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Introduction

Jochen Clasen and Jannis Johann (University of Edinburgh)

The programme Sustainable Welfare and Sustainable Growth is part of the major research initiative Creating Sustainable Growth in Europe funded by the Anglo-German Foundation from 2006 to 2009. Focusing on the fields of family policy, pension policy and dynamic conceptions of social justice it investigates how the German and British welfare states are adapting to common as well as country-specific societal, demographic and labour market challenges. The aim is to identify shifts in the role of public and private (occupational) welfare provision and to assess the sustainability of new welfare mixes in a European context.

This report gives an account of the activities within the first year from September 2006 until November 2007. The introduction addresses general issues of sustainability, in particular social sustainability. Different notions of sustainability are described and some associated problems introduced. The subsequent sections of the report set out the work conducted so far within the three projects. Each project reports about research activities, preliminary findings, dissemination activities such as conference presentations and publications, and next steps.

Perhaps the best-known and most comprehensive definition of sustainability, the Brundtland Commission argued that sustainable development is development that ‘meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (United Nations, 1987). This definition contains two key concepts. There is on the one hand the concept of needs, in particular the essential needs of the world’s poor, to which overriding priority should be given. On the other hand there is the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organisation on the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs at the same time.

Within the growing body of literature sustainability is often distinguished between one-pillar and multi-pillar models. The latter are mainly based upon ecological, economic and social goals (Littig and Grießler, 2005). Ecological or environmental sustainability refers to limiting the impact upon the natural environment to a degree that enables natural regeneration of natural resources. The least contested feature of sustainability seems to be its temporal dimension. Sustainability is concerned with the impact of actions or developments in the long-term. This facet points back to the German origins of the term sustainability (Nachhaltigkeit) in the field of forestry. Here it was originally used to describe a logging practice that not only allowed the current but also future generations many decades ahead an income at subsistence level from the same forest (Tremmel, 2003). Thus, it appears to be important to analyse and define the very conditions of sustainable developments in a particular context – and to extend sustainability to several dimensions. For example, economic sustainability can be understood as a set of conditions that enable companies to compete in internationalised markets; while social sustainability refers to meeting social needs of both individuals and society thereby preventing poverty, fostering social inclusion and promoting social justice.
However, the various dimensions of sustainable development have not been given equal weight, neither in public discourse nor by policy-makers. While environmental and economic issues have dominated the sustainability discourse in the 1980s, and continue to do so, social issues have been taken into account since the 1990s (Drakakis-Smith, 1995). According to Littig and Grießler (2005: 72) social sustainability is ‘a quality of societies. It signifies the nature-society relationships, mediated by work, as well as relationships within the society. Social sustainability is given, if work within a society and the related institutional arrangements satisfy an extended set of human needs [and] are shaped in a way that nature and its reproductive capabilities are preserved over a long period of time and the normative claims of social justice, human dignity and participation are fulfilled.’ However, there are different approaches within definitions of social sustainability and the literature is still relatively limited. A comprehensive study of the concept is still missing (Colantonio, 2007).

It may be helpful to employ sub-dimensions as financial and political sustainability. Financial sustainability applies to both the private and the public sector. In the latter case one may conceive of fiscal sustainability that aims to limit public expenditure to a degree that does not constrain future generations by the fiscal legacies of previous governments. Political sustainability refers to the long-term stability of a political system or political party in power and implies, therefore, an orientation towards the median voter. Political sustainability is often ignored, yet it is crucial for successful welfare reform and tensions between the economic and social dimensions of sustainability are easily conceivable (Colantonio, 2007). Welfare states may not be socially sustainable but display a high degree of political sustainability. Conversely, welfare states might be politically sustainable but at the same time socially and economically unsustainable. In short, it is important to acknowledge that there is a potential tension between different notions of sustainability. There is thus a strong case to be made for ‘unpacking’ the concept and for applying a multi-dimensional notion of sustainability and to include questions of social justice and perceptions of fairness, reciprocity and normative underpinning of public and private forms of social protection. For our purpose, and spanning across the three projects (below), social sustainability may be conceived as an amalgam of normative concepts of social justice with political and economic (or financial) sustainability.

References
Project 1: Sustainable Growth, Social Inclusion and Family Policy

The project ‘Sustainable Growth, Social Inclusion and Family Policy’ consists of three sub-projects addressing various dimensions of family policy. All three sub-projects are well underway and tentative findings were presented at various conferences. A two-day project workshop with members of the international advisory board was held on March 22 and 23, 2007 at Green College, University of Oxford. A further workshop is scheduled for January 31-February 1, 2008.

