, Occasional Paper no.7, World Summit for Social Development, Geneva, November 1994
- ESPON 2013 Programme (2010) *First ESPON 2013 Synthesis Report*, Luxemburg
- ESPON 1.4.2 (2006) *Preparatory Study on Social Aspects of EU Territorial Development: Final Report*, Vienna: Austrian Institute for Regional Studies and Spatial Planning
- European Commission (1998) *Non-monetary Indicators of Poverty and Social Exclusion – final Report*, Luxembourg: OOPEC
- European Commission (2006a) *Bridging the Broadband Gap (COM (2006) 129 Final)* Brussels: European Commission
- European Commission (2006b) *Working Together for Growth and Jobs: Further Steps in Implementing the Revised Lisbon Agenda (SEC (2006) 619)* Brussels: European Commission
- European Commission (2008) *A Renewed Commitment to Social Europe: Reinforcing the Open Method of Coordination for Social Protection and Social Inclusion (COM (2008) 418 final)*, Brussels: European Commission

European Commission (2009) *Portfolio of Indicators for the Monitoring of the European Strategy for Social Protection and Social Inclusion – 2009 Update*, Brussels: European Commission

European Commission (2010a) *Investing in Europe's Future: Fifth Report on Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union

European Commission (2010b) *The European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion: A European Framework for Social and Territorial Cohesion, (COM (2010) 758 Final)* Brussels: European Commission

European Commission (2010c) *Europe 2020: A Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth (COM (2010) 2020 final)* Brussels: European Commission

European Commission (2011) *An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020 (COM (2011) 173 final)* Brussels: European Commission

European Council (1999) *Council Regulation (EC) No 2357/1999 on Support for rural Development from the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund (EAGGF)*

European Council (2006) Council Decision of 20 February 2006 on Community Strategic Guidelines for Rural Development (Programming Period 2007 to 2013) (2006/144/EC), *Official Journal of the European Union* L55

European Council (2010) *Draft Joint Report on Social Protection and Social inclusion 2010 (6500/10)*

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2007) *Second European Quality of Life Survey* (<http://eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef0902.htm>)

Fenger, H. (2007) *Welfare Regimes in Central and Eastern Europe: Incorporating Post-Communist Countries in a Welfare Regime Typology* (www.journal.ciiss.net/index.php/ciiss/article/download/45/37)

Ferrara, M. (1996) The 'Southern' Model of Welfare in Social Europe, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 56 (1) p.17 – 37

Ferrara, M., Matsaganis, M. and Sacchi, S. (2002) Open Coordination against Poverty: the New EU 'Social Inclusion Process', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12 (3) p. 223-239

Fink, M., Pultar, A., Schelepa, S., Wetzel, P., Hanappi, T., Müllbacher, S., Reitzinger, S., Schuh, U. and Schütz, M. (2010) *Armut und sozialer Zusammenhalt: Konzepte, Wahrnehmungen durch Betroffene und Effekte der Wirtschaftskrise*. http://www.Irsocialresearch.at/files/Endbericht_soziale_Kohaesion_11_10.pdf

- Franco, D., Marino, R. and Tommasino, P. (2008) Pension Policy and Poverty in Italy: Recent Developments and New Priorities, *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia* 67 (2) p.119-59
- Geddes, M. (2000) Tackling Social Exclusion in the European Union? The Limits to the New Orthodoxy of Local Partnership, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24 (4), p.782-800
- Glasze, G. and Weber, F. (2010) Drei Jahrzehnte Area-basierte Stadtpolitik in Frankreich: di Political de la Ville. Bearbeitung Gesellschaftlicher Probleme Mittels Rumorientierter Ansätze? *Raumforschung und Raumordnung*, 68 (6) p.459-470
- Golinowska, S. (2002) Poverty in Poland: Causes, Measures and Studies. *Poverty Dynamics in Poland – Selected Quantitative Analyses*, CASE – Centre for Social and Economic Research
- Harris, P. (2002) Welfare Rewritten: Change and Interlay in Social and Economic Accounts, *Journal of Social Policy*, 31 (3) p.377-398
- Hausserman, H. and Kronauer, M. (2009) Raumliche Segregation und Innerstädtisches Ghetto, in Stichweh, R. and Windolf, P. (ed) *Inklusion und Exklusion: Analysen zure Sozialstruktur under Sozialen Ungleichheit*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften
- Havasi, E. (2002) Szegenyseg es Tarsadalmi Kirekesztettseg a Mai Magyarorszagon, *Szociologiai Szemle*, 4, p.51-71
- HM Government (2012) *Social Justice: Transforming Lives* (www.dwp.gov.uk/social-justice)
- Jamet, S. (2007) *Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion in France*, OECD Economics Department Working Papers No. 569, OECD Publishing (www.oecd-ilibrary.org/)
- Jehoel-Gijsbers, G. and Vrooman, C. (2007) *Explaining Social Exclusion: A Theoretical Model Tested in the Netherlands*, The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (www.scp.nl/english/)
- Jonkaryte, A. and Stankuniene, V. (2003) *Lithuania: Mother's Employment and Children's Poverty*. UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence
- Kostadinova, G. (2011) Minority Rights as a Normative Framework for Addressing the Situation of Roma in Europe, *Oxford Development Studies*, 39 (2) p.163-183
- Kristensen, H. (1997) Social Exclusion and Spatial Stress: the Connections, in Room, G (ed) *Beyond the Threshold*, Bristol: Policy Press
- Kuivalainen, S. and Niemela, M. (2010) From Universalism to Selectivism: the Ideational Turn of the Antipoverty Policies in Finland, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20 (3) p.263-276
- Lenoir (1974) *Les Exclus: Un Francais sur Dix*, Paris: Seuil

- Leontidou, L., Donnan, H. and Afouxenidis, A. (2005) Exclusion and Difference along the EU Border: Social and Cultural Markers, Spatialities and Mappings, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29 (2) p.389-407
- Levitas, R. (1996) The Concept of Social Exclusion and the New Durkheimian Hegemony, *Critical Social Policy*, 46 (16) p.5-20
- Levitas, R. (2006) The Concept and Measurement of Social Exclusion, in Pantazis, C., Gordon, D. and Levitas, R. (eds) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, Bristol: The Policy Press
- Lewis, O. (1959) *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*, New York: A Mentor Book
- Lisboa, M, Pereirinha, J., Peixoto, J., Teixeira Dias, A., Particio, J., do Rosario Rosa, M. and Barroso, Z (2010) *Sistema Integrado de Informacao e Conhecimento*, (http://195.23.38.178/siicportal/files/siic-201111SIIC{EIF_CD_MP.pdf)
- Madanipour, A., Cars, G. and Allen, J. (2003) *Social Exclusion in European Cities*, London: Routledge
- Madanipour, A., (2003) *Cities Actions Against Social Exclusion*, Eurocities, Brussels.
- Madanipour, A., (2011) Social Exclusion and Space, in LeGates, R. and Stout, F. *City Reader*, Fifth Edition, London: Routledge, pp.186-194.
- Madanipour, A., (2012a) Ghetto, in Susan J. Smith, Marja Elsinga, Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Ong Seow Eng, SusanWachter, Heather Lovell, editors, *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, Vol 2. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 287–291.
- Madanipour, A., (2012b) Neighbourhood Governance, in Susan J. Smith, Marja Elsinga, Lorna Fox O'Mahony, Ong Seow Eng, Susan Wachter, Montserrat Pareja Eastaway, editors, *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home*, Vol 5, Oxford: Elsevier; 2012. pp. 61–66.
- Mendola, D. and De Cantis, S. (2004) The Analysis of Poverty in Italy: a Fuzzy Dynamic Approach, *Advances in Multivariate Date Analysis*, 10 (IV) p.181-192
- Mingione, E. (1997) Enterprise and Exclusion, in Christie, I. and Perri, H. (eds) *The Wealth and Poverty of Networks: Tackling Social Exclusion*, London: DEMOS
- Ministere de la Famille et de l'Integration (2010) Rapport national sur la situation de la jeunesse au Luxembourg
(<http://www.mfi.public.lu/publications/RapportNationalSituationJeunesse/RapportIntegral.pdf>)
- Misturelli, F. and Heffernan, C. (2010), The Concept of Poverty: A Synchronic Perspective, *Progress in Development Studies*, 10 (1) p.35-58

- Naude, W., Santos-Paulino, A. and McGillivray, M. (2009) Measuring Vulnerability: An Overview and Introduction, *Oxford Development Studies*, 37 (3) p.183-191
- Nicaise, I., Morissens, A. and Cincinnato, S. (2009) *Registering, Surveying and Counting Homeless People in Belgium*, (www.trp.dundee.ac.uk/research/mphasis/papers/PPMphasisBEEN.pdf)
- Niemela, M. (2008) Perceptions of the Causes of Poverty in Finland, *Acta Sociologica*, 51 (1) p.23-40
- O'Brien, M. and Penna, S. (2008) Social Exclusion in Europe: Some Conceptual Issues, *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 17, p.84-92
- O'Connor, A. (2001) *Poverty Knowledge*, Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Olafsdottir, S. (2007) Fundamental Causes of Health Disparities: Stratification, the Welfare State, and Health in the United States and Iceland, *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 48 (3) p.239-253
- Paas, T. (2003) *Social Consequences of Transition and European Integration Process in the Baltic States*, Paper for the ERSA (European Regional Science Association) Conference, Jyvaskyla, August 2003
- Pantazis, C., Gordon, D. and Levitas, R. (2006) *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Britain*, Bristol, Policy Press
- Peet, R. (1975) Inequality and Poverty: A Marxist-Geographic Theory, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 65(4) p.564-571
- Philip, L. and Shucksmith, M. (2003) Conceptualising Social Exclusion in Rural Britain, *European Planning Studies*, 11 (4) p. 461-480
- Polish Presidency and European Commission (2011) *First Annual Convention of the European Platform against Poverty and Social Exclusion Final Report*, 17-18 October 2011, Krakow, Poland
- Quintano, C., Castellano, R. and D'Agostino, A. (2004) Modeling the Incidence of Poverty in Italy: A Comparison of three Statistical Methods, *Quaderni di Discussione 24* Napoli: Istituto di Statistica e Matematica, Universita degli Studi di Napoli, Parthenope
- Reimer, W. (2004) Social Exclusion in a Comparative Context, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 44 (1) p.76-94
- Robinson, P. and Oppenheim, C. (1998) *Social Exclusion Indicators: A Submission to the Social Exclusion Unit*, London: IPPR
- Rodrigues, E., Samagaio, F., Ferreira, H., Mendes, M. and Januario, S. (1999) *A Pobreza e a Exclucao Social: Teorias, Conceitos e Politicas Sociais em Portugal* (<http://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/1468.pdf>)
- Room, G. (1995) Poverty and Social Exclusion: The New European Agenda for Policy and Research, in Room, G. (ed) *Beyond the Threshold*, Bristol: Policy Press

Room, G. (1999) Social Exclusion, Solidarity and the Challenge of Globalisation, *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 8, p.66-74

Rothstein, B. (2002) *Vad bor staten gora*, SNS forlag

Ruggeri Laderchi, C., Saith, R. and Stewart, F. (2003) Does it Matter that we do not Agree on the Definition of Poverty? A Comparison of Four Approaches, *Oxford Development Studies*, 31(3), p243 – 274

Samers, M. (1998) Immigration, 'Ethnic Minorities', and 'Social Exclusion' in the European Union: A Critical Perspective, *Geoforum*, 29 (2) p.123-144

Secretariat General du CIV (2010) *Taking Action for the Residents of Deprived Urban Areas* (<http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/corporate/pdf/taking-action-for-deprived-urban-areas.pdf>)

Shucksmith, M. (2012) Class, Power and Inequality in Rural Areas: Beyond Social Exclusion? *Sociologia Ruralis*, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9523.2012.00570.x

Shucksmith, M. and Chapman, P. (1998) Rural Development and Social Exclusion, *Sociologia Ruralis* 38 (2) p.225 – 242

Shucksmith, M. and Schafft, K. (2012) Rural Poverty in the UK and US, pp. 100-116 in Shucksmith M, Brown D, Shortall S, Vergunst J and Warner M (eds) *Rural Transformations and Rural Policies in the US and UK*, Routledge, New York.

