

Inclusion through Participation

(INPART)

Final report (WP4)

Contract nr. SOE2-CT97-3043

January 2000

Co-ordinator:
Dr. Rik van Berkel
Utrecht University, Faculty of Social Sciences

INPART partners

The Netherlands/co-ordinator:

Rik van Berkel, Ben Valkenburg, Cyril Tholen
Utrecht University
Welfare State Department, Faculty of Social Sciences
Heidelberglaan 2, 13th floor
3584 CS Utrecht, the Netherlands

Belgium:

Jacques Vilroxx, Jan de Schampheleire, Carlos Machado
Free University Brussels
Research group in technological, economic and social change and the labour market (TESA)
Pleinlaan 2
1050 Brussels, Belgium

Denmark:

Iver Hornemann-M ller, Jens Lind, Henning Hansen
Copenhagen Business School
Centre for Social Integration and Differentiation (CID)
Howitzvej 60 VI
DK-2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark

Portugal:

Pedro Hespanha, Fernando Ruivo, Ana Raquel Matos
Coimbra University
Centro de Estudos Sociais (CES)
Largo D. Dinis, Colegio de S. Jeronimo
3001-401 Coimbra, Portugal

Spain:

Soledad Garcia, Aitor Gomez
Barcelona University
Department of Sociological Theory
Diagonal 690
08034 Barcelona, Spain

United Kingdom:

Maurice Roche, Colin Williams, Joanne Cook
University of Sheffield
Political Economy Research Centre (PERC)
Elmfield Lodge, Elmfield, 132 Northumberland Road
S10 2TY Sheffield, United Kingdom

Contents

Abstract	6
1. Executive summary	7
1.1 <i>The INPART project</i>	7
1.2 <i>Results of the project</i>	8
1.3 <i>Policy recommendations</i>	17
2. Background and objectives of the project	23
2.1 <i>Elaboration of objectives of the research project</i>	23
2.2 <i>Work Packages</i>	24
2.3 <i>Re-orientations</i>	25
3. Methodology and project results	26
3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	26
3.2 <i>WP1: Activating social policies in 6 EU countries</i>	26
3.3 <i>WP2: A research review on five alternative types of work</i>	39
3.4 <i>WP3: The national case studies</i>	49
4. Policy recommendations	63
4.1 <i>Social inclusion policies: general comments</i>	63
4.2 <i>Social inclusion programmes: decreasing exclusion risks and increasing inclusion opportunities</i>	66
4.3 <i>Institutional issues</i>	68
5. Dissemination	71
6. Annexes	73

Abstract

This research project took place against the background of the growing emphasis in the countries of the EU on active rather than passive social policies. The project set itself the objective of increasing insight into the presuppositions and the effects of these social policies. Especially, it wanted to investigate the inclusionary and exclusionary potentials of various types of work/participation, using both 'objective' and 'subjective' approaches in researching inclusion and exclusion. Against the background of an analysis of active social policies in the EU-countries involved in the project, and a review of research literature on inclusion and exclusion, various case studies were conducted, distributed over the following types of work: participation in jobs on the primary labour market; participation in jobs on the secondary labour market; participation in unpaid types of work; training and education.

One of the main findings of the project is that the relationship between participation in types of work and inclusion/exclusion is much more complicated than it is usually described. All types of work we have investigated have both inclusionary and exclusionary potentials. The question to what degree participation in certain types of work contributes to inclusion can only be answered by taking into account the following factors:

- Characteristics of the type of participation involved;
- Characteristics of the policy context in which participation takes place;
- Characteristics of the participants.

Thus, the fit between the characteristics of the type of participation, the characteristics of the policy context, and people's needs is crucial.

The above does not mean, that types of participation do not have opportunity and risk structures with respect to their inclusionary potential. They do, even though here again it should be stated that these structures are highly policy sensitive.

In a nutshell, the policy recommendations that are presented in this report, can be formulated as follows:

- The problems social inclusion policies set themselves to solve and the objectives they aim at, should be tuned to the heterogeneity of (members of) target groups;
- When social inclusion policies aim at 'engagement' rather than 'employment', founding them on a broader concept of participation can be very useful;
- Active social policies will be more successful in as much as they succeed in matching people's needs with inclusion opportunities of types of participation. This requires a thorough assessment of people's needs and possibilities;
- To avoid a dichotomy of 'passive' and 'active' policies we advocate 'enabling social policies', which take into account the inclusionary potential of both income and participation, and support rather than counteract people's informal inclusion strategies;
- Social policies can influence the risk and opportunity structures of types of work, and thus their inclusionary potential, to a considerable extent by: mixing participation, learning and support; avoiding participation traps and strengthening career prospects; increasing access to income improvement and employment rights/benefits; making programmes flexible; minimising failure risks and failure effects;
- Active social policies will fail if they are not combined with political and managerial care for the processes of institutional activation they require.

1. Executive summary

1.1 The INPART project¹

The objectives of this research project are situated against the background of the increasing emphasis EU social policies place on the activation of unemployed people. This emphasis on activation reflects a gradual transformation in the aims of social policies from providing unemployed people with income to stimulating their integration in society, particularly in the labour market. And although this transformation process was started at different times, is taking place at different speeds and in different social policy and socio-economic contexts, all EU-countries have witnessed a shift in social security spending from passive to active social policies. For a number of years, the efforts directed at activation have increasingly been subjected to European social policy interventions. These interventions, aimed mainly at stimulating and co-ordinating policy development, take place under the heading of the European Employment Strategy. An annual cycle of EU directives in the context of this strategy, which are subsequently translated and operationalised in so-called National Action Plans, commenced in 1998.

This project distinguishes the following objectives:

- To analyse and compare views on inclusion and exclusion from two connected but at the same time distinct perspectives: firstly, views on inclusion and exclusion as embodied in social policies; and secondly, inclusion and exclusion as experienced by different groups of citizens.
- To gain insight into determinants of success and failure of integration policies, taking into account, firstly, the kind of participation/work being stimulated by these policies; secondly, the domains of social integration these policies aim at; and thirdly, the cultural orientations of the target groups of these policies.
- To gain insight into and to test the validity of the following assumptions underlying most activating social policies: firstly, that unemployment causes exclusion; secondly, that participation in paid work causes inclusion; and thirdly, that unpaid work by itself cannot achieve inclusion.
- To present recommendations concerning future social policies, for example with respect to the conditions under which various forms of participation might contribute to inclusion; the conditions under which social policies might contribute to the empowerment of the poor and unemployed by facilitating participation strategies developed by these groups themselves; the degree to which tailor-made approaches to problems of exclusion (rather than universal or target-group oriented approaches) are desirable and feasible.

The work involved by the project was structured into four work packages:

- Work package 1, analysis of activating social policies: The first step of the research project has been to make a comparative analysis of activating social policies in the INPART countries, taking into account EU-policy developments, to obtain insight into views on social exclusion and inclusion on which these policies are founded;
- Work package 2, review of social scientific research into inclusion and exclusion: The second step involves an analysis of the research literature into experiences of inclusion

¹ In the project, the following countries participated: Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and the UK.

and exclusion of social groups related to various types of work and participation, and into the evaluation of activating social policies that aim to stimulate social inclusion;

- Work package 3, case studies into types of participation/work: This work package is the core of the fieldwork carried out in the context of the research project. It involves national case studies with the objective of gaining empirical insight into experiences of inclusion and exclusion related to participation in various types of work. In the case studies, the main perspective will be that of the participants in types of work/participation;
- Work package 4, synthesis and policy recommendations: The final work package aims at integrating and synthesising the data collected during the research project. Its objective is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of types of work/participation and of integration policies, and to make recommendations regarding social policies aimed at social inclusion.

1.2 Results of the project

In this section we will present the results of this project for each of the work packages separately. The main focus will be on the case studies in this context.

Work Package 1: analysis of activating social policies

The 6 INPART-countries form a variety of countries and welfare states within the EU. They are different in many ways, for example with respect to population, geography, economy, history and type of welfare state. They also have different policies on social exclusion and inclusion.

But despite these differences, the 6 countries also have a lot of similarities. First of all they are all members of the EU. This means that they are part of the common EU-policy on social exclusion and inclusion. They are also influenced by the same economic system and its fluctuations. They have many similar social problems, such as unemployment and social exclusion although the unemployment rates vary from country to country.

Increased flexibility of the labour market is another aspect the countries have in common. Most countries have tried to enhance their competitiveness by increasing flexibility: deregulation of labour-market relations, wage differentiation, temporary work contracts, et cetera. The consequences have included increased job insecurity and increased social exclusion.

A convergence in labour-market policies seems to be taking place over the last decade. Labour-market policy has changed from passive to active measures and labour-market participation is considered the most important measure for improving social inclusion. This is very much in line with the present EU policy. Policies concerning the regulation of the regular labour market in most of the countries are very much oriented towards improving competitiveness by reducing labour costs and enhancing the flexibility of the labour force. The growing number of part-time and casual jobs demands more protection of employees' rights. The general tendency is to substitute job-security with employment-security.

Subsidised work has become a substantial part of the active labour-market policy in all 6 countries. This type of policy is very much targeted at the long-term unemployed who have great difficulties with participation in regular work. More often than not, the general purpose is insertion into the regular labour market. Subsidised work can take many forms, for example job placements in the private or public sector, sheltered jobs, insertion enterprises or self-employment. Normally they involve additional jobs for a limited period of time.

Education and training have become central instruments in most countries. This is very much due to the fact that social exclusion is closely connected to low education. An enlargement and diversification of the classic vocational training schemes have been noticed in almost all

countries. New schemes targeted at specific social groups were created and often combined with other kinds of incentives such as job creation.

Finally, the part played by unpaid activities varies greatly from country to country. In the southern countries participation in unpaid activities appears to be weaker and less institutionalised, and voluntary work is absent from policy concerns, or it is insufficiently protected. Where voluntary organisations and solidarity are stronger, not only do suitable programmes and law promote, protect and offer incentives for performing unpaid work activities, but governments and public institutions are also more and more open to an increased co-operation with voluntary organisations.

Work Package 2: review of social scientific research into inclusion and exclusion

Although economic and political strategies to tackle social exclusion in Europe are conceived and oriented around the integrating function of a regular job, research in the countries reviewed has shown an increase of irregular work, unpaid work and informal work during the last decade. A further phenomenon that throws doubt on the integrating power of work is that of the working poor. This is especially so in countries combining a relatively high atypical employment rate with high poverty rates (e.g. Britain or Portugal). Nevertheless, in other countries too, special attention is given to employment programmes that involve low pay and few long-term prospects. Furthermore, there seems to be a rising awareness among the population that work on the regular labour market cannot be realised for all households, at least not on a lifelong basis. In this respect, the normative expectation for people to have a regular job could be in decline. This is for example reflected by the normative acceptance of informal work, at least when it is done sporadically, and to the extent that this form of work contributes to the survival of marginalised groups, especially in southern countries.

Similarly, work on a voluntary unpaid basis is recognised by public opinion as a source of social integration and participation. Sometimes, there is a tendency to expect from unemployed benefit claimants that they engage in voluntary activities. To a certain extent participation in unpaid activities can be in line with unemployed people's desire to take up responsibilities and to build up respectability. However, some studies observe that participation in voluntary work does not necessarily lead to the improvement of participants' knowledge or skills, and thus to increased opportunities in relation to the labour market. A similar sceptical attitude is found when people feel that they are being used as a reserve workforce.

To evaluate work in its different types is to evaluate the experiences of inclusion-exclusion according to the characteristics of the work participants take part in. If these characteristics do not fit people's capacities, qualifications, skills, physical or mental conditions or needs, participation in these forms of work - whether formal-informal, regular-irregular, paid-unpaid, et cetera - may block full inclusion. Therefore, since people play different roles in society, the degree to which they combine their working life with other relevant activities in society will be important when evaluating the inclusionary-exclusionary potential of their participation in any type of work. For people who do not like having to work all the time, part-time work can be attractive in a number of satisfactory ways (e.g. juggling school, career and child-care for men with families). Hence, the integrating function of a regular (paid) job is qualified since other forms of work might contribute in a more desirable way to the participants' feelings of inclusion.

Work Package 3: case studies into types of work

In this section we will describe the general results of the case studies that we carried out in the six countries of the INPART project. As was outlined before, the main objective of the case

studies was to gain insight into the inclusionary and exclusionary potentials of different types of work; an objective we formulated against the background of, on the one hand, the differentiation of the world of work in modern societies and, on the other, of the persisting ideology that the only road towards full inclusion and participation is a regular paid job.

In the case studies, we have distinguished the following types of work/participation:

- Participation in jobs on the primary labour market ('regular' jobs, full-time or part-time, fixed or flexible, temporary or permanent);
- Participation in jobs on the secondary labour market (subsidised jobs for the unemployed, for example job schemes, or capitalisation of benefits);
- Participation in unpaid types of work;
- Training and education.

All case studies involved research among participants in the types of participation under investigation. Sometimes, in-depth interviews were used, whereas in other case studies participants were surveyed. In some countries the respondents were interviewed twice.

To conceptualise and subsequently operationalise the central concept of the case studies, inclusion, we used both an objective and subjective conceptualisation. When conceptualising the concepts in an *objective* way, measures were developed to assess and measure the degree of participation of respondents and the results of this were translated into different degrees of inclusion/exclusion. In the context of this 'objective' approach of inclusion/exclusion, the question is whether participation in a certain type of work is positively, negatively or not at all related to participation in other (sub-)domains. In a *subjective* conceptualisation of inclusion/exclusion, the focus is on people's needs and the degree to which they are able to satisfy their needs given the types of work they are participating in or (in the objective sense) excluded from. This approach recognises that people's needs may differ, and that different types of work may or may not offer them resources for satisfying their needs.

We will now summarise the main conclusions from the case studies thematically.

The concepts of inclusion and exclusion

In our research, we have tried to avoid using one-sided, 'participation-biased' concepts of social inclusion and social exclusion. We have dealt with both issues of income and of participation by also looking at income and consumption as 'sub-domains' of economic participation, and by paying attention to people's financial and consumptive needs. From our case studies, it is quite clear that the issues of participation and income deserve separate attention (in research, but also in politics). Despite the fact that both issues are closely related, they cannot be subsumed into a single concept. A lack of participation or social isolation is not necessarily only a problem of financial hardship, and financial hardship is not necessarily a problem of a lack of participation, as the situations of the 'working poor' and the 'active unemployed' illustrate. In other words: people's participation problems cannot always be solved by merely providing them with more income, and people's income problems are not automatically solved by promoting their participation. Financial hardship does, of course, often constitute a barrier, for example, to participation in the social and cultural domains. Our case studies have revealed several instances where this is clearly the case. In other words, financial hardship may trigger an accumulation of situations of exclusion. However, we also saw that financial hardship may have different impacts on participation levels of different groups of people and in different domains of participation. At the same time, we have identified several other barriers to participation or, more positively, several other resources that may improve and stimulate participation. Generally, it is impossible to identify one or several resources that

have a fully deterministic impact on participation in the sense that they are to be seen as basic and essential. This does not exclude the possibility, of course, that a lack of certain resources may have drastic effects on participation in specified cases or for specific groups. Income may be one of these resources, but so may health, time (in the case of single parents, for example) and more ‘psychological’ resources such as self-confidence and dignity. However, all in all the life situations and circumstances of underprivileged, socially excluded or marginalised, poor or unemployed people are normally so complicated and multifaceted that trying to identify ‘the single, critical cause’ of their hardship may seem convenient, but will not be quite adequate.

What might be the policy relevance of these general observations? Passive social policies are criticised for being one-sided in emphasising income provision and neglecting participation opportunities. Current active social policies, which have been developed as an answer to this criticism, may end up being criticised for the reverse one-sidedness: emphasising participation and neglecting income, or more generally, resources. Against the background of the above considerations, we would like to emphasise the importance of the development of empowering or, to use a less politicised phrase, *enabling policies*, that support people in both overcoming financial or economic hardship, and in promoting their participation. Given the diversity of people’s life situations and social circumstances, these policies will have to incorporate universal/generic, target-group directed and individualised, tailor-made measures.

Secondly, the concept of social inclusion has also been criticised for the exclusive role it attributes to paid work. Paid work is considered to be the only form of participation that should be pursued in the context of social policies stimulating social inclusion and combating social exclusion. Our case studies show that there are more roads towards integration than regular paid work only. Without implying that these roads are equal in terms of the opportunities for social inclusion they provide (they are not), there is no *a priori* reason why the ‘enabling policies’ should not be based on a *broad concept of participation*.

Thirdly, although the concepts of exclusion and inclusion are widely used in scientific, political and public discourse, their precise meaning is quite unclear and their conceptualisation highly controversial. As we stated above, we have used both objective and subjective approaches in our conceptualisation. When we translate this into social policy approaches, we may say that current activating social policies often start from an ‘objective’ point of view, defining people’s problems and needs and the ways to solve these problems and fulfil these needs without taking into account people’s own definitions of their situation, needs, problems, et cetera. Fully recognising the fact that each intervention in the context of activating social policies is normative, and accepting the pluriformity of norms and values these interventions can be based on, standards of inclusion should ideally be defined in a discursive context, in which –in the framework of social policies- clients and consultants put forward and legitimise their standards in order to negotiate the formulation of norms and values that guide social interventions. In this discursive context, the distinction between an ‘objective’ and a ‘subjective’ approach makes way for intersubjectivity.

Participation and inclusion

One of the clearest conclusions we can draw from our case studies is, firstly, that there is no clear dichotomy between inclusion and exclusion, and secondly, that equating inclusion with having a regular paid job is as much a simplification as equating unemployment with exclusion. To determine the relationships between participation/non-participation on the one hand and inclusion/exclusion on the other, limiting attention to the types of participation people are

involved in is not sufficient. Interrelations between the following sets of factors are important to understand how participation and inclusion are related:

- Characteristics of the type of participation involved;
- Characteristics of the policy context in which participation takes place;
- Characteristics of the participants.

Consequently, we can answer the question to what degree participation contributes to inclusion only by taking into account all these factors. One cannot deal with the issue of the inclusionary potential of types of work in isolation. In other words: the fit between characteristics of the type of participation, characteristics of the policy context and people's needs is crucial.

Nevertheless, our case studies also show that different types of participation offer opportunity and risk structures that are very important in shaping their inclusionary or exclusionary potentials. We have been able to identify the following:

- Income;
- Status;
- Career opportunities;
- Prospects;
- Opt-out and failure provisions;
- Flexibility;
- Availability of guidance and support.

In summary, we might state that the degree to which types of participation offer participants security with respect to their ability to fulfil current and future needs, is an important determinant of the inclusionary potential of these types of participation. People do, of course, have other resources of security: compare, for example, the importance of the family we witnessed in the Southern European countries. However, since all countries increasingly emphasise the importance of labour-market participation, alternative 'security providers' (such as the family, forms of self-provision, mutual aid) are increasingly eroded.

Types of participation

Against the background of the general comments in the previous section, this section will explore the opportunity and risk structures with respect to the inclusionary potential of the different types of participation we distinguished in the case studies.

Regular employment

The emphasis in our case studies has been on types of participation outside the regular labour market and on groups of people with a vulnerable labour-market position. This means, of course, that our findings are biased: they are primarily focused on vulnerable socio-economic groups. But even though we should recognise that people are dependent on their jobs to different degrees for acquiring security, to the degree that they *do* depend on their jobs, the general comments in the previous section apply to people participating in regular employment as well. The part-time case study clearly showed that, even where regular employment is concerned, inclusion can only be partial. Rather than treating regular employment as an undifferentiated category and putting it at the top of a hierarchy of participation, statements on the inclusionary potential of regular employment should be qualified with respect to the growing diversity in the regular labour market.

Secondary labour-market participation

In our research much attention has been paid to participation in the secondary labour market. Many EU countries have started secondary labour-market schemes to create participation op-

portunities for unemployed people. Most of the time, these schemes are directed at groups of older and low-qualified unemployed, offering them low-skilled jobs. The small sample of schemes investigated in our case studies already revealed the diversity of these schemes. The Spanish scheme is clearly exceptional and has hardly any characteristics of a secondary labour-market scheme, since it is not directed at long-term and low-skilled unemployed people and since it is not aimed at creating a labour-market segment of low-skilled and low-paid jobs. In terms of the inclusionary potential of the secondary labour-market schemes, the associated workers in the Spanish capitalisation of unemployment benefits scheme seem to be best off, even though failure effects can be quite large for the participants, larger than in any of the other schemes we investigated. At the same time, compared to participants in the other schemes, the Spanish participants were already better off in the first place, before starting their participation: on average, they were higher qualified, had a more stable labour-market history and were short-term unemployed.

As far as the other schemes are concerned, we have found that these schemes certainly do have an inclusionary potential. Although to different degrees, they provide participants with economic independence, income improvement, social contacts, status and respect, useful activities, self-confidence and a more positive outlook. At the same time, all schemes also have clear exclusion risks. As far as the *temporary schemes* are concerned, the most important issue is, of course, what will happen to participants once their participation in the scheme has ended. Since these schemes are designed to be stepping-stones to regular labour-market participation, their inclusionary potential is significantly increased when they actually manage to contribute to labour-market participation. Participants' positive evaluations of the schemes can at least partly be attributed to the positive expectations they have in this respect. At the same time, we also observed that when these expectations are not fulfilled, experiences of exclusion will increase. This risk is not imaginary, as our case studies and other investigations into similar schemes show: there is a considerable risk that people find themselves trapped in an activation recycling process, participating in one scheme after another.

With respect to the *permanent schemes*, we witnessed a tendency that their inclusionary potential is smaller than that of the temporary ones. However, we should be careful in drawing the conclusion that this means that temporary schemes are 'better' than permanent schemes. In both cases, the degree to which the schemes meet people's needs and expectations is crucial. In the temporary schemes, people have the expectation to be able to find a regular job in the end; when they are disappointed in this respect, the inclusionary potential of the temporary schemes is decreased significantly. As far as the permanent schemes are concerned, the important issue is to what degree developmental and career prospects are offered, either in the context of the scheme or in the regular labour market. Since these offers are practically absent in the schemes we have been investigating, respondents who have these ambitions are confronted with experiences of permanent stigmatisation and marginalisation. Once again, not the temporary or permanent character of the schemes as such, but the fit between participation, policy and participants' characteristics determine the inclusionary or exclusionary potential of the various schemes.

The status of participants in permanent secondary labour-market schemes is an issue that deserves special attention. Whereas for participants in temporary schemes status differences may be acceptable because there is the expectation of a regular job in the near future, status differences for permanent scheme participants may at some point become unacceptable, and turn into an important motive for desiring to leave the scheme. We have seen that various status differences exist: programmes are targeted (at long-term unemployed, low-qualified people, certain age groups, people with multiple problems, et cetera) which may influence interactions with others; they are subject to income ceilings; participants are confined to spe-

cific kinds of tasks; et cetera. Whereas some participants are resigned to these status differences because of a lack of alternatives, or manage to cope with them, they result in increasing feelings of stigmatisation and marginalisation, among other things. Decreasing status differences (for those for whom secondary labour-market participation is likely to be permanent) and increasing investments into people's prospects (for those who want and are able to participate in regular jobs) are two policy options to increase the inclusionary potential of secondary labour-market participation.

Unpaid work

Participation in unpaid work may have an inclusionary potential as well. Obviously, without additional measures, the inclusionary potentials of this type of work are limited to the immaterial aspects, since as such, participation in unpaid work will not offer economic independence and income improvement. Nevertheless, these immaterial aspects are important on their own. Of course, as is the case in the other types of work, people may choose to be active in unpaid work from different backgrounds and for different reasons. The inclusionary potential of unpaid work depends among other things, on the degree to which respondents' motives are met.

Generally speaking, whereas the promotion of secondary labour-market participation is entirely subject to social policies, the opposite is the case with unpaid work. Supportive policies (recognising and rewarding unpaid work, guiding people in finding placements or in finding a job, offering them the resources needed, et cetera) are practically absent and sometimes the performance of unpaid work is counteracted rather than encouraged. Thus, the inclusionary potential of unpaid work is often realised in spite of, rather than due to policies. Reasons for this, of course, are closely related to the dominance of paid work in social policies. This also goes for the Dutch case, where participation in unpaid work is actually encouraged and supported in the 'social activation' programme which, however, is clearly designed as a last-resort integration option: only when participation in measures directed at primary or secondary labour-market integration has failed or is considered unrealistic, integration through unpaid work is allowed. Thus, though the inclusionary potential of unpaid work is recognised, it is clearly positioned at the bottom of a participation hierarchy.

Our case studies into unpaid work did not reveal experiences of stigmatisation of unemployed people in unpaid work. Probably this is related to the fact that our case studies did not deal with forms of obligatory participation in unpaid work, and to the fact that in our case studies, unpaid or voluntary work carried out by unemployed people could not be distinguished from unpaid work done by other categories of unpaid workers. Furthermore, secondary labour-market schemes often limit work tasks to low-skilled and/or low-productive work, whereas such a limitation does not exist where unpaid work is concerned. The degree to which participants in activating social policies or their tasks can be clearly 'identified' (either in existing work organisations or in separate organisations) seems to affect stigmatisation risks. This does not mean, of course, that unpaid workers never report experiences of stigmatisation, for example, in work organisations where both paid and unpaid workers are working. However, in these circumstances, processes of stigmatisation will probably be directed at unpaid workers as such, not specifically at unemployed unpaid workers.

Training and education

The training and education schemes we investigated were all, like the temporary secondary labour-market schemes, designed to prepare people for labour-market participation. Generally speaking, the training and education schemes are targeted at groups of people that are younger than the target-groups of secondary labour-market schemes. The inclusionary potential of

these schemes is, like the temporary secondary labour-market schemes, highly dependent on people's opportunities of finding a job after completing the scheme. And even though participants in these schemes are younger on average, there is a clear risk of 'educational recycling' or 'activation recycling' here as well. Nevertheless, despite these considerations, training and education schemes also have an inclusionary potential. The 'advantages' of participating in education and training schemes may have positive effects on participation in other domains than the labour market. In other words, the successes of training and education schemes in terms of their integrating functions cannot be measured by merely evaluating their contribution to participants' labour-market chances.

