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Abstract

This research focuses on assessing the extent to which Irish politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland have been Europeanized. Social inclusion is a subsystem that lies outside the EU’s legal remit. As a result, an assessment of the EU’s ability to embed change in politics, policy and polity at member state level in this subsystem furthers our understanding of Europeanization through 'soft law'. This is important as there continues to be an empirical deficit within the literature on the Europeanization of policy subsystems that lie outside the EU’s legal competencies even though 'soft law' is increasingly being employed at EU level. To address this research agenda, this thesis uses a research framework based on theoretical and methodological frameworks. The theoretical aspect of the framework is based on the concept of Europeanization, the dominant concept for assessing the role of the EU domestically. The methodological aspect of the research framework is based on gathering data through document analysis of primary and secondary sources, semi-structured in-depth interviews with key policy actors and Q methodology. This research finds that within the subsystem the ability of the EU to embed change in the areas of politics, policy and polity is limited in Ireland and that often the EU through 'soft law' is 'used' by domestic actors. The contribution of this study lies in its ability to further empirical knowledge on Europeanization through 'soft law'.
Declaration

I declare that the work in this thesis is the work of the candidate alone and has not been submitted to any other university or higher education institution in support of a different award. Citations of secondary sources have been fully referenced.

Signed: Mary Ellen Lyons Dated: 23rd November, 2014
Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. Maura Adshead and Dr. Bernadette Connaughton for feedback and advice offered during the writing of this thesis. I would like to thank other members of staff and fellow PhD students in the Department of Politics and Public Administration for their feedback, comments and assistance over the last three years. Furthermore, I would like to thank all those who offered feedback and advice at conferences, panel presentations and seminars. Comments and advice received much improved the work of this thesis.

A thank you also goes to those that participated in the research as without their willingness to participate this research could not have been undertaken.

I would also like to thank the staff of the Glucksman library. As both a student and as a co-worker they provided much assistance and help with the writing of this thesis.

I would like to extend a huge thank you to family, friends and loved ones for all their help and support throughout the writing of this thesis. In particular, my sister Margaret and my mother Noreen for the assistance they provided throughout the writing of this thesis, particularly in the writing up period.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my mother, Noreen Lyons and is in memory of my father, William Lyons.
List of Figures

Figure 1: Policy Transfer Continuum 37
List of Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of New Modes of Governance 24
Table 2: Dimensions and Measures of Change 26
Table 3: RED in Action 52
Table 4: MUD in Action 54
Table 5: SID in Action 56
Table 6: SFD in Action 57
Table 7: Philosophical Worldview 66
Table 8: Continuum of Preference for the Q Sort 74
Table 9: Forced Distribution 75
Table 10: Criteria for Deciding on the Final Set of Factors 76
Table 11: Features of the Open Method of Coordination 111/112
Table 12: Correlation Factor Score 193
Table 13: Factor Loadings 193/194
Table 14: Key Agreement Statements for Factor One 195
Table 15: Key Disagreement Statements for Factor One 197
Table 16: Key Agreement Statements for Factor Two 198
Table 17: Key Disagreement Statements for Factor Two 200
Table 18: Differing Views on Factor Ones Agreement Statements 202
Table 19: Differing Views on Factor Twos Agreement Statements 203
Table 20: Statements both Factors Placed in the Most Strongly Agree/Strongly Agree Columns 204
Table 21: Agreement Statements and Corresponding Z Scores: Factor One 205
List of Tables (Continued)

Table 22: Agreement Statements and Corresponding Z Scores: Factor Two 206
Table 23: Differing Views on Factor Ones Disagreement Statements 207
Table 24: Differing Views on Factor Twos Disagreement Statements 208
Table 25: Statements both Factors Placed in the Most Strongly Disagree/Strongly Disagree Columns 209
Table 26: Disagreement Statements and Corresponding Z Scores: Factor One 211
Table 27: Disagreement Statements and Corresponding Z Scores: Factor Two 212
## List of Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>List of Statements</td>
<td>231-233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Factor Arrays</td>
<td>234-239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quotes from the Literature (Concourse) and Corresponding Statements</td>
<td>240-246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interview Schedule</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sample Interview Questions</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethics Consent Form</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Information Sheet for Interviewees</td>
<td>250/251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>252-255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Characteristics of Interviewees</td>
<td>256-257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Advocacy Coalition Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td>Area Development Management Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMP</td>
<td>Active Labour Market Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF</td>
<td>Construction Industry Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>Confederation of Irish Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORI</td>
<td>Conference of Religious in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Combat Poverty Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETE</td>
<td>Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOF</td>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFA</td>
<td>Department of Social and Family Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRI</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHOS</td>
<td>European Typology of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FÁS</td>
<td>State Employment and Training Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEANSTA</td>
<td>The European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forfás</td>
<td>Ireland’s Policy Advisory Board for Enterprise, Trade, Science, Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>Fianna Fáil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>Fine Gael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUE</td>
<td>Federated Union of Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBEC</td>
<td>Irish Business and Employer’s Confederation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOS</td>
<td>Irish Co-Operative Organisation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTU</td>
<td>Irish Congress of Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFA</td>
<td>Irish Farmer’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOU</td>
<td>Irish National Organisation of the Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Moral Underclass Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>National Advisory Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPS</td>
<td>National Anti-Poverty Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Competitiveness Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESC</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESF</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIB</td>
<td>National Implementation Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMG</td>
<td>New Modes of Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWCI</td>
<td>National Women’s Council of Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMC</td>
<td>Open Method of Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSI</td>
<td>Office for Social Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDs</td>
<td>Progressive Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESP</td>
<td>Programme for Economic and Social Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCW</td>
<td>Programme for Competitiveness and Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNR</td>
<td>Programme for National Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI</td>
<td>Rational Choice Institutionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Social Integrationist Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Sinn Féin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>System Failure Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Sociological Institutionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>Social Protection Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVP</td>
<td>Saint Vincent de Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>Supplementary Welfare Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

**Area-based programmes**: a co-ordinated series of actions which are devised and delivered within a particular spatial context to address social and economic disadvantage

**Community & Voluntary Pillar**: a grouping of national representative community and voluntary organisations that is one of the four pillars of social partnership

**Consistent poverty**: Relative Income Poverty combined with the lack of basic items such as warm coat, sufficient food or adequate heating. The percentage of people living in consistent poverty is the proportion of the total population, e.g. 7% who are living on a lower than normal income and who lack certain basic essential items there by experiencing a lower standard of living than the rest of society.

**EU-SILC**: EU Survey of Income and Living Conditions conducted by the Central Statistics Office, which replaced the Living in Ireland Survey as the major source of poverty data from 2003.

**Lisbon Strategy**: An agreement reached by EU heads of government at the Lisbon European Council in 2000 to integrate employment, economic and social policies in order to make the EU the most competitive economy in the world.

**National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS)**: The 10 year plan of the Irish Government aimed at tackling poverty which involves consultation, target setting and poverty proofing. NAPS aims to achieve better understanding of the structural causes of poverty such as unemployment, low income and educational disadvantage.

**NAPincl**: Two-year National Action Plans agreed by EU member states to work towards greater social inclusion through encouraging sustainable economic growth and quality employment for the poorer sectors of society.

**National Development Plan (NDP)**: The Irish Government’s strategy for allocating EU Structural Funds and other public monies aimed at stimulating long term growth and a fairer distribution of resources across the whole economy.

**Open Method of Policy Co-ordination**: A process whereby EU member states are responsible for national employment and social inclusion policies but are open to evaluation by other member states by submitting national action plans to the EU Commission. These are discussed by the Commission and by social affairs ministers at the EU Council meeting each Spring. Guidelines for the plans are set at EU level and include specific timetables for achieving goals set, the establishment of indicators to compare best practice, translating the European guidelines into national and regional policies, and periodic monitoring and review.

**Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**: International organisation of 34 countries whose objectives are to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and living standards in member and non-member countries.
Poverty: People are said to be living in poverty if their income and resources are so inadequate as to preclude them from having a standard of living considered acceptable in Irish society. Because of their poverty they may experience multiple disadvantage through unemployment, low income, poor housing, inadequate health care and barriers to education. They are often excluded and marginalised from participating in activities that are the norm for other people.