Sub-Project A: Family Policy in Focus
Mary Daly (Queens University Belfast)

The objective of this sub-project is to identify the major reforms in family-related policies, especially in Germany and the UK, and on the basis of these and related developments elsewhere develop a template for how social policy might be refashioned to meet the changing circumstances that families, and states, find themselves in today. Work on the project is well underway. It has been organised around the three questions that drive the research.

The first is about the relationship between economic development and family forms and practices – do different political economies favour different types of families and what form of family life is being created by the current constellation? To answer this question a thorough analysis has been carried out of the changing nature of family life in Europe and elsewhere, documenting changes in the demography of families, in the attitudes towards and practices of family life. This analysis sets the context for the rest of the project. For it a range of sources was utilised, especially EUROSTAT and other data bases on family and private life as well as qualitative data from, inter alia, the European Social Survey and European Quality of Life Survey.

The second line of research is to characterise the policy approach(es) to the family in Germany and the UK and to identify recent reforms and changes. This work is ongoing. For it, a range of official sources, reports and websites in the two countries, as well as international databases on social policy such as MISSOC and that of the OECD, have been examined. Contacts have been initiated with the relevant ministries and a review is underway of relevant academic work. Initial results suggest that the family is a major focus of and spur to policy reform in both countries, as well as in Europe more broadly. The nature of the changes underway, while they have similarities, serve ultimately to underline that Germany and the UK have quite different approaches to the family in that for example British policy has a much more ‘activist’ orientation whereas the German approach in informed by a broader set of consideration around family functioning.

The third aim of the research is to devise a template for policy, which will set out the challenges, opportunities, and dilemmas for policy makers. Work is also proceeding on this. In particular, family policy is being analysed and reviewed from the
perspective of sustainability (understood in economic, social, political and cultural terms). This requires an analysis of both the implications and likely sustainability of recent reforms as well as a review of the philosophical foundations and coherence of different approaches to family policy and of emerging reforms.

**Sub-Project B: The Gateway of Family and Education Policy**

*Sigrid Leitner and Anneli Rüling (University of Göttingen)*

Subproject B focuses on the development of policies in early childhood education and care (ECEC). This is of specific societal importance as the gateway of family and education policy seems to be most contested with regard to children under three years of age. Both, Germany and Britain reformed their ECEC-policies during the last ten years. In a first step, policy analysis was conducted for both countries in order to determine policy legacies and new aims regarding ECEC. In a second step, the political discourse on the reform of ECEC was reconstructed based on documentary analysis and expert interviews. As a first result of the project, we are able to show that a paradigmatic shift in ECEC has taken place in Germany and Britain.

In the period researched, both national governments for the first time introduced new legislation and assumed responsibility for the expansion of childcare for children 0-3. This constitutes a major shift in the understanding of education and care, which pushes the issue to the top of the political agenda in both countries. We are arguing that this policy shift can be primarily understood through the changing framing political and scientific discourses around childcare.

This framing was analysed in the political debates the two countries. Aims of education policy entered the family policy discourse and led to a change in ECEC-policies, however at different degrees. While the educational aspect is central to the English debate, it plays a minor role in the German policy context. Also, the framing is country-specific: In England, the political debates around childcare have been driven by the question of combating child poverty and targeting programmes specifically at children from disadvantaged backgrounds. In Germany, the main policy driver has been the declining birthrate and a political strategy to turn family policy into a hard economic issue. Interestingly, European policy developments and policy diffusion through international organisations did not seem to be relevant in the specific developments.

The main research for the British case was conducted during a three months stay by Anneli Rüling at the University of Oxford. She is currently writing up an interim report for this first part of our subproject.