Shucksmith, M., Shucksmith, J. and Watt, J. (2006) Rurality and Social Inclusion: A Case of Preschool Education, *Social Policy and Administration* 40 (6) p.678-691

Shucksmith, M., Talbot, H. and Lee, R. (2011) Meta-Narratives as Heuristic Generalisations of Rural Change, in Copus, A. and Hornstrom, L. (eds) *The New Rural Europe: Towards Rural Cohesion Policy*, Stockholm: Nordregio

Sibley, D. (1998) The Problematic Nature of Exclusion, *Geoforum*, 29 (2) p. 119 – 121

Silver, H. (1994) Social Exclusion and Social Solidarity: Three Paradigms, *International Labour Review*, 133 (5-6) p.531-578

Soysal, Y. (2012) Citizenship, Immigration, and the European Social Project: Rights and Obligations of Individuality, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 63 (1) p.1-21

Stewart, K. (2003) Monitoring Social Inclusion in Europe's Regions, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13 (4) p. 335-356

Stichweh, R., 2009. Leitgesichtspunkte einer Soziologie der Inklusion und Exklusion. In: R. Stichweh, P. Windolf, (ed) *Inklusion und Exklusion: Analysen zur Sozialstruktur und sozialen Ungleichheit*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 29-42.

Szalai, J. (2002) A Tarsadalmi Kirekesztodes Egyes Kerdesei as Ezredfordulo Magyarorszagan, *Szociologiai Szemle*, 4, p.34-50

- Taylor-Gooby, P. (2008) The New Welfare State Settlement in Europe, *European Societies*, 10 (1)
- Trbanc, M. (2001) *Social Consequences of transition in Slovenia: Who is Endangered by Social Exclusion?* Paper to the 6th meeting of COST A13 Working Group on Unemployment, Ljubljana, June 8-9, 2001
- Trumm, A. (2011) Poverty in the context of Societal Transitions in Estonia, *Dissertationes Sociologicae Universitatis Tartuensis*
- United Nations (1995) *The Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action: World Summit for Social Development 6 – 12 March 1995*, New York: United Nations Department of Publications
- Vabo, S. and Burau, V. (2011) Universalism and the Local Organisation of Elderly Care, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Work*, 31 (3) p.173-184
- Van Oorschot, W. (2002) Miracle or Nightmare? A Critical Review of Dutch Activation Policies and their Outcomes, *Journal of Social Policy*, 31 (3) p.399-420
- Vecernik, J. (2004) Who is Poor in the Czech Republic? The Changing Structure and Faces of Poverty after 1989, *Czech Sociological Review*, 40 (6) p.807-834
- Veit-Wilson, J. (2002) Researching Poverty and the Poor, *Journal of Social Policy*, 31 (3) p. 537-544
- Veit-Wilson, J. (2006) No Rights without Remedies: Necessary Conditions for Abolishing Child Poverty, *European Journal of Social Security* 8 (3) p. 317 – 337
- Vranken, J. (2010) Introduction, in Dierckx, D., Van Herck, N. and Vranke, J. (ed) *Poverty in Belgium* Leuven: Uitgeverij Acco
- Vrooman, C. and Hoff, S. (2004) *The Poor Side of the Netherlands*, The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office
- Wagle, U. (2002) Rethinking Poverty: Definition and Measurement, *International Social Science Journal*, vol 54 (171) p.155-165
- Wall, K., Aboim, S., Cunha, V. and Vasceoncelos, P. (2001) Families and Informal Support Networks in Portugal: the Reproduction of Inequality, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 11 (3) p. 213-233
- Windolf, P., 2001. Inklusion und soziale Ungleichheit. In: R. Stichweh, P. Windolf, (ed.) *Inklusion und Exklusion: Analysen zur Sozialstruktur und sozialen Ungleichheit*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 11-27.
- Zeitlin, J. (2008) The Open Method of Co-ordination and the Governance of the Lisbon Strategy, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 46 (2) p.436-450

Appendix 1: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in Nordic countries

Christian Dymén, Mitchell Reardon, Petri Kahila

NordRegio, Stockholm

1 Academic overview

The following brief overview of academic literature on poverty and social exclusion in the Nordic Countries is intended to complement the overview presented in the application.

To perform a brief overview of the academic literature in the Nordic countries we have primarily done searches in academic databases. We have been searching for the words POVERTY and SOCIAL EXCLUSION (in the title), the last five years. This has been done for Norway, Finland, Sweden, Denmark and Iceland. We have also included other relevant literature when found during our search for policy documents.

1.1 Socioeconomic variables

When scanning through recent academic literature the concept *Nordic Welfare Model* appears to be central in discussing poverty and social exclusion in the Nordic countries and especially in relation to *universalism* (see eg. Vabo et al., 2011; Blume et al., 2007; Niemelä, 2008; Olafsdottir, 2007; Borgeraas et. Al., 2008; Bask, 2009) As an example the Swedish political scientist Bo Rothstein, who has devoted many years in studying the welfare system argues that the Swedish welfare system consists mainly of four different components. These are; publicly produced services such as health care, child care, elderly care and public housing policy; A Social security system; A general allowance system; And targeted social actions. In general terms the main characteristic of the Swedish welfare system is that it is *general* and not *selective* like in other welfare states such as the USA. However, impaired Government finances, increased critiques toward the state's high control of citizen's private sphere of life as well as the question of privatizing public services puts the Swedish welfare system at stake (Rothstein, 2002.).

In the present literature review on poverty and social exclusion in the Nordic countries the four components stressed by Rothstein, are found through socio economic variables measuring poverty and social exclusion (the variables are listed in the section below). Bask (2009) for instance, states 6 variables as being central in defining social exclusion. These are: *chronic unemployment, economic problems, health problems, experiences of threat or violence, crowded housing and lack of interpersonal relationships*. The study performed by Bask (2009) in Sweden concludes that over time (1979-2003) immigrants' situation has become worse as well as the odds for social exclusion among singles with children. This is not the case for couples without children and couples with children. Regarding gender, men are in

general worse off than women; however this trend has diminished over time (Ibid., p 299).

Furthermore, Economic problems (unemployment, budget constraints) and health problems are often found in our Nordic literature overview. For instance, a study from Norway identifies and analyses three different measures of poverty used in the country. These are income poverty, and two measures of a minimum budget standard, one scientifically and one politically defined (Borgeraas et al., 2010). A study from Iceland examines the relationship between the dependant variable health and the independent variables education, employment and relative poverty. A conclusion is that “welfare state intervention may be most successful in equalizing health outcomes by supporting families and by removing advantages traditionally accumulated by the wealthy in capital societies.” (Olafsdottir, 2007).

1.2 Vulnerable groups

We also find in our review that socio-economic variables related to certain groups such as children, elderly, young people and immigrants often are central (see eg. Bask, 2009; Blume et al., 2007). Blume et al. (2007) have been studying poverty in Denmark and Sweden especially focusing immigrants. Their results show that despite similarities in the structure of the Swedish and Danish welfare states immigrants in Denmark compared to Sweden have a higher rate of poverty (Ibid. p 394). The authors also find a relation between education and poverty suggesting that education is central for successful labour market integration. The overall conclusion from that study is that low income status is increasingly becoming an immigrant phenomenon in Denmark and Sweden. This is however most pronounced in Denmark where family cash benefits are more favourable to the typical native family structure, in contrast to the larger families of immigrants from less developed countries (Ibid. p 394). A somewhat old piece of research, but still interesting, has studied long term unemployment among young people in the EU. Findings state that unemployment threatens the overall integration of young people in society. The most important factors for social exclusion are: “Low qualification, passivity in the labour market, a precarious financial situation, low or missing social support, and insufficient or inexistent institutional support.” (Kieselbach, 2003, p 74).

1.3 Governance, universalism and the welfare state

Furthermore, recent literature argues that shifts in governance structures, such as introduction of decentralisation and market circumstances challenges universalism in the Nordic countries. It is also argued that this shift leads to a range of new inequalities among citizens (Vabo et al., 2011). Even if universalism is challenged through shifts in welfare governance in the context of Europe, the Nordic welfare states are the most comprehensive and offer high levels of welfare to most citizens (Kazepov, 2010b & Strohmeier, 2010; cited in Vabo et al., 2011; Rothstein, 2002). An issue that reflects the shifts in governance structures is certainly citizen's attitudes towards welfare. As an example, a Finnish study done by Niemelä (2008) concludes that there is strong consensus on causes of poverty among citizens in Finland. "Finns are more likely to blame the flaws and inadequacies of the labour market than the behaviour of individuals or societal injustice." (Ibid. p 23) Another Finnish study argues that the Nordic universalistic welfare state is challenged in Finland. A new element in Finnish social policy can be called anti-poverty policy. The results emphasise that church, non governmental organisations, the EU Lisbon agenda as well as political opposition has had great influence in shifting focus from universalism to selectivism (Kuivalainen, 2010, p 263).

References

- Bask, M. (2009) Increasing Inequality in social Exclusion Occurrence: The case of Sweden During 1979-2003. *Soc Indic Res*, 2020(97), pp 299-323
- Blume, K., Gustafsson, B., Pedersen, P.J., & Verner, M. (2007) At the lower end of the table: Determinants of poverty among immigrants to Denmark and Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(3), pp 373-396
- Borgeraas E., & Dahl, E. (2008) Low income and poverty lines in Norway: a comparison of three concepts. *International journal of Social welfare*, 2010(19), pp 73-83
- Kieselbach, T. (2003) Long term unemployment among young people: The risk of social exclusion. *American journal of Community Psychology*, 32(1/2), pp 69-76
- Kuivalainen, S., & Niemelä, M. (2010) From universalism to selectivism: The ideational turn of the antipoverty policies in Finland. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2010(20), pp263-276
- Niemelä, M. (2008) Perceptions of the causes of Poverty in Finland. *Acta Sociologica*, 51(1), pp 23-40
- Olafsdottir, S. (2007) Fundamental causes of health disparities: Stratification, the Welfare State, and Health in the United States and Iceland. *Journal of health and Social Behaviour*, 48(3), pp 239-253
- Rothstein, B (2002) *Vad bör staten göra*. SNS förlag
- Vabo, S.I., & Burau, V. (2011) Universalism and the local organisation of elderly care. *International journal of sociology and social work*, 31(3), pp. 173-184

Appendix 2: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in Central European Countries (incl. Portugal)

Isabel Ramos-Lobato

ILS, Dortmund

Austria

The **concepts of poverty and social exclusion** have become a focus of scientific as well as political debates in Austria. Besides the resource approach (see chapter Germany), a multidimensional understanding of poverty gained importance within **scientific discussions**. As a consequence, poverty is not only covered by income, but also by health, housing or access to food and clothes (Verwiebe 2011). In addition, some studies are based on a deprivation approach which includes dimensions such as a lack of participation as well as exclusion. Different topics such as poverty despite employment, the so called working-poor phenomenon (Fink et al. 2012; Verwiebe & Fritsch 2011; Verwiebe 2011), the poverty of education especially in terms of inheritability of poverty (Till-Tenschert & Vana 2009; Verwiebe 2011), or poverty and migration are addressed and different vulnerable groups like women, young adults, people with instable employment careers, families, lone parents, elderly and unemployed people are identified (Fink et al. 2012; Verwiebe 2011). In addition the discussion about social exclusion is also partly related to urban segregation processes (Dangschat 2004).