Redistribution: Individuals and groups on higher incomes or wealth distributing to those on lower incomes or wealth. Redistribution by government is usually through transfers, regulation or provision of public services. Transfers involve the collection of money from people through the tax system and the payment of income to people through payments such as unemployment assistance or subsidies such as mortgage interest relief. The minimum wage or rent controls are examples of regulation. Public transport and local authority housing are examples of state provision of services.

Relative income poverty: This is also known as relative poverty, income poverty or risk of poverty. It is measured by setting a relative income poverty line, which shows how an individual's or household's income compares to the average. This line is usually set at a level between 40% and 70% of the average income. Often, median income may be used rather than mean or average income as it gives a more accurate reflection of income levels - average income figures tend to be distorted by very high incomes at the top end of the scale. In Ireland, relative income poverty is measured by calculating the median income - the mid-point on the scale of all incomes in the State from the highest to the lowest - and setting the line at 60% of the median. People whose incomes fall below this line are said to be at risk of poverty. The most recent figures show 14.1% of the population at risk of poverty.

Social cohesion: Bringing together, in an integrated way, economic, social, health and educational policies to facilitate the participation of citizens in societal life.

Social exclusion: The process whereby certain groups are pushed to the margins of society and prevented from participating fully by virtue of their poverty, low education or inadequate life skills. This distances them from job, income and education opportunities as well as social and community networks. They have little access to power and decision-making bodies and little chance of influencing decisions or policies that affect them, and little chance of bettering their standard of living.

Social inclusion: Ensuring the marginalised and those living in poverty have greater participation in decision making which affects their lives, allowing them to improve their living standards and their overall well-being.

Social partnership: The process where government, employers, trade unions, farmers and the community and voluntary sector devise economic and social agreements for an agreed timeframe. At national level, the draft social partnership agreement Sustaining Progress is under consideration for ratification by each partner to the agreement. At local level social partners are included in many decision-making and service delivery structures such as county development boards and area-based partnerships (Combat Poverty Agency 2013 http://www.cpa.ie/povertyinireland/glossary.htm#ConsistentPoverty and http://www.combatpoverty.ie/povertyinireland/measuringpoverty.htm).
Chapter 1: Introduction: Assessing the Europeanization of Irish Politics, Policy and Polity in the Policy Subsystem of Social Inclusion

1.1 Introduction to the Research

The question of how to tackle poverty and social exclusion while promoting social inclusion has been a prominent and controversial issue at national level as well as at European Union (EU) level for a number of decades. These issues represent a policy subsystem that exists within the broader area of social policy. In particular this subsystem has gained prominence on EU and Irish public and political agendas since the 1970s. As a result, they represent long-standing issues in Ireland and within the EU. The continuing presence of significant levels of poverty and social exclusion exemplify that these issues are a persistent problem for the Irish and EU political systems. For instance, in 2011 119.6 million people or 24.2% of the population of the EU 27 were at risk of poverty or social exclusion (Eurostat 2013). In Ireland, according to the Survey on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) (2010) 15.8% of the population were at risk of poverty (Social Justice Ireland 2013). Even during times of unprecedented economic growth in Ireland addressing poverty and social exclusion continued to be a challenge. For example, Collins and Kavanagh pointed out in 2006 (2006: 149) that,

Ireland has become increasingly wealthy over the past 15 years. However, it is not clear that everyone is sharing in the benefits of a wealthier society. There are concerns that the impressive economic boom in Ireland has raised the living standards of only some and has widened economic gaps.

As a result, this research represents a timely investigation of a policy subsystem that has for over forty years at EU and Irish level proven to be a contested and much debated area of social policy. For instance, at EU level despite progress in many areas, Europe has underperformed in the broader fight against poverty, exclusion and inequality. Poverty in Europe remains stubbornly high; millions experience discrimination and exclusion on a daily basis while the gap between the rich and poor grows ever larger (O’Connor and Visser 2010: 8).
At member state level,

Civil society is under increasing political and financial pressure in many Member States, while political leaders have not yet risen to the challenge of substantially addressing inequality in their societies (O’Connor and Visser 2010: 8).

While the policy subsystem under investigation in this research is one that lies under the principle of sovereignty, it is in reality a subsystem at national level that is increasingly linked to events at EU level. Leibfried and Pierson (1995: 44) point to this when they argue that member states are acting “in the context of an increasingly constraining multitiered polity”. Jacobsson (2004: 357) furthers this and states that “traditional welfare policy areas….have recently been defined as areas of 'common concern' among the EU member states and are no longer exclusively a national responsibility”. Therefore, this thesis argues that even policy subsystems that are closely guarded areas of member state sovereignty are increasingly subject to interaction with EU social policy.

However, social policy at EU level is often viewed as a dilemma (Scharpf 2002) as “in many ways, social policy is improbable at the EU level, tightly constrained by legal provision, a protectionist stance towards their own social policy territory on the part of member states and dominant character of the EU project” (Daly 2008: 2). Geyer and Springer (1998: 208) argue that “social policy fills an uneasy place in the panorama of EC policies” and the “legitimacy of social policy has always been contested”. Yet, the EU’s influence has extended into practically every area of social policy. EU social policy encompasses a broad range of areas for example from equality and labour laws to working conditions (Langford 1999). Langford (1999: 90) argues that EU social policy also embraces broader issues such as social exclusion and unemployment. It is within these broader issues that the EU’s power is most hollow as they are viewed as lying at the core of member states social policy (Daly 2006). While joining the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973 marked a watershed in Irish social policy, it was most noticeable regarding women’s rights and worker’s rights (Kiely 1999; Considine and Dukelow 2009). However, the EU’s impact on the areas of poverty, social exclusion and social inclusion has also been noteworthy (Considine and Dukelow
2009). It is this aspect of social policy that is governed by 'soft law' at EU level that this research is focused on.

Yet, much attention has been placed on the evolution of EU 'soft law' governance mechanisms and on the genesis of New Modes of Governance (NMG) such as the Open method of Coordination (OMC) in EU policymaking. This thesis argues that research needs to look beyond the creation of 'soft law' initiatives at EU level and assess their impact at member state level (Falkner 2008; Mulcahy 2009; Geyer, mackintosh and Lehmann 2005). As a result, this research seeks to understand the role the EU has played in Ireland in a policy subsystem governed by EU 'soft law'. The policy subsystem of social inclusion represents one that that lies at the heart of member states sovereignty with any transfer of legislative powers to the EU explicitly ruled out. Therefore, analysing the impact of the EU at domestic level in a policy subsystem governed by 'soft law' contributes to our understanding of the Europeanization of policy subsystems where member states are least likely to cede control to the EU. In turn, it furthers our understanding of whether tackling issues such as poverty and social exclusion has shifted from the national domain to the EU domain. This is important as it can help us to more fully understand the significance of EU 'soft law' initiatives for member states.

1.2 Research Aims and Research Questions

This research recognises that since the 1970s Ireland has increasingly been “open to and influenced by ideas and developments from outside the country” (Connaughton 2009: 129). One of the most important sources of influence has been the EU (McGowan and Murphy 2003). Geyer (2000a: 259) has highlighted that “the next wave of EU social policy research should be directed towards the interaction of EU social policy and national social policy regimes”. This is important as “the EU has created a new level of supranational policy activity that alters the political arenas and outcomes of national and subnational systems” (Geyer and Mackintosh and Lehmann 2005: xv/xvi). In addition Geyer (2000) argues that due to the establishment of the EU and its considerable pace in growth assessing the EU’s ability to alter domestic politics, policy and polity is an essential avenue of research. As a result, this research aims to assess the EU’s ability to embed change in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. Due to social inclusion being the chosen policy subsystem for investigation this research is focused
on assessing Europeanization through 'soft law'. The literature highlights that we continue to have a limited understanding of 'soft law' which is surprising “given the accelerating development of such non-binding rules internationally” (López-Santana 2009: 134). Furthermore, the very few empirical studies that have been carried out on Europeanization through 'soft law' and New Modes of Governance (NMG) across different policy areas have yielded mixed results as to the extent and depth of the norm and policy diffusion that it produces (Mulcahy 2009: 32). Hence, more research on policy subsystems governed by ‘soft law’ is needed. In light of these gaps this thesis aims to contribute to existing literature on our understanding the extent of the Europeanization through 'soft law' by assessing the interaction and the role of the EU in Ireland within the subsystem of social inclusion. This is important as there is increasing evidence that the EU is playing a role in subsystems beyond its legal remit yet more empirical knowledge is needed on this before we can accurately gauge the EU’s role in these subsystems (Mulcahy 2009).