Domains of participation

In the research, we have distinguished several domains of participation. From our case studies it can be concluded that the economic and social domains seem to be by far the most important in shaping people's experiences of inclusion and exclusion.

It turns out to be rather complicated to establish the relationship between participation on the one hand and inclusion into the various domains on the other. Usually it is assumed that regular employment offers resources and opportunities that enable inclusion into the domains. At the same time, access to these resources and opportunities may differ from one job to another, as the part-time case study showed. Furthermore, having a paid job may also limit resources and opportunities to be engaged in other domains. In other words, generally speaking, there is no straightforward relation between having a regular paid job and inclusion into other domains.

Another aspect that makes the relationship between participation and inclusion into various domains a complicated issue is that people are not necessarily dependent on the resources that regular jobs offer them to be included into domains of participation. Other types of work or participation may give access to similar resources as well. Nevertheless, it is important to stress that different types of participation are not equivalent in the access they offer to certain resources. Thus, different types of participation reveal different patterns of integration opportunities, and the fit between these opportunities and people's needs will determine their inclusionary potential.

In this context, income seems to be a resource deserving special attention. On the one hand we observed that income is an important resource for being integrated into the domains of consumption, culture/leisure and social networks in particular. Many respondents pointed to a lack of income as an important barrier to their integration into these domains. On the other hand, of the various resources that may increase integration into these domains, access to income is most exclusively related to job access. Thus, insofar as income is a prerequisite for inclusion into the various domains, one might argue that participation in a regular job and, to a lesser extent, in secondary labour-market jobs, does actually constitute an entry ticket to full participation. Nevertheless, even in this case, the link between paid jobs and full participation is highly policy-dependent. Passive social policies in the countries we have studied provide people with very different levels of income, thereby influencing the degree to which full participation is dependent on having a job. And proponents of a basic or citizens' income scheme argue in favour of loosening the work-income nexus, which would make availability of income and, consequently, full participation less dependent on availability of paid work. The basic income example shows that, even though income is an important resource to be able to fully participate in a highly monetarised society, there are other options available to improve people's income situation than just offering them a paid job.

In summary, even though paid employment may –at least potentially- give access to resources

for full participation, it does not do so exclusively. Furthermore, insofar as paid employment does stimulate integration into domains of participation, it does not do so by its very nature, but by the way policies deal with work and participation. In other words, to increase full participation of people out of employment, two policy options are open: either to stimulate their participation in paid employment, or to open up other opportunities and resources towards full participation.

In this context, some remarks should be made with respect to the issue of 'self-exclusion'. In the case studies we encountered various instances of self-exclusion. Of course, social interventions do not (and probably should not) take 'self-exclusion strategies' for granted. Even though people might use these strategies as 'survival strategies', and even though they might find it hard to break through them, as 'self-exclusion' also offers them security and a reduction of social risks, in many cases they result from an actual and/or perceived lack of resources, opportunities and options. Here, the importance of a dialogic approach of social interventions aimed at activation becomes clear. Instances of exclusion, assessed from an 'objective' point of view, which are not immediately perceived as problematic by the people involved, do not necessarily indicate that one should refrain from social intervention. Thus, the dialogic character of social interventions implies that norms and values of both the interventionists and the target groups of interventions should be open to debate.

Traditional and new activation approaches

This dialogical approach is not common in social policies. Traditionally, active social policies start from a top-down point of view, fettered by a paternalistic perspective saying that paid employment is the one and only way to integrate people into society. From this perspective, there seems to be no need to legitimise social policy interventions, since the dominance of paid work is considered to be an issue of consensus. However, the dominance of paid work, and with it the top-down and paternalistic character of active social policies, have been criticised again and again.

Against this background, and because of the partial failure of traditional interventions, social policy 'niches' have been developed in which different social policy approaches are used, opening up non-traditional social inclusion strategies and/or paying more respect to strategies and ambitions of the target groups of social policies themselves. In most cases, these policies have been developed for groups of unemployed or poor people who, time and again, were not reached by more traditional social policy approaches: the very long-term unemployed, unemployed or poor people with multiple problems, et cetera. The reasons for not reaching these groups are various such as the lack of flexibility of existing programmes, the lack of an integrating approach in tackling people's problems, the lack of opportunities to develop tailor-made integration routes, et cetera. The failure of traditional social policies for these people has opened up opportunities to experiment with a variety of alternative approaches, ranging from tailor-made guidance in supporting employment, to recognising and facilitating participation strategies developed by poor and unemployed people themselves, to creating new types of participation et cetera. Once again, these new approaches have, up until now, been confined to people who were excluded from traditional activation approaches. However, one may expect that since social policies in the EU countries are becoming more and more activation-oriented, EU countries will be increasingly confronted with groups of people that are not reached by these policies and, consequently, are not only excluded from the labour market, but from activating social policies as well. In a negative scenario, one may expect a situation in which these people are left to their own devices and policy interventions are limited, to reduce the inconvenience they may cause to the better-off and included parts of

society. In a more positive scenario, opportunities will be created to develop the ‘enabling’ social policies we mentioned, providing room for experiments with new social intervention strategies, new ways to improve social inclusion, et cetera.

1.3 Policy recommendations

Against the background of the results of the project, some policy recommendations will be presented regarding social policies aimed at social inclusion.

Social inclusion policies: general comments

Heterogeneity and policy differentiation

Social policies aiming at social inclusion are directed at target groups which are very heterogeneous. ‘The unemployed’ or ‘the poor’ may be adequate categories to indicate the socio-economic status of these target groups, their life-situation in terms of inclusion and exclusion are very different, also within national borders. The degree to which unemployed and/or poor people are able to avoid risks of exclusion varies considerably. Unemployed people’s access to resources such as informal social networks for material and immaterial support, welfare-state arrangements, types of work that provide them with a respectful social role and social networks, et cetera, is different, partly related to their qualifications and competencies, age, health, household composition et cetera. The degree to which they do or do not have access to such resources may influence their situation in terms of inclusion and exclusion significantly. Thus, the *problems* social inclusion policies set themselves to solve, can be quite different for different groups of unemployed and/or poor people. In other words, social policy interventions should be based on the assumption that the *starting point* of social intervention can differ considerably.

Heterogeneity not only refers to people’s life situation, but also to the life-projects they are involved in, the needs they have and the aims they set themselves. From this point, we have been criticising current activating social policies from being too one-sided in their approach: activating social policies mostly recognise one objective only, namely economic independence through labour-market participation. We will return to this issue later. Here, we would like to point out that this objective may be attractive to a lot of unemployed and/or poor people, but not to all and it certainly is not feasible for all. In other words, social policies aimed at inclusion should not only differentiate with respect to the problems they set themselves to solve, but also with respect to their *objectives*.

In sum, the heterogeneity among the group of unemployed and poor people who are the target groups of social policies aiming at inclusion implies a differentiation of both the problems that these social policies address, and of the solutions they provide.

Objectives of social policies aimed at inclusion: jobs or participation?

Most current inclusion policies or activating social policies are, in fact, employment policies, aiming at increasing people’s employability and at stimulating their labour-market integration. Increasing economic independence and decreasing social benefits dependence, rather than promoting social inclusion in a wider sense seem to be the main objectives of these policies. When the objective of social inclusion policies is to combat social exclusion and to enable people to become more involved in social and societal participation, there is no reason to focus on labour-market participation only: other types of work and participation have an inclusionary potential as well. This does not mean that these types of work and participation are equal to (regular) labour-market participation. Compared to regular labour-market participation, other types of participation offer less resources for income generation and, to a lesser

extent, for status and respect. Nevertheless, these other types of work and participation do offer resources that may be important for people's social integration. And in some respects and for certain groups of people, they may be even more attractive than regular labour-market participation, which may involve exclusion risks as well.

In other words, when the objective of social inclusion policies is to increase participation in a wider sense rather than in the narrow meaning of labour-market participation, these policies should be based on a *broader concept of participation* than most of them are now. In more general terms, activating social policies should be based on an *engagement concept* of society rather than an employment concept.

Matching people's needs and social inclusion strategies

In the above, we stated that people's needs with respect to social inclusion are different. Secondly, we stated that other types of work and participation besides (regular) jobs have an inclusionary potential as well. Combining these two conclusions, we should be aware of the fact that different forms of participation may meet people's needs in different ways. When people formulate their most important needs in terms of economic dependence and income improvement, neither unpaid work nor secondary labour-market participation will be very attractive to them. However, when they want to extend their social networks and be engaged in useful activities, these types of work may be more interesting to them. In other words, social inclusion policies that recognise the heterogeneity of needs on the one hand, and the different inclusion opportunities of various types of participation on the other, should pay attention to the *matching of people's needs to the inclusion opportunities of types of participation*.

Participation and income

Activating social policies often claim that labour-market participation is the 'royal road' towards income improvement. Even though this may be true in general, some critical remarks should be made here. Especially in the more developed welfare states, the combined effect of developments on the labour market and the introduction of secondary labour-market schemes on the one hand, and the labour-market opportunities of long-term, often low-qualified unemployed people on the other, result in a situation in which re-entering the labour market may lead to economic independence, but is hardly or not at all accompanied by income improvement.

Although activating social policies are based upon the correct assumption that problems of exclusion and poverty cannot be reduced to lack of income only, the reverse is true as well: they also cannot be reduced to lack of participation. For many unemployed and poor people, lack of income and economic independence is an important source of experiences of exclusion. In highly monetarised societies such as ours, income is an important and often necessary resource for participation, especially in the domains of consumption, social networks and culture/leisure.

Against this background, access to income improvement is an important determinant of the inclusionary potential of types of work/participation. However, access to income improvement, economic independence and purchasing power can be organised in other ways than regular jobs as well. Schemes such as Time Currency and LETS systems, Basic Income or Citizens' Income schemes, and the Active Citizen Credit scheme are examples of 'enabling' social policies which stimulate people's participation and take into account their income situation as well, and can open up *alternative roads to income improvement*. Applying these schemes as part of social policies would certainly increase the inclusionary potential of types of work and participation outside the labour market.

Recognising and supporting informal inclusion strategies

Acknowledging that unemployed and/or poor people are sometimes able to develop informal strategies to counter exclusion and stimulate their inclusion and participation, should encourage social policies aiming at inclusion to recognise and support these strategies. Nowadays, these informal strategies are often neglected or counter-acted, the latter because they are considered fraudulent or because they are seen as diminishing people's labour-market availability. Thus, a paradoxical situation may be created in which activating social policies are making people passive, or in which people see themselves forced to hide their activities from social policy officials. This official attitude towards informal inclusion strategies may be understandable from the point of view of social policies aiming at labour-market participation only, but from a broader perspective on social inclusion there is enough reason to investigate the degree to which these informal strategies do actually meet people's needs and how their inclusionary potential can be improved.

In several EU countries, there is increasing awareness that social exclusion must be tackled through bottom-up, community-based initiatives. Nevertheless, these initiatives are often promoted to create employment or to help citizens into employment. We would argue that these bottom-up initiatives rooted in people's own attempts to 'make something of their lives' should be encouraged, not only because of employment-creating potential, but also – from a broader inclusion perspective- because of their ability to *enable people to help themselves*.

Social inclusion programmes: decreasing exclusion risks and increasing inclusion opportunities

Based on our research into some of these programmes, we can formulate the following conditions that may strengthen the inclusionary potential of these programmes and decrease exclusion risks.

Mixing participation, learning and support

Promoting inclusion by participation involves more than offering people participation opportunities only. For inclusion through participation to be successful, people should be equipped with skills, competencies and other resources necessary to carry out the activities adequately. Furthermore, they should be enabled to cope with potential obstacles to successful participation. Research into social exclusion has stressed time and again that exclusion is characterised by its multidimensionality. Recognising this also implies that inclusion policies should be characterised by a multidimensional approach. Thus, these policies should be able to offer a mix of participation, learning and support. At the same time, this mix needs to be flexible so that it can be adjusted to individual circumstances and needs.

Avoiding participation traps and strengthening career prospects

The same mix of participation, learning and support should also tackle another problem social inclusion policies are often confronted with: namely, a lack of prospects. This may be true for both temporary and permanent participation schemes. The research results point to the necessity for social policy programmes to invest more into human resources or 'human capital' by supporting people in developing themselves and by offering opportunities to meet newly arisen needs. Strengthening career prospects and career opportunities may avoid a situation in which people feel trapped in their participation. Solutions to participation traps may be sought either in the context of the schemes (especially in the case of permanent schemes) or by supporting people in finding other types of participation. Of course, taking measures to avoid participation traps is not only the responsibility of social policy institutions.

It is also a responsibility of employers that hire subsidised workers, trainees, et cetera. Investing in people's employability in the context of company policies should not be restricted to 'regular' workers but should also involve participants in activating social policies.

Income improvement and access to employment rights/benefits

Lack of opportunities for income improvement and of access to employment rights/benefits are important examples of a lack of career prospects related to participation in social inclusion schemes. In our case studies, this issue seemed to be specifically urgent in the context of more permanent secondary labour-market schemes, even though it is not necessarily limited to these schemes. Since these schemes often include income ceilings, income improvement opportunities simply vanish at some point. Tackling this problem asks for one of two possible solutions: raising or abolishing income ceilings on the one hand, or offering guidance and support in finding and entering regular labour-market jobs on the other. More generally, removing differences in access to employment rights and benefits, which we witnessed in secondary labour-market schemes but also in flexible and/or part-time jobs on the regular labour market, will increase the inclusionary potential of these types of work.

Another issue in this context relates to the inclusionary potential of unpaid types of work, that offer little opportunities for income improvement. In the former section we already pointed at non-labour-market or non-monetary solutions to this problem.

Flexibility

In general one might say that the more flexible programmes are, the more they can be accommodated to people's situation and needs, the less creaming-off effects occur, and the more they will be able to contribute to the social inclusion of poor and unemployed people. This is because creating possibilities for a flexible application of social inclusion programmes will offer policy deliverers more opportunities to deliver tailor-made trajectories that match people's abilities and desires. Flexibility may refer to separate programmes and to combinations of various programmes.

Minimising failure risks and failure effects

Participation in social inclusion programmes will never be successful for everyone. In order to minimise failure risks and failure effects, which may have far-reaching consequences for people who are in a vulnerable position anyway, both preventive and curative measures can be taken. Preventive measures relate, for example, to careful placement. Curative measures relate to regulating the consequences in cases that failure turns out to be unavoidable. Moderating the risks of failure, both in terms of income rights such as entitlement to social benefits, and in terms of activation rights such as entitlement to participation in –other- activation programmes, will most likely stimulate people to enter social inclusion programmes.

Institutional issues

Transforming passive into active social policies in general, and dealing with the issues we have discussed in this chapter in particular, will also have consequences for the institutions and agencies involved in delivering these policies and measures.

An integrating approach

Adequate social inclusion policies, as we argued above and has been argued by others as well, require an approach in which social services are provided in an integrated and co-ordinated way. Often, institutional interests and differences in the ways institutions operate, hinder co-ordination and co-operation, which may have negative consequences for the activation proc-

ess of programme participants. Thus, developing and implementing successful activation policies not only requires adequate and effective programmes, but a process of institutional activation as well.

Combining bottom-up initiatives and top-down policies

Traditionally, social policies are characterised by a top-down approach. In the above we have been arguing in favour of a broader approach of policies aiming at inclusion through participation. From this perspective, individual and community-based initiatives should not (at least, not always) be treated as threats to the targets and objectives policy makers set themselves, but as sources for finding new approaches to tackling problems of social exclusion. Complementing these 'bottom-up' initiatives with 'top-down' support and facilities will most likely increase their inclusionary potential.

The dialogical approach and the position of clients

The traditional top-down approach of social policies also affects the position of clients in the activation process. They are the 'objects' of activation policies, that have to adjust to and fit into programmes and schemes; if they cannot adjust, they will drop out, and if they do not want to adjust, they risk sanctions. In the above, we have been arguing that to a large extent, the success of activation programmes depends on the degree to which these programmes meet people's needs. From this perspective, activation processes should not start with ascribing or prescribing certain needs to people, but with an assessment of their needs. This requires a transformation of the setting of client-consultant interactions from a paternalistic into a dialogical approach. It goes without saying, that designing policy delivery in this way cannot be without consequences for the distribution of power and resources in client-consultant interactions. Furthermore, explicit attention should be paid to the means and conditions necessary to making this dialogical approach successful.

Compulsion

It is quite clear that elements of compulsion and workfare are entering social policies more and more. From the perspective we have been developing here, using compulsion is not evident. In our view, compulsion is not necessary to stimulate people to contribute to society and to get them involved into meaningful and useful activities. Most people want to be socially included and want to contribute to society themselves. The use of compulsion in activation policies seems to serve other purposes than that of helping unemployed and poor people to solving problems of exclusion: either, they are aimed at satisfying the payers of taxes and social security contributions, or they are aimed at forcing needs on people they apparently do not recognise as their own.

Decentralisation

Activating social policies are often delivered in a decentralised policy context. Even in the presence of national legislation, these regulations leave regional or local authorities and policy agencies quite some discretion in the design and/or delivery of activation policies. Discretion is indeed necessary to be able to adjust policies to local circumstances and to individual needs. At the same time, decentralisation makes policies potentially subject to processes of inequality of justice and arbitrariness. Safeguarding the position of clients in national regulations, and empowering them in their interactions with consultants may be tools in counteracting the potentially negative consequences of policy decentralisation.

Monitoring

In designing studies to monitor effects of active social policy programmes, the following issues should be taken into account. First of all, they should not be directed at participants of programmes only, but also at drop-outs and at people that have, for whatever reason, been excluded from participation. Thus, insight may be gained into the conditions that make schemes successful for some groups of people but unsuccessful for others. Secondly, our remarks with respect to the objectives of policies aimed at social inclusion also influence the criteria deployed in assessing the success of these policies. From a narrow perspective on social inclusion, success will be measured in terms of outflow to paid jobs only. From a broader perspective, other indicators of social inclusion may gain importance as well.

2. Background and objectives of the project

The objectives of this research project are situated against the background of the increasing emphasis in EU social policies on the activation of unemployed people. This emphasis on activation reflects a gradual transformation in the aims of social policies from providing unemployed people with income to stimulating their integration in society, particularly the labour market. And although this transformation process started at different times, is taking place at different speeds, and in different social policy and socio-economic contexts, all EU-countries witnessed a shift in social security spending from passive to active social policies. For several years now, the efforts directed at activation have increasingly been subjected to European social policy interventions. These interventions, mainly aimed at stimulating and co-ordinating policy development, take place under the heading of the European Employment Strategy. An annual cycle of EU directives in the context of this strategy, which are subsequently translated and operationalised in so-called National Action Plans, commenced in 1998.

One of the key concepts at the core of the transformation process of social policies is the concept of social inclusion. It is assumed that traditional social policies, focusing on income replacement, did little to prevent social exclusion and to promote social inclusion of unemployed people. The new activating social policies intend to repair the short-coming of traditional social policies, under the headings of ‘work over income’ or ‘welfare to work’. Current activating social policies are based on several assumptions, two of which have been important for the INPART research project in particular:

- Social policies presuppose that participation in (regular) paid work is equal to inclusion. This presupposition may be questioned, however, if the heterogeneous nature of paid work in modern society is taken into account, a heterogeneity which is even further promoted by activating social policy itself.
- At the same time, social policies presuppose that unemployment, i.e. non-participation in (formal) paid work, equals exclusion, which presupposition is one of the cornerstones of the legitimisation of their introduction. However, this presupposition neglects the inclusionary potential that other types of participation or work (e.g. unpaid work) may have.

Against this background, the general aim of the research project is to investigate the validity of these assumptions regarding the integrating potential of types of participation/work, by confronting them with experiences of inclusion and exclusion of the people participating in various types of work/participation.

2.1 Elaboration of objectives of the research project

The general aim of the research project described above has been elaborated by distinguishing the following objectives.

- To analyse and compare views on inclusion and exclusion from two connected but at the same time distinct perspectives: firstly, views on inclusion and exclusion as embodied in social policies; and secondly, inclusion and exclusion as experienced by different groups of citizens.
- To gain insight into determinants of success and failure of integration policies, taking into account, firstly, the kind of participation/work being stimulated by these policies; sec-

ondly, the domains of social integration aimed at in these policies; and thirdly, the cultural orientations of the target groups of these policies.

- To gain insight into and test the following assumptions underlying most activating social policies: firstly, that unemployment causes exclusion; secondly, that participation in paid work causes inclusion; and thirdly, that unpaid work by itself cannot cause inclusion.
- To present recommendations concerning future social policies, for example with respect to the conditions under which various forms of participation might contribute to inclusion; the conditions under which social policies might contribute to the empowerment of the poor and unemployed by facilitating participation strategies developed by these groups themselves; the degree to which tailor-made approaches to problems of exclusion (rather than universal or target-group oriented approaches) are desirable and feasible.

2.2 Work packages

The realisation of these research objectives has been operationalised by distinguishing the following work packages.

Work package 1: analysis of activating social policies

The first step of the research project has been to make a comparative analysis of activating social policies in the INPART countries, taking into account EU-policy developments, to obtain insight into views on social exclusion and inclusion on which these policies are founded. In doing this, the following research question should be answered: How are the concepts of inclusion and exclusion defined (and operationalised) in national and supranational (EU) policies?

Work package 2: review of social scientific research into inclusion and exclusion

The second step involves an analysis of the research literature into experiences of inclusion and exclusion of social groups related to various types of work and participation, and into the evaluation of activating social policies that stimulate social inclusion. This work package should give a preliminary answer to the following research question, which will be taken up again in work package 3: How is participating in (social policy programmes) various types of work/participation related to experiences of inclusion and exclusion? To what degree are these experiences determined by cultural orientations of the people involved?

Work package 3: case studies into types of participation/work

This work package is the core of the fieldwork carried out in the context of the research project. It involves national case studies with the objective of gaining empirical insight into experiences of inclusion and exclusion related to participation in various types of work. In the case studies, the main point of view will be the perspective of the participants in types of work/participation. Here again, the main research question is, as in work package 2: How is participating in (social policy programmes) various types of work/participation related to experiences of inclusion and exclusion? To what degree are these experiences determined by cultural orientations of the people involved?

Work package 4: synthesis and policy recommendations

The final work package aims at integrating and synthesising the data collected during the research project. Its objective is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of types of work/participation and of integration policies, and to make recommendations regarding social policies aimed at social inclusion. Thus, this work package should answer the following re-

search question: What conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the results of work packages 1, 2 and 3 for social policies aimed at inclusion?

2.3 Re-orientations

Compared to the original research proposal, two re-orientations that have been taking place during the course of the project should be pointed out.

Firstly, the project has not been exclusively focused on activating social policies and types of work/participation involved in these policies. Given the fact that we were interested in the inclusionary potential of various types of work, and given the 'bias' in activating social policies towards (regular) paid work, we decided to pay attention to types of participation and work in which people are involved, even though they are not promoted by activating social policies as well. Thus, we hoped to be able to gain insight into the extent to which activating social policies should be broadened, to include types of participation and work currently neglected.

Secondly, originally it was envisaged that the comparative work in the project would also involve a comparison between central and peripheral areas. On the one hand, this comparison should involve a comparison between Northern and Southern European countries. This comparison has been carried out according to the original programme. On the other hand, the comparison between central and peripheral areas was also foreseen at the national level of the INPART countries. Unfortunately, realising this objective has been impossible for most of the INPART partners. There are two reasons for this re-orientation. First of all, in making choices with respect to the design of the case studies, the emphasis has been on covering a broad range of types of work/participation rather than on studying the same type of work/participation in various regions. Secondly, preparing the case studies, gaining access to the field of investigation, and finding respondents willing to co-operate in the research absorbed more time and resources than was expected, which made setting priorities more necessary.

3. Methodology and project results

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the main results of the INPART research project. As was elaborated before, the INPART work was structured in 4 work packages, the first three being the core of the project and the fourth being a synthesising work package bringing together findings and results of the other work packages. This chapter will be structured according to the first three work packages. Thus, we will start with an overview of results of work package one, mainly dealing with presenting an overview of activating social policies in the participating countries. Then, we will deal with the results of work package 2, which presented an overview of empirical research into inclusion and exclusion, in particular related to participation in various types of work. Finally, we will summarise the main findings of the case studies we have been doing into types of participation. The methodology used in each work package will be described shortly in the respective section.

Before commencing the presentation of research results, table 1 gives an overview of some important socio-economic indicators that may be seen as highlighting some very general background data on the 6 INPART countries and their position within the EU.

Table 1. Key socio-economic indicators, INPART-countries and EU-average (% , 1997)

	<i>Unemployment</i>	<i>Proportion of long-term unemployment</i>	<i>Youth unemployment</i>	<i>Female unemployment</i>	<i>Labour-market participation</i>	<i>Female LM-participation</i>
Belgium	9,2	58,7	6,8	11,9	57,3	47,0
Denmark	5,5	27,2	6,0	6,6	77,5	71,1
Netherlands	5,2	48,0	6,1	6,9	66,7	54,9
Portugal	6,8	51,5	6,2	7,8	67,5	58,6
Spain	20,8	51,9	15,9	28,3	48,6	33,9
UK	7,0	38,6	2,7	6,0	70,8	63,9
EU-average	10,7	48,6	9,8	12,4	60,5	50,5

Source: EU/DG5, *Employment Policies in the EU and in the Member States. Joint Report 1998*.