Austrian **social policies** have concentrated more on social cohesion and the need to fight poverty in the last years. Material participation facilitated by employment and income is understood as the most relevant dimension of social inclusion. As a consequence measures focus on the areas of integration into the employment market as the best protection to poverty as well as social protection through welfare benefits (Fink et al. 2012). Other dimensions of social inclusion like access to health services, housing, energy or transport are addressed less often. Moreover the effect of education as one reason for the risk of poverty seems to have less influence in political than in scientific discussions (Fink et al. 2012). In terms of **indicators**, scientific as well as political studies are dominantly based on monetary and relative poverty measured by the 60% threshold of the national medium income (Verwiebe & Fritsch 2011). In addition, concepts of manifest or severe poverty are taken up as well.

Belgium

There is a long-running debate about poverty in the scientific and especially in the political context in Belgium. With the appearance of the term “social exclusion”, both notions were tried to be combined into **one cohesive conceptual context** (Vranken 2010), in which poverty is defined as: *“a network of forms of social exclusion that extends over several areas of individual and collective existence. It separates the*

poor from the generally accepted modes of existence in society, creating a gap that poor people are unable to bridge on their own." (Vranckel & Van Mexel 1997) This definition serves as a frame for Belgian poverty policies, especially in the region of Flanders. A strict separation between concepts of poverty and social exclusion does not seem to exist. As a consequence to this, poverty is not seen as a narrow income-based concept. It is rather understood as being multidimensional and dynamic taking different domains of social life like education, housing, income, employment, excessive debts, health and social participation into account (Campaert & Van Herck 2010; Vandermotten et al. 2006). Similar to European-wide discussions, both concepts are often related to particular vulnerable groups like women, single-parent families, unemployed, less-educated and children (Vranken 2010). Attempts are made to include households which are currently not part of the EU-SILC, especially home- and roofless people as well as undocumented migrants, into the database (Nicaise & Schockaert; Nicaise, Morissens & Cincinnato 2009).

The **used indicators** are very similar to the ones used on the European level. In terms of poverty, the "at risk of poverty" indicator with the 60% threshold (Parlament der deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft 2009; Combat Poverty, Insecurity and Social Exclusion Service 2007) as well as the interquintile share ratio, which is defined as the ratio of total income received by the 20% of the country's population with the highest income to that received by the 20% of the country's population with the lowest income, are most popular (Willems & Vyncke 2010). Moreover data on subjective poverty as well as over-indebtedness is included in some studies. Two indicators representing the latter one are (1) percentage of borrowers in default and (2) average arrears by borrowers (Duvivier et al. 2010).

Competences related to **poverty policy** in a broad sense are spread across the range of national, regional and local administrations. As a consequence, there is great number of policy plans and initiatives on different administrative levels. Similar to the scientific discussion poverty is understood as being multidimensional and manifests itself in fields such as health, employment and housing. In addition, the access to energy sources is integrated into some policies (Campaert & Van Herck 2010). Belgium has been experimenting with the participation of the civil society and of organizations in policy-making and public administrations where the poor have been given voice (Campaert & Van Herck 2010).

France

Since the concept on social exclusion entered the political agenda in the 1970s, starting in France, there is a long-running focus in France on the **concepts of poverty and social exclusion** in scientific discussions as well as in social policies. Social exclusion is explained as a "rupture of social bonds" which shall emphasize on the solidaristic nature of society (De Haan 2001). It emphasizes issues of inadequate social participation as disruption of social ties or lack of power as well as aspects of solidarity and civil society (Böhnke 2001). The concept of social exclusion is defined as being multidimensional and being more a process than a state and resulting of a

sequence of unfavourable events (Jamet 2007). In term so **poverty**, it is stated that poverty cannot be reduced to a single indicator and cannot be summed up by the absence or deprivation of monetary resources. As a consequence, for an assessment of poverty situations, all living conditions for a household must be taken into consideration including other dimensions of well being beyond just monetary resources (Jamet 2007; Damon 2008; National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion 2006). Serge Paugam (2005) differentiates three types of poverty: (1) integrated poverty, which refers to a form of poverty in pre- or under industrialised countries where big parts of the society are affected; (2) marginal poverty, a term not only referring to poverty, but also to social exclusion, involving only small parts of the society, who get social transfer and are highly stigmatised; (3) excluding poverty, which refers mainly to the problem of exclusion. The affected people do not necessarily live in poverty, but are in a process of social decline (Paugam 2005). Similar to other European studies, potential risk groups are identified like lone parents, elderly, immigrants, ethnic minorities and women (Jamet 2007; National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion 2006). In the French context, inequalities transmitted across generations due to the inequality of the education system (Jamet 2007) as well as neighbourhood effects are being made a subject of discussion (National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion 2006; Centre d'analyse stratégique 2011).

According to the concepts of poverty and social exclusion, **indicators** similar to other European ones are used. In terms of monetary poverty, the 60% threshold of the "at risk of poverty" indicator dominates although the 50% threshold which was used traditionally in France still seems to be in discussion (Damon 2008; National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion 2006). In addition to the relative poverty indicator, the so called administrative poverty indicator is mentioned which is measured in terms of minimum social benefits (Damon 2012; National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion). Surveys from the National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion (2006) are based on eleven indicators being part of following four dimensions: poverty (poverty rate; proportion of people living in a household with an income less than 50% of the median; poverty intensity; poverty rate for working population; rate of hardships in living conditions), social minima (evolution in the number of social minima beneficiaries of working age; long-term RMI beneficiaries), exclusion indicators (rate of people who forego health care due to financial reasons; rate of people exiting school system without any qualifications; rate of job-seekers not receiving indemnities; proportion of subsidized housing requests not fulfilled after one year) as well as income inequalities (interdecile ratio) (Behaghel 2008).

The fight against poverty seems to be a key component of **social policy in France** (Damon 2008). In the area-based approach "Politique de la Ville", discrimination and equal opportunities seem to be new catchwords (Glasze & Weber 2010). Urban policy for deprived urban areas focus on various dimensions, like housing, quality of

life, employment and economic development, education, citizenship, crime prevention as well as healthcare (Secrétariat general du CIV 2010).

Germany

The **concepts of poverty and social exclusion** have been widely debated in German scientific as well as political contexts. There is a clear distinction between poverty and social exclusion. Whereas poverty is restricted to financial resources, social exclusion goes beyond the material dimensions and has a much broader focus on reinforcing processes of social disadvantages (Böhnke 2001; Häußermann & Kronauer 2009). It is about affiliation or non-affiliation (Buhr & Leibfried 2009). The **concept of social exclusion** is defined as being multidimensional, comprehensive and dynamic. It entails different dimensions: economic, institutional, social, cultural and spatial exclusion as well as a subjective component (Häußermann, Kronauer & Siebel 2004; Böhnke 2001; Böhnke 2005). A unidimensional consideration of poverty with its main focus on income is described, however, as being too unilateral. An **extended understanding of poverty** has grown which also refers to social disadvantages as well as precarious circumstances which undermine the social and societal integration of a person (Buhr & Leibfried 2009; Böhnke 2005). As a consequence, it is usually differentiated between the “resource approach”, which defines poverty as deprivation of income and the so called “Lebenslagen-Ansatz” understanding poverty as deprivation in different situations of life (Buhr & Leibfried 2009). In German social research, there is a strong emphasise on the spatial dimension of social exclusion, the neighbourhood effects (Drever 2004; Friedrich & Blasius 2000; Farwick 2009; Häußermann 2006; Häußermann et al. 2010). Risk groups such as lone parents, retired people, young adults, immigrants, children and people with low education levels and professional qualifications are mentioned as well (Voges & Jürgens 2003; Häußermann 2006).

The urban development programme “Social City” launched in 1999 aims at counteracting exclusion in deprived neighbourhoods and improving living situations of neighbourhood residents. Besides this programme, which focuses on local economy, employment, housing, school and education or integration of immigrants (BMVBS 2008), most of the **political aims** concerning poverty refer to the European poverty dimension employment (Hanesch 2011). As a consequence, most measures concentrate on the promotion of employment as well as an improved access to education since overcoming of unemployment is seen as the most effective way of social inclusion (BMAS 2004; BMAS 2008). The at-risk-of-poverty **indicator** with a threshold of 60% of the median income is normally used in poverty related studies; sometimes the 50% threshold is used for poverty and 40% for severe poverty (Böhmer & Heimer 2008; BMAS 2008; Buhr & Leibfried 2009; Häußermann & Kronauer 2009). Social exclusion indicators refer to areas such as labour market performance (long-term unemployment), standard of living, income poverty, educational status, housing conditions (less than one room per person/no bath or

toilet in apartment), residential area (feeling of insecurity in residential area/bad living conditions), social relationships (limited possibilities to contact other people), politics (pessimism concerning political influence) or anomie (feeling lonely) (Böhnke 2001).

Luxembourg

Poverty plays an important role in Luxembourgish **scientific and political discussions**. Similar to other European debates, it is described as being multidimensional and relative comprising monetary aspects as well as deprivations in terms of housing, education, access to health services, social competences or cultural participation (Chambre de travail 2007; Caritas Luxembourg 2010). The focus hereby often lays on the economic dimension. However, there are substantial differences in the scientific but especially in the **political debate** about poverty in Luxembourg compared to the discussion in other European countries. Poverty is a problem in Luxembourg as well, but due to the high living standard of its population a definition and assessment of poverty is more specific and difficult than in neighbouring countries (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010). In this context, Prime Minister Juncker differentiated in a speech in 2008 between statistical poverty measured with the risk-of-poverty indicator and the real poverty, emphasising that the latter one has to be fought and the former one only to be caught in mind (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010). The amount of money resulting from the 60% threshold is considerably higher than in the majority of the EU member states. Therefore, the question of definition, measurement of poverty as well as the significance of used indicators arises (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010).

In some political publications, there is a distinction between the concepts of poverty and social exclusion (Chambre de travail 2007). In contrast the political debate, however, seems to concentrate on poverty issues, whereas the **concept of social exclusion** is discussed in some **scientific publications**. Raleanu Szeles (2007) defines social exclusion as being a result of a dynamic and complex process, divided into different dimensions: unemployment, economic hardship, possession of durable goods, housing conditions and dwelling type (Raleanu Szeles 2007). Similar risk groups than in other European countries are identified like families with many children, lone parents, homeless people or people with low educational level. Moreover, the risk is highly dependent on the nationality (Chambre de travail 2007; Meyers et al. 2010; Kneip 2008). More than in other countries, Luxembourgish debates focus mainly on children who bear the highest risk of poverty (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010; Meyers et al. 2010; Caritas Luxembourg 2010).

Like already mentioned, due to the specific context in Luxembourg, questions arise how to measure poverty. Moreover, there does not seem to be a mandated entity to define an official threshold for poverty for the determination of social minimum benefits. As a consequence, the EU is the frame for defining such indicators (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010; Chambre de travail 2007). Whereas

in most cases, relative **poverty indicators** like the risk-of-poverty indicator with a 60% threshold area used (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010; Chambre de travail 2007), the question arises if the share of material deprivation could be better to capture poverty in Luxembourg (Meyers et al. 2010). In order to cover other dimensions of poverty as well as social exclusion, indicators referring to poverty of different households, persistence of poverty, unemployment, the role of social transfer benefits, housing, education, access to health services, depths as well as subjective assessments of poverty are used (Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration 2010; Chambre de travail 2007; Raleanu Szeles 2007).