Hence, in order to make an empirical contribution this research is guided by an overarching research question and a number of sub-questions each relating to the areas of politics (Q. 1 and 2), policy (Q. 3) and polity (Q.4)

Overarching Research Question: To what extent has the EU embedded change in the areas of politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland?

Sub-question 1) Has the EU led to changes in relationships and interactions for domestic actors?

Sub-question 2) Has the EU led to an increase in efforts to tackle a recognised domestic issue?

Sub-question 3) Has the EU led to the stimulation of policy change in Ireland?

Sub-question 4) Has the EU led to changes in domestic institutional arrangements?

This overarching research question and set of sub-questions form the basis of assessing the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland and the role the EU has played in this subsystem.
1.3 Significance of the Research
This research is important as Geyer, Mackintosh and Lehmann (2005) point out that often research focuses on social policy at EU level or at domestic level rather than focusing on the interaction between the two. The Europeanization of social policy can result from either legislative means or New Modes of Governance (NMG) yet neither have been empirically addressed to a sufficient extent (Falkner 2008). Mulcahy (2009: 27) highlights that in particular assessment of the EU’s ability to alter domestic politics, policy and polity beyond the first pillar remains under-researched. Therefore, conducting analysis of a policy subsystem like social inclusion can add to the empirical knowledge of the extent of non-hierarchical Europeanization (Mulcahy 2009). This empirical contribution is important as given the conflicting findings which have emerged from the studies conducted thus far, more research is needed in order to give us a better sense of the extent and nature of Europeanization in policy areas where new modes of governance are in operation (Mulcahy 2009: 32).

As a result, this thesis thus aims to add to our knowledge of Europeanization through 'soft law' literature by focusing on the EU’s role in areas that are under member state sovereignty but nonetheless have come to be areas of common concern for member states. This in turn adds to empirical knowledge of the Europeanization of policy subsystems outside the EU’s legal remit. The EU’s use of 'soft law' is likely to become more prominent in the coming years and as a result any contribution to furthering our understanding of Europeanization through 'soft law' is important. In addition, it focuses not just on one area that the EU can impact on but all three areas of politics, policy and polity.

This research also contributes to Europeanization research focusing on Ireland. Recent studies such as Laffan and O’Mahony (2008) and Rees, Quinn and Connaughton (2009) have contributed hugely to our understanding of the Europeanization of Ireland and Irish policy areas. This thesis aims to add to this body of research by focusing on the policy subsystem of social inclusion which is not addressed by these studies. Other work has also assessed the impact of the EU on the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. For example O’Donnell and Moss (2005) assessed the impact of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), Norris (2007) has also investigated the impact of the
OMC in Ireland while Adshead (2010) and Adshead and Millar (2008) assessed the National Anti-Poverty Strategy and National Action Plan on Social Inclusion reporting process in Ireland. However, due to the timing of their work an adequate amount of time since the inception of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) had not passed. In order to complete an accurate empirical account of a process like the OMC a time span of at least a decade is required “in order to complete at least one cycle of formulation and to obtain a reasonably accurate portrait of program success and failure” (Sabatier 1993: 16). Thus, empirical work on Ireland within this policy subsystem is still required. Due to the timing of this research project (i.e. after ten years of the Open Method of Coordination in operation) this research can make a more accurate empirical assessment of the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland than other research conducted before. Furthermore, this research focuses on a longer period of time than just the OMC and takes account of other EU initiatives previous to the OMC.

1.4 Outline of the Thesis

This chapter introduced the research of this thesis, that is assessing the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. It also illustrated the areas that this research aims to make a contribution to, for instance the contribution to empirical knowledge on Europeanization through 'soft law' and Europeanization literature focusing on Ireland as a case study and social inclusion as a policy subsystem. Following this introduction the rest of the thesis is structured as follows:

Chapter two offers a literature review of the relevant bodies of literature for assessing change and the role of the EU. An overview of Europeanization is firstly discussed as it continues to be the dominant concept used in studies seeking to understand the role of the EU domestically. The main approaches in Europeanization are set out, namely the 'top-down' approach to Europeanization and a conceptualisation of Europeanization as an 'interactive process' as well as a discussion of features such as the 'misfit' explanation for change and the role of new institutionalism in assessing Europeanization. The literature centred on exploring the differences between Europeanization through 'hard law' and 'soft law' is also presented. While, the literature review outlines that Europeanization remains the dominant concept in exploring the role of the EU and change in a member state it acknowledges that increasingly the Europeanization
literature is being linked with public policy literature. In particular, it is being linked with public policy concepts such as policy transfer and the ACF. As a result, the first section of the literature review discusses the most relevant and dominant concept in assessing change and the role of the EU - Europeanization. However, this thesis recognises the importance of exploring more recent turns in Europeanization literature that discuss the link between Europeanization and public policy concepts. Hence, the second section of the literature review highlights the literature that has endeavoured to explore the usefulness of using policy transfer to assess Europeanization. This section of the chapter sets out the relevance of policy transfer to studying change linked to the European Union and introduces the central elements of policy transfer. In addition, this literature review explores the literature that focuses on the usefulness of the ACF for studying Europeanization. A discussion of the relevance of the ACF to European studies and its central features are also introduced. Finally, a literature review on the discourses of exclusion (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED); Moral Underclass Discourse (MUD); Social Integrationist Discourse (SID) and System Failure Discourse (SFD) is reviewed which outlines the central beliefs and values that underpin each discourse as well as indicators of the discourses in practice. These feature in the literature review as they are relevant for providing an insight into the policy subsystem of social inclusion.

Chapter three proposes a research framework that allows for the assessment of the Europeanization of policy subsystems such as social inclusion. The theoretical aspect of the research framework is presented first which is based on using Europeanization as a single theoretical concept as it remains the dominant concept used in research seeking to understand the interaction between the domestic and EU levels within a subsystem. Its use in this research moves beyond the dominant approach used in most Europeanization studies, that of the 'top-down' hierarchical approach, and uses a re-conceptualisation of Europeanization that recognises that it is a 'top-down', 'bottom-up' and horizontal process in order to make the concept more applicable for assessing the impact of the EU through 'soft law'. The research questions as well as the parameters of the research are also outlined. The research questions are based on assessing to what extent the EU has embedded change in the areas of politics, policy and polity within the subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland while the timeline for the research is 1987 to 2010. The hypothesis of this research is based on gaining an insight into the expected outcomes of
Europeanization through 'soft law'. This thesis argues that in the absence of strong EU adaptational pressure and legal power change is dependent on domestic actors with the question regarding Europeanization through 'soft law' being whether the EU has led to the altering of expectations and beliefs of domestic actors in such a way that leads to domestic change in the areas of politics, policy and polity in the subsystem (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002). As a result, the hypothesis of this thesis hypothesises the expected outcomes of Europeanization through ‘soft law’ in order to contribute to our understanding of the expected outcomes of Europeanization through 'soft law'. Chapter three also presents and justifies the research methodology chosen for this research, outlines the methods of data collection used in order to conduct this research and discusses policy subsystem and case selection. This research is part of a social constructivist worldview that uses document analysis, semi-structured in-depth interviews and Q methodology to gather data. The limitations of such choices in methodology are outlined, in particular in relation to limitations associated with Q methodology. The policy subsystem chosen is social inclusion while the case chosen is Ireland.