3.2 WPI: Activating social policies in 6 EU-countries

3.2.1 Introduction

The main purpose of this work package is to give an overview of activating social policies (or participation policies) in the 6 countries involved in the INPART-project: Spain, Portugal, The Netherlands, Denmark, UK and Belgium. Researchers from each of the 6 countries have prepared national reports describing the various national policies to combat social exclusion and enhance social inclusion by means of participation. The focus will be on different kinds of policies that aim to activate people by stimulating participation in different kinds of activities, for example paid work on the labour market, subsidised work, unpaid activities, and training. This means that benefit schemes and other kinds of policies aiming at passive support are not included in this overview.

In developing this overview of active social policies, several methods have been used: analysis of policy documents, analysis of relevant literature, and interviews with key-informants in the social policy area.

The first part of this section is devoted to a more general analysis of policies of inclusion and exclusion. In the second part we will deal with more specific policies on integration through participation.

3.2.2 Historical review and discourses

3.2.2.1 Historical review

During the period from the 1970s to the 1990s, the European countries have faced major changes in economic and political life. Perhaps the most profound changes are the ones which are related to the shift from manufacturing to service industry, and from Fordist regimes to more flexible patterns of production, frequently combined with the implementation of information technology and the adaptation of new organisational structures and management strategies. In some countries and in some industries, these changes have been more significant than in others, but hardly any country has been left untouched by these tendencies.

In the labour market this has highlighted the quest for more flexibility of the labour force, reflected in the growth of non-standard employment patterns. Combined with the almost simultaneously growing, and increasingly persistent high level of unemployment and the change from a predominantly Keynesian macroeconomic growth regime to a monetarist regime of macroeconomic management, the interests of labour have been subordinated to those of capital. This process was reinforced during the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s by a political scene dominated by right wing parties in government in most European countries. The age of post war social democracy appeared at an end, and labour-market regulation was increasingly influenced and dominated by policies which aimed at strengthening the market forces and competition in the labour market. The dominant rationality of labour market regulation changed from 'co-operation' to 'competition'.

During the last half of the 1990s hard core liberalism seems to have lost some of its influence, and maybe some of the social aspects in European labour-market policies have regained some influence. At least the EU influence on labour-market policies seems to point in that direction, as does the return of labour and social democratic parties into office in most EU member states; even though it should be emphasised that these parties went through a thorough re-orientation during the last two decades.

There are both similarities and differences between the 6 INPART-countries. The similarities are first of all that unemployment is the dominant problem of social exclusion in all countries and labour-market policy has been changing from passive to active measures. Labour-market participation is considered the most important aspect of social inclusion. This is very much in line with the present EU policy.

Increased flexibility in the labour market is another common aspect in the 6 countries. Most countries try to enhance their competitiveness by increasing flexibility, i.e. deregulation of labour-market relations, wage differentiation, the introduction of temporary work contracts, et cetera. The consequences were increased job insecurity and increased social exclusion.

A general tendency during the entire period has been the feminisation of the labour market. In all countries the activity rate of women has been growing. However, there are still differences in women's activity rate, as table 1 showed. It is relatively high in northern Europe and relatively low in southern Europe. But the changed position of women leads to new demands in the welfare state. It is increasingly being accepted that women should be treated as individuals,

and not just as family members, and that the welfare state must create the necessary care facilities, especially for children.

There are also historical differences between the 6 countries. Portugal and Spain have a common history of dictatorship until the mid-seventies. They had to build a new welfare state and introduce democratic labour-market relations. They joined the EU in 1986. The other 4 countries have a long welfare-state tradition with continuity and have been members of the EU for many years.

Furthermore, Spain and Portugal have a family oriented welfare state where family support is still of great importance, while Denmark, Belgium and The Netherlands have a high degree of welfare state support on an individual basis.

The position of the UK deserves some special attention here as well. The UK had a conservative government for many years and have experienced relatively far-going processes of deregulation of labour-market relations. The UK have stayed outside the EU Social Charter until recently, when the New Labour government joined the Social Charter and introduced the Welfare reform programme.

3.2.2.2 Policy

The problems behind the shift in paradigm from passive to active labour-market policy are concentrated on the financial implications for the welfare states of periods of high unemployment and social exclusion. During the period of low unemployment in western Europe, i.e. until the oil crisis in 1973, the aim of the welfare state was to compensate for loss of income. Normally, unemployment was a temporary situation and unemployment benefits could avoid serious social problems. The financial burden of the welfare state was rather limited since unemployment was low, even though the compensation rate was rather high (for example in Denmark and The Netherlands).

The economic crisis after the oil crisis caused high unemployment. The number of benefit recipients increased and the financial burden became a serious problem. Most countries had budget deficits. The crisis was not temporary and it was considered necessary to cut public expenses. Benefits were reduced and it became more difficult to be entitled to benefits. But these actions were not sufficient to solve the problems of social exclusion. On the contrary: unemployment and social exclusion increased. Passive policy measures, it was concluded, were insufficient to solve the problems.

Another difficulty developing during the 1980s were the structural problems on the labour market. The neo-liberalists claimed that lack of wage flexibility was an obstacle to increasing employment. In most countries labour-market structures were deregulated. Unemployment was especially high among the low-skilled, and in some countries education and training programmes were introduced to enhance flexibility (and 'employability').

The neo-liberal focus on the lack of incentives to accept jobs implied that benefits were considered too generous and that the difference between social benefits and working incomes was too small. The assumption was that the unemployed did not want to seek employment.

Social exclusion increased not only because the number of unemployed increased. A derived consequence was that a lot of older and disabled people were excluded from the labour force. They were placed in early retirement or disablement schemes even though they were still able to work. Competition in the labour market became stronger. The labour market became dualised. On the one hand a group of insiders, and on the other hand a group of outsiders. To sum up, during the 1980s it became obvious that the traditional passive measures were

insufficient. Increased flexibility on the labour market and deterioration of social benefits only made things worse. Social exclusion increased.

In order to solve the exclusion problems, during the 1990s activation and workfare policies were given a higher priority. Excluded people should be helped or forced into employment and labour-market participation was recognised as the best way to avoid social exclusion. Although structural problems on the labour market such as inflexibility, low education, et cetera, were still considered serious problems, in the 1990s unemployment was increasingly seen as an individual problem. It was considered necessary to create a range of participation forms in which the unemployed could be placed, such as education, job placements in the private and public sectors, employment projects, sheltered jobs, et cetera.

In these activation policies, there are both carrots and sticks. The carrots are the participation forms mentioned. The sticks are compulsion and reduced benefits if people do not accept participation offers in the proposed activities. Activation involves a kind of contract between the state and the unemployed with consequences for the unemployed.

The problems have been different in the different countries.

In Spain the problems have been concentrated on employment security and work contracts. In order to increase labour-market flexibility, the number of temporary labour contracts increased in the 1980s. At the same time dismissal costs for employers have been reduced. This has led to serious problems of more insecurity of employment.

In Portugal, neo-liberalist policies have increased job insecurity and low wages more than high rates of employment. To compensate for flexibilisation of labour relations and deregulation, active measures for employment promotion have been introduced with some success.

The Netherlands and Denmark have both experienced a dramatic shift in paradigm from passive to active labour-market policy. The workfare strategy has been used more and more, especially in relation to young people. Labour-market participation is seen as the best way of solving the exclusion problems.

The UK has for many years been dominated by neo-liberal activation policies which contained very few carrots and lots of sticks. Now, after many years of conservative government and deregulation, the UK seems in the process of getting more in line with the activation policy measures in other northern European countries. The New Deal is being implemented by the New Labour government, and the UK is joining the EU strategy.

EU-policy has had a great influence on labour-market policy in Spain and Portugal, while The Netherlands and Denmark seem to show a more autonomous development. Still the EU-policy of job creation and active labour-market policy has become a commonly agreed solution to exclusion problems in all countries. All EU-countries are now obliged to formulate job creation policy plans (National Action Plans), and to evaluate these plans.

3.2.2.3 Debate

In many countries, the debate on active labour-market policy and participation has been about rights and obligations. The point of view of trade unions and socialists has been to emphasise rights to jobs and social protection of employees. This has been the aim of the labour movement's struggle for many years. The employers and the liberalists have argued for deregulation and increased incentives to work. Increased labour-market flexibility is seen as a measure to improve employment and enhance competitiveness. This means deterioration in social protection schemes.

A new dimension in the debate in some countries has been the moral point of view. It is considered unethical to receive public support without doing something in return. Able-bodied persons should contribute to the wealth of society and participate in work activities. Nowadays, most people agree with the concept of active labour-market policy, but the key question is the degree of compulsion. For many years compulsion was seen as a bad thing. Rights and motivation were considered the best measures to increase employment. But the workfare strategy implies a certain degree of compulsion which seems to be accepted by more and more people.

Another question in the debate on active labour-market measures concerns the rights of the participants. In many cases participants in activation projects do not have the same rights as other employees. They often have no influence on wage setting, working time and working conditions. Moreover, they often have fewer social rights than ordinary employees.

3.2.2.4. EU policy and NAPs

In the (long) process leading to the consolidation of a European employment strategy, some historical landmarks can be mentioned, such as: the Treaty of Amsterdam (which introduced a new title on employment); the White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment (emphasising the structural dimension of unemployment) and some European Councils, especially the Extraordinary European Council on Employment that took place in Luxembourg in November 1997. In fact, the 'Luxembourg Summit' is particularly relevant, because it was there that all member states agreed to implement a (common) strategy to fight unemployment, built on four main pillars: employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability and equal opportunities². For practical implementation purposes, a set of guidelines are adopted every year for each of those four aspects, which all member states agree to translate into concrete administrative measures, through their National Action Plans for Employment (NAPs).

Although unemployment generally affects all member states, the specific characteristics of the different labour markets determine the priorities set by each national government. This is something particularly important if we bear in mind that one of the main aspects of the implementation of the Guidelines is the definition of both European and national targets. Or, on the basis of a preliminary analysis, we may conclude that only a small number of European targets have been set and that a large measure of autonomy has been given to the member states, offering them the opportunity to decide what timing, dimensions and/or strategies should be implemented, according to their particular economic and social situation.

Therefore, considering the different problems that characterise some of those contexts, we can, according to the Joint Employment Report for 1998, distinguish some of the most relevant initiatives that were developed in the six countries represented in this research project: Belgium, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Portugal, and Spain. Before we mention some recent developments in these countries, we should mention the fact that the first Pillar (Employability) constitutes the most relevant area of action for the majority of the member states. In fact, the introduction and/or development of an early intervention strategy in the case of both long-term and young unemployment is considered a priority by national states; a parallel priority is the improvement of life-long training and/or activation measures. We must therefore emphasise the preoccupation towards two of the categories (the young and the long-term unemployed) which are particularly vulnerable to processes of social exclusion.

With respect to employability, Denmark and the United Kingdom have developed actions to fight youth unemployment. In the first case, this problem has been considered since 1996 and special action was taken "with the aim of taking young unemployed off passive benefits and get

² EC (1997), Commission adopts Guidelines for Member States Employment Policies for 1998.

them started on some form of education or on employment”³. The UK’s strategy to tackle youth unemployment includes “new active labour market policies, the largest of which is the ‘New Deal for Young People’”⁴. Based on a strong component of workfare, this kind of policy “aims to offer employment or training with appropriate support to unemployed young people before they flow into long-term unemployment”⁵.

Portugal has taken relevant initiatives for the promotion of entrepreneurship. In Portugal, the aim of the “Centros de Formalidades de Empresas” (Enterprise Formalities Centres) is to facilitate the setting up, restructuring or closure of businesses, revealing a strong interest in the creation of new jobs. Once again the young unemployed are the main target group.

The Netherlands are particularly preoccupied with the reduction of taxes and social security contributions for low-wage workers, which is one of the guidelines within Pillar 2.

With the highest unemployment rate in the EU as well as the highest rate of temporary employment, Spain tries to guarantee a more consistent participation of the social partners, establishing agreements with the aim of developing “a more stable model of industrial relations to increase firms’ competitiveness, to improve employability, and to reduce turnover and the share of temporary employment”.⁶

Considering the examples mentioned as some of the important initiatives undertaken by some of the European member states during the first year of the implementation of NAPs, we realise that, for instance, the fourth Pillar, which concerns the promotion of equal opportunities, has not yet been regarded as a central domain of action. Maybe that is one of the reasons why one of the innovations included in the 1999 Guidelines is, precisely, that equal opportunities must be tackled in a more integrated and/or transversal manner.

Nevertheless, the definition of European Guidelines represents not only a common concern regarding unemployment, but they also have a positive impact on national strategies/policies for the creation of new jobs and/or the revitalisation of the labour markets: the revitalisation of public services, the consolidation of new measures and the reorganisation of those already in existence, the participation of different sets of actors, the prosecution of (common) evaluation processes, the development of measures concerning the social categories which are more vulnerable to unemployment (for example, young unemployed and long-term unemployed; women and people with disabilities), are in themselves good examples of affirmative initiatives.

Although the European Employment strategy could be based upon stricter common targets, in a period of growing interdependency between countries and/or political and economic organisations such as the European Union, and in which important economic and social transformations are occurring rapidly and on a large scale, we recognise that this kind of co-ordinated action is particularly important when we try to solve problems similar to unemployment, like poverty, social exclusion, et cetera.

3.2.2.5. Prospects

The active labour-market policy has become dominant in the EU and the member states, and labour-market participation is seen as the most important form of inclusion. Yet there have been very few evaluations of these policies. In some countries the employment situation has improved (Denmark, The Netherlands, UK and Spain), but it is difficult to say whether this improvement is due to the active labour-market policy.

³ EC (1998), European Commission adopts 1998 Joint Employment Report, p. 33.

⁴ EC (1998), European Commission adopts 1998 Joint Employment Report, p. 34.

⁵ Idem.

⁶ EC (1998), European Commission adopts 1998 Joint Employment Report, p. 44.

On the EU level, active labour-market policy has a high priority and the new Amsterdam Treaty confirms this tendency. Moreover, the annual NAPs strongly focus on employment policy. We can therefore expect more emphasis on labour-market policy in the coming years.

3.2.3 Regulations of the regular labour market

This section deals with policies which regulate participation in the regular labour market. We will concentrate mainly on policies which affect the size and the manner of labour-market participation in general. We have used the following categories of policies:

- Wages, taxes and labour costs
- Employment security and working time
- Job rotation and leave schemes
- Job centre and job promotion
- Child care
- Self-employment and employment support
- Education and training for the employed

3.2.3.1 Wages, taxes and labour costs

These types of policies aim at expanding employment and improving economic incentives for unemployed and employers.

Wages

An important factor in employment is the wage level, especially the minimum wage. If minimum wage is set too high it will create barriers to employment. Low productivity workers will not be employed if they are not profitable for the employer. Not all countries have minimum wages or only in certain branches.

Wage negotiations normally take place in the sphere of labour-market partners. In some countries there is a situation of more or less voluntary moderate wage increases in order to increase employment, and in some countries governments have a certain influence on wage setting, for example tripartite agreements (social contracts).

Labour costs

Reducing employers' contributions to social security is another way of reducing labour costs and improving employment. This measure has been in operation in most countries.

Taxation and income traps

The economic incentive for job seekers is the difference between unemployment benefit and net income from a job. If income taxation is high, the net result of getting an ordinary paid job might be close to zero or even negative if they lose some income related benefits/advantages. Economic (dis)incentives are issues in most countries.

Some countries have changed their tax and benefits system, for example by lowering income tax on low incomes, or by introducing a system of in-work benefits, tax credits and raising tax paying limits for low income earners. Whatever the concrete measures, their aim is to reward labour-market participation.

Another way of widening the gap between benefits and working income is to reduce and freeze benefits for a period. This has more or less been the case in most countries.

3.2.3.2 Employment security and working time

The overall tendency to make labour markets more flexible has increased the problem of flexible work. On the one hand, flexible work can lead to increased employment, but on the other hand it often means less social security, for example because temporary employees usually do not have access to the same rights as "normal" employees. More flexible work often leads to a dualisation of the labour force.

The EU has recommended more flexibility but at the same time argued for more social security for temporary work. In most countries social security for flexible work has not been improved.

In some countries, temporary work or flex-work is a big issue. Especially in Spain, the issue of labour contracts has been very central. Unions, employer associations and central and local governments have tried to convert temporary contracts into indefinite contracts (labour reform of 1997).

Dismissal

Another aspect of flexibility concerns regulations concerning dismissal. If dismissals are difficult or expensive for employers, they will hesitate when hiring and firing employees. This will reduce the numeric flexibility of private firms. On the other hand, it will improve security for the employees.

Part-time work

Part-time work is another participation form, often with limited rights for the employees. Social security in part-time jobs is either at a lower level than full-time work, or there are no social rights at all; although in some countries the situation of part-time workers has improved in recent years. Women form the majority of part-time workers.

Working overtime

An obvious way of creating more jobs is to convert overtime work into ordinary jobs. Overtime is often a convenient way for employers to increase labour flexibility. Working overtime can be in the interest of both employers and employees. The employers do not have to hire new employees and the employees can earn extra money.

Unions and governments are normally interested in regulating overtime work. It creates more jobs and it creates security for the employees against being exploited and forced to work more than they want to.

Domiciliary work

A special form of work is domiciliary work: working in the private home - but not domestic work. This kind of work is often without any rights or control. But in some countries domiciliary work has been regulated to be included into the provision of social rights.

3.2.3.3 Leave schemes and job rotation

Leave schemes and job rotation is another way to employ more people or to redistribute employment and unemployment. These policies do not create more jobs, but enable more people to participate in the labour market over a period of time. Denmark, The Netherlands and Portugal have introduced leave schemes.

Job rotation can be used in connection with training and education of employees. When the employees are participating in training/education they may be substituted by unemployed persons.

3.2.3.4 Job centres and job promotion

Important institutions in all labour markets are job-seeking and employment services. Most job seeking activity is informal, such as making use of personal contacts or advertising in newspapers. But in most countries official employment services exist and registration with employment services is a condition for receiving unemployment benefits normally.

In some countries special agencies for job promotion exist, for example 'job clubs' for the integration of young and long-term unemployed people offering training in job-seeking techniques or providing vocational guidance.

3.2.3.5 Child care

A general tendency in all countries has been the feminisation of the labour market and the growing activity rate of women. But an obstacle to employment of women can be lack of child care facilities.

In most countries child care is carried out in the private sector or by family relations. Child care can be supported in different ways. Either a child care tax credit, or tax-financed child care institutions.

3.2.3.6 Self-employment and employment support

An obvious way to create more employment is to support employment, have more self-employed people and create new firms. Private initiatives and innovations are driving forces in market economies.

One way of supporting employment is to give subsidies to firms to create new jobs. In some countries there are special schemes to expand employment in domestic services, such as cleaning. Households are given a subsidy to reduce the price for the services or the subsidy is given to the employer, but only if he hires long-term unemployed.

Traditionally, another way to increase employment was to support private firms. This was an important measure some years ago when special industries were subsidised by the state to prevent unemployment. The EU policy has tried to reduce this kind of support for competitive reasons, but it still exists in some countries.

In some countries, small and medium size firms are economically supported in order to create more jobs. The support can either be in the form of money paid per new job or reduction in employers' social contributions.

There are two principal ways to support self employment. The one is to give economical support to (unemployed) people who want to start their own business. The other is to give counselling, et cetera, to new starters.

Spain supports the foundation of ALS (Anonymous Labour Societies), co-operatives and Limited Labour Societies through the capitalisation of unemployment benefits. Spain also supports co-operatives in the social economy.

3.2.3.7 Education/training for employed people

In order to improve the qualifications of the employed, and to prevent them from being excluded, some countries have schemes for education and training for employed people.

3.2.4 Subsidised participation

Another category of policies entails subsidised participation on the labour market. It is a type of policy targeted at unemployed and disabled people who have difficulties in participating or are unable to participate in productive activities without subsidies from national or local authorities.

The target groups are placed in jobs which in principle could be substituted by ordinary employees and the working conditions are close to normal conditions. The jobs are mostly

additional and subsidised by public funds. Because of a lack of economic profitability they would (in principle) not have been created in the absence of public support and members of the target groups would not have occupied them without help from the employment authorities. In some countries, for example The Netherlands and Denmark, there is a debate about whether all additional jobs are really additional or would have been established anyway.

The target groups are mostly socially excluded people, such as long-term unemployed or disabled persons who are unable to get a job on their own.

We will deal here with the following categories of subsidised participation.

- Job-placements in the private sector
- Job-placements in the public sector or NGOs
- Sheltered jobs
- Insertion enterprises
- Self-employment

3.2.4.1 Job-placements in the private sector

This category of subsidised participation normally involves additional jobs in the private sector for a limited period of time. All 6 INPART-countries have schemes for private job placements.

Usually, the purposes of the schemes are reinsertion and enrolment into the labour market. A common feature of the job-placement schemes is wage subsidisation for additional jobs during a period of time, for example 6-12 months. Another form of subsidy is reduction of the employers' social contribution.

The target groups differ slightly in the different countries. However, the long-term unemployed are generally considered to be the main target group. In some countries the young unemployed and recipients of social assistance/subsistence allowance are special target groups.

3.2.4.2 Job placement in the public sector and NGOs

Job placements in the public sector and NGOs are the most frequent form of subsidised participation. Mostly they involve additional jobs for a limited period of time. This kind of scheme exists in all 6 INPART-countries.

The general purpose is, again, reinsertion and enrolment of long-term unemployed people into the labour market. In some schemes, the purpose is activation without ambitions of reinsertion into the labour market. In general, the reinsertion ambitions of job placements in the public sector are lower than in the private sector.

In general, job-placement schemes in the public sector and NGOs consist of work and activation in additional jobs or functions. Often, they are jobs in 'soft' areas like social services, environmental and cultural institutions, or social and humanitarian organisations/NGOs. These are areas where subsidisation of employment will have limited consequences for private firms and competition.

The target groups are normally long-term unemployed and receivers of social assistance benefits. Compared to the target groups of job placement in the private sector, the target groups of public job placements are, generally speaking, more vulnerable and underprivileged, i.e. very long-term unemployed.

3.2.4.3 Sheltered employment

Most countries have special participation schemes for disabled people - often called sheltered jobs. There are a lot of similarities between job-placements and sheltered jobs, but the target groups are different. Job-placements are meant for able-bodied, unemployed people, while

sheltered jobs are meant for the disabled. Most countries have schemes for sheltered employment.

The general purpose of sheltered jobs is reinsertion into the labour market and employment. Sheltered jobs can be jobs on the regular labour market in the private or public sector on special terms according to the handicap. But they can also be special jobs in sheltered firms/organisations separated from the regular labour market: sheltered workshops.

3.2.4.4 Insertion enterprises

In most countries new initiatives are being taken, both by the state and in civil society, that function as a platform for marginal workers to enter the labour market. Created under different legal forms (mostly as co-operatives or associations), Insertion Enterprises are societal undertakings aiming at providing training, temporary jobs and job training activities to their members and clients.

There are various ways to establish and organise insertion enterprises. In Belgium, the insertion enterprises are initially subsidised companies that give priority to employment with the legal obligation of having, after three years from the start, in full-time-equivalents at least 30% of people belonging to target groups (the low skilled) among their employees. In Spain they are supported by fiscal payments and reductions of social contributions. In Portugal training grants are supplied at a level of 70% of the minimum wage.

The general target group is people who are most excluded and have very little access to the labour market.

3.2.4.5 Self-employment

Self-employment has become a very common form of subsidised work. It has several advantages. It involves work in the private sector and the self-employed may be able to employ more unemployed. Self-employment could also be an innovative measure where new products and services are invented and produced. All countries now have schemes for self-employment to offer to the unemployed.

The general purpose of self-employment is to give the unemployed an opportunity to become self-employed and start their own enterprise. Moreover, it is hoped that these initiatives will have an employment ‘spin-off’ effect when the new companies are able to employ other unemployed.

The general form of subsidy to unemployed people who want to be self-employed is granting them a special benefit instead of unemployment benefit for a certain period, e.g. 2-3 years. During the period of support the unemployed person should not be available for other kinds of work.

3.2.5 Education and Training

In the context of labour-market policies, education emerges as a central instrument for participation, since uneducated and low-skilled workers run a high risk of becoming unemployed. Moreover, as the demand for low-skilled labour is diminishing, education is seen to be essential for future employment and employability.

In spite of a diversification trend that took place in general education systems over the past years in different countries, there still seems to be a lack of strategic integration of basic education, vocational education and vocational training, aimed at increasing the level of performance of human capital, and improving the opportunities for integration through the labour market.

As an outcome of the above mentioned trend towards a diversification of educational curricula, new technological courses were created within secondary education. However, the

perception of the risks generated by an excessive specialisation has held governments back from following this trend more openly.

Acknowledgement of the need for good preparation and certification of young persons aiming at entering the labour market, led some countries to create vocational courses outside the education system and outside the vocational training system. In Spain, Training Schools have been implemented in the 1990s offering two-year courses. In Portugal there are Training Schools offering three-year courses and further job training. They were instituted, in the 1980s, by social partners (local authorities, employer associations and trade unions), and partly funded through ESF.

3.2.5.1 Vocational training policies

Over the last few decades, vocational training has become one of the most important instruments for combating social exclusion and labour-market marginality. The worsening of labour conditions due to the flexibilisation trend associated with technological and economical restructuring, has been experienced differently by workers according to age, sex, education, et cetera. Some categories of workers became highly vulnerable to exclusion in a context where classic vocational training schemes turned out to be rather inadequate. New vocational training schemes targeted to specific social groups are commonly regarded by governments as the appropriate tool for reducing those vulnerabilities.

3.2.5.2 Young people

A particular concern is presented by inexperienced young people, since any delay in the normal age of incorporation into the labour market is considered to increase the risk of unemployment.