Portugal

Due to its relative high poverty rate (Bruto da Costa et al. 2003), the poverty and later social exclusion as well have been playing an important role in scientific as well as political debates since the end of the dictatorship in 1974. In Portuguese discourse, there seems to be a strict distinction between the definition of both concepts. . **Poverty** is mostly defined as material deprivation, interrelated with income and participation in the labour market and divided in relative and absolute poverty (Bureau International de Trabalho 2003). In some articles, poverty is described as being one dimension of social exclusion, the most visible (Rodrigues 1999). Like in the European definition, **social exclusion** is understood as wider concept, related to job market and financial resources, but also to areas like health, education, housing, social protection, family and private life, security and participation (Lisboa et al. 2010). It is defined as being more complex, persistent and dynamic, having a cumulative and reproductive character (Rodrigues 1999). Emphasis lays on the latter one, the so called poverty cycles (Rodrigues 1999, Governo de Portugal 2008). In the Portuguese context, the discussion about poverty and social exclusion refers also to vulnerable groups, like lone parents, disabled people, drug abuser, retired people, unemployed, ethnic minorities, illiterates or homeless. One study especially concentrates on the different vulnerability between men and women (Lisboa et al. 2010).

Limited access to education as one dimension of social exclusion seems to attract a lot of attention in scientific and especially **policy documents**. To break poverty cycles and diminish the exclusive character of the educational system in a lot of cases children and young adults are the main target group for projects against poverty (Governo de Portugal 2008; Bruto da Costa et al 2003). In contrast to other European countries, discussions about poverty and social exclusion address the presence of informal networks of support and mutual acknowledgement based on kinship and neighbourhood relationships, the so called welfare-society (Wall et al. 2001; Bruto da Costa et al. 2003). The **used indicators** are in most of the cases very similar to the European ones: the risk of poverty indicator with the 60% threshold as well as the interquintile share ratio and the poverty gap indicator (Capucha et al. 2005; Governo de Portugal 2008). In studies focused on social exclusion and poverty of women, indicators concentrate on specific gender aspects, as female participation

in education, difference in salary by sex, division of responsibilities in family or time dedicated to family (Lisboa et al. 2010).

The Netherlands

The scientific and political debates about the **concepts of poverty and social exclusion** are quite similar to the discussions on the European level. Whereas poverty is understood as a static and unidimensional concept with a focus on the distribution of economic aspects, social exclusion is mostly seen in juxtaposition. It is mostly defined as being dynamic, multidimensional and focusing on relational and socio-cultural aspects, such as participation, integration, engagement etc (Vrooman & Hoff 2004). In contrast to the concept of poverty which is typically analysed at the individual or household level, social exclusion is not only regarded as endogenous, but also derives from a lack of “communal resources” such as social networks and social infrastructure (Jehoel-Gijsberts & Vrooman 2007). A distinction is made between the state of social exclusion and the risk factors which increase the risk of social exclusion. As a consequence, indicators such as risk of poverty and the share of jobless households used in the European definition are not regarded as characteristics of social exclusion but as risk factors of it.

Other **definitions of poverty**, however, use the concept more or less synonymous with social exclusion and define poverty as a deficiency in the material as well as cultural and social sphere. In this case, the only distinction that still remains between poverty and social exclusion concepts is that the latter one always involves different dimensions while poverty relates only to the financial aspect. Especially the Netherlands Institute for Social Research refers to different characteristics of social exclusion and distinguishes between the concept of socio-cultural exclusion with inadequate social participation and insufficient cultural and normative integration on the one hand, and economic-structural exclusion with the characteristics of material deprivation and inadequate access to government and semi-government provisions on the other hand (Vrooman & Hoff 2004). Similar to other European concepts, social exclusion is often related to specific risk groups or risk factors such as single-parent families, members of non-Western ethnic minorities, unskilled labour or low educational level (Jehoel-Gijsberts & Vrooman 2007). A strong focus lays on social exclusion among children. In the Dutch context, neighbourhood effects as well as links between segregation and integration are investigated intensively (Murie & Musterd 2004).

The **indicators used** differ a little from the European-wide ones, especially in terms of poverty. Besides the relative poverty threshold of 60% of the median disposal income, there are two further indicators used: the low-income threshold and the so called social policy minimum. The former is based on the social assistance benefit level for a single person made in 1979 (Vroomann & Hoff 2004). It is indexed in line with the inflation rate and equivalence factors are used for multiple-person households. The social policy minimum is adopted by the government in the social

legislation and refers to the applicable social assistance benefit level or the state retirement pension. Supplementary indicators such as long-term poverty, wealth position of the household (balance of assets less debts) as well as the subjective perception are integrated as well. The Netherlands Institute for Social Research tried to develop an index for social exclusion (Hoff & Vrooman, 2011). In contrast to the European approach which is limited to socioeconomic indicators, this definition is multidimensional and differentiates between characteristics which describe the current state of social exclusion (status characteristics) and risk factors which increase the chance of social exclusion (Vroomann & Hoff 2004). The index entails indicators representing the mentioned four characteristics: material deprivation (e.g. has difficulties in making ends meet, cannot afford basic expenditures), access to institutions and housing (e.g. refused by commercial service organisations, unsafe feeling in neighbourhood), social participation (e.g. experiences lack of social contacts, has little social support) as well as cultural/normative integration (e.g. trespassing the law is no problem as long as one does not get caught, people with a paid job may moonlight for up to 150 Euro a month).

Switzerland

The **scientific debate about poverty** in Switzerland seems to follow the discourse in other European countries. It is emphasized that new research about poverty is increasingly dealing with terms like integration and exclusion. The poverty concept goes beyond the question of income and material supply (Mäder 2009). Research about **social exclusion** seems to have a clear theoretical-conceptual focus. Concepts and theories of Foucault, Luhmann, Bourdieu or Castel are analysed in order to develop a new inclusion and exclusion concept (Bohn 2008; Windolf 2009, Stichweh 2009). In some articles, the legitimacy of exclusion and especially the classification in inside and outside the society is criticised. It is argued that there are no socially vacant spaces in society. As a consequence, a social “outside” does not exist; exclusion leads into another form of inclusion (Stichweh 2009).

Poverty plays a role in some political discussions. A growing risk of poverty and a huge amount of social inheritance of poverty is mentioned. The focus of political debates about fighting poverty and disintegration lays on measures for professional integration into the labour market; a lack of education is seen as the most important poverty risk factor (Städteinitiative Sozialpolitik sociale 2007; Städteinitiative Sozialpolitik 2008). Children and young adults as well as early retired and care-dependent people are identified as the most vulnerable groups in terms of poverty. “Projets urbains” is an area-based initiative which shall promote social integration in neighborhoods and improve the quality of life of its inhabitants. The project consists of an integrated approach combining physical renewal, migration and safety measures with social projects (Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung ARE 2010; Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung ARE 2012). In this context, the concept of social mixture and its feasibility are discussed (Schulte-Haller 2011).

References

Behaghel, L., 2008. Poverty and Social Exclusion in Rural Areas. Final Report. [online] Available at:

http://www.parisschoolofeconomics.com/behaghel-luc/rural_poverty_annex_fr_en.pdf

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Bohn, C., 2008. Inklusion und Exklusion: Theorien und Befunde. Von der Ausgrenzung aus der Gemeinschaft zur inkludierenden Exklusion. *Soziale Systeme* 14(2), 171-190.

Böhnke, P., 2001. Nothing Left to Lose? Poverty and Social Exclusion in Comparison Empirical Evidence on Germany. Berlin: Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB). [online] Available at:

<http://skylla.wz-berlin.de/pdf/2001/iii01-402.pdf>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Böhnke, P. 2005. Teilhabechancen und Ausgrenzungsrisiken in Deutschland. Aus *Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung *Das Parlament*, 37, pp. 31-37.

Böhnke, P., 2001. Nothing Left to Lose? Poverty and Social Exclusion in Comparison. Empirical Evidence on Germany. [online] Available at:

<http://skylla.wz-berlin.de/pdf/2001/iii01-402.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Bruto Da Costa, A.; Cardoso, A.; Baptista, I. & P. Perista, 2003. The dynamics of income poverty and social exclusion in Portugal. In: E. Apospori & J. Millar, ed. *The Dynamics of Social Exclusion in Europe. Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, pp. 114-138.

Buhr, P. & S. Leibfried, 2009. Ist die Armutsbevölkerung in Deutschland exkludiert? In: R. Stichweh, P. Windolf, ed. *Inklusion und Exklusion: Analysen zur Sozialstruktur und sozialen Ungleichheit*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 103-122.

Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales (BMAS), 2004. Nationaler Aktionsplan zur Bekämpfung von Armut und sozialer Ausgrenzung 2003-2005. Aktualisierung 2004. [online] Available at:

http://www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Publikationen/nationaler-aktionsplan-2003-2005-aktualisierung2004.pdf;jsessionid=316BC860F56D9192E019FD9A53867E7D?__blob=publicationFile

[Accessed 25 Ma 2012]

Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung ARE, 2010. Programm Projets urbains – Gesellschaftliche Integration in Wohngebieten. [online] Available at:

<http://www.news.admin.ch/NSBSubscriber/message/attachments/21574.pdf>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung ARE, 2012. Infobrief Programm Projets urbains. [online] Available at:

<http://www.are.admin.ch/themen/agglomeration/00630/02258/index.html?lang=de>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales (BMAS), 2008. Life situations in Germany. The German Federal Government's 3rd Report on Poverty and Wealth. Executive Summary. [online] Available at:

http://www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Publikationen/forschungsprojekt-a333-dritter-armuts-und-reichtumsbericht-englisch_kurzfassung.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS), 2008. Status Report The Programme „Social City“ (Soziale Stadt) Summary. [online] Available at:

http://www.sozialestadt.de/en/veroeffentlichungen/statusbericht-kurzfassung_en.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Bureau International de Trabalho, 2003. A Luta contra a Pobreza e a Exclusão Social em Portugal. [online] Available at:

http://www.ilo.org/public/portugue/region/eurpro/lisbon/pdf/pub_luta.

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Campaert, G. & N. Van Herck, 2010. The poverty policy in Belgium. D. Dierckx; N. Van Herck & J. Vranke, ed. Poverty in Belgium. Leuven: Uitgeverij Acco, pp. 61-73

Capucha, L.; das Dores, M.; Bernardo, J.; Madelino, F.; Calado, A.; Correia, S.V. & A.R. Cruz e Silva, 2005. Formulação de Propostas de Concepção Estratégica das Intervenções Operacionais no Domínio da Inclusão Social. [online] Available at:

www.qren.pt/download.php?id=69

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Caritas Luxembourg, 2010. Kinderarmut in Luxemburg. Bildungsförderung in der frühen Kindheit gegen die soziale Vererbung von Armut. [online] Available at:

<http://www.caritas.lu/Files/Publications/Kinderarmut%20in%20Luxemburg.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Centre d'analyse stratégique, 2011. Des « effets de quartier » à la politique de la ville. Perspectives internationales. [online] Available at :

<http://www.strategie.gouv.fr/content/colloque-des-effets-de-quartier-la-politique-de-la-ville-perspectives-internationales>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Chambre de travail, 2007. Armut in Luxemburg. [online] Available at:

www.csl.lu/component/rubberdoc/doc/83/raw

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Combat Poverty, Insecurity and Social Exclusion Service, 2007. Armut bekämpfen. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven. [online] Available at:

<http://www.armutsbekaempfung.be/Zweijahresbericht2007.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Damon, J., 2008. Measuring Poverty in order to Eradicate It.

Damon, J., 2012. Les Chiffres de la Pauvreté : Le Sens de la Mesure. Fondapol, Fondation pour L'Innovation Politique.