*List of expert interviews:*

**Germany:**

– Dr. Petra Mackroth, Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend, Abteilung ‘Familienpolitik’, Unterabteilungsleiterin
– Dr. Karin Jurczyk, Deutsches Jugendinstitut München, Leiterin der Abteilung „Familienpolitik“
Background interviews with childcare experts at the Deutsches Jugendinstitut München: Dr. Martina Heitkötter (Abteilung Familienpolitik), Dr. Angelika Dietzinger and Dr. Birgit Riedel (Abteilung Kinderbetreuung)

Dr. Saumweber, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter bei Ekin Deligöz, Familienpolitische Sprecherin der Fraktion Bündnis 90/Die Grünen im Deutschen Bundestag

England:

– Helen Bennet, Department for Education and Skills, Responsible for taking the Childcare Bill through parliament.
– Norman Glass, Head of NatCen, National Research Centre, and former government official in the Treasury, who developed the Sure Start Programme.
– Dr. Ivana Lavalle, Senior Researcher at NatCen, conducted major studies on parent’s use of childcare institutions, participated in the Evaluation of various childcare programmes (Neighbourhood Nurseries Initiative)
– Meg Munn, Labour Party, MP, House of Commons, Minister for Women and Equality at the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
– Helen Goodmann, Labour Party, MP, House of Commons, Member of the Select Committee on the Childcare Bill
– Roberta Blackmann-Woods, Labour Party, MP, House of Commons, Member of the Select Committee on the Childcare Bill
– Annette Brooke, Liberal Democrat, MP, House of Commons, Member of the Select Committee on the Childcare Bill
– Tim Loughton, Conservative Party, MP, House of Commons, Conservative Spokesperson for Family policy, Member of the Select Committee on the Childcare Bill

Sub-Project C: Enterprises as Actors in Family Policy?

Martin Seeleib-Kaiser and Timo Fleckenstein (University of Oxford)

This sub-project focuses on enterprises as ‘agents’ of family policies. The aim is to identify the extent to which such actors are active providers of family support in Britain and Germany. It further aims to illuminate the conditions under which companies provide firm-level family policies. In a first step, a comprehensive literature review and an analysis of governmental policy documents with regard to firm-level family policies has been conducted. In parallel, an address database and questionnaire were developed for a survey among DAX, M-DAX and S-DAX as well as FTSE 100. The survey was conducted in the summer of 2007. The survey data as well as secondary data sources are currently being analysed. A first descriptive data analysis of secondary data and the survey data will be presented at the AGF Mid-term conference in Berlin. Our analysis will be further complemented by case studies, the work on which started in autumn 2007.

Our preliminary findings show that companies have indeed expanded firm-level family policies in both countries in recent years. The provision of flexible working time arrangements is widely spread among companies; however, family-friendly services or benefits are much more thinly spread. Within those German companies
offering firm-level family policies, the provision is usually highly formalized, whereas in UK companies there seems to be a much higher degree of managerial discretion. As firm-level family policies going beyond flexible working time arrangements are particularly concentrated in a limited number of sectors, such as financial intermediation and utilities, a public policy approach promoting firm-level family policies will inevitably contribute to ‘enclave social policy’ provisions. Such enclave social policy provisions can be especially beneficial to employees working in (service sector) companies requiring high general skills (banking) as well as their employers, eventually leading to a win-win situation, which may eventually lead an increased sustainability of both the German and the British political economy in an era of globalization. However, we have to acknowledge that firm-level policies can only complement and not substitute public family policies, if the aim is to increase the overall maternal employment rate and contribute to an improved work-life balance of all working parents. Although we should not rule out the possibility that, an increase of female employment in male-dominated sectors largely requiring specific skills and/or an increased demand by fathers for firm-level family policies in these sectors might precipitate an expansion of firm-level policies in the future, the current level of provision among these companies is very low. Evidence from those economic sectors requiring low general skills, e.g. hotels and restaurants as well as retail, also seems to demonstrate that there are clear limits to employer-provided family policies, as workers can be easily substituted. At least so far, it does not seem to make much economic sense for companies in these sectors to provide comprehensive firm-level policies in neither of the countries compared. As Suzanne Berger et al. (2006: 47) observe in their recent study How We Compete: ‘Within a given country we find a range of variation of types, of linkages, and of ideas about how things ought to be run.’ One may hypothesize that this finding also applies to firm-level family policies in post-industrial economies that increasingly rely less on (industry) specific skills and more on high and low general skills.

Publications and presentations

Publications

Profile of Presentations

M. Daly, Supporting Parents in Europe, presentation to EUROCHILD Seminar Children in Northern Ireland, Belfast, 26-27 April 2007.
M. Daly, European Developments in Regard to Families and Children, keynote presentation to annual meeting of Parenting Forum Northern Ireland, Belfast, 15 October 2007.
S. Leitner, Zur ökonomischen (Dys-)Funktionalität von Familienpolitik, Presentation at the Annual Conference of the German Sociological Association, University of Kassel, 13 October 2006.