A large set of measures targeted at young people is available in each of the countries under analysis. Some are oriented to introducing young unemployed people to a first temporary job, giving them work experience and an introduction to the labour market. Very commonly, training and employment under an alternating scheme are combined in order to ease the integration of trainees in working life, and simultaneously to develop skills and attitudes in work contexts. A combination of job training and formal education has been used.

In general, training measures aim at making the integration of youths into working life easier, and at reducing the number of people that are incorporated in the labour market without a suitable basic education. The co-operation of employer associations and companies in the implementation of measures trying to combine training and employment, such as job training, is quite crucial.

3.2.5.3 Unemployed Adults

Long-term unemployed workers increasingly share with inexperienced young people the major part of the resources available for training activities. In almost all countries, training courses have been adapted to the particular unemployment condition of the trainees.

Special modalities of training for unemployed workers include training courses, job training, training and employment and substitutional jobs associated with educational leave.

3.2.5.4 Education

Education is a basic condition for social participation and a central issue for social policies. In some countries a big effort has been made to compensate for shortage and deficiencies in education policies. There is a great variety of education schemes aiming at improving the qualifications of the labour force, mainly of the unemployed.

3.2.6 Unpaid activities

From a phenomenological perspective, participation in unpaid activities is assuming different forms in different countries. National reports reveal that in Northern European countries, regular participation in voluntarily organised activities engages a significant part of the population: 26% in Denmark, 28% in Belgium, 36 % in The Netherlands and 22% in the UK.

Conversely, in Southern countries this kind of participation appears to be weaker. However, when we consider less institutionalised forms of activity — such as mutual help, informal care, domestic work — voluntary work emerges as a deeply rooted, strong activity in these countries. Family and community solidarities stand for an important source of services and goods provided through voluntary and unpaid work. Moreover, Spain and Portugal have in common the experience of long lasting authoritarian political regimes that limited free associative movements and, after that, the experience of an effervescent democratic transition period where associative movements developed in an unprecedented way. The church, finally, assumes a central role as an inspiring agency of paternalistic voluntarism. Religion and militancy, not law, are the main motives for voluntary work in these countries. However, participation went through a process of diversification in the last decade. For example, nowadays NGO volunteers are working in social welfare, the third world, but also in sports.

Even where social problems are traditionally the responsibility of public institutions, governments tend to give higher priority to voluntary work and organisations and to increase co-operation between public institutions and voluntary organisations.

In many countries, participation in unpaid activities became an objective for unemployed persons under activation policies, since unpaid work is considered to contribute to inclusion through self-help and reciprocity. Unemployed people on benefits can take unpaid activities as long as they are seeking jobs or are available for a job.

In The Netherlands, the Melkert III programme accords financial incentives for socially excluded and long-term unemployed recipients of social assistance (mostly those “at a large distance from the labour market”) who are participating in unpaid activities. In return, unpaid workers are exempt from the obligation to apply for jobs. In the UK, voluntary work forms are one of the five options of the New Deal. However, people claiming Job Seekers Allowance are limited as to the time they can spend carrying out voluntary activities because of the “actively seeking work” clause. The same situation exists in Denmark, where in principle the unemployed should be available for a job at any time. Nowadays the participation in unpaid activities is restricted to the non-insured unemployed, i.e. to receivers of social assistance benefit (ca. 1000 persons in 1997).

3.2.7 Conclusions

The 6 INPART-countries form a variety of countries and welfare states within the EU. They are different in many ways, for example with respect to population, geography, economy, history and type of welfare state. They also have different policies on social exclusion and inclusion.

In spite of these differences, the 6 countries also have a lot in common. First of all they are all members of the EU. This means that they are part of the common EU-policy on social exclusion and inclusion. They are also influenced by the same economic system and its fluctuations. They have a lot of similar social problems such as unemployment and social exclusion although the unemployment rates vary from country to country.

Increased flexibility of the labour market is another aspect the countries have in common. Most countries tried to enhance their competitiveness by increasing flexibility: deregulation of labour-market relations, wage differentiation, temporary work contracts, et cetera. The consequences were increased job insecurity and increased social exclusion.

A convergence in labour-market policies seems to be taking place during the 1990s. Labour-market policy has changed from passive to active measures and labour-market participation is considered the most important measure to improve social inclusion. This is very much in line with the present EU policy. Policies concerning the regulation of the regular labour market in most of the countries are very much oriented towards improving competitiveness by reducing labour costs and enhancing the flexibility of the labour force. The growing number of part-time and casual jobs demands more protection of employees' rights. The general tendency is to substitute job-security with employment-security.

Subsidised work has become a substantial part of the active labour-market policy in all 6 countries. This type of policy is very much targeted at the long-term unemployed who have great difficulties to achieve participation in ordinary work. Most often, though not always, the general purpose is insertion into the ordinary labour market. Subsidised work can take many forms, for example job placements in the private or public sector, sheltered jobs, insertion enterprises or self-employment. Normally this involves additional jobs for a limited period of time.

Education and training have become central instruments in most countries. This is very much due to the fact that social exclusion is closely connected to low levels of education. An enlargement and diversification of the classic vocational training schemes have been noticed in almost all countries. New schemes, targeted at specific social groups were created and often combined with other kinds of incentives such as job creation.

Finally, unpaid activities are very different from country to country. In the Southern countries participation in unpaid activities appears to be weaker and less institutionalised, and voluntary work is absent from policy concerns or is insufficiently protected. Where voluntary organisations and solidarity are stronger, not only suitable programmes and the law promote, protect and provide incentive for unpaid work activities, but governments and public institutions are also more and more open to increased co-operation with voluntary organisations.

3.3 WP2: a research review on five alternative types of work

Although work in the form of a full-time, permanent, paid job is regarded as a key factor in the battle against social exclusion, the importance of other possible sources of identity and integration is often underestimated. Hence, going beyond employment and workfare, other forms of work, that can be considered both as integrating basins for social recognition, and as providing integration, should not be ignored. Thus, it was the purpose of this work package to refine the concepts of alternative forms of work under study in (and by) the six countries participating in the INPART research. A research review should shed light on the inclusionary/exclusionary potentials of various types of work in the different national realities: irregular work, subsidised work, unpaid work, targeted training and informal work.

In addition, the observations attained in this synthesis serve to cast light on the different activating social policy measures implemented. In this respect, research on the relation between work and social inclusion-exclusion can be oriented both at evaluating labour-market policies (from a top-down approach) and in appraising individuals' orientation towards work (from a bottom-up approach). However, our interest at this point was not so much to gauge the effectiveness of the various employment or work-oriented programmes included in this research, as to illustrate differences in perspective between countries and between policy-makers on the one side, and the people involved on the other.

In this latter context, a relevant issue arises around the status that should be given to these alternative types of work. To what extent should we keep defending "regular work" as the most important - if not unique - way of participating fully in society, in comparison, for instance, with voluntary or unpaid work? Should work be evaluated in terms of the access it

gives to regular (paid)-work? Should it be assessed for its inherent opportunities and limits on income? Or should it be valued according to its capacity for social integration, citizen participation and social network creation? Of course, all these approaches can be entangled, but most of the evaluations and studies made from a 'top-down' perspective (i.e. from policy-makers and public authorities) tend to be eventually reduced to taking regular (paid)-work as the normative reference.

With these questions as a general background, the review of five types of work, and their inclusionary-exclusionary potentials, are presented in the following order.

- Flexible and part-time work
- Subsidised work
- Education and work-training
- Unpaid work
- Informal (paid) work

3.3.1 Flexible and part-time work

Flexible - or a-typical work - has been heralded for some time now as a solution to unemployment and social exclusion, and is therefore strongly promoted within the EU. The necessity for more flexible labour markets, as a structural condition for competitiveness and employment growth in Europe is facing an era of globalisation,. This has led to the transformation of the work organisation and its regulatory framework (for example through working-time arrangements). In fact, most of the additional jobs created during the 1990s have been part-time rather than full-time jobs.

This is as much true for jobs for men as for jobs for women, though working part-time tends to be concentrated among the latter. The general tendency in the pattern of employment change for the six INPART countries during the first half of this decade showed that the number of men in full-time employment fell everywhere, except in the Netherlands where it rose only slightly. By contrast, the number of men in part-time work increased in all countries except Denmark. At a European level, 71% of the additional jobs created for men in 1995 were part-time, versus 85% for women. The reason for the elevated participation of women in part-time jobs is found, among other motives, in the different implication of men and women in housework. Particularly in the Netherlands, the participation of women in wage labour has doubled during the last 20 years. At the same time, the number of people in part-time jobs went up in all countries except Denmark. On the contrary, the number of women in full-time jobs rose significantly only in Belgium. The rise of female work in the six INPART countries has also led to a rise in the number of double-earning households. In a nutshell, there is evidence of an increase in the importance of irregular work relative to regular work.

All these relative changes of regular and irregular jobs have revealed certain counter-mechanisms in the development-character of irregular work. In the UK, much research has been done during the last 20 years into the impact and consequences of gender inequalities and inequalities on the labour market. Results show that participation in the labour market is substantially influenced by the 'gender question' in the workplace (e.g. women being excluded from certain types of jobs). Other surveys highlight the importance of recognising the gender-biased participation in flexible work, and therefore the probability that its inclusionary potential impacts unevenly on particular social groups. For example, in England older women with fewer educational qualifications than young women tend to be disproportionately represented in low-skilled, low-paid part-time jobs.

Even though there is still an overwhelming majority of women in part-time jobs, this trend may be gradually changing. High rates of unemployment, the decreasing availability of full-time jobs, combined with changes in qualifications for welfare benefits may result in more men entering into part-time employment. In Spain, irregular work tends to be concentrated not only among women but also among young students. However, they normally occupy precarious, temporary and badly paid jobs.

Whereas the introduction of short-term or part-time contracts has facilitated the rotation and mobility of workers in the market, it has facilitated a rise in work precariousness as well. In Spain, this situation makes occupational insertion difficult for the new-comers on the labour market, as it does not offer economic stability and does not permit the worker enough time to invest in social relations. In the Netherlands, an increase in precarious jobs is observed, concentrated principally in trade, food service, repair, transport and services sectors. It should be noted that two-thirds of all the jobs in this country that do not require skills and are done by young people, are to be found in the categories of shop-assistant, operator or clerical work. In some flexible labour-relations, loaning the employees to third-party companies has led to indistinct situations with respect to the care for good labour conditions and the balance between employer and flex-worker.

However, the debate in Europe has increasingly been diverted, not so much to the quality of the part-time jobs created as such, as to the tension that impinges on the social security of 'flex-workers'. On the one hand, one can say that flexibilisation of work offers chances to both employers and employees. The first can optimise their production process while the latter can combine work with other activities: for example, the female workforce can dedicate more time to domestic tasks or to their children. On the other hand, if flexibilisation does not carry along a minimum of social safety and equality, in terms of rights and benefits for the employees, this will put into question the introduction and maintenance of policies that promote flexibility. The issue has proved to be a prominent one in the different countries. In the UK, one third of part-time workers do not qualify for insurance-based rights because these part-timers earn below the National Insurance threshold. In Spain, trade unions, employer associations and central and local governments have tried to convert temporary contracts into indefinite contracts. In the Netherlands, a bill was put forward to increase flex-workers' legal security and give core workers more opportunities to take on flexible work. In Belgium, part-time job restraints are compensated by guaranteed, fairly high minimum wages.

A final analysis about the potential of part-time work regards the difficulty of assessing participation in part-time work as completely inclusive when employment protection does not provide equal rights to flex-workers as compared to those employed in regular jobs. In the UK, a big barrier facing flexible workers with respect to qualification and work rights consisted in the legal regulation to work for two years for the same employer before getting statutory rights. Besides, it was observed that employers tend to hire part-time workers based on their profitability when saving costs (e.g. not entitled to overtime wages). In Spain, 'below minimum' contracts (the so called 'junk contracts') proliferate. They carry no social security benefits, no social rights and they are fulfilled principally by young people. Conversely, in the Netherlands, despite many workers in flexible jobs with indefinite contracts are encountering many difficulties in satisfying the qualification requirements for benefits entitlement, the majority of workers found in part-time jobs have legal insurance.

To sum up, the huge growth of part-time work, its gender dimensions, the quality of work involved, and the constant evolution of employment rights legislation, render flexible and

part-time work an interesting case study which offers insight to what extent participation in this form of employment can bring about greater social inclusion for particular social groups, specially when its current drawbacks are overcome.

3.3.2 *Subsidised work*

A central policy feature of local, national and supra-national authorities is increasingly to respond to social exclusion and unemployment problems from co-ordinated directions. Hence, according to the general EU employment guidelines, a number of job-creation strategies must be implemented in all member states. Nonetheless, the input dedicated to subsidised work varies according to governments and countries. In general, the main objective of subsidised work as a 'toolkit' against exclusion is to offer a bridge to disadvantaged groups towards labour-market participation. In addition, other, more 'altruistic' objectives, such as creating forms of social participation also occur.

In Denmark, the aim of subsidised work policies is to lead the unemployed to permanent regular work since it is assumed that regular employment will lead subsequently to integration and higher participation in society. A number of activation schemes for specific target groups (such as social assistance receivers, insured unemployed) have been put into practice during the 1990s. In the Netherlands, governmental institutions have also created special programmes for subsidised jobs, specifically the Youth Employment Act (YEA) and the Jobpool (integrated later into the Jobseekers Employment Act), Melkert-I (nowadays: I/D-jobs) and Melkert-II. The main provision of subsidised job programmes in the UK is constituted by local authority inspired initiatives in cities like Glasgow, Liverpool, Sheffield et cetera, and the national government's New Deal Programmes.

In Spain, the focus is on the capitalisation of employment through the subsidised creation of co-operatives, anonymous labour societies and limited labour societies. In this context, the importance of the role the social economy plays in this country needs to be underlined, basically through the role of Co-operative Societies and the Anonymous Labour Societies (SAL). In recent years there has been a growth of this type of businesses, generating new jobs. On the same line, the development of a social space in Belgium fulfilled by hybrids of public and private enterprises – the so-called third system organisations (TSOs) - is dedicated to providing goods and services to the local community. These enterprises undertake economic activities at local level, but contrary to private enterprises, without the aim of profit maximisation or profit generation. They combine the economic sphere with social goals, providing collective mechanisms against social exclusion. Although third system organisations and the social economy they involve are just one social actor in the policy against unemployment, they are now starting to play a very important role in terms of social inclusion, especially for risk groups with low levels of education and lack of work experience. In Portugal, locally based strategies are used alongside social networks in the attempt to increase the opportunities of finding a job for unemployed people. In all these countries, however, it is too early to say that social economy constitutes a clear solution for unemployment.

Although the broader social integration effects of the different subsidised schemes can be seen as a step forward in meeting the needs of the unemployed and the local communities, research in the different countries also reveals a number of limitations.

One of the arguments against many subsidised schemes is the lack of real opportunities for participants. In Britain, Intermediate Labour Market measures have in many cases not resulted in permanent employment once the subsidy period has ended. Additionally, while a substantial number of participants gain the skills and experience necessary to get paid employment, these jobs are often of a low-skilled and temporary nature. In Belgium, similar

conclusions have been attained. Whereas the provision of combined measures may enable different ways for integration into the labour market, the risks of stagnation and stigmatisation are latent when participants roll into a 'carousel' of secondary and tertiary labour circuit activities since full employment is not available for these participants. In Denmark, it was observed how 40-50% of the people who had participated in subsidised work or training had not improved their opportunities of getting regular employment. Also, 7% of the unskilled long-term unemployed had never received an offer of a subsidised job.

In the Netherlands, the Melkert-plans, in contrast to the employment activation programme in Denmark, appear to have more capacity to generate jobs specially in the public and non-profit sectors. The Melkert-I scheme creates permanent work at the bottom of the labour market. The jobs are concentrated in the care sector and in municipal services. Melkert-II involved both new organisations and existing companies and its objective was to stimulate access to regular jobs. In general, the labour market position of the Melkert-II participants is better than the labour market position of the participants in other social policy measures. However, less positive elements are encountered in both schemes. On the Melkert-I side, two elements foster discontent among beneficiaries. Firstly, there is low remuneration. Secondly, the kind of work beneficiaries have to do, and the fact that in many cases their capacities remain unused also rankles. If, additionally, the subsidised job offers small opportunities to find another type of work, this will increase demotivation and dropping out. On the Melkert-II side, job contracts are of a temporary nature (they used to last no more than two years). Besides, the formula is tempting for the employer for, it offers the option to get rid of workers when they do not perform the way the employers want them to. Similarly, in Belgium, many measures are often limited in time and fragmented, therefore achieving limited objectives. Work experience projects may supply job experience through full-time contracts, but the life of these projects is limited to the period that subsidies sustain them. In Spain, workers in co-operatives, Limited Labour Societies and Anonymous Labour Societies run high risks when the society happens to go bankrupt.

Regarding the potential for social inclusion of subsidised work, the conclusion is that the success of social policies depends on the match between the measures implemented and the beneficiaries' needs in the short and the long run. Tailor-made approaches and route counselling seems to be adequate in the development of efficient roads for social integration. Furthermore, substitution, displacement and creaming off are characteristics of many subsidised programmes.

3.3.3 Education and training

Following the recommendations accorded by the European Council at the Essen Summit in December 1994, the improvement of education systems and vocational training are regarded as the most suitable preventive means against unemployment, and thus against social exclusion. Lacking qualifications is considered to be a major obstacle for having access to the labour market. Besides, a flexible labour market requires a flexible labour force. Due to a growing demand for re-education and training in new skills, education and training programmes should be adapted to supply those skills required by the labour market. Furthermore, access to training is considered the best tool to combat inequalities and to foster equal opportunities.

In the UK, two forms of training provision have been put into practice. At national level: the Government Training schemes such as New Deal and its forerunners ET, TFW and YTS. At local level, training projects operating through partnerships between organisations such as local authorities, Training and Enterprise Councils, further education colleges, voluntary or-

ganisations, et cetera. In Denmark, the two most successful forms of training for young people are long-term training unemployment schools and 'Production schools'. Participation in these measures improves the chances of getting an ordinary job or education by 15%. Also, it is worth noting that 'High schools' such as 'day high schools' or 'folk high schools' in Denmark have a specific meaning far from the educational system of other countries. They pertain to special education schemes for the unemployed. In Spain, work-oriented training is chiefly conducted through vocational training schools (*escuelas de formación profesional*). Moreover, in Portugal, the IEFPP (*Instituto de Emprego e Formação Profissional*) and the *Escolas Profissionais* provide vocational training courses dedicated to the acquisition of technical and practical knowledge.

In the Netherlands, a distinction between education and training is made in the context of the new Jobseekers' Employment Act. While education is oriented towards a pre-trajectory for vocational training, at social participation or at self-efficacy and self-development, schooling or training is directed at improving prospects of reintegration into paid labour and has two aims: preparation for functioning in created or subsidised jobs and/or creating access to a regular job. After years of 'upgrading' policies in the Netherlands, it is now recognised that training measures have not been equally distributed, with the outcome that some groups are better-off in terms of employability than others.

In Belgium, the unemployed with low levels of education constitute a major target-group of participation in training programmes. These programmes can be compulsory, in principle. Specifically for the low-qualified (people with primary or low secondary school education), the federal government imposes a counselling plan (which can imply a compulsory training programme) after ten months of unemployment. However, this plan has proved to be rather inefficient. Training programmes of the Flemish and French communities are better adapted, involving route counselling – an intensive and individual guidance and accompaniment to work. NGOs and TSOs can also supply work-training for special groups (for example through *Enterprises de Formation par le Travail, Leerwerkbedrijven*, et cetera).

As far as the inclusionary potential of training and vocational education is concerned, the general orientation in Europe is to evaluate training measures by the number of participants finding jobs. In Spain, the evaluations of vocational training by the *PNFP (Plan Nacional de Formación Profesional)* concluded that almost 57% of the students that participated in the plan found a job afterwards. Other studies, however, show that although this training is important for job searching and job finding, it is not indispensable. In Portugal, studies reveal the secondary place of training for socially marginalised people. One of these researches shows how the concerns of people in precarious situations are not centred on taking training courses, but on obtaining a minimum of living conditions. This can be due to the fact that institutional measures are not sufficiently effective in combating exclusion, as another study demonstrates.

In Denmark, the evaluation of subsidised work and training developed by Rosdahl in 1998, concluded that the policies of targeted training have positive effects on employment only in the courses on occupational orientation. The opinions of the participants showed how the courses have served to improve their vocational qualifications. In the UK, as well as in Denmark, the plans for targeted training are connected to those for subsidised jobs. A study done in 1996 pointed out a series of problems related to the effects of social inclusion in these projects. One of the major problems was found in the unavailability of jobs for the recipients of targeted training after completion of the course. Besides, no follow-ups were at the trainee's disposal and no support was given. A last deterrent is found in the quality of the

courses. Some of them have been set at a low level. Thus, the skills acquired by the participants are not enough to be able to get a job after completing the training scheme.

In the Netherlands, it has been observed how training raises the possibilities of re-entering the market for some groups of unemployed. However, research done in this country shows negative aspects of targeted training as well. A study done in 1998 indicates that education can only play a role in the fight against social exclusion if the learning process is oriented in a practical way. In particular, the training should take the abilities of the participants as a starting point and keep in mind the needs for support that these people have. The effect of participation in adult education can be negative if attempts to earn a diploma fail. Moreover, research into labour insertion of training programmes observed that participation in such schemes does not guarantee a future job. In the area of Rotterdam, for example, 50% of the people who participated in the training courses in 1996 did not find a job.

In Belgium, since the Essen Treaty of December 1994, special measures aiming at employability for risk groups have been implemented through training provisions that can be organised either by public institutions and private organisations, or within the 'third sector'. While preventive actions are taken in order to decrease the flow of young and older unemployed people into long-term unemployment, unfortunately, due to constant structural unemployment, a growing proportion of people are extending their stay in the education and vocational training system, as a way of looking for a job.

3.3.4 Unpaid work

A great deal of social life is carried out in, and made possible by, the associative tissue, whether involving cultural, political or other activities. Certainly, belonging to a special group or association may become the centre of one's social life. Every association attracts members with similar interests, beliefs or concerns, and usually those who live in the same neighbourhood. In cohesive associations, people will work harder because the work is a way of enjoying interaction with others. Thus, non-paid forms of work, such as voluntary work, may be legitimate ways of promoting inclusion. In other words, participation in voluntary associations constitutes another channel for tackling social exclusion.

In Denmark, unpaid work is an important measure in solving exclusion and inclusion problems. On the one hand excluded people can be included by doing unpaid work themselves. On the other hand unpaid work can help excluded people in need. One of the few studies on the subject showed that people developing unpaid tasks have almost the same chances of getting ordinary employment or start training/education as most other forms of activation. In recent years, government has taken initiatives to give voluntary work a higher priority. For many participants unpaid work has entailed integration in social life and even insertion into the regular labour market. The government has realised that there are many problems which are better solved by voluntary work (e.g. homelessness, abuse problems, et cetera).

In the Netherlands, voluntary work is often differentiated into organised and non-organised work. In 1985, voluntary work represented an amount of work which corresponded to 17% of formal employment. In 1987, the size of unpaid domestic work measured in working years exceeded that of the domestic work done in the formal sector. Given the importance of voluntary work as a tool for social participation, a number of experiments are taking place as part of the new Social Assistance Act of 1996. The experiments primarily aim at stimulating labour-market participation and/or preventing or combating social exclusion through participation in unpaid activities. For some participants, this Melkert-III (or social activation) plan is considered as a step towards labour-market participation. For others, the reasons for and objectives of participating in the programme are not directly related to participation in the

labour market. According to the participants, Melkert-III is very useful in the creation and enlargement of social networks and as a satisfying way of spending one's time. Especially single mothers see the social activation scheme as a way of combining child-care tasks with outside activities.

Within British society, some 25% of people do voluntary work each year. Time-budget studies show that the leisure time available to most people in Britain has increased substantially since the 1950s, and that most choose to use this extra time (after child care) outside, rather than inside, the home. Overall, the average Briton belongs to more organisations now than 50 years ago and organisation membership in particular among women has more than doubled. However, although a good deal of volunteering takes place in Britain, it is not a uniform society in terms of participation in organisational networks. The situation is getting more polarised over time. In 1959, working class citizens participated to the same degree as middle class ones, about 62% on average belonging to voluntary associations. In 1990 this figure went down to 45%. Volunteering in Britain, thus, shows up the problem, also occurring in other spheres of informal economic activity, that the social capital gained from such activity is unevenly distributed, reinforcing rather than mitigating the social inequalities produced by unemployment. In practice, therefore, those not already possessing high skills are left to carry out the menial, marginal tasks which do not require high levels of ability and are of minimal value in improving skill-levels or employment prospects.

In Portugal, a wide range of support activities strategic for day-to-day needs are provided neither by the state nor by the market, but by primary social networks (so called *welfare-society*). However, it is not until recently that researchers have shown an interest in voluntary work and the associative life in voluntary organisations. Research on unpaid work was mainly focused on housework, petty-commerce and handicraft. In the area of welfare, the voluntary organisations are being increasingly supported and financed by the state to compensate for the gaps in public provision. This is the case for about 3000 private non-profit institutions of social solidarity, that are recognised as agencies of the Portuguese social protection system, and combine voluntary unpaid work with professional work. Unfortunately, like in the British case, it seems that the opportunities for self-development within these organisations are meagre. The participation in voluntary organisations of technical personnel and of the beneficiaries or users is relatively low.

In Spain, reviews on unpaid work are mainly concerned with voluntary and community work, research done on domestic work being rare. Hence is important to distinguish between the individual work developed by a person in a collective or individual way, and the employment promotion through initiatives without lucrative objectives. Within this context, there is a debate going on about whether unpaid activities affect paid ones. Some sectors of the population see how unpaid activities cause unfair competition with the formal sector. One third of the population surveyed in a study in Catalonia perceived voluntary work as a threat to the occupation of formal jobs. To co-ordinate the several policies around volunteering existing in this country, a legal framework (State Plans of Volunteers) was set up in 1997 in order to establish the necessary mechanisms and instruments, so that volunteering benefits the volunteers, the organisations, and society as a whole.