Dangschat, J.S., 2004. Segregation – ein Indikator für Desintegration? Journal für Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung, 6(2), pp. 6-31.

de Haan, A., 2001. Social Exclusion : Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation. [online] Available at:

<http://www.admin.susx.ac.uk/cspt/documents/issue2-2.pdf>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Drever, A.I., 2004. Seperate Spaces, Seperate Outcomes? Neighbourhood Impacts on Minorities in Germany. Urban Studies, 41(8), pp. 1423-1439.

Duvivier, R.; Noel, D. & V. Van Kerrebroeck, 2010. Over-indebtedness: measures, causes and connctions with poverty. D. Dierckx; N. Van Herck & J. Vranke, ed. Poverty in Belguim. Leuven: Uitgeverij Acco, pp. 125-150.

Hanesch, W., 2011. Deutschland verabschiedet sich vom Kampf gegen Armut und soziale Ausgrenzung. Stellungnahme der Nationalen Armutskonferenz (nak) zum deutschen Nationalen Reformprogramm im Rahmen der Strategie Europa 2020. [online] Available at:

http://nationalearmutskonferenz.de/data/nak-Stellungnahme_zum_NRP.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Glasze, G. & F. Weber, 2010. Drei Jahrezehnte area-basierte Stadtpolitik in Frankreich: die politique de la ville. Bearbeitung gesellschaftlicher Probleme mittels raumorientierter Ansätze? Raumforschung und Raumordnung, 68(6), pp. 459-470.

Governo de Portugal, 2003. Plano Nacional de Acção para a Inclusão Portugal. [online] Available at:

http://www.gep.msss.gov.pt/estudos/peis/pnai0608_pt.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Häußermann, H., 2006. Desintegration durch Stadtpolitik? Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament, 40-41, pp. 14-22.

Häußermann, H. & M. Kronauer, 2009. Räumliche Segregation und innerstädtisches Ghetto. In: R. Stichweh, P. Windolf, ed. Inklusion und Exklusion: Analysen zur Sozialstruktur und sozialen Ungleichheit. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 157-173.

Häußermann, H.; Schwarze, K.; Jaedicke, W., Bär, G. & Bugenhagen, I., 2010. Möglichkeiten der verbesserten sozialen Inklusion in der Wohnumgebung. [online] Available at:

http://www.bmas.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/PDF-Publikationen/forschungsprojekt-a400.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Hoff, S. & C. Vrooman, 2011. Dimensions of Social Exclusion. Towards an improved measurement instrument. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Jamet, St., 2007. Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion in France. OECD Economics Department Working Papers, 569, OECD Publishing. [online] Available at:

<http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/download/fulltext/5l4jmm083mjk.pdf?expires=1338022222&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=BF932CBB08A86EA46E2CCEC4825F16A8>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Jehoel-Gijsbers, G. & C. Vrooman, 2007. Explaining Social Exclusion. A theoretical model tested in the Netherlands. The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/SCP.

Kneip, R., 2008. Solutions de logement pour les personnes sans domicile. [online] Available at:

http://www.feantsa.org/files/Housing_Annual_Theme/National_Reports/Luxembourg_logement_exclusion_2008_FR.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Lisboa, M.; Pereirinha, J.A.; Peixoto, J.; Teixeira Dias, A.L. ; Patrício, J. ; do Rosário Rosa, M. & Z. Barroso, 2010. Sistema Integrado de Informação e Conhecimento. [online] Available at:

http://195.23.38.178/siicportal/files/siic-201111SIIC_EIF_CD_MP.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Mäder, U., 2009. Draußen im Drinnen: Integration durch Ausschluss? In: F. Kessl & H.-U. Otto, ed. Soziale Arbeit ohne Wohlfahrtsstaat? Zeitdiagnose, Problematisierungen und Perspektiven. Weinheim und München: Juventa Verlag, pp. 35-52.

Meyers, C.; Milmeister, P. & H. Willems, 2010. Armutsrisiken bei Kindern und Jugendlichen in Luxemburg. [online] Available at:

http://www.forum.lu/pdf/artikel/6994_300_MeyersMilmeisterWillems.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Ministère de la Famille et de l'Intégration, 2010. Rapport national sur la situation de la jeunesse au Luxembourg. [online] Available at:

<http://www.mfi.public.lu/publications/RapportNationalSituationJeunesse/RapportIntegral.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Murie, A. & S. Musterd, 2004. Social Exclusion and Opportunity Structures in European Cities and Neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*, 41(8), pp. 1441-1459.

National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion, 2006. Report by the National Observatory on Poverty and Social Exclusion 2005-2006. [online] Available at:

<http://www.onpes.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/rapport2005anglais.pdf>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Nicaise, I.; Morissens, A. & S. Cincinnato, 2009. Registering, surveying and counting homeless people in Belgium. [online] Available at:

<http://www.trp.dundee.ac.uk/research/mphasis/papers/PPMphasisBEEN.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Nicaise, I. & I. Schockaert, n.y. The „SILC-CUT“ Survey. [online] Available at:

www.feantsa.org/files/freshstart/.../silccut.ppt

[Accessed 25 Ma 2012]

Parlament der deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft, 2009. Armut bekämpfen – Entwicklungen und Perspektiven. Ein Beitrag zur politischen Debatte und zur politischen Aktion. [online] Available at:

http://www.armutsbekaempfung.be/publications/2008-2009_D_88_2_52620doc%5B1%5D.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Paugam, S., 2005. Les forms élémentaires de la pauvreté. Paris : Presses universitaires de France.

Raileanu Szeles, M., 2007. The patterns and causes of social exclusion in Luxembourg. In: centre d'Études de Pauvreté et de Politiques Socio-Economiques, ed. EPS Working Papers. [online] Available at :

<http://iriss.ceps.lu/documents/irisswp77.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Rodrigues, E.V.; Samagaio, F.; Ferreira, H.; Mendes, M.M. & S. Januário, 1999. A pobreza e a Exclução Social: Teorias, Conceitos e Políticas Sociais em Portugal. [online] Available at:

<http://ler.letras.up.pt/uploads/ficheiros/1468.pdf>

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Schulte-Haller, 2011. Soziale Mischung und Quartiersentwicklung: Anspruch versus Machbarkeit. [online] Available at:

<http://www.wohnen-nachhaltigkeit.ch/wirtschaft/2-1-gebaeude-bausubstanz/2-1-1-standort/190>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Secrétariat general du CIV, 2010. Taking action for the residents of deprived urban areas. [online] Available at:

<http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/corporate/pdf/taking-action-for-deprived-urban-areas.pdf>

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Städteinitiative Sozialpolitik, 2007. Sozialpolitik öffnen und vernetzt handeln. Städteinitiative Sozialpolitik: Strategie 2015. [online] Available at:

http://staedteinitiative.ch/cmsfiles/broschuere_kurz_d.pdf

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Städteinitiative Sozialpolitik, 2008. Im Spiegel des Arbeitsmarkts: Armut und Sozialhilfe in Schweizer Städten. [online] Available at:

http://staedteinitiative.ch/cmsfiles/broschure_de.pdf

[Accessed 26 May 2012]

Vandermotten, C.; Marissal, P.; Van Hamme, G.; Kesteloot, C., Slegers, K.; Broucke, L.V.; Ippersiel, B.; de Bethune, S. & R. Naiken, 2006. Dynamic Analysis of Deprived Neighbourhoods in the Belgian Urban Regions. [online] Available at:

http://www.mi-is.be/sites/default/files/doc/atlas_of_troubled_neighbourhoods__en.pdf

[Accessed 25 May 2012]

Vranken, J., 2010. Introduction. In: D. Dierckx; N. Van Herck & J. Vranke, ed. Poverty in Belgium. Leuven: Uitgeverij Acco, pp. 19-34.

Vrooman, C. & S. Hoff, 2004. *The Poor Side of the Netherlands*. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Wall, K.; Aboim, S.; Cunha, V. & P. Vasconcelos, 2001. Families and informal support networks in Portugal: the reproduction of inequality. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 11(3), pp. 213-233.

Willems, S. & V. Vyncke, 2010. Social disparities in health. A status quaestionis and the policy in Belgium. D. Dierckx; N. Van Herck & J. Vranke, ed. *Poverty in Belgium*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Acco, pp. 151-178.

Appendix 3: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in Mediterranean countries

George Kandyl

EKKE, Athens

Policy considerations I: common trends in the Mediterranean countries

1. The overall social spending in the South European countries increased significantly since the 1980s, thus reducing the gap between them and the highest spenders in the EU by the end of the previous decade. However, in 2008 the percent reduction of the at-risk-of-poverty rate before and after social transfers was systematically lower than the EU 27 average. The recent economic slowdown together with fiscal crisis (most prominent in the case of Greece) creates new questions about the sustainability of welfare expenditures.
2. Public policies and interventions associated to safety nets have developed in a fragmented manner, in the context of a dual labour market (with some workers of the formal in a privileged position and those in the informal sector being severely under-protected) and of a clientelistic political system. The recognition of this fact has led to institutional reform agendas that are strongly connected with the integration of the Mediterranean countries in the EU.
3. One important element of this institutional reform is the priority given to the decentralization of the national welfare systems. The tradition of a decentralized welfare system is more prominent in Spain (where exclusive regional competence on social assistance was institutionalized by the 1978 Constitution), but it is also a key feature of civil administration restructuring in Italy and Greece.
4. In the process of welfare system modernization, efforts are made to mobilize the civil society and support the active participation of non-state stakeholders and the third sector in the delivery of welfare services.
5. Decentralization as well as increased participation are not technical issues and may be implemented in ways that are often politically diverse and with a diversified social impact.

Policy considerations II: common concerns in the Mediterranean countries

1. The Mediterranean countries are characterized by comparatively low employment rates in a European context, especially concerning the participation of women (although this is rapidly changing) and young people in the labour market. The task to increase employment rates in accordance with the Lisbon and the EU 2020 strategy is associated with a welfare-to-work approach which could disturb traditional gender roles in social reproduction.
2. Family networks have been of crucial importance in providing individualized safety nets and combating P & SE, as in the case of housing provision and access to home-ownership. However having an employment anchor in the guaranteed sector is of great importance for every single family.

3. A large part of total welfare spending is devoted to pensions. Poverty rates among aged persons are slightly above the European (EU27) average but the pension system reform under fears of population ageing might worsen the living conditions of the elderly.
4. Child poverty seems to be more widespread, especially concerning children in single-parent households. Early school leaving requires intervention to support vulnerable families.
5. Concerning immigrant groups, the adoption of legalization procedures in the two previous decades supported integration in the 'host' societies. On the other hand, the Mediterranean countries continue to receive immigrants who find themselves entrapped in conditions of 'illegality' and poor integration opportunities. Discriminations in the labour and housing markets and in other fields of social life add up to the impoverishment and social exclusion of immigrant and minority groups.

Co-variates

Indicators of poverty and social exclusion are a powerful tool for monitoring progress in the reduction of these problems. However, although considerable debate has taken place in recent years, there is no *universal agreement* on the choice of the most suitable indicators. The differences around the world were uncovered by the United Nations Statistical Division's (UNSD) global survey of poverty measurement approaches, conducted in the period of 2004-5. Undoubtedly, the greatest differences are found between the developed and less developed countries. However, the differences between developed countries were found to be minor, helping the comparisons across countries and across time.

The differences between European Union countries are totally absent. A review of the literature suggests that the choice of indicators depends on the aim of the study or the paradigm of the researcher, rather than on cross country differences. For example, a review of the literature for Italy shows the lack of agreement on the choice of indicators for the same country. Some scholars use poverty lines of income or consumption (usually the threshold of the line ranges from 40% to 60% of the median income). For instance, the poverty line is defined as half the mean (median) of the income variable by Addabbo and Baldini (2000), Brandolini et al. (2001), Brasini and Tassinari (2004) and Andriani and Karyampas (2010). Other scholars, following the Statistical Office of the European Commission, set the poverty line at 60 percent of the median income (see for example Quintano et al. 2004, Devicienti et al. 2010, Baldini and Ciani , 2011).