Chapter 4 serves to provide a context for understanding the topic in question in this thesis. It provides an introduction to the wider area of social policy and the subsystem relating to the issues of poverty, social exclusion and social inclusion. It subsequently provides a background to this thesis by reviewing the development and evolution of these areas at Irish and EU level. As outlined previously the research aims to assess the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity in relation to the policy subsystem of social inclusion. In order to establish this it is first necessary to delve deeper into the context surrounding this change and set the scene in the Irish and EU political systems from which then to assess Europeanization. The first part of the chapter provides an insight into the Irish political system. Firstly, historical legacies and links with Britain are discussed, in particular reference is made to the Poor Relief Act and its legacy as well as the early days of independence with the election of Cumann na nGaedheal and the conservative nature that prevailed. The following section discusses the election of Fianna Fáil in the 1930s and the beginning of certain social reforms, for example the Unemployment Assistance Act and the introduction of Children’s Allowances.
Thirdly, the chapter makes reference to the dominance of the Catholic Church in Ireland and its influence on the development of social policy, for example the failure of the Mother and Child Scheme. In addition, the chapter discusses the beginnings of social reform in Ireland during the 1960s, for example the introduction of the Housing Act in 1966 and the increasing influence of international organisations on social policy, for instance the International Labour Organisation and the Council of Europe as well as membership of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973. It also makes reference to the increased focus on the issue of poverty in Ireland during the 1970s and events such as the 1971 Kilkenny Conference on Poverty. Next, the return of economic recession and a more conservative approach during the 1970s and 1980s is discussed including the focus on active labour market policies due to the high unemployment. The establishment of the Commission on Social Welfare (1986) and Social Partnership is also referenced. The following part of the chapter outlines the return of economic prosperity to Ireland including the era of the ‘Celtic Tiger’, the establishment of the National Economic and Social Forum (NESF) and partnership companies as well as the inclusion of the community and voluntary pillar in social partnership. The next section introduces the National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) and the influence behind its creation as well as the main features of the NAPS. The continuing economic prosperity experienced by Ireland and the 2002 revision of the NAPS as well as criticisms of the NAPS that became apparent during this time are also outlined. Finally, the most recent economic crisis in Ireland, including changes to the operation of bodies such as the Combat poverty Agency and the Equality Authority as well as the election of Fine Gael and Labour, is discussed.

This chapter also provides a context to understanding the developments of the subsystem of social inclusion within the broader area of social policy at European level. It firstly focuses on those early decisions and the impact these have had on the EU’s limited role within social policy. The EU Anti-Poverty Programmes and EU recommendations in the 1970s and 1980s as well as the EU’s attempts to make progress in the area in the 2000s to battling the most severe economic depression in Europe since World War 2 are discussed. Firstly the early decisions made, for example during the time of the Treaty of Rome, that underpin the EU’s role in social policy and its lack of legal competence in the area are discussed. It also outlines the development of the EU’s social policy competences during the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. The following section
focuses on the development of the subsystem of social inclusion at EU level. It discusses the establishment of the Social Action Programme and EU Anti-Poverty Programmes including the features of these programmes. The introduction of the language of social exclusion at EU level is also referenced. Following this the EU’s increasing focus on social integration and labour market attachment and its promotion of labour market measures is discussed. Next, the convening of the Lisbon European Council and introduction of the OMC and its main features are outlined as well as the EU’s commitment to active inclusion and labour market attachment. Finally, this part of the chapter discusses the most recent economic crisis at EU level.

While chapter four provides a basis to understanding the context of the development of social policy and the subsystem of social inclusion at Irish and EU level chapters five, six and seven build on this context setting chapter to explore the interaction between the Irish and EU political systems and in turn the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity within the subsystem of social inclusion. Chapter five focuses on the Europeanization of politics, chapter 6 concentrates on the Europeanization of policy while chapter 7 centres on assessing the Europeanization of polity. These chapters present the findings from the assessment of Europeanization through 'soft law' on the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland.

Chapter five outlines the findings from the analysis of the Europeanization of Irish politics and seeks to answer the research questions: has the EU led to changes in relationships and interactions for domestic actors and has the EU led to an increase in efforts to tackle a recognised domestic issue? Firstly, the chapter discusses how the EU is 'used' domestically. For example, by providing a means to increase efforts to tackle a recognised domestic issue such as poverty through the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. The chapter also outlines how the EU has been 'used' by domestic actors in particular in relation to accessing knowledge and learning on certain domestic issues through the peer review process as part of the OMCinclusion process. In other instances EU initiatives, such as the European Years, acted as a 'leverage' and as a legitimisation tool in order to have a continuing focus on issues such as social inclusion domestically. Secondly, the chapter outlines how the EU has impacted on domestic actor’s relationships and interactions with each other. For example, the role of the Social Protection Committee for Irish officials is discussed as well as the increased interaction between Irish actors due to the reporting process associated with the OMCinclusion and
the European Years initiative. Next, the chapter assesses the impact of participation in EU level networks and projects for domestic actors such as NGOs, local government officials and those working in government agencies. Finally, the chapter offers reflections on while the EU has played a role in the domain of politics within the subsystem in Ireland it has not been able to overcome domestic politics issues, for example regarding the closing down of agencies such as the Combat Poverty Agency (CPA) and the Equality Authority as well as a lack of support for implementing the NAPS (National Anti-Poverty Strategy).

Chapter six illustrates the empirical findings from the assessment of the Europeanization of Irish policy and seeks to answer the research question has the EU led to the stimulation of policy change in Ireland? This chapter firstly focuses on the role of the EU in transferring policy language such as social exclusion through Ireland’s participation in the third EU Anti-poverty Programme and social inclusion through Ireland’s participation in the OMCinclusion. In addition, the EU also led to the transfer of policy lessons and policy practices regarding combating poverty and social exclusion through the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. In other instances the EU was used to validate domestic approaches taken in the areas of social protection systems and employment supports in particular regarding an ‘activation’ approach and the prioritisation of the inclusion through employment approach. The recent economic crisis of the late 2000s is also discussed and its impact on Irish policy in relation to the subsystem of social inclusion as well as the EU’s role. The EU’s role domestically as a result of the reporting process adopted in Ireland due to participation in the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) is also outlined.

Chapter seven presents findings from assessing the Europeanization of Irish polity which assesses has the EU led to changes in domestic institutional arrangements? This chapter outlines how the EU has served to strengthen existing institutional arrangements rather than being the impetus for new arrangements due to the presence of pre-existing commitments through social partnership and institutional arrangements created as part of the 1997 and 2002 NAPS, for instance poverty proofing. As was evident in chapter five this chapter also outlines how the EU is unable to overcome the lack of implementation and engagement with institutional arrangements associated with the NAPS, for example with poverty proofing. This chapter outlines how the EU did play a role in the development of the principle of partnership in Ireland and built on existing
commitments to partnership in Ireland. Firstly, the impact of the EU Structural Fund reforms that established Monitoring Committees is discussed along with the community initiative OPLURD and other initiatives such as INTERREG, EQUAL, URBAN and PEACE that also contributed to developing partnership in Ireland. This could also be seen with the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes that were created to further the principles of partnership in particular in relation to the subsystem under investigation in this research.

The central focus of this thesis is assessing the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity. Chapter five, six and seven assessed the impact of the EU on these domains within the policy subsystem of social inclusion. Chapter eight serves to build on this assessment and further our understanding of the role of the EU domestically by correlating respondent’s views on the subsystem and their views on the role of the EU. It is hoped this chapter can contribute to further our understanding of the views of respondents on the role of the EU in changing politics, policy and polity with their understandings of social exclusion and inclusion and the subsystem in general in Ireland. This is important as the policy subsystem of social inclusion is one that has proved difficult to make significant progress or change in. The chapter uses semi-structured in-depth interviews and Q methodology (that was part of the in-depth interview process) as a means of conducting this assessment. Q methodology is used to gain us an insight into people’s views on how social exclusion should be combated and social inclusion promoted. In-depth interviews give an insight into any similarities or differences on their views of change as a result of the EU, their perceptions of the EU in this area and on the subsystem in general.

Finally, in chapter nine the main findings of the research are summarised and discussed further. The implications of this research and the original contributions it has made to the academic literature are illustrated. The chapter also outlines the limitations of this study and offers suggestions for future research.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature: Europeanization, Policy Transfer, the Advocacy Coalition Framework and Discourses of Exclusion

2.1 Introduction

Assessing the role of the EU in embedding change at national level has remained a salient issue within political science. The purpose of this chapter is to present a literature review of the approaches relevant for assessing this change. Europeanization has become the dominant approach in seeking to explain this change. However, Europeanization is increasingly being linked to public policy concepts such as policy transfer and the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). Therefore, this literature review goes beyond the limitations of most studies assessing change by focusing on a wider range of concepts that are present in discussions about Europeanization. Firstly, this chapter discusses the current body of literature on Europeanization. A discussion on the different approaches apparent follows, for example the move from a ‘top-down’ application of Europeanization to a conceptualisation of Europeanization that is focused on not just vertical processes but also horizontal processes.