In Belgium, 'empowerment' of low-income groups through voluntary work is an uncertain strategy. Whereas employment policies are very much oriented to reducing (or to solving) the high rate of unemployment, they are not so much concerned with underemployment or the unequal opportunities and incomes of different groups on the labour market. As a result, voluntary work by unemployed benefit claimants meets with much suspicion.

Finally, the relation between unpaid work – in particular voluntary work – and social inclusion has an ambiguous nature. Principally in Northern countries, voluntary work is reckoned as a way of gaining work-experience, and esteemed for the satisfaction produced by work done, and for the extension of social networks that it entails. At the same time, the situations in Britain or Portugal show that the low possibilities that low-qualified and unemployed people have in developing their skills limit their chances of finding a non-routine job.

3.3.5 Informal (paid) work

In very general terms, informal economic activity tends to be interpreted by a range of analysts as a fraudulent activity which deprives the state of the revenue that could be used for social cohesion purposes, and is characterised by the fact that its activities are not registered in the national accounts, and that workers are not recognised as part of the labour force by official employment statistics. Apart from that, informal work is not protected by labour laws or labour policies, which puts the informal workers in a position of great insecurity. In the UK, paid informal work is also thought to involve the exploitation of some of the most marginalised social groups and, therefore, needs to be regulated.

International institutions (such as the OECD) have reported an increase in paid informal work on an international level. It is more substantial in countries like the UK where it has been reported up to be 34.3% of the GNP, but it is also appreciable in less 'suspect' countries like the Netherlands where, in 1995, the informal economy was estimated to represent between 12 and 39% of the GNP. In Spain and Portugal it continues to be an important sector of economic activity. In Portugal, the calculations made by the National Statistics Agency attribute a figure of 12% of the GNP to the informal sector, a low estimate compared to other sources (the Ministry of Employment suggested a 1991 figure of around 20%). In Spain, an inquiry of the Ministry of Finance in 1985 considered that 30% of self-employed workers and 36% of women in the labour force were informal workers. At the end of the eighties, informal activities represented 20% of active workers. Belgium is very close to these southern patterns. Research in the eighties estimated that the black market economy constituted 5 to 25% of the GNP. These estimates were moderated in a recent research done by the European Commission (1995) according to which the Belgian informal economy attains percentages of 10-15% of its GNP. The country in which the informal economy is less patent is Denmark, where studies have assessed the value of this economy to be 3% of its GNP.

Research into informal (paid) work in the six INPART countries came to the conclusion that this informal activity may perform several functions in society. Hence, some of them contain inclusionary potentials. In the Netherlands, the informal economy is of some importance as a compensatory work circuit for the unemployed. In some respects, this type of activity is an alternative for unemployed people, although 'formal workers' with a strong position on the formal labour market profit more from informal work. The informal Dutch society may also function as a source of solidarity, preserving traditional survival strategies, and producing identity and dignity.

In Belgium, informal activities are concentrated in major urban areas. The problem is that for low-skilled people in these neighbourhoods there is a lack of opportunities of getting a formal job or, in case they can find one, it has very bad conditions (low-paid, irregular working-hours, temporary). The economy, thus, is inclusionary (and functional) in the sense that it supplies people with extra resources and a way of guaranteeing their living standards – as a survival strategy, it proves to be successful. Nevertheless, the informal economy can hardly be seen as a compensation for a lack of welfare through a formal job since working

conditions are bad and informal jobs do not give possibilities for gaining access to the regular labour market.

In the UK, many of the people who became unemployed in the last decade decided to introduce themselves into the submerged economy. In this way, the informal economy becomes a kind of support for the unemployed. However, again, the jobs the unemployed occupy in the informal sector are predominantly oriented towards routine and monotonous jobs. In Portugal and Spain the informal economy is studied as an element used by segments of the population to solve unemployment problems. Research on submerged employment in Spain explains why high unemployment rates have not resulted in higher rates of poverty and social exclusion. Moreover, social networks based on community and family are the means by which people avoid getting into situations of labour and social exclusion and, to a large extent, by which the unemployed obtain an irregular job. In Portugal, studies on particular situations, like those of immigrants, reveal that informal work plays a central role in individuals' strategies to survive in unfamiliar contexts.

Research into 'black' work in Denmark does not say much about social, political or cultural aspects. But it is obvious that 'black' work has economic aspects, since informal workers (mainly unemployed) are paid for their work.

Another issue regarding participation in the informal economy is its acceptance by the people involved, and by society in general. In the Netherlands, a study among the long-term unemployed in Rotterdam showed that occasional participation in the 'black' economy was better accepted, than if it was done systematically. The former was perceived as a way of surviving and the latter as fraud. In Spain, the level of tolerance among the population is very high, although tolerance varies with the person involved. An opinion poll in 1997 showed that informal activities carried out by an employer were much less tolerated than those of a young worker. In the second case, as in the Netherlands, it is seen as a strategy for survival. In the UK, one of the studies on the matter shows that people that work in the informal economy do not have a self-concept of immorality about what they are doing, which they do have about frauds organised on a large scale. Another study, where 214 unemployed people working in an informal situation were interviewed showed that none of them conceived of their activities as being immoral. In contrast, they did express feelings of immorality with respect to large-scale fraud involving employers. In Denmark, the idea of doing 'black' work is not generally well received. In 1992 research about participation in the informal economy found that half of the total Danish population does not want to be involved in moonlighting, while 38% are prepared to do so if they have the opportunity. In Portugal, although some of the workers in the informal economy prefer to remain on the margins of the labour market, taking advantage of the fiscal advantages, for a considerable number of informal workers their participation is simply a matter of survival. This is more frequent among long-term unemployed, elderly, young people and women.

Although informal work can comprise inclusionary potentials in terms of access to an income, to social networks and even to a source of identity and dignity, it can not be seen, however, as a general compensation for formal work. As a matter of fact, formal work connections prove to be the best instrument for accessing (interesting) informal work. In many cases, those involved in formal work are the ones who profit most by supplementary informal work. Moreover, the formally employed have easier access to creative and autonomous informal work in comparison with the unemployed, who frequently are dependent on more routine, badly-paid jobs.

3.3.6 Conclusions

Although economic and political strategies to tackle social exclusion in Europe are conceived and oriented around the integrating function of a regular job, research in the reviewed countries has shown an increase of irregular work, unpaid work and informal work during the last decade. A further phenomenon questioning the integrating power of work is that of the working poor. This is especially so in countries combining a relatively high atypical employment rate with high poverty rates (e.g. Britain or Portugal). Nevertheless, in other countries too, special attention is given to employment programmes that involve low pay and few long-term prospects. It could also be put forward that there is a rising consciousness among the population that work on the regular labour market cannot be realised for all households, at least not on a lifelong basis. In this respect, the normative expectation for people to have a regular job could also be in decline. This is for example reflected by the normative acceptance of informal work, at least when it is done sporadically, and to the extent that this form of work contributes to the survival of marginalised groups, especially in southern countries.

Similarly, work on a voluntary, unpaid basis is recognised by public opinion as a source for social integration and participation. Moreover, there is a tendency to expect from the unemployed claimants of benefits participation in voluntary activities. To a certain extent this can be in line with unemployed people's desire to take up responsibilities and to build up respectability. However, some studies observe that participation in voluntary work does not necessarily lead to the improvement of participants' knowledge or skills and thus to increased opportunities in relation to the labour market. A similar sceptical attitude is normal when people feel that they are being used as a reserve working force.

To conclude the research done in WP2, to evaluate work in its different types is to evaluate the experiences of inclusion-exclusion according to the characteristics of the work participants take part in. If these characteristics do not match people's capacities, qualifications, skills, physical or mental conditions or needs, participation in these forms of work - whether formal-informal, regular-irregular, paid-unpaid, et cetera - may block full inclusion. Therefore, since people occupy different roles in society, the degree to which they combine their working life with other relevant activities in society will be important when evaluating the inclusionary-exclusionary potential of their participation in any type of work. For people who do not like having to work all the time, part-time work can add attraction in a number of satisfactory ways (e.g. juggling school, career and child-care for men with families). Hence, the integrating function of a regular (paid)-job is qualified, since other forms of work might contribute in a more desirable way to the participants' feelings of inclusion.

3.4 WP3: the national case studies

In this section we will describe the general results of the case studies that we carried out in the six countries of the INPART project. As was outlined before, the main objective of the case studies was to gain insight into the inclusionary and exclusionary potentials of different types of work; an objective we formulated against the background of, on the one hand, the differentiation of the world of work in modern societies and, on the other, of the persisting ideology that the only road towards full inclusion and participation is a regular paid job.

3.4.1 Methodology

In the case studies, we distinguished the following types of work/participation:

- Participation in jobs on the primary labour market ('regular' jobs, full-time or part-time, fixed or flexible, temporary or permanent);

- Participation in jobs on the secondary labour market (subsidised jobs for the unemployed, for example job schemes or capitalisation of benefits);
- Participation in unpaid types of work;
- Training and education.

This distinction, for practical reasons, is slightly different from the distinctions we made in the other work packages. The following table shows what types of participation were investigated in the national case studies.

Table 2. INPART-case studies

	Primary labour market	Secondary labour market	Unpaid work	Training & Education
Belgium		Local social economy activities within TSOs		Education and work-training in TSOs
Denmark	Regular paid work	Activation: subsidised work	Voluntary work	Activation: educational projects
The Netherlands		Subsidised work: Melkert-1	Unpaid work: Social Activation	
Portugal		Occupational Programmes		Measure 2, INTEGRAR subprogramme
Spain		Capitalisation of unemployment benefits		
UK	Part-time work		Unpaid (and informal paid) work	

Some of these case studies, especially those under the headings of secondary labour market and training & education, refer to activating social policies in the various INPART-countries. Annex II presents a more substantial description of the various case studies and the social policies they refer to.

All case studies involved research among participants in the types of participation under investigation. Sometimes, in-depth interviews were used, whereas in other case studies participants were surveyed. In some countries (Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands) the respondents were interviewed twice. The following table summarises the design of the various case studies.

Table 3. Design of the case studies: methods and number of respondents

	Primary labour market	Secondary labour market	Unpaid work	Training & Education
Belgium		Survey (25 projects, n=218)		Survey (27 projects, n=297)
Denmark ⁷	In-depth interviews & Survey (n-survey = 284)	In-depth interviews & Survey (n-survey = 267)	In-depth interviews & Survey (n-survey = 22)	In-depth interviews & Survey (n-survey = 39)
The Netherlands		In-depth interviews (n = 25)	In-depth interviews (n = 20)	
Portugal		In-depth interviews (n = 20)		In-depth interviews (n = 20)
Spain		In-depth interviews (n = 100)		
UK	In-depth interviews (n = 23)		Survey (n = 125)	

To conceptualise and subsequently operationalise the central concept of the case studies, inclusion, we used both an objective and a subjective conceptualisation. When conceptualising the concepts in an *objective* way, measures are developed to assess and measure the degree of participation of respondents and the results of this are translated into different degrees of inclusion/exclusion. In the context of this ‘objective’ approach of inclusion/exclusion, the question is whether participation in a certain type of work is positively, negatively or not at all related to participation in other (sub-)domains. In a *subjective* conceptualisation of inclusion/exclusion, the focus is on people’s needs and the degree to which they are able to satisfy their needs given the types of work they are participating in, or (in the objective sense) excluded from. This approach recognises that people’s needs may differ, and that different types of work may or may not offer them resources to satisfy their needs.

In the context of our case studies, we distinguished various ‘domains’ of participation, enabling us to investigate whether (non-)participation in the domain of work is related to (non-)participation in other domains, and whether participating in these domains fulfilled people’s needs. The following domains of participation were distinguished which, in turn, can be subdivided into various sub-domains.

- The economic domain, encompassing the sub-domains of work, income and consumption;
- The social domain, encompassing social relations and networks with family, friends, neighbours, colleagues and so on. These social networks may operate in more or less formal and institutionalised contexts (compare the social relations with colleagues at the workplace with social relations in mutual-aid groups or friendships);
- The political domain, which may range from involvement in more ‘formal’ politics (voting, membership of political parties or trade unions) to involvement in, for example, decision-making processes at community level or forms of protesting. Of course, participation in the political domain may be more passive (membership) or active (being actively involved in interest representation, for example);
- The cultural or leisure domain, which involves a large number of formal and informal activities: visiting theatres, cinemas, museums; being an active or passive member of lei-

⁷ In the Danish case studies, no distinction was made between activated people in secondary labour-market programmes and training & education: both groups were treated under the heading of ‘activated people’. For the purpose of this report, people participating in Educational Projects will be grouped under the heading of ‘Training & Education’, whereas people in other activation projects (job training, individual job training, pooljobs and starting own business) will be dealt with under the heading of ‘secondary labour market’.

sure organisations (sports, health, education, hobbies etc.); reading books or newspapers; taking part in community-based or religious activities, et cetera.

As far as the concept of ‘needs’ is concerned, apart from the ‘material’ need of income (and access to consumption), we distinguished the following ‘immaterial’ needs:

- Status and respect (e.g. feeling recognised by others, feelings of pride/shame, being able to live up to one’s own and others’ expectations);
- Autonomy and self-determination (e.g. being able to live independently, having control over one’s living and working conditions);
- Social participation and social networks (e.g. feeling a full member of society, considering oneself a full and ‘interesting’ partner in daily social interactions);
- Appreciation and being able to contribute to society (e.g. being useful to others or society at large, getting appreciation for one’s contribution);
- Individual development and personal rehabilitation (e.g. being able to use and develop one’s capacities and qualifications, being able to deal with personal problems);
- Spending time (e.g. having opportunities to engage in meaningful activities and avoid boredom).

3.4.2 Main conclusions from the case studies

3.4.2.1 Introduction

In this section, we will formulate some general conclusions based on the case studies. First, we will comment on the central concepts of this study: social inclusion and social exclusion. Then, some conclusions are presented with respect to the relationship between participation and inclusion, first from a general point of view, then for the various types of participation we have been investigating in the case studies. Subsequently, some conclusions with respect to the domains of participation will be drawn. Finally, we will say something about the different policy approaches that we have encountered while conducting the case studies.

Before proceeding we would like to emphasise that our conceptualisation and operationalisations of inclusion/exclusion should be seen as ‘working’ conceptualisations and operationalisations. Even though we have tried to develop a more sophisticated conceptualisation of inclusion and exclusion by distinguishing several ‘domains of participation’, needs related to participation and by combining an ‘objective’ and a ‘subjective’ approach to inclusion/exclusion, there is still a need for further elaboration of the concepts and of thinking through the consequences of conceptualisation for doing empirical research into the topic. This need for elaboration relates among others to:

- The still somehow unsatisfactory distinction between an objective and a subjective approach to inclusion and exclusion;
- The notion of ‘domains of participation’, which is helpful but at the same time involves the risk of an endless list of ‘domains’ and ‘sub-domains’ of society;
- The relations between the domains and sub-domains and the issue of the dominance of certain domains in bringing about an accumulation of situations and experiences of inclusion/exclusion, were dealt with in our case studies to a limited extent only.

3.4.2.2 The concepts of inclusion and exclusion

Inclusion and exclusion are the key concepts in the research on which we report in this document. We will, therefore, start our conclusions with some comments on these concepts.

First of all, the introduction of the concepts of inclusion and exclusion have often been interpreted as distracting attention from the concept of poverty and from issues related to people's income. Even though 'broad' interpretations of the concepts of inclusion/exclusion (the same goes, of course, for the concept of poverty) may be used, in which case they become almost synonymous, inclusion and exclusion focus our attention on participation whereas poverty draws attention to financial hardship.

In our research, we have tried to avoid using one-sided, 'participation-biased' concepts of social inclusion and social exclusion. We have dealt with both issues of income and participation by looking also at income and consumption as 'sub-domains' of economic participation and by paying attention to people's financial and consumptive needs. From our case studies, it is quite clear that the issues of participation and income deserve separate attention (in research, but also in politics). Despite the fact that both issues are closely related, they cannot be reduced to each other. A lack of participation, or social isolation, is not necessarily only a problem of financial hardship, and financial hardship is not necessarily a problem of a lack of participation, as the situations of the 'working poor' and the 'active unemployed' illustrate. In other words: people's participation problems cannot always be solved by merely providing them with more income, and people's income problems are not automatically solved by promoting their participation. Financial hardship does, of course, often constitute a barrier, for example, to participation in the social and cultural domains. Our case studies have revealed several instances where this is clearly the case. In other words, financial hardship may trigger an accumulation of situations of exclusion. However, we also saw that financial hardship may have different impacts on participation levels of different groups of people and in different domains of participation. At the same time, we have identified several other barriers to participation or, more positively, several other resources that may improve and stimulate participation. Generally, it is impossible to identify one or several resources that have a fully deterministic impact on participation in the sense that they are to be seen as essential conditions. This does not exclude the possibility, of course, that a lack of certain resources may have drastic effects on participation in specified cases or for specific groups. Income may be one of these resources, but so may health, time (in the case of single parents, for example), and more 'psychological' resources such as self-confidence and dignity. However, all in all the life situations and circumstances of underprivileged, socially excluded or marginalised, poor or unemployed people are normally so complicated and multifaceted that trying to identify 'the single, critical cause' of their hardship may seem convenient, but will not be adequate.

What could be the policy relevance of these general observations? As a provisional conclusion, which will be elaborated below, we present the following. Passive social policies are being criticised for being one-sided in emphasising income provision and neglecting participation opportunities. Current active social policies, which have been developed as an answer to this criticism, may end up being criticised for the reverse one-sidedness: emphasising participation and neglecting income, or more generally, resources. Against the background of the above considerations, we would like to emphasise the importance of developing empowering or, to use a less politicised phrase, *enabling policies*, that support people in both overcoming financial or economic hardship, and in promoting their participation. Given the diversity of people's life situations and social circumstances, these policies will have to incorporate universal/generic, target-group directed and individualised, tailor-made measures.

Secondly, the concept of social inclusion has also been criticised for the exclusive role it attributes to paid work. Paid work is considered to be the only form of participation that should be pursued in the context of social policies stimulating social inclusion and combating social exclusion. The fact that other types of work or participation may not only be socially useful,

but may also contribute to people's integration into society, is often neglected. This criticism of the conceptualisation of participation in the context of social inclusion policies has been the main point of departure of our research, and we will say more about it in the following sections. At this point, we would like to emphasise that our case studies show that there are more roads towards integration than regular paid work only. Without implying that these roads are equal in terms of the opportunities for social inclusion they provide (they are not), there is no *a priori* reason why the 'enabling policies' should not be based on a *broad concept of participation*.

Thirdly, although the concepts of exclusion and inclusion are widely used in scientific, political and public discourse, their precise meaning is quite unclear and their conceptualisation highly controversial. As we stated above, we have used both objective and subjective approaches in our conceptualisation. It should be pointed out that both approaches are normative. In objective conceptualisations, scientists, policy-makers or policy-administrators set standards for inclusion; those who do not meet these standards are considered to be excluded. The advantage of this approach is that it is relatively straightforward: by measuring, for example, people's labour-market participation, income situation, number and frequency of social contacts et cetera, and comparing the results with the specified standard, we can decide whether they are included into or excluded from the domains of work, income and social participation respectively.

However, the most obvious weakness of the objective approach is its assumption that people in a society share a specific set of needs that goes uncontested. Reality is very different. Thus, the standards used in 'measuring' inclusion and exclusion are not as objective as they are presented to be: they reflect norms of certain groups, not necessarily coinciding with the needs of the people whose inclusion and exclusion is being 'measured'. In order to take account of these differences, a subjective conceptualisation of exclusion and inclusion is introduced. Here, people's own standards are taken as points of reference in defining their situation in terms of inclusion and exclusion. Thus, two people in the same 'objective' situation can be assessed differently from a 'subjective' point of view, depending on the standards they set. Of course, this subjective approach has disadvantages as well. It might result in a situation where people's standards are taken as given, without contextualising them by taking into account their social background, experiences, opportunities, the social consequences their standards may have, et cetera. Thus, setting standards may be partly individualised, but can never take place either completely by a top-down (at least, in a democratic society) or a bottom-up approach: ideally, they should be defined in a dialogue between clients and consultants.

When they are translated into social policy approaches, we may say that current activating social policies often start from an 'objective' point of view, defining people's problems and needs and the ways to solve these problems and fulfil the needs without taking into account people's own definitions of their situation, needs, problems et cetera. Fully recognising the fact that each intervention in the context of activating social policies is normative, and accepting the pluriformity of norms and values these interventions can be based on, standards of inclusion should ideally be defined in a discursive context, in which –in the framework of social policies- clients and consultants put forward and legitimise their standards in order to negotiate on the formulation of norms and values that guide social interventions. In this discursive context, the distinction between an 'objective' and a 'subjective' approach makes way for intersubjectivity.

3.4.2.3 Participation and inclusion

One of the clearest conclusions we can draw from our case studies is, firstly, that there is no

clear dichotomy between inclusion and exclusion, and secondly, that equating inclusion with having a regular paid job is as much a simplification, as equating unemployment with exclusion is. Of course, we did find instances where employment is related to inclusion and unemployment to exclusion, but the overall picture is much more complicated than this. To determine the relationships between participation/non-participation on the one hand and inclusion/exclusion on the other only, paying attention to types of participation people are involved in is not sufficient. Interrelations between the following sets of factors are important to understand how participation and inclusion are related:

- Characteristics of the type of participation involved: are we dealing with paid or unpaid activities? Do the activities concern regular or additional/subsidised jobs? Are they stable or precarious jobs, permanent activities or activities aimed at improving labour-market participation?
- Characteristics of the policy context in which participation takes place, where the policy context may refer both to social policies and to employment policies: are activities supported or opposed by policies? What securities and insecurities are people confronted with? What resources are offered to people in terms of income, guidance, prospects? What stigmatisation risks are involved and how are they dealt with?
- Characteristics of the participants: their social situations, cultural orientations and life histories, the needs people have in terms of income and consumption, autonomy, status and respect, personal development, et cetera. These characteristics are, of course, related to social and demographic characteristics (gender, age, educational achievement, household composition, ethnic background et cetera) but can never be completely reduced to them.

Consequently, we can answer the question to what degree participation contributes to inclusion only by taking into account all these factors. This also explains the fact that our case studies show quite different experiences of inclusion and exclusion within the same type of participation. Different types of participation and different policy contexts in which participation takes place can meet people's needs to different degrees. Thus, one cannot deal with the issue of the inclusionary potential of types of work in isolation: in assessing the inclusionary or exclusionary potential of types of participation, all factors mentioned above should be taken into account. In other words: matching the characteristics of the type of participation, the characteristics of the policy context, and people's needs is crucial.

Nevertheless, our case studies also show that different types of participation offer opportunity and risk structures that are very important in shaping their inclusionary or exclusionary potentials. We have been able to identify the following:

- **Income.** Types of participation outside the regular labour market normally offer only limited income improvement opportunities or no income improvement opportunities at all. This implies that these types of participation have little to offer to those people for whom increasing income and consumption levels are important needs, and for those people who perceive remuneration as an important symbolic expression of society's recognition of the usefulness of their activities. More generally, even though income is not a sufficient condition for inclusion, we have seen that it is an important resource to improve social inclusion in other domains, specifically the social and cultural domains.
- **Status.** Different types of participation offer participants different status resources. Status resources are partially structured by social and employment policies, and resulting status differences may be reflected in social interactions, for example, between different 'kinds' of workers in work situations. Status differences may be sources of stigmatisation, reducing the inclusionary potential of forms of participation.

- Career opportunities. Participation often involves processes of development in which people acquire new skills and competence, develop new ambitions and needs to engage in new challenges. Types of participation can vary considerably in the degree to which they encourage these developments and offer opportunities to meet career needs of participants, either by adapting placements/jobs to new needs or by supporting people's outflow into other types of participation.
- Prospects. More generally, types of participation may open up or block prospects of participants. In some cases, types of participation are designed explicitly to improve prospects, for example by being stepping-stones towards regular labour-market participation. In other cases, participants themselves use types of participation to increase their prospects. However, the degree to which participants are actually offered resources, guidance, support and training opportunities to enhance prospects, varies widely. Thus, types of participation may act as springboards, but may also be dead-end activities, trapping people in an endless recycling process of activation.
- Opt-out and failure provisions. Types of participation, and particularly those developed in the context of activating social policies, may or may not offer people opt-out or failure provisions. 'Opt-out' refers to the issue whether people are allowed to refuse activation offers, for example, because they consider the offer as not meeting their needs. In the context of 'welfare-to-work' and 'workfare', obligatory activation programmes have, of course, become more and more widespread and accepted, transforming activation offers into offers that cannot be refused. Failure provisions refer to the options available to people who do not consider their participation successful. Can they stop participating, take up their benefit rights and try different activation offers? Or are benefit entitlements reduced, will they be sanctioned and not be entitled to other activation offers?
- Flexibility. Types of participation offer different degrees of flexibility to participants. For example, flexibility of the number of working tasks, the number of working hours or the scheduling of working hours, and autonomy in deciding over these issues, may be an important condition to increase the inclusionary potential of types of participation, specifically for people with caring responsibilities (for example, single parents) or for people with physical or mental health problems.
- Availability of guidance and support. Activation schemes may operate according to a 'plug-in-and-play' philosophy, in which little care is given to participants after placement, or according to a more human-resource-management like philosophy, in which guidance and support is offered after placements. As we have seen in our case studies, the availability of guidance and support may be an important factor in increasing the inclusionary potential of types of participation. This is specifically the case for long-term unemployed people who are or have been confronted with several and severe problems.