A proposal by Mary Daly and Martin Seeleib-Kaiser has been submitted for a conference stream on ‘Family Policies and the Reform of the Welfare State’, in which the current research project will take a leading role, at the 16th International Conference of the Council for European Studies, due to be held in Chicago on March 6-8, 2008.
Project 2: Combining Social Inclusion with Financial Sustainability? The Reconstruction of British and German Pension Regimes

Paul Bridgen, Traute Meyer (University of Southampton, UK)
Barbara Riedmüller, Michaela Willert (Free University of Berlin, Germany)

As stated in our first project report of March 2007 our research developed according to our plan included in the application. The following aims were on the agenda regarding between March and November 2007:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/07-7/07</td>
<td>Building databases of new and changed occupational schemes (Germany) and DB/DC shift (UK), -Riester-Rente/Stakeholder pension provision, -relevant inter-locking directorships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/07-6/07</td>
<td>Mapping changing coverage of occupational schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/07</td>
<td>Drafting of preliminary results of part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/07</td>
<td>Project team meeting in preparation for microsimulations and discussion of preliminary findings of part A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/07</td>
<td>Preparation of illustrative biographies and microsimulation assumptions; electronic consultation with project I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/07-12/07</td>
<td>Microsimulations and initial drafting of preliminary results of part B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/07</td>
<td>Mid-point conference; progress report; presentation of initial results and project team meeting in preparation for interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the following overview we would like to show that we have met these aims.

1. Building databases of new and changed pension schemes and mapping changing coverage

We have built databases for Britain and Germany for FTSE and DAX companies, which show how change developed since the early/mid 1990s in the British and since 2001 in the German case.

Specifically, so far we have collected information on the types of pension schemes the companies offer, their conditions for employees, the date of opening, closure or change. In order to collect this data we drew on company reports and additional sources such as the Union Pensions Service and the Incomes Data Service in the UK, and newspapers, union homepages and e-mails to occupational pensions administrators in Germany. On the basis of this information we have been able to assess how coverage of occupational schemes in both countries has changed during the time under scrutiny.

With regard to personal pensions we analysed how the market for personal pensions and for stakeholder pensions in the UK and for Riester pensions in Germany evolved after governments introduced these types of pensions. Moreover, we did an internet research and analysed consumer tests of the conditions, which are offered by insurers.
and other private pension providers in Germany and the UK. These data will be used for further micro-simulations (see below).

2. Drafting preliminary results of part A: mapping pension change
We have drafted the results of part A.

We have written assessments of the British and German regulatory regimes and embedded them in the wider framework of pension regime change in Europe. The results of this research will be published in 2008 (see dissemination below).

We have also drafted the evolution of change. This draft is going to be developed further for the paper ‘Non-state actors and changing pension regimes: Britain and Germany compared’, which will be presented as part of the Panel *Labor Markets and Social Protection in Europe* at the Council for European Studies Annual Conference in Chicago, March 2008.

With regard to the main personal pension providers, a draft was prepared, which will be finalized after discussing the results in interviews with representatives of the private pension industry in both countries. This shows that the private pensions industry reacts heavily to public regulation. In Britain, private pensions have only been sold on a larger scale so long as private pension regulations were light. With stakeholder pensions a highly regulated private pension scheme were introduced in 2001, but the take up rates since then have been rather low. In Germany the introduction of Riester pensions started with highly regulated products. Take up were low at the beginning, but a now stable regulatory framework and the cutback of tax breaks for alternative long term savings produced increasing take up and contribution rates.

3. Preparation of illustrative biographies and microsimulation assumptions
We have developed 3 male and 3 female hypothetical biographies, each on different wages (0.5, 1 and 1.5 of average wages), and we made a range of assumptions for their lives, incomes, wage development and retirement, based on national and European trends. We used these hypothetical individuals to calculate pension outcome.

We have also decided on common selection criteria for pension schemes. Our simulations comprise the main sectors of the economy, and from each we chose one of the lowest, one of the highest, and the median.

On this basis we conducted a range of micro-simulations, and wrote a preliminary draft of results (see the paper prepared for the Mid-term conference).

The Berlin and the Southampton team were in constant email contact, and therefore it was decided that an additional meeting was not needed. The team therefore postponed the meeting to a later stage in the project.
There have also been exchanges between project one and three, about literature and access to companies. On this basis both projects have agreed to use the same sample of companies (FTSE100, UK; and DAX, Germany) and have collaborated in collecting basic company information (e.g. contact names and addresses). More general collaboration in collecting data was not feasible due to differences in the means of accessing data about pensions and family policy in companies (e.g. the point of contact for the two forms of provision is generally different). Further collaboration between the projects is envisaged at the data analysis stage.