The second section of this chapter focuses on concepts that are increasingly being linked with literature exploring European policymaking. Firstly, the concept policy transfer is discussed. This section of the chapter sets out its relevance to studying change linked to the European Union and introduces the central elements of the concept of policy transfer. Following this discussion of policy transfer the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) is introduced as well as a review of its relevance for European studies. Finally, the literature on the discourses of exclusion is presented as they are relevant for providing an insight into the policy subsystem of social inclusion. The literature centres on the Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED), the Moral Underclass Discourse (MUD), the Social Integrationist Discourse (SID) and the System Failure Discourse (SFD) approaches. In sum, this literature review highlights how assessing the role of EU in embedding change at national level has evolved from just focusing on Europeanization in order to provide an insight into change.
2.2 Europeanization: Studying the Impact of the EU

Europeanization is a term that is used to explain a variety of changes within European politics and can “be a useful entry-point for greater understanding of important changes occurring in our politics and society” (Featherstone 2003: 3). Yet from the literature it is clear there are numerous ideas of what Europeanization entails. Europeanization is a complex process that is yet to be accurately defined and is a term that is used in different ways and for different purposes (Bomberg and Peterson 2000). It is however a concept that has increased in popularity since the 1990s (Vink and Graziano 2008). Moumoutzis (2011) argues that even though the usage of Europeanization has increased in the academic literature a meaning of Europeanization has not yet been agreed. Dyson and Goetz (2002: 2) have pointed out this difficulty relating to Europeanization,

it is sometimes used narrowly to refer to implementation of EU legislation or more broadly to capture policy transfer and learning within the EU. It is sometimes used to identify the shift of national policy paradigms and instruments to the EU level. (Other)…..times it is used in a narrower way to refer to its effects at the domestic level….or in a more expansive way to include effects on discourse and identities as well as structures and policies at domestic level.

McGowan and Murphy (2003: 183) also argue that “different authors have approached the subject from different viewpoints and have placed different emphasis on whom and how it impacts”. Marciacq (2012: 58) suggests that not all explanations of Europeanization have “conceptual utility”. Hence, the study of Europeanization has so far been recognised as a field of study that has produced more questions than answers (Dyson 2002). As a result, Europeanization has often been viewed as a “disorderly field” (Howell 2004: 4) but nonetheless a useful concept (Olsen 2002; Moumoutzis 2011). In addition, in a recent study Radaelli (2012:1) asserts that “the field of Europeanization is well established in political science and more generally in the social sciences”. Moumoutzis (2011: 609) also highlights that,

While initially the growing number of meanings attributed to Europeanization was considered problematic, it is now understood that the concept’s usefulness lies in its ability to raise interesting questions, and the challenge for researchers is to develop explanatory models that provide answers to these questions.
As a result, while Europeanization is understood to mean different things to different authors and has been used in different ways it is now an acknowledged concept for political scientists to use in order to assess the role of the EU in embedding change in a member state.

2.2.1 First Generation Analysis and 'Top-down' Europeanization

In 1994 Ladrech set in motion the discussion on Europeanization and ultimately the emergence of an ever-growing body of literature on the concept. Ladrech (1994: 69) offered one of the first definitions when he defined Europeanization as

an incremental process re-orientating the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organisational logic of national politics and policy-making.

This definition suggests Europeanization as a process of 'down-loading' for member states and is therefore associated with 'top-down' procedures. Buller and Gamble (2002: 17) acknowledge this and define Europeanization as “a situation where distinct modes of European Governance have transformed aspects of domestic politics”. Other scholars also recognise Europeanization as a process “of influence deriving…from European decisions and impacting member states’ policies and political and administrative structures” (Herriter, Kerwer, Knill, Lehmkuhl, Teutsch and Douillent 2001: 3) and that ultimately Europeanization “involves a response to the policies of the European Union” (Featherstone 2003: 3). This use of Europeanization corresponds with first generation analysis of the EU which rose to prominence in the 1970s and 1980s and which analysed the impact of European integration on member states. The emphasis in first generation studies as a result was on “seeing the locus of change as a hierarchical relationship between the EU and the national” and “they tended to emphasise the reactive and involuntary nature of adaptation” (Adshead 2005: 159). There is also a focus on convergence amongst member states (Adshead 2002).

This 'top-down' Europeanization is the most widely used approach (Lenschow 2004; Mulcahy 2009; Adshead 2005). 'Top-down' Europeanization was initially used to assess the impact of the EU on policy areas governed by the Community method (Moumoutzis 2011). Indeed, most academic studies have so far focused on 'top-down' hierarchical Europeanization to explain changes at domestic level as the areas studied have come
under the remit of the first pillar and are governed by 'hard law' (Mulcahy 2009) and the 'Classic' Community Method (CCM) which dates back to the founding of the EU (1957). This transfer of legislative powers to the European Union in certain policy areas means that it acts as a superior legislator that “assumes a shadow of hierarchy and coercion mechanisms to induce compliance, namely adaptational pressure backed up the European Court of Justice” (Mulcahy 2009: 28). The most important aspect of EU law is its supremacy over national law in member states (Kennedy, Cahill and Power 2006). This supremacy means that

Community law takes priority over, and supersedes any national law. In the event of a conflict between Community Law and national law, the conflicting domestic provision is rendered invalid. This is the case even where the national provision is part of the national constitution. Supremacy was developed to avoid disparities arising out of different national approaches to the incorporation of EU law and to ensure uniformity of application (Kennedy et al. 2006: 59)

This 'hard law' tends towards uniformity of treatment and creating the same standards across the European Union (Trubek, Cottrell and Nance 2006: 67). Most research assessing the impact of this ‘hard law’ focuses on a 'top-down' approach. Vink and Graziano (2008) have pointed out that focusing on a 'top-down' approach to Europeanization is now an over simplistic view of Europeanization. Mulcahy (2009: 27) argues that 'top-down' Europeanization is a useful approach when analysing policy subsystems that fall under the legal remit of the EU. Thus, since the 1990s a second generation analysis has emerged and focuses on how Europeanization can involve 'top-down', 'bottom-up' as well as 'horizontal' processes. This move to second generation analysis came at a time when New Modes of Governance (NMG) and 'soft law' became increasingly used at EU level. The 'top-down' approach to Europeanization can often be insufficient to explain change at domestic level due to Europeanization through 'soft law' (Mulcahy 2009). As a result, a broader understanding of Europeanization is needed in order to be able to further Europeanization research.
2.2.2 Second Generation Studies

From the late 1990s a broader concept of Europeanization became more prevalent which marked a period of second generation analysis within Europeanization research. For example, researchers like Börzel (2002), Bulmer and Burch (2001), Dyson (1999) and Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001) also recognise that it can involve 'up-loading' by member states or 'bottom-up' Europeanization. Member states can project their priorities at an EU level to avoid potential 'misfits' when they need to transpose EU policies (Laffan and O’Mahony 2008; Howell 2004). As a result, successful uploading will determine the subsequent level of change (Howell 2005). 'Bottom-up' Europeanization and a focus on the 'up-loading' by member states was an element neglected by the 'top-down' approach to Europeanization. Lenschow (2004: 59) points out that the EU can provide a point of reference for domestic actors “who not merely react to European impulses but anticipate such impulses by inducing bottom-up processes changing the European level or by 'using' or 'endogenising' Europe in domestic politics independent of specific pressures from Brussels”. Dyson and Goetz (2003: 20) recognise this and speak of Europeanization as a circular process and as a complex interactive top-down and bottom-up process in which domestic polities, politics and public policies are shaped by European integration and in which domestic actors use European integration to shape the domestic area.

Second generation analysis as a result recognises that member states can project their own domestic issues to EU level (Bomberg and Peterson 2000).