In summary, we might state that the degree to which types of participation offer participants security with respect to their ability to fulfil current and future needs is an important determinant of the inclusionary potential of these types of participation. People do, of course, have other resources of security: compare, for example, the importance of the family we witnessed in the Southern European countries. However, since all countries increasingly emphasise the importance of labour-market participation, alternative 'security providers' (such as the family, forms of self provision, mutual aid) are increasingly eroded.

3.4.2.4 Types of participation

Against the background of the general comments in the previous section, this section will explore the opportunity and risk structures with respect to the inclusionary potential of the dif-

ferent types of participation we distinguished in the case studies.

Regular employment

The emphasis in our case studies has been on types of participation outside the regular labour market and on groups of people with a vulnerable labour-market position. This means, of course, that our findings are biased: they are primarily focused on vulnerable socio-economic groups. For example, our conclusion that security offered by types of participation is an important aspect of their inclusionary potential should be qualified when focusing on people with a strong market position, in the double sense that, firstly, they have more opportunities to make supply meet their demands and, secondly, they can rely on private security arrangements.

But even though we should recognise that people are dependent on their jobs in different degrees for acquiring security, to the degree that they *do* depend on their jobs, the general comments in the previous section apply to people participating in regular employment as well. This was clearly illustrated by the part-time case study in the UK. Part-time work offered the female respondents partial security: a moderate income, social interactions outside the private sphere of the family, and a certain degree of flexibility to match paid work with the prioritised mother role. At the same time, part-time work excluded them from opportunities to choose the job they would like to do, from certain employment rights and from long-term security. Thus, this case study clearly shows that, even where regular employment is concerned, inclusion can only be partial. Rather than treating regular employment as an undifferentiated category and putting it at the top of a hierarchy of participation, statements on the inclusionary potential of regular employment should be qualified with respect to the growing diversity in the regular labour market.

Secondary labour-market participation

In our research, much more attention has been paid to participation in the secondary labour market. Many EU countries have started secondary labour-market schemes to create participation opportunities for unemployed people. Most of the times, these schemes are directed at groups of older and low-qualified unemployed, offering them low-skilled jobs. The small sample of schemes investigated in our case studies already revealed the diversity of these schemes. The Spanish scheme is clearly exceptional and has hardly any characteristics of a secondary labour-market scheme, since it is not directed at long-term and low-skilled unemployed people, and since it is not aimed at creating a labour-market segment of low-skilled and low-paid jobs. In terms of the inclusionary potential of the secondary labour-market schemes, the associated workers in the Spanish capitalisation of unemployment benefits scheme seem to be best off, even though failure effects can be quite large for the participants, larger than in any of the other schemes we investigated. At the same time, compared to participants in the other schemes, the Spanish participants were already better off in the first place, before starting their participation: on average, they were more highly qualified, had a more stable labour-market history and were short-term unemployed. Part of this, of course, can be attributed to the preventive nature of the scheme. Rather than providing activation opportunities after people have been unemployed for some time, the Spanish scheme provides these opportunities the moment people are threatened with unemployment.

As far as the other schemes are concerned, we have found that these schemes do certainly have an inclusionary potential. Although to different degrees, they provide participants with economic independence, income improvement, social contacts, status and respect, useful activities, self-confidence and a more positive outlook. At the same time, all schemes also have clear exclusion risks. As far as the temporary schemes are concerned, the most important

issue is, of course, what will happen to participants once their participation in the scheme has ended. Since these schemes are designed to be stepping-stones to regular labour-market participation, their inclusionary potential is significantly increased when they actually manage to contribute to labour-market participation. Participants' positive evaluations of the schemes can at least partly be attributed to the positive expectations they have in this respect. At the same time, we also observed that when these expectations are not fulfilled, experiences of exclusion will increase. This risk is not imaginary, as our case studies and other investigations into similar schemes show: there is a considerable risk that people find themselves trapped in an activation recycling process, participating in one scheme after another. This does not imply that people prefer to be on passive benefits, but being caught in this activation process, and lacking opportunities to escape from it, may contribute to experiences of marginalisation and stigmatisation.

With respect to the permanent schemes, we witnessed a tendency that their inclusionary potential is smaller than that of the temporary ones. However, we should be careful in drawing the conclusion that this means that temporary schemes are 'better' than permanent schemes. In both cases, the degree to which the schemes meet people's needs and expectations is crucial. In the temporary schemes, people have the expectation to be able to find a regular job in the end; when they are disappointed in this respect, the inclusionary potential of the temporary schemes is decreased significantly. As far as the permanent schemes are concerned, the important issue is to what degree developmental and career prospects are offered, either in the context of the scheme or in the regular labour market. Since these offers are practically absent in the schemes we have been investigating, respondents who have these ambitions are confronted with experiences of permanent stigmatisation and marginalisation. Once again, not the temporary or permanent character of the schemes as such but the fit between participation, policy and participants' characteristics determine the inclusionary or exclusionary potential of the various schemes.

The status of participants in permanent secondary labour-market schemes is an issue that deserves special attention. Whereas, for participants in temporary schemes, status differences may be acceptable because there is the expectation of a regular job in the near future, status differences for permanent scheme participants may at some point become unacceptable, and turn into an important motive for desiring to leave the scheme. We have seen that various status differences exist: programmes are targeted (at long-term unemployed, low-qualified people, certain age groups, people with multiple problems, et cetera) which may influence interactions with others; they are subjected to income ceilings; they are confined to specific kinds of tasks; et cetera. Whereas some participants resign to these status differences because of a lack of alternatives, or do manage to cope with them, they result in increasing feelings of stigmatisation and marginalisation, among other things. Decreasing status differences (for those for whom secondary labour-market participation is likely to be permanent) and increasing investments into people's prospects (for those who want and are able to participate in regular jobs) are two policy options to increase the inclusionary potential of secondary labour-market participation.

Unpaid work

Participation in unpaid work may have an inclusionary potential as well. Obviously, without additional measures, the inclusionary potentials of this type of work are limited to the immaterial aspects, since as such, participation in unpaid work will not offer economic independence and income improvement. Nevertheless, these immaterial aspects (status and respect, social networks, personal development, meaningful activities) may be and, in our case studies, actually are important on their own. Of course, as is the case in the other types of work, peo-

ple may choose to be active in unpaid work from different backgrounds and for different reasons. Among the Danish volunteers, reasons for participating seem to be more ideologically inspired than among the Dutch, where motives are more related to breaking social isolation and/or increasing social networks and developing meaningful activities, sometimes seen as first steps towards labour-market participation. In the British case, where the attention was focused on different kinds of unpaid activities, motives were related to getting things done in the household. The inclusionary potential of unpaid work depends among other things, on the degree to which these motives are met. For example, unpaid work is often not allowed to unemployed people, certainly not as an alternative to paid work, which of course limits its inclusionary potential. Where unpaid work is done as a stepping-stone towards paid employment, its inclusionary potential is highly dependent on support people get in realising this objective. The British case shows that being able to make use of unpaid work to fulfil needs, depends on the availability of resources.

Generally speaking, whereas the promotion of secondary labour-market participation is entirely subjected to social policies, the opposite is the case with unpaid work. Supportive policies (recognising and rewarding unpaid work, guiding people in finding placements or in finding a job, offering them the resources needed, et cetera) are practically absent, and sometimes unpaid work is counteracted rather than encouraged. Thus, often the inclusionary potential of unpaid work is realised despite rather than as a result of policies. This is, of course, closely related to the dominance of paid work in social policies. This also goes for the Dutch case, where participation actually is encouraged and supported in social policies. For the target group of these policies is limited to those unemployed whose chances on the labour-market are considered to be nil. In other words, here it is clearly designed as a last-resort integration option: only when participation in measures directed at primary or secondary labour-market integration has failed or is considered unrealistic, integration through unpaid work is allowed. So, even though the inclusionary potential of unpaid work is recognised, it is clearly positioned at the bottom of a participation hierarchy⁸.

Contrary to what was the case with secondary labour-market programmes, our case studies into unpaid work did not reveal experiences of stigmatisation of unemployed people in unpaid work. Probably this is related to the fact that our case studies did not deal with forms of obligatory participation in unpaid work, and to the fact that in our case studies, unpaid or voluntary work carried out by unemployed people could not be distinguished from unpaid work done by other categories of unpaid workers. Furthermore, secondary labour-market schemes often limit work tasks to low-skilled and/or low-productive work, whereas such a limitation does not exist where unpaid work is concerned. The degree to which participants in activating social policies or their tasks can be clearly 'identified' (either in existing work organisations or in separate organisations) seems to affect stigmatisation risks. This does not mean, of course, that unpaid workers never report experiences of stigmatisation, for example, in work organisations where both paid and unpaid workers are working. However, in these circumstances, processes of stigmatisation will probably be directed at unpaid workers as such, not specifically at unemployed unpaid workers.

Training and education

The training and education schemes we investigated were all, like the temporary secondary

⁸ To illustrate this: according to the Dutch Social Assistance Act, single parents with children under 5 are relieved from the obligation from paid work. Until 1996, single parents with children under 12 had no obligation to look for a job. Recently, the Dutch government launched a proposal to put single parents with children under 5 under the obligation to look for part-time (24 hours) jobs, thus decreasing single parents' opportunities to raise children on their own.

labour-market schemes, designed to prepare people for labour-market participation. Generally speaking, the training and education schemes are targeted at groups of people that are younger than the target groups of secondary labour-market schemes are. The inclusionary potential of these schemes, like the temporary secondary labour-market schemes, is highly dependent on people's opportunities of finding a job after completing the scheme. And even though participants in these schemes are on average younger, there is a clear risk of 'educational recycling' or 'activation recycling' here as well. Thus, even though participation in the schemes raises people's expectations to be able to find a job, the risk that these expectations will be frustrated is very real. Nevertheless, despite these considerations, training and education schemes also have an inclusionary potential: they may offer people new skills, social contacts, status, meaningful activities, some income improvement in some cases, et cetera. These 'advantages' of participating in education and training schemes may have positive effects on participation in other domains than the labour market. In other words, the successes of training and education schemes in terms of their integrating functions cannot be measured by merely evaluating their contribution to participants' labour-market chances. Sometimes training and education programmes recognise this explicitly, as we saw in the Portuguese case study where stimulating social participation was considered to be a separate objective of the training programme, apart from labour-market integration.

3.4.2.5 Domains of participation

In the research, we have been distinguishing several domains of participation: the economic, the social, the cultural (including leisure and religion) and the political domain. From our case studies it can be concluded that the economic and social domains seem to be by far the most important in shaping people's experiences of inclusion and exclusion; even though this does not mean, that they never feel excluded from or would like to be more included into the cultural or political domains.

It turns out to be rather complicated to establish the relationship between participation on the one hand, and inclusion into the various domains on the other. Usually it is assumed that regular employment offers resources and opportunities that enable inclusion into the domains: income, social networks, status, employment rights et cetera. At the same time, access to these resources and opportunities may differ from one job to another, as the part-time case study showed. Furthermore, having a paid job may also limit resources and opportunities to be engaged in other domains: the Spanish case studies illustrated this with respect to the resource of time. In other words, generally speaking there is no straightforward relation between having a regular paid job and inclusion into other domains.

Another aspect that makes the relationship between participation and inclusion into various domains a complicated issue is that people are not necessarily dependent on the resources that regular jobs offer them to be included into the domains of participation. For example, other types of work or participation may give access to similar resources as well. This goes for all types of participation we have been distinguishing. And even beyond the types of participation we distinguished, people may find other ways to get integrated into the various domains, such as through networks of family or friends, leisure activities et cetera. Nevertheless, it is important to stress that different types of participation are not equivalent in the access they offer to certain resources. For example, we showed that unpaid work gives no access to income, and that secondary labour-market participation may give only limited access to status. Thus, different types of participation reveal different patterns of integration opportunities, and matching these opportunities and people's needs will determine their inclusionary potential.

In this context, income seems to be a resource that deserves special attention. On the

one hand we observed that income is an important resource for being integrated into the domains of consumption, culture/leisure and social networks in particular. Many respondents pointed at a lack of income as an important barrier to their integration into these domains. On the other hand, of the various resources that may increase integration into these domains, access to income is most exclusively related to job access. Thus, insofar as income is a prerequisite for inclusion into the various domains, one might argue that participation in a regular job and, to a lesser extent, in secondary labour-market jobs does actually constitute an entry ticket to full participation. Nevertheless, even in this case, the link between paid jobs and full participation is highly policy-dependent. For example, passive social policies in the countries we have studied provide people with very different levels of income, thereby influencing the degree to which full participation is dependent on having a job. Furthermore, proponents of a basic or citizens' income scheme argue in favour of loosening the work-income nexus, which would make availability of income and, consequently, full participation less dependent on availability of paid work. In a more moderate version, a participation income might give people access to income improvement depending on their involvement in useful activities, rather than just paid work. And systems of informal exchange may open up non-monetary income resources that can enhance people's full participation. In other words, even though income is an important resource to be able to fully participate in a highly monetarised society, there are other options available to improve people's income situation than just offering them a paid job.

In summary, even though paid employment may –at least potentially- give access to resources for full participation, it does not do so exclusively. Furthermore, insofar as paid employment does stimulate integration into domains of participation, it does not do so by its very nature, but by the way policies deal with work and participation. In other words, to increase full participation of people out of employment, two policy options are open: either to stimulate their participation in paid employment, or to open up other opportunities and resources towards full participation.

In this context, some remarks should be made with respect to the issue of 'self-exclusion'. In describing the results of the case studies in previous chapters, we encountered various instances of self-exclusion. People withdraw from the labour market in order to avoid disappointments and frustrations related to frequent rejections when applying for jobs. People withdraw from social networks in order to save money, because they cannot afford it, or because of feelings of shame and a lack of self-confidence. People withdraw from political participation because of their lack of trust in the political system. Of course, social interventions do not (and probably should not) take these 'self-exclusion strategies' for granted. Even though people might use these strategies as 'survival strategies' and even though they might find it hard to break them, as 'self-exclusion' also offers them security and a reduction of social risks, in many cases they result from an actual and/or perceived lack of resources, opportunities and options. Here, the importance of a dialogic approach of social interventions aimed at activation becomes clear. Instances of exclusion, assessed from an 'objective' point of view, which are not immediately perceived as problematic by the people involved, do not necessarily indicate that one should refrain from social intervention. Thus, the dialogic character of social interventions implies that norms and values of both the interventionists and the target groups of interventions should be open to debate.

3.4.2.6 Traditional and new activation approaches

Traditionally, active social policies start from a rather top-down point of view, fettered by a

paternalistic perspective saying that paid employment is the one and only way to integrate people into society. From this perspective, there seems to be no need to legitimise social policy interventions, since the dominance of paid work is considered to be an issue of consensus. However, the dominance of paid work, and with it the top-down and paternalistic character of active social policies, have been criticised again and again. The reasons for this criticism are various:

- There is not enough paid employment for the ever increasing number of people that are subjected to active social policies;
- Paid employment is not the only way in which people can contribute to society, neither is it the only route towards social integration;
- Not everyone wants or is able to participate in paid work.

Against this background, social policy ‘niches’ have been developed in which different social policy approaches are used, opening up non-traditional social inclusion strategies and/or paying more respect to strategies and ambitions of the target groups of social policies themselves. Examples of these policies were found in the Dutch and Belgian case studies, and were advocated on the basis of the British case study into informal work. In most cases, these policies have been developed for groups of unemployed or poor people who, time and again, were not reached by more traditional social policy approaches: the very long-term unemployed, unemployed or poor people with multiple problems, et cetera. The reasons for not reaching these groups are various such as the lack of flexibility of existing programmes, the lack of an integrating approach in tackling people’s problems, the lack of opportunities to develop tailor-made integration routes, et cetera. The failure of traditional social policies for these people has opened up opportunities to experiment with a variety of alternative approaches, ranging from tailor-made guidance in supporting employment, to recognising and facilitating participation strategies developed by poor and unemployed people themselves, to creating new types of participation et cetera. Once again, these new approaches have, up until now, been confined to people who were excluded from traditional activation approaches. However, one may expect that since social policies in the EU countries are becoming more and more activation-oriented, EU countries will be increasingly confronted with groups of people that are not reached by these policies and, consequently, are not only excluded from the labour market, but from activating social policies as well. In a negative scenario, one may expect a situation in which these people are left to their own devices and policy interventions are limited to reducing the inconvenience they may cause to the better-off and included parts of society. In a more positive scenario, opportunities will be created to develop the ‘enabling’ social policies we mentioned, providing room for experimenting with new social intervention strategies, new ways to improve social inclusion, et cetera.

4. Policy recommendations

In the final chapter of this report, we will present recommendations regarding social policies aimed at social inclusion on the basis of the findings of our research project. First, we will make some general comments with respect to social inclusion policies. Then, we will present more specific recommendations aiming at decreasing exclusion risks and strengthening inclusion opportunities of social inclusion programmes. Finally, we will make some remarks with respect to the institutional context of social inclusion policies.

4.1 Social inclusion policies: general comments

Heterogeneity and policy differentiation

Social policies aiming at social inclusion are directed at target groups which are very heterogeneous. ‘The unemployed’ or ‘the poor’ may be adequate categories to indicate the socio-economic status of these target groups, their life-situation in terms of inclusion and exclusion are very different, also within national borders. Of course, generally speaking unemployed and/or poor people run higher risks of social exclusion than socio-economic groups that are participating on the labour market. However, the degree to which unemployed and/or poor people are able to avoid these risks varies considerably. This is true for both ways in which we have conceptualised the concept of exclusion in our research: the ‘objective’ approach, focusing attention on inclusion in, and exclusion from domains of participation; and the ‘subjective’ way, focusing on the degree to which people are able to satisfy material and immaterial needs. Unemployed people’s access to resources such as informal social networks for material and immaterial support, welfare-state arrangements, types of work providing them a respected social role and social networks et cetera, is different, partly related to their qualifications and competence, age, health, household composition et cetera. The degree to which they do or do not have access to such resources may influence their situation in terms of inclusion and exclusion significantly. Thus, the *problems* social inclusion policies set themselves to solve, can be quite different for different groups of unemployed and/or poor people. In other words, social policy interventions should be based on the assumption that the *starting point* of social intervention can differ considerably.

Heterogeneity not only refers to people’s life situation, but also to the life-projects they are involved in, the needs they have and the aims they set themselves. From this point, we have been criticising current activating social policies from being too one-sided in their approach: most of the time activating social policies recognise one objective only, that is economic independence through labour-market participation. We will return to this issue later. Here, we would like to point out that this objective may be attractive to a lot of unemployed and/or poor people, but not to all and it certainly is not feasible for all. In other words, social policies aimed at inclusion should not only differentiate with respect to the problems they set themselves to solve, but also with respect to their *objectives*.

In sum, the heterogeneity among the group of unemployed and poor people who are the target groups of social policies aiming at inclusion, implies a differentiation of both the problems that these social policies address and of the solutions they provide.

Objectives of social policies aimed at inclusion: jobs or participation?

As we mentioned above, most current inclusion policies or activating social policies are, in fact, employment policies, aiming to increase people's employability and stimulate their labour-market integration. Increasing economic independence and decreasing social benefits dependency, rather than promoting social inclusion in a wider sense, seem to be the main objectives of these policies. Apart from the issue whether the objective of employment is feasible and desirable for all unemployed and poor people, our research shows that there are also substantial arguments for being critical about social inclusion policies that are restricted to labour-market participation. When the objective of social inclusion policies is to combat social exclusion, and to enable people to become more involved in social and societal participation, there is no reason to focus on labour-market participation only: other types of work and participation have an inclusionary potential as well. This does not mean that these types of work and participation are equal to (regular) labour-market participation. Compared to regular labour-market participation, other types of participation offer fewer resources for income generation and, to a lesser extent, for status and respect. Nevertheless, these other types of work and participation do offer resources that may be important for people's social integration. And in some respects and for certain groups of people, they may be even more attractive than regular labour-market participation, which may involve exclusion risks as well.

In other words, when the objective of social inclusion policies is to increase participation in a wider sense rather than in the narrow meaning of labour-market participation, these policies should be based on a *broader concept of participation* than most of them are now. In more general terms, activating social policies should be based on an *engagement concept* of society rather than an employment concept.

Matching people's needs and social inclusion strategies

In the above, we have formulated two conclusions with respect to social inclusion policies. First, we stated that people's needs with respect to social inclusion are different. Secondly, we stated that other types of work and participation besides (regular) jobs also have an inclusionary potential, without neglecting that this inclusionary potential may be different (though not necessarily less) from what regular jobs have to offer. Combining these two conclusions, we should be aware of the fact that different forms of participation may meet people's needs in different ways. When people formulate their most important needs in terms of economic dependence and income improvement, neither unpaid work nor secondary labour-market participation will be very attractive to them. However, when they want to extend their social networks and be engaged in useful activities, these types of work may be more interesting to them. In other words, social inclusion policies that recognise the heterogeneity of needs on the one hand, and the different inclusion opportunities of various types of participation on the other, should pay attention to *matching people's needs to inclusion opportunities of types of participation*.

Participation and income

In transforming social policies from passive into active, we have witnessed not only an increasing emphasis on the importance of participation but also decreasing attention for the issue of income improvement. Activating social policies often claim, that labour-market participation is the 'royal road' towards income improvement. Even though this may be true in general, some critical remarks should be made here. Especially in the more developed welfare states, the combined effect of developments on the labour market and the introduction of secondary labour-market schemes on the one hand, and the labour-market opportunities of long-term, often low-qualified unemployed people on the other, result in a situation, in which re-

entering the labour market may lead to economic independence, but is hardly or not at all accompanied by income improvement.

Although activating social policies are based upon the correct assumption that problems of exclusion and poverty cannot be reduced to lack of income only, the reverse is true as well: they cannot be reduced to lack of participation either. For many unemployed and poor people, lack of income and economic independence is an important source of experiences of exclusion. In highly monetarised societies such as ours, income is an important and often necessary resource for participation, especially in the domains of consumption, social networks and culture/leisure.

Against this background, access to income improvement is an important determinant of the inclusionary potential of types of work/participation. However, access to income improvement, economic independence and purchasing power can also be organised in other ways than by regular jobs. For example, so-called 'Time Currency' and 'LETS' systems reward involvement in unpaid and reciprocal activities by converting the contribution people make into a form of currency that can be used to acquire goods and services that one needs or desires. A more 'monetary' and radical approach is put forward by adherents of Basic Income or Citizens' Income schemes, who advocate a situation in which access to income and economic independence is less exclusively tied to labour-market participation. A less radical approach might be the Active Citizen Credit scheme, entitling people to an income not as a general citizens' right but as a reward for participation and contributing to society, whatever form that contribution takes. The most moderate solution to this problem would be rewarding participants in unpaid activities with some kind of financial bonus or incentive.

These schemes reveal, that what we have called 'enabling' social policies, which stimulate people's participation and pay attention to their income situation, could open up *alternative roads to income improvement*. Applying these schemes as part of social policies would certainly increase the inclusionary potential of types of work and participation outside the labour market.

Recognising and supporting informal inclusion strategies

Acknowledging that unemployed and/or poor people are sometimes able to develop informal strategies to counter exclusion and stimulate their inclusion and participation, should encourage social policies aiming at inclusion to recognise and support these strategies. Nowadays, these informal strategies are often neglected or counter-acted, the latter because they are considered fraudulent or because they are seen as diminishing people's labour-market availability. Thus, a paradoxical situation may be created in which activating social policies are making people passive, or in which people see themselves forced to hide their activities from social policy officials. This official attitude towards informal inclusion strategies may be understandable from the point of view of social policies aiming at labour-market participation only, but from a broader perspective on social inclusion there is enough reason to investigate the degree to which these informal strategies actually meet people's needs and how their inclusionary potential can be improved.

In several EU countries, there is increasing awareness that social exclusion must be tackled through bottom-up, community-based initiatives. Nevertheless, based on the 'traditional' social policy assumptions that employment equals social inclusion, and unemployment equals social exclusion, these initiatives are often promoted to create employment or to help citizens into employment. In our case studies, for example, we saw these kinds of initiatives in the context of the Belgian third system organisations' efforts in combating exclusion. However, we would argue that these bottom-up initiatives rooted in people's own attempts to 'make something of their lives' should be encouraged not only due to their employment-

creating potential, but also –from a broader inclusion perspective- due to their ability to *enable people to help themselves*.

4.2 Social inclusion programmes: decreasing exclusion risks and increasing inclusion opportunities

In this section, we will have a closer look at social inclusion programmes. Based on our research into some of these programmes, which involved secondary labour-market participation, unpaid work, and education and training, we will formulate some conditions that may strengthen the inclusionary potential of these programmes and decrease exclusion risks.

Mixing participation, learning and support

From several of our case studies we have learned, that promoting inclusion by participation involves more than offering people participation opportunities only. For inclusion through participation to be successful, people should be equipped with skills, competence and other resources necessary to carry out the activities adequately. Furthermore, they should be enabled to cope with potential obstacles to successful participation (for example, debt problems, physical or mental health problems, social problems, the economic sustainability of their companies, et cetera). Research into social exclusion has stressed time and again that exclusion is characterised by its multidimensionality. Recognising this also implies, that inclusion policies should be characterised by a multidimensional approach. Thus, these policies should be able to offer a mix of participation, learning and support. At the same time, this mix needs to be flexible so that it can be adjusted to individual circumstances and needs.

Avoiding participation traps and strengthening career prospects

The same mix of participation, learning and support should also tackle another problem social inclusion policies are often confronted with: that is, a lack of prospects. This may be true for both temporary and permanent participation schemes. In the case of temporary schemes, we have seen that they often do not manage to bring about more permanent inclusion. After participating in the schemes, many participants end up being unemployed again, and the best social policies can offer them is semi-permanent participation in temporary schemes that are designed to get them into paid work but do not manage to succeed. In the case of permanent schemes, often targeted at long-term, low-skilled and often older unemployed people, a more lasting form of participation is realised but with high risks of marginalisation, for example due to a lack of income improvement opportunities or due to the absence of possibilities to become involved in more interesting and challenging work.