4. Project team meeting
In order to prepare the company interviews a project team meeting will be held in Berlin. Here we will discuss the findings of the first year of the project and on this basis decide the main analytical focus of the company interviews. We will consider the choice of companies for interview and also begin drafting an interview schedule.

5. Publications and presentations

Publications

Presentations
03/2008: Non-state actors and changing pension regimes: Britain and Germany compared. Paper to be presented as part of the Panel Labor Markets and Social Protection in Europe at the Council for European Studies Annual Conference in Chicago
Unforeseen events – particular developments
The process of mapping pension change and the microsimulations are time-consuming; however, this was anticipated from the start. We are a little delayed with regard to our planning of interviews. We aim to start this process in January 2008. The reason for this slight delay is that we decided to disseminate some of our findings as early as possible to ensure peer review, and thus a solid base for further developments. However, response has been very encouraging so far and we are greatly looking forward to the discoveries to be made in the next stage of the project.
Project 3: Shifting Paradigms of Social Justice

Professor Steffen Mau and Christoph Burkhardt (University of Bremen)
Professor Peter Taylor-Gooby and Rose Martin (University of Kent)

1. Theoretical approach
The project deals with attitudes towards normative principles of state provided welfare and tries to identify a possible shift in social justice attitudes. It addresses three main questions (for further details see project application):

A. What are the conceptions of social justice that correspond to the traditional welfare state models in Germany and the UK?
B. How have they changed in recent years and to what extent do the attitudes to social justice correspond to these changes?
C. How are the new themes in welfare reform (social investment, reciprocity and accommodation to greater social diversity) viewed and discussed by the ordinary citizen?

The project makes use of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Based on the results of qualitative and quantitative research we will contribute to the discussion on welfare state pressures, social policy reforms and its impact on attitudes to social justice.

2. Research activities
There has been an advisory board meeting in late June 2007 in Berlin organised by the German project team and hosted by the Anglo-German Foundation bringing together members of the advisory board and the researchers involved in the project. During this meeting first results from the project were presented to the board members to receive input and advice on future directions. The next advisory board meeting will be held in summer 2008 in the UK.

The teams of both countries closely cooperate to establish the comparative framework of the project. For the quantitative analysis this concerned the design of the German survey including the selection of questions drawn from the British Social Attitudes survey to produce comparable data. The project is now able to analyse similar items for both countries in the context of representative surveys. With regard to the qualitative research the teams work together to design both the sampling and the topic guide of the focus groups to ensure similar conditions for the interviews and to produce highly comparable data for both countries.

In Germany, research concentrated on analysing quantitative data sets, mainly the project’s own survey and international data sets like the European Social Survey. The research focused on the impact of ethnic diversity on attitudes towards foreigners and towards the support of the welfare state itself. We have finished two working papers in German and one in English. One paper on attitudes towards migration and the inclusion of foreigners into the welfare state is to be published in the forthcoming
issue (January 2008) of the ‘Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren - ISI’ (39). Some of the results have been presented at the ESPAnet Conference 2007 in Vienna, Austria.

On the qualitative side activities focus on drafting the framework for the group discussions. This involves the design of the joint topic guide and the sampling procedure. The focus groups will be held at the same time as the second wave of the UK team.

In the UK, on the qualitative side four focus groups have been conducted so far: two in London and two in Birmingham. A preliminary coding frame has been created and applied using NVivo. This coding frame incorporates and expands on the concepts highlighted in the project proposal: reciprocity; social investment and economic concerns; racial diversity; sustainability/ the future of welfare; need; desert; equality (of outcome and of opportunity). This has formed the basis of analysis for three working papers on reciprocity, diversity and equality.

On the quantitative side, the British Social Attitudes survey has been used to analyse attitudes to poverty and government spending in Britain. This resulted in a chapter which is to be published on 23 January 2008 in ‘British Social Attitudes: the 24th Report’ (London: Sage). The ideas in this chapter form a possible means of further comparison between the UK and Germany.