On the other hand, other scholars, using a multidimensional approach of poverty (more related with social exclusion), apply composite indicators. For example, Devicienti et al. (2010) use a composite indicator including 13 variables (e.g. color TV, a car or van, a microwave, eating meat or fish every other day, having friends or family for a drink or meal at least once a month) where in each case the lack of possession is indicative of a household's inability to afford the item due to its financial

situation. Quintano et al. (2004) use 24 variables (e.g. a holiday at least once a year, ability to afford a car, inadequate space and light, experience of arrears for scheduled payments), divided into five groups. Dagum and Costa (2004) use variables such as household equivalent disposable income, gender, age and job status, educational achievement, professional occupation, household size and number of bathrooms in the household residence. Finally, Andriani and Karyampas (2010) investigate social exclusion in Italy using the rate of unemployment, the proportion of households facing housing problems and facing difficulties in purchasing necessary goods, and the percentage of individuals having the elementary license as the highest degree of education.

Similar indicators, however, have been used not only for countries of southern Europe such as Spain (see for example Calvo et al 2010), Portugal (see for example ILO, 2004) and Greece (see for example Tsakloglou 2000, Aggelopoulou et al. 2011) but also for the other countries of the EU (see for example Muffels et al., 2000, Didier and Ruud, 2000, Brewer et al. 2009, Smith and Middleton, 2007).

References

- Addabbo T. and Baldini M. (2000), *Poverty dynamics and social transfers in Italy in the early 1990s*, *International Journal of Manpower*, 21(3):291-321
- Aggelopoulou D., Zografakis S. and Sypsas P. (2011), Distribution of poverty and inequality indices for various groups in Greece using the bootstrap technique, *International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research*, 4(2): 81-97
- Andriani L. and Karyampas D. (2010), *Social Capital, Poverty and Social Exclusion in Italy* Birkbeck Working Papers in Economics and Finance, No 1005, University of London
- Baldini M. and Ciani E. (2011), Inequality and poverty during the recession in Italy, *CAPP paper n. 95*, Centro di Analisi delle Politiche Pubbliche.
- Brandolini A., Cipollone P., Sestito P. (2001), Earnings Dispersion, Low Pay and Household Poverty in Italy, 1977-1998", *Temi di discussione*, n. 427, Roma, Banca d'Italia.
- Brasini S. and Tassinari G. (2004) Multiple deprivation, income and poverty in Italy: an analysis based on European Community Household Panel, *Statistica*, 4: 673-696
- Brewer M., Muriel A., Phillips D. and Sibietta L. (2009), *Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2009*, Commentary no. 109, Institute for Fiscal Studies, London.
- Calvo, L., Sanchez C. and Cortina P. (2010), Joint estimation of the characteristics and intensity of poverty in Spain: The case of Imputed Rent, *Economics Research International*, vol. 2010, Article ID 854634.
- Dagum C. and Costa M. (2004), Analysis and Measurement of Poverty, Univariate and Multivariate Approaches and their Policy Implications: A Case Study of Italy, in Dagum C. and Ferrari, G. (eds) *Household Behaviour, Equivalence Scales, Welfare and Poverty*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Germany.
- Devicienti F., Gualtieri V. and Rossi M. (2010), The dynamics and persistence of poverty: evidence from Italy. No.173, Collegio Carlo Alberto.
- ILO (2004), *The fight against poverty and social exclusion in Portugal: experiences from the National Programme of Fight against Poverty*, Geneva, ILO.
- Muffels R., Fouarge D., Dekker R. (2000), *Longitudinal poverty and income inequality: a comparative panel study for the Netherlands, Germany and the UK*, *MPRA Paper No. 13298*
- Quintano C., Castellano R., and D'Agostino A. (2004), Modeling the incidence of poverty in Italy: A comparison of three statistical methods, *Quaderni di discussione* 24, Istituto di Statistica e Matematica, Università degli Studi di Napoli, Parthenope", Napoli.

Smith N. and Middleton S. (2007), *A review of poverty dynamics research in the UK*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Tsakoglou P. (2000), Poverty and Anti-Poverty Policies in Greece and a Comparison with Other Mediterranean EU Member States, in *Contemporary Greece and Europe*, edited by A. Mitsos, and E. Mossialos. Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 331-355.

Appendix 4: Concepts of poverty and social exclusion in the East European Member States

Gergely Tagai Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Concepts of poverty

In the poverty literature of the New Member States of the European Union the general approaches and the definition of poverty follow broadly the trends of international poverty researches since the 1990s, while in different situation (questions, phenomena etc.) different elements of the concepts are emphasized. Within these ranges three main approaches dominate the poverty definitions of East European countries. One is linked with the narrow income-based concept of poverty or more reductionist approaches like that (from Poland) which identifies “poor” as those who apply to institutions for social assistance (Golinowska, 2002). In many countries an absolute income based poverty definition is connected to the identification of poor people as those whose incomes' are less than the social minimum (or minimal subsistence level) calculated by the national government (e.g. in Poland, in the Baltic States or also in Czech Republic and Slovakia) – see Milanovic, 1992; UNDP, 2000; Einasto, 2002; Paas, 2003. However, in some of these countries there is no explicit definition of poverty line which is only considered equivalent to these definitions (UNDP, 2000). For example, in Poland economists and statisticians apply nine different poverty measures (Tarkowska, 2008). The poverty in this meaning is only conventional and is relevant only in a specific context, limited both in space and time.

Beside the numeric interpretation income based poverty, material deprivation poverty is often quoted in East Europe as a poverty concept and it refers to a set of basic necessary units, which a person cannot obtain due to economic difficulties (UNDP, 2000; Einasto, 2002; Szukielojc-Bienkunska, 2005). The combination of income-based and material deprivation approaches forms a relative concept of poverty which defines the phenomenon as the absence of income and other resources ensuring living standards acceptable to the public (UNDP, 2000; Ferge, 2002; Golinowska, 2002; Trumm, 2002; Molnár, 2009). In this sense, poverty limits a human's chance to live a free, long, healthy and creative life in an adequate environment (Reynolds, 2000). This definition appears in the academic and policy papers of several countries, for example Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary. In these countries the concept is spread since the late 1990s and early 2000s when as being candidate countries of the EU they took over the directives of EU (and United Nations) which have already laid down before.

The adaptation to these international principles is also related to the nature of poverty in the post-socialist New Member States of EU. It is referred that this definition of poverty is quite new to these countries (Jonkaryte–Stankuniene, 2003; Trumm,

2011). Poverty was not a new phenomenon to the East European societies but it had other characteristics than it has today (Milanovic, 1998; Ferge 2002; Havasi, 2002). The so-called “old poverty” was related to the stages of life cycle (e.g. that of the elderly) (Vecernik, 2004). In the current conceptualization of poverty in post-socialist NMSs the key factor is socio-economic transition of the 1990s (Kutsar, 1995). Under the socialist regime these countries were characterized by more egalitarian income distribution than western market economies (Paas, 2003). Economic reforms and structural adjustment as consequences of the transition and the EU integration processes had their negative impacts with reduction of real incomes and the fast increase of inequalities and unemployment (Golinowska, 2002; Paas, 2003; Vecernik, 2004). These processes lead to alternate interpretations of poverty, which doesn't fit simply to absolute financial deprivation. Despite after the stress of transformation the economy of the East European countries showed an impressive improvement, poverty status of many social groups remained. In this situation the self assessment of households on their own economic situation doesn't fit to the image of the situation being interpreted through different poverty lines: the subjective and objective poverty can differ, and the latter often does not reflect the real situation (Kutsar–Trumm, 1993). Under these conditions the more relative approaches of poverty fit better to the interpretation of the phenomenon in post-socialist NMSs, and it doesn't mean only the mechanical adaptation of EU directives and international “standards”.

The other thing which makes reject the conception of poverty as absolute financial deprivation that many academic and policy papers (for example from Hungary, Poland, Estonia, Lithuania etc.) claims that poverty in the East-European countries is multidimensional (Stankuniene, 1998; Paas, 2003). However there is also a confusion over the question of multidimensionality. The statement that “poverty is multidimensional” could mean that 1) poverty itself relates to income but the causes of poverty are multidimensional or 2) also the concept of poverty is multidimensional and relates to more than just income (Paas, 2003). That the causes of poverty are multidimensional, it is reflected in the interpretation of processes of the socio-economic transition of the area after 1990. The “new” poverty of these countries is related mainly to the economic status of people, nevertheless poverty status is strongly affected by other factors, like educational attainment (Noncheva, 1997; Golinowska, 2002; Jonkaryte–Stankuniene, 2003; Vecernik, 2004). Besides, it can also be said that poverty relates not just to income status but to the absence other material resources of living and to the inability to participate in social, cultural or civic life of the society (Jonkaryte–Stankuniene, 2003; Trumm 2011). In these sense, terms “poverty” and “social exclusion” in East European literature are frequently used in the same context, even synonymously (e.g. Simonyi 2002; Paas, 2003).

Concepts of social exclusion

The academic and policy literature in many East European members states of the European Union discuss the conception of social exclusion by the recommendations of the European Commission or the United Nations Development Program (Aasland–Flotten, 2001; Paas, 2003; Rajevska, 2006) or based on the concept of social exclusion of Atkinson (e.g. Romania – European Training Foundation 2000) or – like in Slovenia – through the well-known principles of Allardt about basic needs (Vidmar, 2000). In these countries the widespread adaptation of these internationally accepted approaches of social exclusion is just partly due to the unification of basic principles of social affairs with the adherence to the Community. Until the 2000s there was little understanding for social exclusion in many of the East European countries. Social exclusion was reduced to a problem of dysfunction of social systems and often was replaced by poverty as a synonym of it. Many reports on social issues is titled „poverty and social exclusion” without the differentiation of the two terms.

The interrelationship between poverty and social exclusion is explained by East European authors as they differ only in the vantage points from which they are investigated (Havasi, 2002). By describing an outcome or a condition in which people have been deprived, one can identify poverty, while exclusion reflects more to the processes leading to poverty (Einasto, 2002; Havasi, 2002; Strategy of the Slovak Republic... 2011). Considering social exclusion as being a process, its relation with poverty can be interpreted by the different poverty types which reflect the different stages in the process of becoming impoverished (Einasto, 2002). In the interpretation of several East European authors another characteristics of the interrelationship between poverty and social exclusion can also be discovered by regarding social exclusion as being not just a cause but as well as a consequence of poverty – as a serious consequence of poverty is exclusion of a part of population from the socio-economic participation in society life (e.g. Paas, 2003).

Beside the interrelationship of the two phenomena the differences are also often stressed. The main basis of that is that poverty is mainly related to individuals and households, while social exclusion is rather regarded through its relations to society and the individuals' relations with the state and the society (Trbanc, 2001; Paas, 2003). In this sense it can be claimed that social exclusion is more related to needs, which are neglected by the society. And the reason for NMSs academic and policy papers on social issues emphasize the differences of the two phenomena is that they reflect differently to the socio-economic situation of the society of these countries. In many countries like Bulgaria, Hungary or Slovakia the indicators of social exclusion shows a worse situation than poverty indices. Or as a Czech study tells, when it comes to comparing some indicators of social exclusion (e.g. unemployment of Roma or people with disabilities), the Czech Republic is among the countries with unfavourable conditions in the EU. While the country itself is said to be one with the lowest levels of income poverty (Sirovatka–Rákoczyová, 2007).