This points to the necessity for social policy programmes to invest more in human resources or ‘human capital’ by supporting people in developing themselves and by offering opportunities to meet newly arisen needs. Strengthening career prospects and career opportunities may avoid a situation in which people feel trapped in their participation. Solutions to participation traps may be sought either in the context of the schemes (especially in the case of permanent schemes) or by supporting people in finding other types of participation. Of course, taking measures to avoid participation traps is not only the responsibility of social policy institutions. It is also a responsibility of employers that hire subsidised workers, trainees, et cetera. Investing in people’s employability in the context of company policies should not be restricted to ‘regular’ workers but should also involve participants in activating social policies.

Income improvement and access to employment rights/benefits

Lack of opportunities for income improvement, and of access to employment rights/benefits, are important examples of a lack of career prospects related to participation in social inclusion schemes. In our case studies, this issue seemed to be specifically urgent in the context of more permanent secondary labour-market schemes, even though it is not necessarily limited to these schemes, as the British case study into part-time work revealed. Since these schemes often operate income ceilings, income improvement opportunities simply vanish at some point. Tackling this problem asks for either of two possible solutions: raising or abolishing income ceilings on the one hand, or offering guidance and support in finding and entering regular labour-market jobs on the other. More generally, removing differences in access to employment rights and benefits, which we witnessed in secondary labour-market schemes but also in flexible and/or part-time jobs on the regular labour market, will increase the inclusionary potential of these types of work.

Another issue in this context relates to the inclusionary potential of unpaid types of work, that may contribute to increasing participation but at the same time offer few opportunities for income improvement. In the former section we already pointed to non-labour-market or non-monetary solutions to this problem. Whatever solution one supports, it is quite evident that improving the income situation of people contributing to society by their involvement in unpaid activities will increase the inclusionary potential and, thus, the attractiveness of this 'road to inclusion' considerably; even though one should not neglect the immaterial gains participation in unpaid activities may have for people.

Flexibility

Another element that increases the inclusionary potential of social inclusion programmes is their flexibility. In general one might say that the more flexible programmes are, the more they can be accommodated to people's situation and needs, the less creaming-off effects will be and the more they will be able to contribute to the social inclusion of poor and unemployed people. For creating possibilities for a flexible application of social inclusion programmes will offer policy deliverers more opportunities to deliver tailor-made trajectories that fit with people's abilities and desires. Flexibility may refer to separate programmes and to combinations of various programmes. As far as the first is concerned, secondary labour-market programmes that demand fulltime involvement, or are restricted to low-skilled and low-productivity jobs, will not be able to meet the needs of various categories of unemployed people: people with health problems that are not able to work fulltime but would like to work part-time; people who have been unemployed for a long time and would like to be able to gradually increase the number of working hours; people who have caring responsibilities, either for children or sick relatives; highly educated people; people looking for career and development prospects in the context of secondary labour-market programmes. Opportunities for combining several programmes may increase participation in these programmes of people who are confronted with complex problem situations, the solution of which asks for multidimensional interventions rather than interventions in the domain of participation only.

Minimising failure risks and failure effects

Participation in social inclusion programmes will never be successful for everyone. People may not be able to continue participation, they may decide that participation does not meet their needs, or, as in the case of people starting their own companies, they may not be able to make their company profitable. In order to minimise failure risks and failure effects, which may have far-reaching consequences for people who are in a vulnerable position anyway, both preventive and curative measures can be taken. Preventive measures relate, for example,

to careful placement procedures: these can contribute to an optimal matching of people's abilities and needs and conditions of participation. Preventive measures can also involve training, consultancy et cetera. Curative measures relate to regulating the consequences in cases that failure turns out to be unavoidable. Moderating the risks of failure, both in terms of income rights such as entitlement to social benefits and in terms of activation rights such as entitlement to participate in –other- activation programmes, is most likely to stimulate people to enter social inclusion programmes.

4.3 Institutional issues

In the final section of this chapter we will pay attention to some institutional issues related to social inclusion policies. Transforming passive into active social policies in general, and dealing with the issues we have discussed in this chapter in particular, will also have consequences for the institutions and agencies involved in delivering these policies and measures.

An integrating approach

Adequate social inclusion policies, as we argued above and has been argued by others as well, require an approach in which social services are provided in an integrated and co-ordinated way. In many countries we can observe that against the background of the emphasis on activation, and of processes of marketisation and privatisation, an increasing variety of institutions and organisations are involved in delivering activating social policies: public institutions, private organisations, NGOs et cetera. Often, institutional interests and differences in the ways these institutions operate, hinder co-ordination and co-operation, which may have negative consequences for the activation process of programme participants. Thus, developing and implementing successful activation policies not only asks for adequate and effective programmes, but for a process of institutional activation as well.

Combining bottom-up initiatives and top-down policies

Traditionally, social policies are characterised by a top-down approach. Policy makers define the problems that these policies have to solve, and the direction in which solutions to these problems should be found. Little room is given to the strategies unemployed and poor people themselves use to cope with problems of exclusion, and to local, community-based initiatives with a similar objective.

In the above we have been arguing in favour of a broader approach of policies aiming at inclusion through participation. From this perspective, these individual and community-based initiatives should not (at least, not always) be treated as threats to the targets and objectives policy makers set themselves, but as sources for finding new approaches to tackling problems of social exclusion. Complementing these 'bottom-up' initiatives with 'top-down' support and facilities will most likely increase their inclusionary potential.

The dialogical approach and the position of clients

The traditional top-down approach of social policies also effects the position of clients in the activation process. They are the 'object' of activation policies, that have to adjust to and fit into programmes and schemes; if they cannot adjust, they will drop out, and if they do not want to adjust, they risk sanctions. In the above, we have been arguing that to a large extent, the success of activation programmes depends on the degree to which these programmes meet people's needs. From this perspective, activation processes should not start with ascribing or prescribing people certain needs, but with an assessment of their needs. This asks for a transformation of the setting of client-consultant interactions from a paternalistic into a dialogical approach. As we argued in the former chapter, this implies that defining the objectives of ac-

tivation trajectories involves a process of negotiation. It goes without saying, that designing policy delivery in this way cannot be without consequences for the distribution of power and resources in client-consultant interactions. Furthermore, explicit attention should be paid to the means and conditions necessary to make this dialogical approach successful.

Compulsion

Without entering into an extensive debate here on compulsion in activating social policies, some remarks can be made in the context of this chapter. It is quite clear that elements of compulsion and workfare are entering social policies more and more. It is also quite clear, that compulsion fits into a social policy design, in which not clients but policy makers and deliverers determine the objectives of inclusion policies: it is sometimes considered necessary when people are expected to get engaged in types of participation that do not meet their needs or, in other words, when they have to develop forms of participation that, in their perception, do not contribute to their social inclusion. From the perspective we have been developing here, in which social inclusion policies aim at creating participation opportunities that match people's needs, using compulsion is far less evident. In our view, compulsion is not necessary to stimulate people to contribute to society and to get them involved into meaningful and useful activities. Most people want to be socially included and want to contribute to society themselves. In sum, the use of compulsion in activation policies seems to serve other purposes than helping unemployed and poor people to solve problems of exclusion: either, they are aimed at satisfying the tax and social contribution payers, or they are aimed at enforcing needs on people who apparently do not recognise them as their own.

One might also wonder to what degree compulsion is used to activate social policy agencies rather than the unemployed. Given the high workloads of these agencies, they deal with a shortage of resources by concentrating their efforts on those who have a work obligation, leaving those who do not to their own devices. In other words, extending the work test and increasing the obligatory character of activation may well be intended to stimulate social policy deliverers to widen their scope of operation to groups that are normally excluded from their services.

Decentralisation

Activating social policies are often delivered in a decentralised policy context. Even in the presence of national legislation, these regulations leave regional or local authorities and policy agencies quite some discretion in the design and/or delivery of activation policies. Discretion is indeed necessary to be able to adjust policies to local circumstances and to individual needs. In other words, tailor-made processes of activation require discretion in the design of activation policies. At the same time, decentralisation makes policies potentially subject to processes of inequality of justice (clients have different rights and obligations in different local contexts or are treated differently by different consultants), and arbitrariness. Safeguarding the position of clients in national regulations and empowering them in their interactions with consultants may be tools in counter-acting the potentially negative consequences of policy decentralisation.

Monitoring

The transformation of social policies from passive into active measures has resulted into a large number of schemes and initiatives. In order to gain insight into the degree to which these schemes and initiatives are successful, monitoring them and comparing results of various programmes is highly necessary. In designing these monitor studies, the following issues should be taken into account. First of all, they should not be directed at participants of pro-

grammes only, but also at drop-outs and at people that have, for whatever reason, been excluded from participation. Thus, insight may be gained into the conditions that make schemes successful for some groups of people but unsuccessful for others. Secondly, our remarks with respect to the objectives of policies aimed at social inclusion also influence the criteria deployed in assessing the success of these policies. From a narrow perspective on social inclusion, success will be measured in terms of outflow to paid jobs only. From a broader perspective, other indicators of social inclusion may gain importance as well.

5. Dissemination

During the period of the project, all partners have been involved in disseminating the results of the project. These dissemination activities have been directed at both the scientific and the social policy world, and involved both articles and publications in books, papers and presentations at conferences or meetings of policy makers and policy administrators. Publications were targeted at national audiences as well as international audiences. As far as the (paper) presentations are concerned, up until now these have been targeted predominantly at national or subnational (regional, local) levels, such as the 4th conference of the European Sociological Association in Amsterdam (1999) and the IREC conference in France. In Annex 1 of this report, an overview is presented of publications and presentations by the INPART partners.

Apart from these dissemination activities, results of the project have been published in reports on the various work packages. These encompass both comparative reports and annexes containing the national reports on the basis of which the comparative reports have been written. Also, a homepage has been developed describing the main objectives of the project, the various work packages and outlines of the reports that have been produced.

Of course, dissemination activities will continue after termination of the project as such. It is expected, that new dissemination activities will focus more strongly on comparative findings. Partly, these dissemination activities will be undertaken by the various partners separately. Apart from that, some joint dissemination activities will be organised. These are outlined in the following scheme.

Overview of joint dissemination activities of results of the INPART project

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Partners involved</i>	<i>Audience</i>	<i>Scheduled</i>
INPART dissemination meeting	All	National and EU policy makers/policy administrators	February 2000
Presentation of results on internet home page	Co-ordinator	-	-
Volume on the basis of the INPART results	All	Mainly social scientists	2001
Special issue 'Tijdschrift voor Arbeid en Participatie'	All	Social scientists and policy makers (Dutch language)	March 2000
SASE conference, London	At least NL, UK, E	Social scientists	July 2000
Special issue 'Journal of European Area Studies'	All	Social scientists	Early 2001
Special issue 'Transfer'	All	Social scientists, policy makers, union representatives	Early 2001

Joint dissemination activities will be taking place in close co-operation and co-ordination with another TSER-project, the Comparative Social Inclusion Policies Network. This goes for most of the dissemination activities presented in the overview above. In this context, the following dissemination options are still being discussed:

- A joint publication on both the results of INPART and the CSIP-network by the co-ordinators of both projects in the Journal of European Social Policy;

- Special issues of various journals, such as *Inchiesta* (Italy), *Innovations* (Austria) and the journal of the Centre for Social Studies in Coimbra, Portugal;
- Presentations at various conferences, such as the American Sociological Association conference in 2000, the Basic Income European Network conference in Berlin, 2000, the International Social Security Association conference in Helsinki, 2000, the European Sociological Association conference in Helsinki, 2001, and the International Sociological Association conference in Australia, 2002.

6. Annexes

Annex I: Publications, presentations et cetera

Publications

Aa, P. Van der, R. Van Berkel (eds.) (1998), *Sociale Activering. Ervaringen van Rotterdamse deelnemers*. Utrecht: Jan van Arkel.

Berkel, R. van, H. Coenen, A. Dekker (1999), 'Regulating the unemployed: From protection to participation', in J. Lind, I. Hornemann Møller (eds.), *Inclusion and Exclusion: Unemployment and non-standard employment in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 89-111.

Berkel, R. van (1999), 'Activering van werkloze jongeren in Finland, Zweden, Denemarken en Nederland', *Tijdschrift voor Arbeid en Participatie*, jrg. 21, nr. 1, pp. 28-40.

Berkel, R. van, A. Brand (1999), 'Onbenutte Kwaliteiten in Rotterdam', in S. Grotenhuis, J. van der Zwaard (red.), *Met de beste bedoelingen. Professionele interventies in het gezin*. Maarssen: Elsevier/De Tijdstroom, pp. 39-53.

Hespanha, P. (1997), 'O lugar dos Actores Colectivos na Regulaçao Social: o caso das Instituiçoes Particulares de Solidariedade Social', in: B.S. Santos, *O Estado e Sociedade Civil: a criaçao de actores sociais num período de reconstituiçao do Estado*. Coimbra: CES.

Hespanha, Pedro (1997) "Novas perspectivas sobre os direitos sociais", in *Intervençao Social* ns 15/16. Lisbon: Instituto Superior de Serviço Social.

Hespanha, P. (1997), *The Portuguese late Modernisation and the Complexities of Social Integration through Work*. Oficinas de CES nr. 93.

Hespanha, P. (1999), 'Em torno do papel providencial da sociedade civil portuguesa' (On the social protective role of the civil society), *Cadernos de Políticas Sociais*, no.1, pp.15-42.

Hespanha, P., A. R. Matos (1999), 'From passive to active social policies. The softness of workfare policies in Portugal', *Oficina do CES*, no. 145.

Hornemann Møller, I. (1999), 'Trends in the Danish social mode of economic regulation', in J. Lind and I. Hornemann Møller (eds.), *Inclusion and Exclusion: unemployment and non-standard employment*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Knudsen, H., J. Lind (1999), 'The implementation of EU-directives in national systems - lessons from the Danish case', *Transfer*, vol. 5, no. 1/2, Brussels, pp.136-155.

Lind, J. (1998), 'Socialpolitikken og arbejdet', in J. E. Larsen, I. H. Møller (eds.), *Socialpolitik*, Munksgaard, pp.242-259.

Lind, J., I. Hornemann Møller (1999), *The labour market process of change? Some critical comments*. CID- study no.23, Copenhagen.

Lind, J., Hornemann Møller, I. (1999), 'Introduction', in J. Lind, I. Hornemann Møller (eds.), *Inclusion and Exclusion: Unemployment and non-standard employment in Europe*, Ashgate, pp. 1-9.

Lind, J. (1999), 'Labour market flexibility and regulation', in J., I. Hornemann Møller (eds.), *Inclusion and Exclusion: Unemployment and non-standard employment in Europe*, Ashgate, pp. 187-215.

Lind, J., I. Hornemann Møller (1999), 'European convergence or national specificities?', in J. Lind, I. Hornemann Møller (eds.), *Inclusion and Exclusion: Unemployment and non-standard employment in Europe*, Ashgate, , pp. 219-230.

Lind, J. (1999), 'Tripartism and Collective Bargaining: The Social Pact on Employment in Denmark', *International Journal of Employment Studies*, Volume 7, No 1, Sydney, pp.33-52.

- Lind, J. (1999), 'Arbejdsløshedspolitikken siden 1960erne - fra forsørgelse til disciplinering', *Magistrenes Arbejdsløshedskasse: Nå, hvad laver du så?*, Magistrenes Arbejdsløshedskasse, Copenhagen, pp.49-61.
- Lind, J., I. Hornemann Møller (1999), 'Unemployment or Basic Income? - Danish Debates', in I. Gough, G. Olufsson (eds.), *Capitalism and social cohesion. Essays on Exclusion and Integration*, London: Macmillan, pp.169-188.
- Vilrocx, J., J. Oste, C. Machado, J. de Schampheleire, D. Ransom (1999), 'Tussen arbeid en inkomen', *Werkgelegenheid, Arbeid, Vorming. Nieuwsbrief van het steunpunt WAV*. No 3, Augustus 1999, pp. 178-183.
- J. Vilrocx, J. Oste, C. Machado, J. De Schampheleire, D. Ransom (1999), 'Over Arbeid en inkomen. Enkele eerste impressies naar aanleiding van een onderzoek bij laaggeschoolde werkzoekenden', *UVV info*. 16^e jaargang nr.3, Mei-Juni 1999, pp. 15-17.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1999), *A Helping Hand: Harnessing Self-Help to Combat Social Exclusion*. York: York Publishing Services.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (November 1999), 'Reconceptualising paid informal work and its implications for policy: some lessons from a case study of Southampton', *Policy Studies*, vol.20, no.4.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1999), 'Unshackling the future of work from the ideology of full-employment', *Foresight*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 309-322.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1999), 'The Formalisation of Work Thesis: a critical evaluation', *Futures*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 547-558.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1999), 'Helping people to help themselves and others: how a new way of crediting active citizens could make a difference', *New Start*, October.
- Williams, C.C. (1999), 'LETS - Local Exchange and Trading Systems', *Hard Times*, 66: pp.39-40.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), *Informal Employment in the Advanced Economies: implications for work and welfare*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'Informeel economische activiteit in achterstandswijken: enkele bevindingen van een case-studie in Leicester', *Tijdschrift voor Arbeid en Participatie*, vol. 20, no.1, pp. 60-74.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'The unemployed and informal sector in Europe's cities and regions', in P. Lawless, R. Martin and S. Hardy (eds.), *Unemployment and Social Exclusion: landscapes of labour inequality*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'Tackling social exclusion and inclusion in an age of informalisation: a 'whole economy' approach', in A. Pike and D. Sobers (eds.), *New Lifestyles, New Regions: integrated approaches to local and regional development and planning policy*. London: Regional Studies Association.
- Williams, C.C. and Seyfang, G. (1998), 'LETS: middle-class hobby or viable trading alternative?', *Permaculture*, vol.18, pp. 21-24.
- Williams, C.C. and Seyfang, G. (1998), 'Give DIY Economies a Break: Local exchange and trading systems are a great benefit to the unemployed', *New Statesman*, 27 March, p.24.
- Williams, C.C. (1998), *Helping People To Help Themselves: an appraisal of the potential of Local Exchange and Trading Systems (LETS)*. Political Economy Research Centre (PERC) Policy Working Paper no. 15, PERC, University of Sheffield, Sheffield.

Papers and presentations

- Aa, P. van der, R. van Berkel, T. Wentink (1999), 'Social activation in welfare society', paper presented at the 4th European conference of sociology, *Will Europe Work*, August 18-21, 1999, Amsterdam.

- Berkel, R. van (1999), 'Social Activation in the Netherlands', presentation at *Social Activation Seminar*, STAKES, Helsinki, June 21-22, 1999.
- Berkel, R. van (1999), 'Social participation of social security claimants', presentation at BUS-meeting, Tilburg, 29-1-1999.
- Berkel, R. van (1999), 'Sociale Activering', paper presented at NCDO-meeting *Experimenteren in en met de bijstand*, Amsterdam, 18-1-1999.
- Hespanha, P. (1999), 'Exclusão Social e Políticas Sociais: uma abordagem a partir da globalização' (Social Exclusion and social Policies: a perspective from globalization), conference to the Post-graduation Course in Social Re-insertion organised by Universidade Internacional of Figueira da Foz, May 22 1999.
- Hespanha, P. (1999), 'Das políticas passivas para as políticas activas. Uma análise comparada das mudanças' (From passive social policies to active social policies: a comparative analysis of the changes), Conference at the Master Course in Sociology of Work, ISCTE, Lisbon, June 1st 1999.
- Hespanha, P. (1999), 'Perspectiva sociológica sobre a exclusão e a reinserção social' (A sociological approach to social exclusion and social re-insertion), conference at the Seminar on Social re-insertion, organised by the CAT of Viseu, June 14th 1999.
- Hespanha, P. (1999), 'Os caminhos e os descaminhos do terceiro sector. A propósito da experiência portuguesa recente' (The incongruencies of the Third Sector. The Portuguese Case), paper to the *Seminário de Antropologia e Sociologia* do Congresso Brasil-Portugal, Ano 2000, Recife, Brazil, September 29th 1999.
- Hornemann MÅler, I. (1998 and 1999), presentations of theoretical and empirical parts of the INPART project at *European Sociological Association*, Amsterdam 1999; *Nordic conference for labour studies*, Norway 1999; *Seminars/Conferences* at Ålborg University, 1998 and 1999; *Seminars* at Stockholm University and Lund University (Sweden); *Seminar* at University of Coimbra; *Seminars* at Roskilde University, School of Social Work in Copenhagen and School of Social Work in Aarhus and the *Danish network on marginalisation studies*; *Public hearing* with the Minister of Social Work, Denmark; *Presentation* at the Ministry of Social Work, Stockholm.
- Lind, J. (1999), 'The social pact on employment and competitiveness in a new trajectory', paper presented at the *IREC Conference*, Aix en Provence, 21-23 May 1999.
- Lind, J. (1999), 'The social pact in Europe', paper presented on a conference *on Labour market regulation between co-operation and competition*, Aalborg, 15-17 June 1999.
- Lind, J. (1999), 'The outcome of activation policies in Denmark', paper presented at a seminar for the *Danish Association of Masters and PhDs*, Ør, 27 August 1999.
- Lind, J. (1999), 'The labour market and the welfare state', paper presented at a *COST A13 seminar*, Brussels, 16 September 1999.
- Matos, A.R. (1999), 'O discurso e as práticas de activação num Estado-Providência Sul Europeu' (The Activation Discourse and Practices in a South-European Welfare State), presentation in the *Colóquio A Reinvenção da Teoria Crítica*, Coimbra, April, 16th 1999.
- Matos, A.R. (1999), 'A dimensão subjectiva da participação nas políticas activas de emprego. Avaliação com base nos cursos de formação especial do Sub-Programa INTEGRAR' (The subjective dimension of the participation in activation policies. An evaluation based on special training courses under de INTEGRAR Sub- Programme), seminar in Centro de Estudos Sociais. University of Coimbra, 22nd January 1999.
- Williams, C.C. (1999), 'LETS and social exclusion', paper presented to Local economy Policy unit seminar on *Complementary Currencies: latest developments in LETS and Time Money*, London, November.

- Roche, M., Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1999), 'Towards a New European Social Model: an evaluation of Complementary Social Inclusion Policies (CSIPs)', paper presented to British Association meeting on *Globalisation and Social Policy*, Sheffield, September.
- Williams, C.C., Tooke, J., Aldridge, T., Lee, R., Leyshon, A., Thrift, N. (1999), 'Evaluating the effectiveness of the social economy in tackling social exclusion: some lessons from Local Exchange and Trading Schemes (LETS)', Paper presented to VIth International Planning and Environment Research Group of the RGS/IBG on *Local and Economic Restructuring: Social and Economic Impacts*, Brunel University, 26-29 June.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1999), 'Making intermediate labour markets lead to real jobs: what jobs?', Paper presented to the *DETR/National Council for Planning and Housing 1st National Regeneration Convention*, The Brighton Centre, Brighton, 26-28 May.
- Tooke, J., Aldridge, T., Lee, R., Leyshon, A., Thrift, N and Williams, C.C. (1999), 'Local Exchange and Trading Systems: a working alternative', *International Centre for Labour Studies Seminar*, Manchester, May.
- Williams, C.C. (1999), 'Helping people to help themselves: tackling social exclusion in deprived neighbourhoods', Paper presented to *University of Sheffield Department of Geography Staff Seminar*, Sheffield, February.
- Williams, C.C. (1999), 'Re-forming or re-placing the welfare state', Paper presented to the *Royal Geographical Society Annual Conference*, University of Leicester, Leicester, January.
- Aldridge, T., Lee, R., Leyshon, A., Thrift, N. and Williams, C.C. (1999), 'LETS and Alternative Futures', Paper presented to the *Royal Geographical Society Annual Conference*, University of Leicester, Leicester, January.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'Tackling social exclusion and inclusion in an age of informalisation: a "whole economy" approach', Paper presented to the Regional Studies Association Annual Conference on *New Lifestyles, New Regions: integrated approaches to local and regional development and planning policy*, London, November.
- Williams, C.C. (1998), 'Geographies of the social economy'. Paper presented at Conference on *Local Approaches to Social Inclusion*, Queen Mary College, University of London, London, November.
- Aldridge, T., Lee, R., Leyshon, A., Thrift, N. and Williams, C.C. (1998), 'LETS and social exclusion: new money, new value and local social development', Paper presented at Conference on *Local Approaches to Social Inclusion*, Queen Mary College, University of London, London, November.
- Williams, C.C., Aldridge, T. And North, P. (1998), 'Researching LETS', paper presented to LetsLink UK Conference on *Complementary Currencies: new choices for the millennium*, Portsmouth, October.
- Williams, C.C. (1998), 'Local purchasing and the community economy', paper presented to LetsLink UK Conference on *Complementary Currencies: new choices for the millennium*, Portsmouth, October.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'From Workfare to Fair Work: rationales and strategies for harnessing informal economic activity', Paper presented to the *Citizen's Income Trust Conference on Flexibility, Competitiveness and Welfare Benefits*, London School of Economics, London, September.
- Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'From doing things to people towards enabling people to do things for themselves: the new institutional turn in local economic development', paper presented to Conference on *The New Institutional Turn in Local Economic Development*, University of Sheffield, September.
- Williams, C.C. (1998), 'Local Exchange and Trading Systems (LETS): a new tool for economic development', Paper presented at session on *Regional Impacts of a Single European*

Currency at the British and Irish Section Regional Science Association Conference, University College of Ripon and York St John, York, September.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (1998), 'Developing the informal sector in deprived neighbourhoods: towards a complementary approach to local economic development', Paper presented to the ESRC Urban and Regional Economics Seminar Group Conference on *Local Econometric Modelling and Forecasting*, Portsmouth University, July.