Radaelli (2003: 30) offers one of the broadest definitions of Europeanization,

Europe

This definition recognises Europeanization through both 'hard' and 'soft' law and that Europeanization is not just about formal rules but also informal rules (Radaelli 2006). As Radaelli (2006: 59) states this definition moves beyond viewing Europeanization as
a 'top-down' impact and recognises that “domestic actors often have discretion to use Europe in many different ways”. A new approach to explaining Europeanization in the academic literature corresponds with this definition and is termed 'interactive' Europeanization which conceptualises Europeanization as a process that involves not only hierarchical (top-down) processes, but also bottom-up processes, whereby domestic actors seek to upload norms to the European arena, and horizontal processes, whereby norms can be diffused across member states using the EU as a facilitator of norm and policy diffusion (Mulcahy 2009: 23).

Lenschow (2004: 59) also recognises that “the EU represents a set of rules, an arena and a discursive framework for domestic actors, in short a point of departure for impulses that flow top-down, horizontally and 'round-about' when impacting on the domestic level”. 'Interactive' Europeanization has so far been mostly neglected by the literature (Bomberg and Peterson 2000). 'Interactive' Europeanization “emphasises domestic determinants, suggesting that it is not Europe that is the catalyst for change but the domestic political and ideological constellation in individual member states” (Mulcahy 2009: 23). 'Interactive' Europeanization can also involve cross-loading between member states as an explanation for impacts at home (Mulcahy 2009). Lenschow (2004: 58) states that horizontal or cross-loading transfer processes can take place independently of the existence of the EU but the EU and its institutions can act as facilitators of change as well as an arena for inter-state communication which can facilitate “the exchange of ideas which may diffuse into national practices”.

Thus, 'interactive' Europeanization in particular emphasises the importance of learning at domestic level and in turn is linked in particular to assessing change through 'soft law'. The EU provides an arena for learning as it acts as a classroom where member states can learn from each other. As a result, the “EU becomes a source of innovative policy by acting as a sort of supranational idea hopper” (Bomberg and Peterson 2000: 12). Policy learning is often a pre-condition for Europeanization through 'soft law' (Radaelli 2008). The aim of this form of Europeanization is to encourage member states “to an efficient coordination of reforms which may thus produce Europeanization” (Radaelli 2008: 240). This form of Europeanization places a particular emphasis on beliefs and values and is based on voluntary adaptation (Bache and Marshall 2004).
Europeanization through 'soft law' is thus reflected in changes in domestic beliefs and values and has been termed Europeanization by framing integration or framing domestic beliefs and values (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002). Due to this reconceptualization of Europeanization the literature has increasingly focused on differentiating between Europeanization through 'hard law' and Europeanization through 'soft law'.

2.2.3 Europeanization through 'Hard Law'

'Hard law' is underlined by the 'Classic' Community Method (CCM), which dates back to the founding of the EU (1957). The CCM involves

- the transfer of legislative powers to the EU, the creation of a 'supranational' executive, the European Commission, the possibility to vote in order to adopt binding legislation, and the enforcement powers vested in the European Court of Justice (Cerami 2007: 1)

and is thus based on governance by hierarchy. 'Hard law' has formed the basis of the European Union and how it governs and is based on governance by hierarchy. EU law takes precedence over member states national law and some have termed this a hollowing out of the national state as power has now shifted from the national level with the state now being one actor among many, thus “EU membership is a partnership between member states and institutions of the EU” (Richards and Smith 2002). This has been viewed in many ways as a negative development “for some Eurosceptics the EU is reducing the role of national government to that of a local authority responsible for an extremely narrow range of functions” (Richards and Smith 2002: 151). Once legislation is agreed upon all member states must implement such legislation at a national level.

The legislative power of the EU is outlined in Article 249 EC “In order to carry out their tasks the Council and Commission shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Treaty, make regulations, issue directives, take decisions, make recommendations or deliver opinion” (Treaty Establishing the European Community 2002). Regulations, directives and decisions are the only measures that are binding (Steiner, Twigg and Flesner 2006). The European Court of Justice (ECJ) is the European Union’s judicial institution (Kennedy, Cahill, Power 2006). The importance of the European Court of Justice is that without the ECJ enunciating the supremacy of Community law,
the EU would be a much weaker institution today. It has been instrumental in
developing many of the principals of EU law including proportionality, non-
discrimination, effectiveness, the doctrine of legitimate expectation, direct effect
and supremacy (Kennedy, Cahill, Power 2006: 14)

The main function of the Court of Justice is to “ensure that in the interpretation and
application of this Treaty the law is observed (EC Treaty Art 220)” (Kennedy, Cahill,
Power 2006: 15). The most important aspect of EU law is its supremacy over national
law in member states (Kennedy, Cahill and Power 2006). This means that

Community law takes priority over, and supersedes any national law. In the
event of a conflict between Community Law and national law, the conflicting
domestic provision is rendered invalid. This is the case even where then national
provision is part of the national constitution. Supremacy was developed to avoid
disparities arising out of different national approaches to the incorporation of EU
law and to ensure uniformity of application (Kennedy, Cahill, Power 2006: 59)

This principle of supremacy has been developed by the ECJ and it has held that “The
law stemming from the treaty, an independent source of law, cannot because of its very
nature be overridden by rules of national law” [Established in Case 11/70 Internationale
Handelsgesellschaft mbH [1970] ECR 1125] (Case 11/70 1970). Therefore, the ECJ is a
prominent agent of Europeanization and thus provides a clear impetus for domestic
change (Panke 2007).

'Hard law' has many benefits. For example, it provides a clear outline of what is
expected of member states and provides a strict timeline of when said objectives must
be achieved. If not there are clear repercussions through the ECJ and sanctions for non-
compliance. It is also beneficial in making sure there is a Europe wide consensus on
issues and has created a level playing field across Europe on certain issues, for example
employment issues. However, 'hard law' is not without its issues. Firstly, it means that
national courts have lost much of their legislative power to the European Union
(Quaglia, Neuvonen, Miyakoshi and Cini 2007). This means that a great deal of
legislation is decided at EU level with member state governments only having an
indirect role in the process (Quaglia, Neuvonen, Miyakoshi and Cini 2007). However,
this has changed somewhat due to the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 (Europa
(b) 2010). Due to the Lisbon Treaty a greater role has been introduced for national
governments in EU decision-making (Europa (c) 2010). The treaty allows member states greater scope to participate along EU institutions as well as a new power to enforce subsidiarity\(^1\) (Europa (c) 2010). Yet, many have noted that this could actually make the decision-making process in the EU more complex (Warleigh-Lack and Drachenberg 2009).

Being a member state of the European Union is a complex and a demanding position as “Action must be coordinated at and between at least two levels, the domestic and the European, so proposals in Brussels are consistent with national imperatives” (Kassim 2003: 85). Thus, even though through a process of codecision member states can have an input into legislation once an act is agreed though the process of codecision member states must implement the said act. Even though member states voluntary agree to be in the EU and agree to adopt legislation it can still bring many challenges for member states. The legislation agreed on can often be difficult to implement as member states national legal systems differ considerably across Europe. The EU involves a number of highly complicated treaties and a number of institutions of power – Parliament, Council, Commission and European Court of Justice. Policies on the agenda are ever-changing in the European Union with decision making involving a large number of different actors, for example all member states, European Institutions and interest groups (Kassim 2003).

Legislative procedures are often long and complex “….and combined with the different decision rules that apply to the Council in different policy sectors and subsectors, present a bewildering array of formal processes” (Kassim 2003: 86). Trubek, Cottrell and Nance (2006: 67) summarise very well the main critiques of 'hard law':

- Hard law tends toward uniformity of treatment while many current issues demand tolerance for significant diversity among Member States;
- Hard law proposes a fixed condition based on prior knowledge while situations of uncertainty may demand constant experimentation and adjustment;

\(^1\) Subsidiarity means that the EU can act in areas outside of where it has exclusive powers as action is more effective on a EU level than at a national level. National parliaments can object to such a proposal for EU action if it feels it does not respect this principle. For example, if one third of national parliaments consider that the proposal is not in line with subsidiarity, the Commission will have to re-examine it and decide whether to maintain, adjust or withdraw it or, if a majority of national parliaments agrees with the objection but the Commission decides to maintain its proposal anyway, the Commission will have to explain its reasons, and it will be up to the European Parliament and the Council to decide whether or not to continue the legislative process (Europa, (c), 2010).
- Hard law is very difficult to change yet in many cases frequent change of norms may be essential to achieve optimal results.