It is also claimed that conception of social exclusion emerges in the case of post-socialist New Member states of the EU as this phenomenon more fully reveals the contemporary social situation than material poverty does (Golinowska, 2009). Many manifestations of the negative consequences of the socio-economic transformation in the area are relatively new ones (as unemployment, homelessness, housing financial defects etc.) (Stankuniene, 1998; Golinowska, 2009). And they cannot be treated by the same way like poverty. Many distribution problems of poverty can be remedied fairly easy with a (better) job and some money, but the exclusion from the society by different ways has no short-term escape route. The victims of exclusion have lost or had never built up the relations binding their lives to mainstream society (Szalai, 2002). With the several changes of the resources and institutions related to social issues in the post-socialist countries, the well-being of the individuals has also been affected, and the possibility of their social and economic integration has also been changed (Trbanc, 2001). (Became worse.)

In the conception of social exclusion based on the East European „situation” it is also said – but it may be more international characteristics – that problems associated with social exclusion need to be approached and analysed from the perspective of wider development context (UNDP, 2006). For example with the background information about the mechanisms of globalization, the information revolution, and the changes in economic structure and on the labour market (Golinowska, 2009). In this sense, for the post-socialist member states of the European Union the issue of social exclusion became especially important in the context of the global financial and economic crisis after 2008 (European Commission 2008).

With reference with this, in the interpretation of the general social exclusion situation in Another key point of the explanation of social exclusion in the East-European NMSs is that exclusion endangers social groups more than individuals (like in the case of poverty). Belonging to underprivileged groups or minority social groups, who are at higher risk of facing social exclusion gives the direction of the interpretation of social exclusion (Tökke, 2011). Thus, the knowledge and the identification of these multiply marginalized groups (like Roma population, people living in small villages, people with disabilities, families with children) and the way they suffer from disadvantages is particularly important for the countries (Trbanc, 2001; Szalai, 2002; European Commission 2008).

References

- Aasland, A. – Flotten, T. 2001: Ethnicity and Social Exclusion in Estonia and Latvia. – *Europe-Asia Studies*. Volume 53, Issue 7, pp. 1023–1049.
- Einasto, M. 2002: Income and Deprivation Poverty, 1994 and 1999. Kutsar, D. (ed.): *Living Conditions in Estonia Five Years Later*. University of Tartu, Fafo Institute for Applied Social Research, Tartu University Press.
- European Commission 2008: *National Strategy Report on social Protection and Social Inclusion, Bulgaria, 2008–2010*.
- European Training Foundation 2000: *Vocational Education and Training Against Social Exclusion, Romania*. Country report. Bucharest.
- Ferge Zs. 2002: Struktúra és egyenlőtlenségek a régi államszocializmusban és az újkapitalizmusban. – *Szociológiai Szemle*. Issue 4, pp. 9–33.
- Golinowska, S. 2002: Poverty in Poland: Causes, Measures and Studies. *Poverty Dynamics in Poland - Selected Quantitative Analyses*. CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research. pp. 11-36.
- Golinowska, S. 2009: The National Model of the Welfare State in Poland. Tradition and Changes. *Diversity and Commonality in European Social Policies: The Forging of a European Social Model*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar Friedreich Ebert Stiftung, Warsaw, pp. 213–260.
- Havasi É. 2002: Szegénység és társadalmi kirekesztettség a mai Magyarországon. – *Szociológiai Szemle*. Issue 4, pp. 51–71.
- Jonkaryte, A. – Stankuniene, V. 2003: *Lithuania: Mother's Employment and Children's Poverty*. UNICEF Innocenti Research Center.
- Kutsar, D. – Trumm, A. 1993: Poverty among Households in Estonia. *International Journal of Social Welfare*. Volume 2, Issue 3, pp. 128–141.
- Kutsar, D. 1995: Social change and stress in Estonia. *International Journal of Social Welfare*. Volume 4, Issue 2, pp. 94–107.
- Milanovic, B. 1992: Poverty in Poland, 1978-88. *Review of Income and Wealth Series*. 38, Number 3.
- Molnár, M. 2009: Development and poverty in Romania. – *MegaByte*. Volume. 9, Issue 1 (May 2010), pp. 103–109.
- Noncheva, T. 1997: *Poverty in Bulgaria – Researches and Debates*. Centre for the Study of Democracy, Sofia.
- Paas, T. 2003a: *Social Consequences of Transition and European Integration Process in the Baltic States*. Paper for the ERSA (European Regional Science Association) Conference, Jyväskylä, August, 2003.

Paas, T. 2003b: Poverty and Social Exclusion as Consequences of Transition and EU Enlargement in the Case of the Baltic States. *The European Union Enlargement Social and Economic Impacts*.

Rajevska, F. (ed.) 2006: *Insiders' View about Social Inclusion and Social Security in Latvia*. Fafo report, 527.

Reynolds, M. 2000: A Comparison of the Draft Poverty Reduction Strategies of the Baltic States. In UNDP: *Poverty Reduction in Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia, 2000*. Riga.

Simonyi 2002: Családok peremhelyzetben városon és falun. *Szociológiai Szemle*. Issue 4, pp. 131–142.

Sirovatka, T. – Rákoczyová, M. 2007: *The Strategy of Social Inclusion in the Czech Republic*. Paper to be presented at the ESPAnet conference, Vienna, Sept. 20-21, 2007.

Stankuniene, V. 1998: *Family Well-being and Fertility in Transition to Market Economy: the case of Lithuania*. Committee for International Cooperation in National Research in Demography [CICRED]

Strategy of the Slovak Republic for the integration of Roma up to 2020. 2011

Szalai, J. 2002: A társadalmi kirekesztődés egyes kérdései az ezredforduló Magyarországon. – *Szociológiai Szemle*. Issue 4, pp. 34–50.

Szukielojc-Bienkunska, A. 2005: Poverty and Social Exclusion in Poland. *Seminar on Poverty Measurement. Paris, 30 November – 2 December 2005*.

Tarkowska, E. 2008: Poverty and Social Exclusion in Rural Areas – Poland. *Study on Poverty and Social Exclusion in Rural Areas - Final Report*.

Tökke, M. 2011: *Poverty and Social Exclusion in Estonia*. Presentation.

Trbanc, M. 2001: *Social Consequences of Transition in Slovenia: Who is Endangered by Social Exclusion?* Paper presented at the sixth meeting of a COST A13 Working Group on Unemployment, Ljubljana, June 8-9, 2001.

Trumm, A. 2011: Poverty in the Context of Societal Transitions in Estonia. *Dissertationes Sociologicae Universitatis Tartuensis*.

UNDP 2000: *Poverty, Social Exclusion and Marginalization – National Human Development Report of Slovak Republic*

UNDP 2006: *Social Exclusion and Integration in Poland - An Indicator Based Approach*. Ministry of Labour and Social Policy – UNDP.

Vecernik, J. 2004: Who Is Poor in the Czech Republic? The Changing Structure and Faces of Poverty after 1989. – *Czech Sociological Review*. Volume 40, Issue 6, pp. 807–834.

Vidmar, A.K. 2000: *Social Exclusion and Poverty in Slovenia*. „New Governance” and the Social dimension of Enlargement. Brussels, 18 October 2000.

Collection of Policy Documents in Eastern EU			
Country	Author	Title	Place and time of issuing
Romania	Government of Romania	Strategic national report regarding social protection and social inclusion, 2008-2010.	Bucharest, 2008. (http://www.mmuncii.ro/pub/imagemanager/images/file/Rapoarte-Studii/081208Report2008-2010.pdf)
	European Approaches to Inter-Generational Lifelong-Learning	Country Report: Romania	www.eagle-project.eu (http://www.google.hu/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&sqi=2&ved=0CHwQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.eagle-project.eu%2Fwelcome-to-eagle%2Fdownloads%2F2nd%2520EAGLE%2520Flyer%2520Final.pdf&ei=d-GwT9C-HIbi4QSR5dTPCQ&usg=AFQjCNFwg4228yININSzJbF62257MceBOA&sig2=a5QtpGoeFumSEKfEODyXTQ)
	WHO	Poverty and Social exclusion in WHO European Region health system respond.	WHO? Geneva, 2010. 344 p. (http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/115485/E94018.pdf)
	European Training Foundation	Vocational education and training against social exclusion - Country report: Romania.	Bucharest, 2000. 111 p. (http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C125788C00311F89C12571700040BFBA/\$file/NOTE6PUFTP.pdf)
	Government of Romania	European year of combating poverty and social exclusion proposal of activities implementation program. Romania.	Bucharest, 2010. 11 p. (http://www.google.hu/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&ved=0CHQQFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FblobServlet%3FdocId%3D1693%26langId%3Den&ei=KOKwT4K8DKzP4QTepSiCQ&usg=AFQjCNF81Owp6qZLwmXug39SuKAz0w2oeg&sig2=q02dVNQXxHyOeDvBcB-7PA)
Gherghinescu, Oana	Study on poverty and social exclusion in rural areas.	European Commission, 2008. 38 p. (http://www.google.hu/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CHgQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FblobServlet%3FdocId%3D2085%26langId%3Den&ei=ZuKwT96ACura4QTUrIWmCQ&usg=AFQjCNHh0X-L8lcE0mgMyZsFJ63duhrxEA&sig2=kw0kazJrB8D-4VQep4Vmg)	

Bulgaria	Republic of Bulgaria	Joint Memorandum on social inclusion of the Republic of Bulgaria.	Brussels, 2005. 61 p. (http://www.ncedi.government.bg/en/JI_M.pdf)
	Republic of Bulgaria	National Report on the Strategies for social protection and social inclusion of the Republic of Bulgaria 2006-2008.	Sofia, 2006. 76 p. (http://www.mlsp.government.bg/en/docs/index.htm)
	Republic of Bulgaria	National Programme: European year of combating poverty and social exclusion proposal of activities implementation program. Bulgaria.	Sofia, 2010. 15 p. (http://www.google.hu/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CHIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2Fajax%2FblobServlet%3FdocId%3D3708%26langId%3Den&ei=WOOwT82DDYnm4QTh5YWUCQ&usg=AFQjCNGcShLQ2SgPH3C7povFb2UVjzs8pw&sig2=KEB6-gOglU5gY4oAxdOkUQ)
Latvia		POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY IN LATVIA	http://www.un.lv/down/pover/povertyinLatvia.pdf
	SIGITA LAPINA TATJANA SKUBURE	NATIONAL REPORT ON HOMELESSNESS IN LATVIA - For FEANTSA – September 2003	www.feantsa.org/files/enlargement/ngo_Latvia.pdf
	Youth Partnership - Council of Europe EC	FACTSHEET ON SOCIAL INCLUSION/EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IN LATVIA	
		ACTION PLAN of LATVIA European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion (2010)	www.lm.gov.lv/.../sociala.../sociala.../plan_final_eng
		The setting of national poverty targets Latvia	www.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu
	Study financed by the European Commission – Employment and Social Affairs DG	Study on the Social Protection Systems in the 13 Applicant Countries - Latvia Country Report	http://elibrary.zdrave.net/document/EU/Social%20Protection%20Systems/Latvia_draft.pdf
	European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI)	Third report on Latvia Adopted on 29 June 2007	http://hudoc.ecri.coe.int/XML/Ecri/ENGLISH/Cycle_03/03_CbC_eng/LVA-CbC-III-2008-2-ENG.pdf
		“The National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008 – 2010”.	http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?pager.offset=10&langId=hu&mode=advancedSubmit&policyArea=0&subCategory=0&year=0&country=0&type=3&advSearchKey=nsr%20spsi
		“Latvian National Action Plan for Reduction of Poverty and Social Exclusion (2004-2006)”,	http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/nap_incl_2004_lv_en_version.pdf