Williams, C.C., Windebank, J. and Hughes, S. (1998), 'Helping people to help themselves: some lessons on harnessing informal economic activity from Southampton', Paper presented to the Regional Studies Association Conference on *Building the Social Economy: Beyond the Millennium*, Leeds, June.

Williams, C.C., Windebank, J. and Hughes, S. (1998), 'Harnessing informal economic activity: towards a complementary approach to local economic development', Paper presented to the East Midlands Regional Studies Association Conference on *Towards the Millennium: Economic and Social Developments in the East Midlands*, Nene College of Higher Education, Northampton, May.

Forthcoming

Hespanha, P., A. R. Matos (forthcoming), 'Compulsão ao trabalho ou emancipação pelo trabalho? Para um debate sobre as políticas activas de emprego' (Compulsion to work or emancipation by work ?. For a debate on active labour market policies), *Sociologia*, Univ. Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

Ruivo, F. (forthcoming), 'Poder local e exclusão social: uma abordagem introdutóri' (Local Power and Social Exclusion: an introductory approach), Oficina do CES.

Ruivo, F. (1999), 'Poder local e exclusão social' (Local Power and Social Exclusion), Coimbra, Quarteto, (March 2000).

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming October 2000), 'Beyond Employment: an examination of modes of service provision in a deprived neighbourhood', *The Service Industries Journal*.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming 2000), 'Helping People to Help Themselves: some policy lessons from deprived urban neighbourhoods in Southampton', *Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 29.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming January 2000), 'Self-Help and Mutual Aid in Deprived Urban Neighbourhoods: some lessons from Southampton', *Urban Studies*, vol. 37, no.1, pp. 127-147.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming January 2000), 'Modes of goods acquisition in deprived neighbourhoods', *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, vol. 10, no.1, pp.73-94.

Cook, J., Roche, M., Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming 2000), 'The evolution of active welfare policies as a solution to social exclusion in Britain', *Tijdschrift voor Arbeid en Participatie*, vol. 21, no.6.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming January 2000), 'The growth of urban informal economies', in W.F. Lever and R. Paddison (eds.), *Handbook of Urban Studies*. London: Sage.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming 1999), 'Beyond Formal Retailing and Consumer Services: an examination of how households acquire goods and services', *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming 1999), 'Helping each other out? Community exchange in deprived neighbourhoods', *Community Development Journal*.

Williams, C.C. and Windebank, J. (forthcoming 1999), 'Informal economic activity in deprived neighbourhoods: some case study evidence from Leicester', in G. Haughton (ed.), *Community Economic Development: linking the grassroots to regional economic development*. London: The Stationary Office.

Annex II: description of the case studies (WP3)

This annex describes the national case. Some of the case studies will get more attention than others, simply because the less ‘regular’ types of work need more explanation than the regular ones. The basis of the case studies was a distinction into four types of participation which will be used to cluster the case studies in this annex.

1. Primary labour market

Participation in the primary or ‘regular’ labour market constitutes, at least from the perspective of social policies, the prime form of social inclusion. Other types of work are either preparations for regular labour-market participation or considered to be only imperfect substitutes for a regular job.

There is, of course, no such thing as ‘a regular job’: the concept ‘regular’ itself can hardly be defined. As we have pointed out before, the primary labour market has become more and more differentiated, including all kinds of flexible jobs, temporary jobs, part-time jobs, jobs where people are self-employed or working in secondment constructions, et cetera. This diversity would justify a research project on its own, studying the inclusive potential of all these different types of ‘regular’ jobs.

We did not choose to use this approach, as we have already explained. Nevertheless, two case studies do focus on primary labour-market participation directly. One of the *Danish* case studies focused at a sample of employed people drawn from the national labour force register (with respect to the survey part of this particular case study). No selection criteria were used with respect to kind of jobs, types of contract and so forth, so that the sample includes all types of jobs found in the primary labour market.

The *British* case study under the ‘primary labour market’ heading did focus on a specific kind of job in the primary labour market, namely the part-time job. Part-time work is becoming an increasingly ‘regular’ way of labour-market participation, especially for women. At the same time, the British case study clearly shows the importance of contextualising the types of work in the case studies. For example, compared to full-time jobs, part-time jobs do not necessarily have to be ‘regular’ where employment rights protection of part-time workers is concerned. This goes especially for the British case, where part-time work under the Conservative governments has been adopted as a low-pay, ‘low-skilled’ labour-market strategy. Furthermore, Britain was exempt from the Social Protocol of the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, so that many of the employment rights directives developed in the EU were not applied in the UK. Since Labour came to power, the inclusive potential of part-time work has been increased, for example, by the introduction of new employment rights, which particularly benefited part-time workers. Thus, the British case is interesting for investigating the connections between part-time work, part-time workers’ entitlements and part-time workers’ experiences of inclusion and exclusion. The British case study into part-time work adopted in-depth interviews and took place in the retail and catering sectors in the city of Sheffield. As a demarcation criterion, working less than 30 hours a week was used to define part-timers. The largest group of respondents, however, work 16-24 hours; 35% work less than 16 hours, 9% more than 24 hours.

2. Secondary labour market

Under the heading ‘secondary labour market’ we grouped several activating programmes that are designed to integrate the unemployed, temporarily or permanently, into some type of paid work or ‘benefit-+’ construction. Apart from being targeted schemes, one of the main characteristics of these programmes is that the jobs involved are somehow subsidised, for example,

by using benefits to subsidise wages or to capitalise benefits in order to help people start their own company. Sometimes, these initiatives combine the objectives of stimulating social inclusion and meeting unsatisfied local needs (for example, with respect to the environment, services, public security). The relationship between this ‘secondary labour market’ and the primary labour market can be quite different for the schemes involved in the case studies. Sometimes, the schemes provide subsidies to help to create regular employment. In other cases, the focus is on giving the unemployed opportunities for work experience (and sometimes qualifications), and the schemes are designed to be stepping-stones towards participation in the primary labour market. And finally, there are schemes that provide more permanent participation opportunities, on conditions more or less divergent from primary labour-market conditions.

The *Belgian* case study focused on local economy initiatives undertaken by third-system organisations. The local operation of these initiatives is an example of decentralisation tendencies we can observe in all EU countries where tackling the problems of unemployment and social exclusion is concerned. The third system organisations aim at providing goods and services to the local community and therefore undertake economic activities at the local level, but contrary to private enterprises, profit maximisation or profit generation are not their objectives. Besides other actors and institutions involved in policies against unemployment and exclusion, these organisations play an increasingly important role, since they are giving particular attention to the problems of disadvantaged persons or groups, either by integrating them into the labour market or by providing services (or a combination of both). These organisations are subsidised by the state and may also raise funds from donations or non-commercial loans. Consequently, the organisations are often involved in partnerships with public and/or private organisations or resulting from individuals associating together in order to meet a common need.

It should be emphasised that contrary to many nationally implemented social policies, some of these initiatives try to develop bottom-up approaches where individual demands are the starting point of reintegration interventions.

Methodologically, the local initiatives are a mix of three ingredients: a job offer, a training programme and individual guidance and assistance. The way these ingredients are mixed in specific programmes is an important aspect of the contextualisation of this type of work. Local projects may contain different mixes of these ingredients. In this section, we will focus at the more ‘work-oriented’ projects; the more ‘training-oriented’ projects will be described in section 4. Within these ‘work-oriented’ projects, we may distinguish the following types.

- Work experience, involving various kinds of temporary work contracts combining paid-job experience with preceding or supplementary training. The basis of the payment for training hours is the social benefit, for working hours it is the sectoral minimum wage. Since the activities are mostly of a social or environmental nature without being economically very profitable, the projects and third-system organisations organising them are highly dependent on subsidies. Participation usually lasts 1 to 2 years.
- Insertion enterprises, where low-skilled or long-term unemployed people work temporarily on a subsidised contract. The subsidy is considered a compensation for low productivity of the employees. These enterprises, though primarily concerned with social and environmental needs, have to be economically profitable. In Flanders, the enterprise has to become independent of subsidies after three years of operation. In Wallonia and Brussels profitability rules are less strict. Participation may be permanent, but wage subsidies of the participants are not.

- Social enterprises, which only involve work with no explicit perspective on an increase in skills or productivity. Most people involved are very long-term unemployed (more than 5 years) or those who have been dependent on the subsistence minimum. Work is subsidised at a moderate level but continuously; participation may be permanent. The enterprise has to be economically profitable.

Both the work-experience projects and the insertion enterprises should prepare people for regular labour-market participation. The case study investigated 25 initiatives in the Antwerp, Liège, Mons and Ghent areas, and Brussels.

The *Danish* case studies include a group of activated people. This group involves people who are dependent on unemployment benefits and people dependent on social assistance. Although the activation of both groups of unemployed is regulated by different laws, the activation programmes are quite similar. Here, we will deal with work-oriented programmes; education and training will be discussed in section 4.

The unemployed in Denmark have become increasingly subjected to activation policies. For some groups these programmes have a stronger work-fare-like character than others, for example, age-groups are treated differently under current Danish social policies. Above, we have pointed at the obligatory nature of participation in activation schemes as an important contextual element in understanding people's experiences with these schemes. Generally speaking, recipients of unemployment benefits are activated after one year of benefit dependency, and the same goes for people on social assistance who are 30 years old or older. Younger social assistance recipients receive an activation offer after 13 weeks of unemployment. Thus, in most cases the activated unemployed will be long-term unemployed, that is they have been unemployed for at least one year. Work-oriented activation programmes include the following schemes.

- Job training, which may be with private or public employers. Pay and other working conditions should be according to collective agreements applicable to the sector. Wages are a maximum of 12 Euros per hour for persons activated in the public sector. Employers receive a wage subsidy of about 6 Euros per hour for each recruited unemployed. After 6 months of having received subsidies, a private employer has to employ the unemployed without receiving a subsidy any longer, or should offer the unemployed training.
- Individual job training also involves a temporary job at a private company, a public institution or a semi-public organisation. The employer receives a wage subsidy, which may exceed 6 Euros per hour. The subsidy period may be longer than 1 year. Conditions in individual job training are rather flexible and working time is set individually. The wage is a special project allowance and should not exceed the maximum rate of unemployment benefits. Other working conditions should be as close to normal as possible.
- Pool jobs are public sector jobs of up to three years' duration for persons who have been unemployed for a period of 1 year. Hourly pay is the same as in public job training. The main aim of this scheme is to create more permanent jobs to meet social needs or improve the quality of existing services. Jobs can be created by public employers in the following sectors: environmental protection, conservation of nature, culture, collective public transport, housing, education, health and care, and the labour-market field.

With the exception of those involved in job training in the private sector where no income ceiling exists, the participants in these schemes may not earn more than the maximum rate of unemployment benefits. When full-time wages exceed this limit, working hours are reduced accordingly. Although participation periods may be shorter or longer, they are in general designed to increase integration opportunities within the primary labour market.

One of the *Dutch* case studies deals with the ‘Extra Employment for the Long-term Unemployed Scheme’ or Melkert-1 Scheme which was introduced in 1995. The aim of this scheme is to enlarge the availability of low-skilled and low-paid jobs in the Dutch labour market, and, at the same time, to improve the quality of public services. The jobs are targeted at people who have been unemployed for at least 1 year and who are entirely or partly dependent on social assistance. Participation in these jobs may be permanent. In January 1999, 34,700 Melkert-1 jobs had been created, partly in the health sector, partly by the 79 municipalities that, in 1997, were allowed to create Melkert-1 jobs. This case study focuses only on the latter part of the scheme as implemented in the city of Rotterdam, which employs over 10% of all Dutch Melkert-1 workers. On average, Melkert-1 workers work 32 hours a week. Wages are set at a minimum of 100% of the nationally set minimum wage⁹ and a maximum of 120% of the minimum wage, on the basis of a regular full-time working week (usually 36-38 hours). Other labour conditions depend on the collective agreement applicable to the sector in which the Melkert-1 worker is employed. Although the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment likes to stress that Melkert-1 jobs are ‘regular jobs’, they deviate from regular jobs in the following ways:

- Melkert-1 jobs are funded according to specific regulations;
- They are targeted at the long-term unemployed;
- They are subjected to the legal regulation that Melkert-1 workers can never earn more than 120% of the minimum wage. This also means that working overtime must be compensated in free time once the 120% threshold is reached. Since July 1997, supplements for irregular working hours are no longer taken into consideration;
- The work tasks of Melkert-1 workers are defined by legal regulations, and should only involve simple, routine tasks requiring little formal qualifications.

Formally, people may refuse a Melkert-1 offer (as any job offer may be refused), but, according to social assistance regulations, they risk sanctions when refusing a job offer. Melkert-1 jobs are completely subsidised: for each newly created Melkert-1 job, a subsidy of 18,000 Euros is available.

One of the *Portuguese* case studies focuses at the Occupational Programmes for Unemployed People (POC), that have been in operation since 1985. POCs are oriented towards people receiving either unemployment benefits or the unemployed in economic need, whom they provide with short-duration (< 1 year) occupational activities under projects promoted by non-profit organisations, largely in the areas of environment, culture, heritage, social support and other social areas. According to official documents, POCs were created to ‘combat demotivation and marginalisation tendencies’ among the unemployed, and to aid their social integration through a ‘socially useful occupation’. It is recognised that the programmes ‘are not targeted at job creation nor at being engaged in productive jobs in the labour market’. Participation in a POC is explicitly temporary.

According to a recent revision of the law, recipients of an unemployment benefit or social security benefit are obliged to accept a POC job offer, or else they will lose their benefit entitlements. POC placements entitle recipients to a complementary income of 20% of the unemployment benefit, plus transportation, meals and costs for accident insurance. The Portuguese POC case study took place in the town of Figueira da Foz.

Finally, the *Spanish* case studies have the least characteristics of a secondary labour-market programme. In fact, subsidies are provided to create ‘normal’ jobs in the primary labour mar-

⁹ As of January 1st 1999, Dutch minimum wage for adults (23 years of age and older) is 1,064 Euros per month (gross).

ket. Thus, of all job schemes presented in this section, the Spanish scheme resembles primary labour-market participation most. The scheme under investigation is the capitalisation of unemployment benefits scheme. This scheme is the most important activation measure in Spain aimed at creating new employment in the regular labour market. The jobs that this measure tries to stimulate are located in the social economy sector. Until 1992, workers had the option to invest their capitalised benefits either in an autonomous company or in the social sector. In 1992, the option to invest the money in self-employment actions was cancelled. From then on, to make use of the scheme one has to invest all the money generated by capitalising unemployment benefits into a social company (Anonymous Labour Societies, Limited Labour Societies or Social Co-operatives). The general idea of this capitalisation process is that workers can receive in one time the total value of their unemployment benefit entitlements. Contrary to most other schemes discussed in this section, the Spanish scheme is not targeted at the long-term unemployed specifically. The reason for that is simple: the longer people are unemployed, the more of their unemployment benefit entitlements they will have consumed, and the less interesting capitalising their unemployment benefits will be. In general, people will apply for the capitalisation scheme as soon as they get unemployed. Since administrative procedures for judging the application take about 3 months, the applicants will have been unemployed for about 3 months once they start working in the new business. Furthermore, since the scheme only involves people that are entitled to unemployment benefits, it is aimed at people who can be assumed to function in the labour market and have years of work experience.

One should distinguish two periods in the history of the scheme. During the first period, 1985-1992, investments often took place in previous private companies located in the industrial sector that had closed down. Thus, the capitalisation of unemployment benefits scheme were used to 'take over' private companies that were threatened with closure. Besides, during this period workers also had the option to invest the money in self-employment actions. The latter option was used by workers to create a new company, different from the one they were employed by before. Starting in 1992, workers were obliged to invest the money in social companies. Some of the new social companies that were established after 1992 are managed by young workers, which was not the case during the first period.

In 1997, the Labour Societies Law was approved. According to this law, to create Limited Labour Societies it is necessary to invest 3,000 Euros and to have three associated workers. After this legislation, many social companies of this kind are being established: workers prefer to establish Limited Labour Societies rather than Labour Anonymous Societies.

Within the social companies, two categories of workers can be distinguished. The associated workers have shares in the company and have a voice in the company's assemblies. The second category of workers, non-associated workers, do not have these rights.

The case studies took place in the areas of the metropolitan cities of Barcelona and Bilbao, where unemployment was relatively higher.

3. *Unpaid work*

The case studies presented under this heading involve different degrees of ‘social policy relatedness’. The British case study, mainly concerned with unpaid work but also involving a certain degree of informal paid work, focuses attention to working and unemployed people’s strategies of doing and making use of unpaid work to get work for themselves or others done. The Danish case study involves a group of unemployed people that, on their own initiative, began to participate in voluntary work and received permission from benefit agencies to do so. The Dutch case study is concerned with a specific activating social policy scheme, targeted at the long-term unemployed and aimed at increasing their social inclusion by stimulating and supporting their involvement in unpaid activities.

The *British* case study deals with informal work, predominantly unpaid work but also informal paid exchange. The promotion of unpaid work is often seen as problematic since governments may harness it either to reduce the welfare state by trimming social services and emphasising ‘individual responsibilities’, or to cut back on social rights. However, besides this social policy approach of unpaid or informal work as a way of replacing employment and the welfare state, another approach may be distinguished which seeks to supplement, not replace, employment and state provision: the ‘assisted self-help’ approach. In this case study, unpaid work is studied from the latter point of view.

Two socio-economic backgrounds seem to legitimise attention to unpaid/informal work in the context of the INPART research. First, there is the continuous high level of unemployment and underemployment in many European countries. Second, although unpaid and informal work are often thought of as manifestations of ‘backwardness’ rather than ‘modernity’, unpaid work has always formed a very important part of the total work time in advanced economies and its importance has even increased. In other words, at least some advanced economies seem to witness a process which might be defined as a ‘southification of the north’ rather than the opposite: an informalisation of work.

Paying attention to this type of work may contribute to answering the question which of the three following policy options should be chosen to deal with unpaid and informal work:

- To enable deprived populations to rely less on informal work by giving them access to formal-sector provision through either employment creation or higher benefits;
- To allow the situation to continue as it is by adopting a ‘laissez-faire’ approach;
- To swim with the tide of these structural changes and harness such work.

These same issues and policy choices are relevant to the two other case studies dealing with unpaid work as well. The *Danish* case study includes a group of unemployed people who are participating in some sort of institution or organisation on a voluntary basis, while still receiving benefits. They might be called ‘self-activated’, since they have found this voluntary work themselves. Their participation does not take place in the social-policy context of a process of qualifying for labour-market participation. One might even state that this group of people do not necessarily have major difficulties in finding an ordinary job. Generally, they are unemployed for a relatively short term. Although social security systems have often been reluctant to recognise or allow voluntary work by unemployed people, because it was considered to reduce their labour-market availability, the Danish social security system does, under certain conditions, permit unemployed people to do voluntary work without this having any consequences for their unemployment benefits.

Finally, the *Dutch* case study on unpaid work deals with a social policy initiative focusing on socially integrating long-term unemployed people through unpaid activities. The case study

focuses on one of the experiments in the context of the scheme ‘Experiments working while retaining benefits based on article 144 of the Social Assistance Act’, also known as Social Activation or Melkert-3. In 1996, a new Social Assistance Act was introduced in the Netherlands, aimed at, among other things, increasing the activating function of social assistance. In this context, municipalities were offered the opportunity to start experiments with the objective of activating unemployed people with very small labour-market chances in unpaid activities. In a sense, the scheme targets a ‘hard-core’ group of unemployed people that have been subjected to ‘creaming-off’ processes by previous activation measures. In other words, Social Activation was designed to be a ‘participation safety net’.

Social activation is *not* a job scheme. Participants are engaged in unpaid activities and remain social assistance recipients. Local discretion in designing experiments is quite large, which means that these experiments may differ on various dimensions. Our case study focuses on the largest and one of the earliest Social Activation experiments, the experiment in the city of Rotterdam. The dimensions of classification of Social Activation experiments and the position of the experiment in Rotterdam within this classification are as follows:

- The objectives of the experiments may primarily focus on combating social exclusion (‘welfare policies’), on preparing labour-market participation (‘labour-market policies’), or on a mix of both. In the Rotterdam experiment, labour-market participation is no objective. At the same time, social activation participants who want to find a job should be supported while realising this objective. Re-entering the labour-market is considered to be a positive ‘side-effect’ of social activation.
- Participation in the experiments may be voluntary or obligatory. In Rotterdam, participation in the project is voluntary. If people do not want to participate, they will not be sanctioned in any way.
- The target group may be defined narrowly (very long-term unemployed on social assistance), but sometimes participation is opened up for other groups of people confronted with social exclusion as well (for example, elderly people or people on disability benefits). In Rotterdam, long-term unemployed social assistance recipients are the most important target group in the experiment. Nevertheless, other groups do occasionally participate in the project.
- The methodology used in the experiments may be ‘top-down’: municipalities develop some forms of participation and then start looking for candidates; or the methodology may be ‘bottom-up’ or client-centred, starting with an assessment of people’s capacities, wishes, ambitions etc. and finding or developing appropriate participation opportunities when this assessment has been completed. In Rotterdam, the latter approach is being used.

In addition, the following characteristics of the experiment in Rotterdam should be mentioned.

- Participation in the experiment is allowed for a maximum period of 2 years. After this period, prolongation of participation is possible.
- Participants in social activation are released from the obligation to apply for jobs. People who do not want to participate remain under this obligation.
- A variety of unpaid participation options is open to participants. These options include organised voluntary work, informal unpaid activities, education and intensive guidance or counselling.
- Participants in the project that are involved in socially useful activities receive a reimbursement of expenses. The maximum reimbursement participants can get amounts to 540 Euros a year.
- Social activation in Rotterdam is not just targeted at people who are not participating in

social activities at all. It is also open to people who are already participating in unpaid activities. In practice this often means that they continue these activities, but now are released from the obligation to apply for jobs and get a reimbursement of expenses.

- The ‘activation work’ is carried out by 12 decentralised Social Activation agencies. These agencies operate independently from the municipal social services.

4. Training and education

Like the case studies that were described under the heading of ‘secondary labour market’, the case studies focusing on training and education relate directly to active social policy initiatives. Training and education are practically always aimed at increasing the qualifications or ‘human capital’ of the unemployed in order to improve their labour-market chances. From this perspective, the effect and ‘successfulness’ of training/education programmes may be described in terms of their contribution to labour-market integration of participants. From a broader perspective, however, training and education activities can also be seen as types of participation in themselves, for they may provide participants with new social networks, useful activities, status (‘trainee’ or ‘student’) et cetera. In the case studies, training and education initiatives will be investigated from both perspectives.

As we have already described above the *Belgian* case studies deal with several local social economy initiatives undertaken by third-system organisations. A number of these initiatives can be classified as training, even though the demarcation lines between initiatives focusing on training and on work are not drawn very clearly. Thus, the initiatives we will describe here are *primarily* oriented at training, but may involve elements of work or work experience as well.

There are three kinds of programmes that can be distinguished in the Belgian case studies on education and training.

- Alternating learning is primarily focused on young school drop-outs (aged 15-21). These programmes give young people the opportunity to learn and to acquire skills in a workshop environment during a maximum period of 4 years. Although the workshop formula involves the production of economic goods, these are not economically profitable, which explains the involvement of third-system organisations. Participants receive an income that is derived from the minimum wages for young people.
- Vocational training. The content of these training programmes is quite similar to training programmes organised by municipal governments. However, the involvement of third-system organisations facilitates the participation of people who are not registered as unemployed or of people facing individual problems. Programme duration is between 1 and 3 years. Participants remain on social benefits.
- Training enterprises. Resembling the alternating learning programmes, training enterprises also involve learning in a workshop environment. However, the target group of these programmes is not as homogeneous as is the case in alternating learning. Regional differences exist with respect to the target group of the schemes. For example, in Brussels and Wallonia, access is restricted to people who have not finished secondary education. Furthermore, the participation period is shorter than in the case of alternating learning: 9-18 months. Participants receive social benefits plus a remuneration of 1 Euro per hour. Individual guidance and route counselling are typical for these programmes.

In the Belgian case study, 27 of these training and education initiatives were investigated.

As was already stated, the *Danish* case study involves a group of activated unemployed. In section 2 we described the general rules that govern the activation of unemployment benefits

and social assistance recipients. There, we also described the work-oriented activation programmes. Here, in the context of training and education, we will deal with the education/training part of the Danish activating policies. These training and education schemes may take place in the ordinary educational and training system or are organised as part of special, tailor-made programmes. Unemployed persons participating in these schemes may receive a trainee allowance, but as a main rule, no training allowance will be granted to participants in medium- or higher-level education programmes. Participation in vocational training programmes is another option in the context of these schemes. Young people (under 25) on unemployment benefits who have not completed a formal education or training programme are treated differently from other unemployed. After 6 months of unemployment, their benefits are reduced to 50%, and they have the right and obligation to participate in education or training for at least 18 months.

Finally, the *Portuguese* case study on training and education focuses on the so-called Measure 2 of the Integrar Sub-Programme. This programme was adopted in 1994 under the second EU Support Framework through the programmes 'Improving the Quality of Life and Social Cohesion', and 'Health and Social Integration'. The core aim of the Integrar sub-programme is to create, through training and employment measures, conditions for the economic and social integration of marginalised social groups.

Measure 2 is directed at the vocational reintegration of the long-term unemployed by promoting informative sessions, vocational guidance and training courses. Priority is given to the low-skilled unemployed, women who have difficulties with vocational reintegration, persons unemployed for more than 2 years and those who are not receiving unemployment benefits (neither contributory benefits nor social assistance), as well as to recipients of the Guaranteed Minimum Income. The case study investigates a Measure-2 training course targeted at women in the town of Figueira da Foz.