Due to these difficulties and limitations of ‘hard law’ the European Union has come to rely on 'soft law' to govern with and to further the integration and Europeanization of its member states. ‘Soft law’ can also be used alongside 'hard law' in some areas, for example environmental policy (Quaglia, Neuvonen, Miyakoshi and Cini 2007). Winchell (2006) and Mulcahy (2009) argue that 'soft law' mechanisms are used to complement the CCM, rather than replace it and have become an important part of EU governance in recent years. Bomberg and Peterson (2000) suggest that there is a growing conviction at EU level that traditional policy methods do not work as efficiently anymore and are thus not being extended to new areas of EU policy making. Radaelli and Pasquier (2008: 37) point out that the use of 'soft law' mechanisms are related to the decline in the traditional Community Method and “that some areas of EU policy are moving away from vertical policy making in the sense of laws created in Brussels and then 'imposed' onto member states via transposition and implementation”.

A turn to 'soft law' has also become more apparent due to resistance by member states for further integration yet national governments face pressure to act at EU level on certain issues such as monetary and immigration policy (Bomberg and Peterson 2000). ‘Soft law’ as a result is usually related to policy subsystems which fall outside of the European Union’s legal remit (Quaglia, Neuvonen, Miyakoshi and Cini 2007). Radaelli (2008: 239) points out that 'soft law’ is usually applied “in policy areas where the Treaty base for EU competence is thin or non-existent” and /or “where diverging interests of the member states make agreement on proposed EU legislation impossible”. As a result, there is increasing evidence that the EU over the last number of years has been using 'soft law' or 'new modes of governance' to extend its influence over policy areas outside its legal remit (Mulcahy 2009).

2.2.4 Europeanization through 'Soft Law'

Governance by facilitated coordination or framing integration (Quaglia, Neuvonen, Miyakoshi and Cini 2007) is a broader understanding of Europeanization (Adshead 2005). It is a process governed by 'soft law'. Europeanization through 'soft law' or 'new modes of governance' is voluntary and can involve both vertical and horizontal processes and is thus ‘interactive’ (Bulmer and Radaelli 2005). Governance by
facilitated coordination or framing integration recognises that Europeanization is unfolding “to a large extent outside the classical Community Framework” (Wallace 2000: 6). It is based on practice and policy exchange that facilitates “….cross-fertilization of ideas and learning” where norms can be diffused through ‘bottom-up’, ‘top-down’ processes and horizontally across member states (Bulmer and Radaelli 2005: 345; Adshead 2005). In this regard the EU acts as an arena which can facilitate norm and policy diffusion in policy subsystems where it has no legal competence (Mulcahy 2009).

New modes of governance (NMG) is often a term assigned to 'soft law' mechanisms which diverge from the traditional Community Method (Jacquot 2010), the most well known being the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). The Open Method of Coordination is a term that is used “to provide a definition to modes of policy-making that emerged in different policy areas in the 1990’s” (Bulmer and Radaelli 2005: 349) and is seen as an alternative to the 'classic' Community Method (Scott and Trubek 2002). It is based on practice and policy exchange that facilitates “….cross-fertilization of ideas and learning” (Bulmer and Radaelli 2005: 345), where norms can be diffused through 'bottom-up', 'top-down' processes and horizontally across member states (Bulmer and Radaelli 2005; Adshead 2005). In this regard the EU acts as an arena which can facilitate norm and policy diffusion in policy subsystems where it has no legal competence (Mulcahy 2009). ‘Soft law’ in turn is characterised by its voluntary nature that is based on involving more actors in the policymaking process with policy learning a key elements underpinning policy transfer and policy change. 'Soft law' involves non-legally binding processes and lacks features such as “…obligation, uniformity, justifiability, sanctions….“ (Trubek, Cottrell and Nance 2006: 65). It uses a range of tools such as peer review, reporting processes and benchmarking rather than imposing legal standards.
Table 1: Characteristics of New Modes of Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation:</th>
<th>Having more and different actors participating in the policy-making process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Level:</td>
<td>Policy coordination involves actors from various levels of the political system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiarity:</td>
<td>Policy design is decided at the lowest, most appropriate level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation:</td>
<td>Policy learning and policy transferability are part of the policy-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility:</td>
<td>The use of soft law ensures flexibility to adapt policy strategies quickly if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge creation:</td>
<td>Some NMG use tools like benchmarking or peer review, which can lead to the creation of new knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Warleigh-Lack and Drachenberg, 2009: 217)

'Soft law' allows the European Union to become a platform for the exchange of ideas, best practice and learning (Lenschow 2004). It involves non-legally binding processes and lacks features such as obligation and sanctions (Trubek, Cottrell and Nance 2006) and is thus based on governance by facilitated cooperation. Francis Snyder has offered one of the more definitive classifications of soft law. Snyder defines soft law as “rules of conduct which in principle have no legally binding force but which nevertheless may have practical effects” (Snyder 1993: 198). Many accept that “…soft law has provided the EU with a powerful regulatory mechanism in jurisdictions over which the EU has no legal authority” (O’Hagan 2004: 394). 'Soft law' is a more flexible method to govern with as it “…allows for renegotiation or modification of agreements as circumstances change; can accommodate diverse legal systems; and can cope better with uncertainty” (Trubek, Cottrell and Nance 2006: 74). It also accommodates for diversity between member states as in contrast to legally binding initiatives NMG allow more flexibility for member states to interpret goals and objectives (Treib, Bähr and Falkner 2007). 'Soft law' involves more openness and an inclusion of a multitude of interested parties including non-state actors thus it hopes to increase transparency and the diffusion of knowledge (Trubek, Cottrell and Nance 2006). Europeanization can occur because
the EU had provided an arena for the exchange of ideas and shaped a discourse by identifying general goals or principles, disseminating information and pointing out examples of ‘best practice’ (Lenschow 2004: 66).

It can often 'set the stage' and be a precursor for 'hard law' by ‘….developing shared ideas, building trust, and establishing non-binding standards that can eventually harden into binding rules once uncertainties are reduced and a higher degree of consensus ensues” (Trubek, Cottrell and Nance 2006: 89).

However, a major drawback regarding 'soft law' is that its implementation is voluntary rather than obligatory. Therefore, divisions are still apparent in the analysis on 'soft law' being used in the European Union. Scholars who support 'soft law' include Sciarra who argues that it is an exciting innovation for the European Union and that 'soft law' processes can be effective, especially in the area of social policies (Sciarra 1995). Cini (2011) also points out that it can be implemented much quicker than legislation. Others like Sabel (1994), Teague (2000) and Trubek and Mosher (2001) point out that policy reforms can be much more effective through a learning process involving 'soft law' as they have not been imposed (O’Hagan 2004). On the other hand other scholars have pointed out that 'soft law' can have implications for governance in the EU (O’Hagan 2004). For example Scharpf argues that 'soft law' cannot be truly effective if it is not implemented in a “shadow of legislation” (Scharpf 2001: 11). Goetschy (2003) also voices concerns stating that there is no guarantee member states will implement many non-binding guidelines properly and that ‘soft law’ should never be the dominant tool of governance in the European Union. Thus, it is evident from this literature review that the EU can be seen as 'Europe as pressure' [Actors comply with rules] as well as 'Europe as usage' [Actors learn of alternatives within an extended frame of reference] (Lenschow 2004: 65). This also implies that actors play a key role in the different ways the EU can be used. The Europeanization literature has also sought to define the dimensions of change as well as a means of measuring change.
2.2.5 Dimensions and Measures of Change

An important element of the Europeanization process is outlining the expected areas in which the EU can embed change. For example, Börzel and Risse (2003) argue for a focus on three dimensions, that of politics, policy and polity. The different areas of change are outlined below in table two.