3. Findings

Research by the German team has mainly focused on ethnic diversity and prerequisites to accommodate to increasing stocks of foreigners among the population of European welfare states, especially in the UK and Germany. In the case of Germany attitudes towards foreigners are ambiguous. The majority of the population supports the legal inclusion of foreigners into the welfare state and welcomes the positive effect of migration on the labour market. At the same time it becomes obvious that the willingness to grant social benefits to migrants depends on Germans’ perception about whether payments by foreigners are adequate. The impression of the Germans that foreigners take more out of the welfare state than they contribute to finance the social security system clearly influences attitudes to foreigners.

Also with regard to social investment and reciprocity the results indicate that there is no clear-cut shift in paradigms of social justice in Germany. However, we can observe a transition of the support of welfare spending from consumption-oriented to a more future-oriented spending based on the enhancement of human and social capital among the German population.

The German data also indicates that awareness of inequality and support for the welfare state has decreased since the late 1990s. In the UK the analysis of the British Social Attitudes survey has shown that, over the last 20 years, there has been a steady decline in support for government spending on the poor and intervention to redistribute wealth. This pattern of decline holds even among those who believe that there is a lot of poverty and that the gap between the rich and the poor is too large. Our analysis confirms previous studies suggesting that socio-demographic and political factors are partly responsible, but furthermore finds that changes in
values held about the role of government (in particular);
beliefs about poverty;
and beliefs about the functionality of government intervention are also
significant in the change.

The qualitative analysis of the UK focus groups is at a preliminary stage. However,
our analysis so far can be used to suggest that:

Criteria for allocation (reciprocity, equality, need)
- Equality of opportunity finds stronger support among middle class
  respondents, while equality of outcome is more extensively and
  sympathetically discussed among the working class groups, with far more
  consensus on the merits of equal outcomes than in the case of the middle class.
  (However, the distinction is not clear-cut. The class differences are partly a
  matter of tone and the extent to which the conviction was clearly personally
  felt.)
- Working class groups reacted far more strongly against high pay for certain
  professions; justifications were given by middle class groups, by contrast.
- The concept of an inclusive society was important to respondents.
- Respondents constructed a vision of society and of fairness that relates closely
to ‘people like them’ and tends to be critical of those at the margins and
involves very little explicit addressing of society’s most extreme social
problems, such as homelessness and unemployment.
- Reciprocity is a core element of fairness.

Diversity
- There is strong concern about diversity and the lack of governmental control
  over immigration. Responses partly reflected media hysteria over topics like
  asylum seekers, but there were also thoughtful responses, which weighed up
  both costs and benefits of labour migration.
- Attitudes to diversity tended to be framed very much in reciprocal terms.
- Concerns about the job market were expressed by all respondents, with
  particular consensus among the working class participants.

Social investment
- There was a clear feeling of powerlessness among many of the working class
  respondents with regard to opportunities and the scope for self-advancement.
  Middle class respondents also saw some structural problems: however, these
  were seen as surmountable. The middle classes were less keen on government
  intervention for this reason, as they saw individual agency as key.
- Government is expected to facilitate and fund ‘lifestyle’ choices as well as
  meet basic needs under certain circumstances/ in certain scenarios. This is
  understood partly as a question of rights and partly as a question of investment
  in society and in the economy. The extent to which this is applied varies
  according to the policy area and the individual respondent.
4. Future directions

Focus groups
The German and the UK teams are currently working together to make the sampling and the topics covered as comparable as possible between the two countries. The UK team will be holding up to eight more groups, either in December 2007 or in January 2008. The German team aims at 5-6 groups in two large German cities (probably Nuremberg and Cologne). In the near future the research will focus on analysing the data from the group discussions and to combine the results in a joint paper.

We hope to further explore the themes emerging in the first groups in the UK (see above). The literature review conducted at the beginning of the project found that there is a significant gap in the literature regarding attitudes to equality of opportunity – despite recent emphasis on activation policies, on which opportunities have significant bearing. There is little data on whether the public believes that there are opportunities for poorer members of society. Nor is there much information on the measures they are prepared to pay for and to give power to government to implement. Part of these questions will be addressed in more depth through the remaining focus groups. We will also be looking at attitudes to different groups in society which will give us information on how the respondents weigh up the different criteria for receipt of government benefits and services.

Surveys
We are currently looking at the feasibility of:
- using the European Social Survey to compare attitudes of migrants in the UK and Germany;
- looking at attitudes to and usage of private welfare: how and whether these affect views on universalism and redistribution.

5. Publications and presentations

Publications resulting directly from the project

Presentations


Publications within the area of the project

Books

Book chapters


Articles


Presentations