		“National Report on Strategy for Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2006-2008”	http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/pa_u/docs/age/2007/AGE_2007_MiCA07_CntrRprtLVAAdd3_e.pdf
Hungary		National Strategy report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010	http://www.szmm.gov.hu/download.php?ctag=download&docID=20408
		National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2006-2008	http://www.szmm.gov.hu/download.php?ctag=download&docID=13845
		National Inclusion Plan on Social Exclusion Hungary 2004-2006, July 2004	http://www.szmm.gov.hu/download.php?ctag=download&docID=14303
		JOINT INCLUSION MEMORANDUM HUNGARY	http://www.szmm.gov.hu/download.php?ctag=download&docID=754
Slovenia		NATIONAL REPORT ON STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION 2008–2010	http://www.mddsz.gov.si/fileadmin/mddsz.gov.si/pageuploads/dokumenti_pdf/np_sszsv08_10_en.pdf
		AMENDED NATIONAL REPORT ON STRATEGIES FOR SOCIAL PROTECTION AND SOCIAL INCLUSION 2006-2008	http://www.mddsz.gov.si/fileadmin/mddsz.gov.si/pageuploads/dokumenti_pdf/nap_soc_zascita_dop_an_sep07.pdf
		Building the tools to fight in-work poverty, Slovenia, Liljana Rihter	http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu/peer-reviews/2011/building-the-tools-to-fight-in-work-poverty/slovenia_fr11/download
		JOINT MEMORANDUM ON SOCIAL INCLUSION OF SLOVENIA, 2003	http://www.mddsz.gov.si/fileadmin/mddsz.gov.si/pageuploads/dokumenti_pdf/jim_an.pdf
Estonia	Mare Viies	Report on Recent Developments in the Fields of Poverty and Social Exclusion in Estonia	European Commission, 2004 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Mare Viies	Monitoring and Evaluation of the Estonian National Action Plan for Social Exclusion	European Commission, 2004 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Mare Viies	Regional and Local Implementation of the Estonian National Action Plan for Social Inclusion	European Commission, 2005 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en

Mare Viies	Trends, Recent Developments, "Feeding in" and "Feeding out"	European Commission, 2007 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
Mare Viies	Tackling Child Poverty and Promoting the Social Inclusion of Children	European Commission, 2007 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	National Report on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010	Ministry of Social Affairs, 2008 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Estonian National Programme for the European Year 2010 for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion	Ministry of Social Affairs, 2009 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=637&subCategory=808&type=0&country=15&year=0&advSearchKey=&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Building the tools to fight in-work poverty, Estonia, Kati Lõbu Hede Sinisaar	http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu/peer-reviews/2011/building-the-tools-to-fight-in-work-poverty/estonia_fr11/download
	Health, Labour and Social Life in Estonia 2000-2008	Ministry of Social Affairs, 2009 http://www.sm.ee/fileadmin/meedia/Dokumendid/V2ljaanded/Publikatsioonid/2009/esinduskogumik_2009eng.pdf
Pirjo Turk, Liis Kraut, Sten Anspal, Epp Kallaste	Gender Pay Gap in Estonia: Policy Recommendations	European Commission, 2011 http://www.sm.ee/fileadmin/meedia/Dokumendid/V2ljaanded/Publikatsioonid/2011/Gender_pay_gap_Estonia_recommendations.pdf
Liina Järviste	Gender Equality and Inequality: Attitudes and Situation in Estonia in 2009	Ministry of Social Affairs, 2010 http://www.sm.ee/fileadmin/meedia/Dokumendid/V2ljaanded/Toimetised/2010/series_20103eng.pdf
Hede Sinisaar, Piia Tammpuu	Single-parent Families: Problems, Needs and Policy Measures	Ministry of Social Affairs, 2009 http://www.sm.ee/fileadmin/meedia/Dokumendid/V2ljaanded/Toimetised/2009/series_20094eng.pdf
	Estonia's National Action Plan for Social Inclusion	Ministry of Social Affairs, 2004 http://www.sm.ee/fileadmin/meedia/Dokumendid/Sotsiaalvaldkond/Sotsiaalne_kaasatus/Sotsiaalse_kaitse_ja_kaasatuse_riiklikud_aruanded/National_Action_Plan_for_Social_Inclusion_2004-2006_.pdf

Lithuania		National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010 - Lithuania (2008)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2555&langId=en
		Feeding In And Feeding Out: The Extent Of Synergies Between Growth And Jobs Policies And Social Inclusion Policies Across The Eu - Second Semester Report 2007 - National Reports Lithuania (2007)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5132&langId=en
		Tackling Child Poverty And Promoting The Social Inclusion Of Children In The European Union - Key Lessons - First Semester Report 2007 - National Reports Lithuania (2007)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5160&langId=en
		Regional and local implementation of national action plans on social inclusion in new Member States (2005) - Lithuania (2005)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5232&langId=en
		Monitoring and evaluation of the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2004) - Lithuania (2004)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5256&langId=en
		Evaluation of the implementation of the second National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2003-2005) - Lithuania (2004)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5281&langId=en
		Social protection systems in the 13 candidate countries, including pensions (25/3/2003) - Lithuania (2002)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5476&langId=en
		Social protection systems in the 13 candidate countries, including health care - Lithuania (2002)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5490&langId=en
		Poverty and the formulation of an anti-poverty strategy in Lithuania	www.un.lv/down/pover/povertyinLithuania.pdf
		Razutka R, Poviliunas, A Inwork poverty and labour market segmentation	http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu/peer-reviews/2009/measuring-the-impact-of-active-inclusion
	Razutka R, Poviliunas, A Inwork poverty and labour market segmentation. Lithuania	http://www.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu/peer-reviews/2011/building-the-tools-to-fight-in-work-poverty	
Czech Republic		National Social Report 2012 - Czech Republic (2012)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=7685&langId=en
		JOINT MEMORANDUM ON SOCIAL INCLUSION OF CZECH REPUBLIC, 2003	http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/2059/memo.pdf

		National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010 - Czech Republic (2008)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2540&langId=en
		Feeding In And Feeding Out: The Extent Of Synergies Between Growth And Jobs Policies And Social Inclusion Policies Across The Eu - Second Semester Report 2007 - National Reports Czech Republic (2007)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5122&langId=en
		Tackling Child Poverty And Promoting The Social Inclusion Of Children In The European Union - Key Lessons - First Semester Report 2007 - National Reports Czech Republic (2007)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5149&langId=en
		Regional and local implementation of national action plans on social inclusion in new Member States (2005) - Czech Republic (2005)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5226&langId=en
		Monitoring and evaluation of the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2004) - Czech Republic (2004)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5245&langId=en
		Evaluation of the implementation of the second National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2003-2005) - Czech Republic (2004)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5271&langId=en
		Social protection systems in the 13 candidate countries, including pensions (25/3/2003) - Czech Republic (2002)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5472&langId=en
		Social protection systems in the 13 candidate countries, including health care - Czech Republic (2002)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5486&langId=en
Poland		National Action Plan on Social Inclusion for 2004-2006	Ministry of Social Policy, 2004 http://wiadomosci.ngo.pl/files/01english.ngo.pl/public/nap_incl_2004_final_eng.pdf
	Janusz Czapiński, Tomasz Panek	Social Diagnosis 2009 - The Subjective Quality and Objective Conditions of Life in Poland	Council for Social Monitoring, 2010 http://analizy.mpips.gov.pl/images/stories/publiRaporty/Social%20Diagnosis%202009.pdf
		National Implementation Programme for the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion	European Commission, 2009 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=637&subCategory=808&type=0&country=18&year=0&advSearchKey=&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en

		National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, 2008 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=3&country=18&year=0&advSearchKey=social+inclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Irena Wóycicka	Tackling Child Poverty and Promoting the Social Inclusion of Children	European Commission, 2007 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=0&country=18&year=0&advSearchKey=poverty&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Irena Wóycicka	The Fight Against Poverty and Social Exclusion	European Commission, 2004 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=0&country=18&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Irena Wóycicka	The Implementation of the National Action Plan of Social Inclusion at Regional and Local Level	European Commission, 2005 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=0&country=18&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Irena Wóycicka	Trends, Recent Developments, "Feeding in" and "Feeding out"	European Commission, 2007 http://ec.europa.eu/social/keyDocuments.jsp?policyArea=&type=0&country=18&year=0&advSearchKey=social+exclusion&mode=advancedSubmit&langId=en
	Irena Wóycicka	Child Poverty and Child-well Being in the European Union - Policy Overview and Policy Impact Analysis	European Commission, 2010 http://www.tarki.hu/en/research/childpoverty/case_studies/childpoverty_poland.pdf
Slovakia	UNDP	Millenium Development Goals, Reducing poverty and Social Exclusion, Slovak Republik	2004, Bratislava, http://europeandcis.undp.org/poverty/show/97465000-F203-1EE9-BFC92D6DF1303A0E
	UNDP	National Human Development Report Slovak Republic 2000	http://www.cphr.sk/english/undp2000.htm , http://www.cphr.sk/english/undp2000en_06_part3.pdf
	Zuzana Kusá	Promoting the Social Inclusion of Roma, A Study of National Policies	2011, EC, http://www.google.hu/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CGIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.peer-review-social-inclusion.eu%2Fnetwork-of-independent-experts%2Freports%2F2011-second-semester%2Fslovakia-report-on-promoting-the-social-inclusion-of-roma&ei=61yyT-L8E5PT4QT8soyOCQ&usg=AFQjCNEMIOecSjzT4hNLBVZnDpdbh2PBjQ

Caroline Sykora et al.	Towards Roma Inclusion, A Review of Roma Education Initiatives in Central and South-Eastern Europe	Unicef, 2011, http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/ROMA_PAPER_FINAL_LAST.pdf
Hugh Frazer and Eric Marlier	Promoting the Social Inclusion of Roma, Synthesis Report Overview based on the national reports prepared by the EU Network of independent Experts on Social Inclusion	EU Network of Independent Experts on Social Inclusion, EC, 2001, www.ceps.lu/pdf/12/art1766.pdf
Dr. William BARTLETT Dr. Roberta BENINI Dr. Claire GORDON	Measures to promote the situation of Roma EU citizens in the European Union	EC, 2011, http://www2.lse.ac.uk/businessAndConsultancy/LSEConsulting/pdf/Roma.pdf
	Strategy for Roma inclusion up to 2020	Slovak Republic, 2012, http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/roma_slovakia_strategy_en.pdf
MINISTRY OF LABOUR, SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND FAMILY OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC	REPORT on the social situation of the population of Slovak Republic for 2010	http://www.google.hu/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CGUQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.employment.gov.sk%2Freport-on-the-social-situation-of-the-population-of-the-sr-in-2010.pdf&ei=yVOyT5WOKao4gS21amCCg&usg=AFQjCNGvO9fkyhUYWuslGFVh9APKCIB4kA
	National Strategy Report on Social Protection and Social Inclusion 2008-2010 - Slovakia (2008)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=2564&langId=en
	Feeding In And Feeding Out: The Extent Of Synergies Between Growth And Jobs Policies And Social Inclusion Policies Across The Eu - Second Semester Report 2007 - National Reports Slovakia (2007)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5140&langId=en
	Tackling Child Poverty And Promoting The Social Inclusion Of Children In The European Union - Key Lessons - First Semester Report 2007 - National Reports Slovakia (2007)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5168&langId=en
	Regional and local implementation of national action plans on social inclusion in new Member States (2005) - Slovakia (2005)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5238&langId=en
	Monitoring and evaluation of the National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2004) - Slovakia (2004)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5264&langId=en
	Evaluation of the implementation of the second National Action Plans on Social Inclusion (2003-2005) -	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5287&langId=en

		Slovakia (2004)	
		Social protection systems in the 13 candidate countries, including pensions (25/3/2003) - Slovakia (2002)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5480&langId=en
		Social protection systems in the 13 candidate countries, including health care - Slovakia (2002)	http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=5494&langId=en