Table 2: Dimensions of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Polity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Interest formation; aggregation; representation; intermediation</td>
<td>- Norms and goals</td>
<td>- Political institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public discourse</td>
<td>- Standards</td>
<td>- Intergovernmental relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Party and electoral politics</td>
<td>- Instruments and policy style</td>
<td>- Judicial structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public opinion</td>
<td>- Problem-solving approaches</td>
<td>- Public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patterns of contestation</td>
<td>- Policy narratives and discourses</td>
<td>- State traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resources</td>
<td>- Economic institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organisational structures</td>
<td>- State-society relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Actor Networks</td>
<td>- Collective identities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: Börzel and Risse 2003; Lenschow 2004)

The Europeanization literature has also outlined a measure for change regarding the Europeanization process. Börzel (2005: 58) terms this the “outcomes of domestic change”. The five degrees of domestic change are inertia, retrenchment, absorption, accommodation and transformation (Börzel 2005). Inertia occurs when there’s an absence of change. This absence of change is not due to a 'goodness of fit' between the domestic and EU level but rather the resistance of the member state to change (Börzel 2005). However, resistance can only be sustained for a period of time particularly regarding EU legislation (Börzel 2005; Quaglia, Neuvoner, Miyakoshi and Cini 2007). Retrenchment “involves the empowering of a coalition of domestic actors who oppose EU-inspired changes” (Quaglia et al. 2007) and can even serve to increase the 'misfit'
between national and EU requirements (Börzel 2005). Absorption refers to a level of low change as member states are able to “incorporate European requirements into their domestic institutions and policies without substantial modifications of existing structures and the logic of political behaviour” (Börzel 2005). Accommodation represents a moderate level of change as member states do not have to change core domestic features but rather adapt existing domestic features to meet EU requirements (Börzel 2005). Finally, transformation represents the strongest level of change. Transformation requires member states to significantly adjust domestic features,

member states replace existing policies, processes, and institutions by new, substantially different ones, or alter existing ones to the extent that their core features and/or the underlying collective understandings are fundamentally changed (Börzel 2005).

The Europeanization literature not only focuses on the level of change but also the context that produces change which relates to the level of 'misfit' between domestic and EU requirements.

2.2.6 'Misfit'

The 'misfit' explanation for change suggests that in order for the EU to elicit change at domestic level, the EU initiative must provide a challenge for domestic actors and institutions (Lenschow 2004). Börzel (2005: 50) defines 'misfit' as a situation that occurs “only if European policies, institutions and/or processes differ significantly from those found at the domestic level, do member states feel the need to change”. First generation studies on Europeanization focused on a hierarchical and 'top-down' perspective as well as recognising that 'misfit' was necessary for change to take place (Adshead 2002). The 'misfit' explanation as a result is often used in studies assessing the impact of the EU on policy subsystems governed by the Community method (Börzel 2005). While the 'misfit' element to understanding Europeanization is most prevalent in studies analysing policy subsystems under the EU’s legal remit some of the academic literature also suggests it can be a useful explanation for studies of policy subsystems governed by 'soft law'. Börzel (2005: 51) asserts that,

it is not only 'integration through law' that can produce misfit at the domestic level. Softer forms of integration in the 'shadow of law' or 'without law', such as
the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), may equally challenge domestic institutions, policies and processes inducing processes of social learning, or empowering domestic reform coalition.

Featherstone, Kornelakis and Zartaloudis (2012: 55) assert that regarding 'soft law' adaptational pressure and 'misfit' are absent due to the lack of powers held by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) and the lack of coercive elements to 'soft law'. As a result “it is up to the Member States to align their domestic policy with it only if they wish to do so”. However, Börzel and Risse (2000: 5) point out how the 'misfit' explanation or rather how a 'goodness of fit' can be relevant for those studying Europeanization through soft law,

If European norms, rules and the collective understandings attached to them are largely compatible with those at domestic level, they do not give rise to problems of compliance or effective implementation more generally speaking. Nor do they provide new opportunities and constraints to domestic actors which could lead to a redistribution of power resources at the domestic level.

Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001) outline in their work a three-step approach to studying Europeanization of which the idea of 'misfit' or in other terms the level of 'goodness of fit' is a central element. The first element of the three step approach is identifying the relevant Europeanization process apparent at EU level and whether it is “formal and informal norms, rules, regulations, procedures, and practices” (Risse et al. 2001: 6). These different types of processes “necessitate some adjustments on the domestic level of the member states so that states can be in compliance with EU norms, rules and procedures” (Risse et al. 2001: 6).

The second aspect of the three-step approach is the 'goodness of fit' element between the Europeanization processes outlined above and what is at domestic level (Risse et al. 2001). 'Goodness of fit' is associated with the level of adaptational pressure applied on the domestic level (Risse et al. 2001). Risse et al. (2001) outline that the level of adaptational pressure determines how much domestic institutions, norms, rules etc. have to change in order to be in line with what is emanating from the EU. Börzel and Risse (2003: 63) suggest 'misfit' is a necessary but not sufficient condition of domestic change,
whether misfits produce a substantial effect at the domestic level depends on the presence of various factors facilitating adaptation and serving as catalysts for domestic change. Only if and when these intervening factors are present can we expect a transformation of policies, politics, or polities in the member states.

The third element of the three-step approach as a result focuses on mediating factors for explaining the degree of domestic change (Risse et al. 2001). Radaelli (2003) suggests that even in instances of strong adaptational pressure a member state can implement EU policies relatively easily due to the presence of mediating factors. As a result, the focus on mediating factors suggests that features at domestic level will shape the outcomes of Europeanization (Risse et al. 2001). These mediating factors include multiple veto points in the domestic structure, facilitating institutions, and cooperative cultures (Risse et al. 2001: 9). The study of domestic change can also be furthered by examining branches of institutionalism, in particular rational choice and sociological institutionalism (Rees and Connaughton 2009). These branches of institutionalism also focus on different mediating factors and provide a further insight into this aspect of the Europeanization framework.

2.2.7 New Institutionalism

Within second generation studies new institutionalism has become a part of assessing Europeanization (Rees and Connaughton 2009). Europeanization is often cited as being a phenomenon that still needs to be explained rather than a theory and as a result Europeanization is now often placed within an institutional perspective in order to help understand how the EU is affecting the domestic level (Vink and Graziano 2008; Laffan and O’Mahony 2008; Featherstone 2003). Rees and Connaughton (2009: 22) argue that “in developing an explanation around Europeanization, 'new' institutionalism provides an important source of ideas and a basis for understanding domestic change in the member states”. Placing Europeanization within a 'new institutionalist' perspective implies that institutions are important, “shaping actor preferences and structuring both the process of policy making and substantive policy” (Bulmer and Padgett 2005: 105). In relation to the European Union institutionalisation involves both formal and informal rules, the supranational institutions that create and enforce these rules as well as non-governmental actors engaged in policy making as well (Bulmer and Padgett 2005; Vink and Graziano 2008). Thus, ‘institutions’ are not just the European institutions that have
a legal status but can also include “extending beyond the formal organs of government to include standard operating procedures, so-called soft law, norms and conventions of behaviour” (Bulmer 1994: 355). The new institutionalist literature is generally divided into three variants: Historical Institutionalism (HI); Rational Institutionalism (RI) and Sociological Institutionalism (SI) with each having a core interest in institutions (Nugent and Paterson 2006; Bulmer 2008). In particular Europeanization scholars argue for a focus on rational choice institutionalism and sociological institutionalism as a means of furthering our knowledge of the Europeanization process.

Rational Choice Institutionalism (RCI) views behaviour as being a rational and goal-driven process and hence a 'logic of consequentialism' (Börzel 2005; Rees and Connaughton 2009). The EU provides opportunities and constraints for these actions (Rees and Connaughton 2009). Börzel and Risse (2003: 63) argue that “Europeanization is largely conceived as an emerging political opportunity structure which offers some actors additional resources to exert influence, while severely constraining the ability of others to pursue their goals”. Rees and Connaughton (2009: 23) suggest that “based on such assumptions there will be winners and losers in the domestic polity”. These actions are mediated by two factors according to rational choice institutionalists – multiple veto players and facilitating formal institutions (Rees and Connaughton 2009). Firstly, multiple veto points can serve to “empower domestic actors with diverse interests to avoid constraints, and thus, effectively inhibit domestic adaptation” (Börzel 2005: 53). For example, if power is widely dispersed it makes it more difficult for a dominant coalition to introduce any change as a result of the EU (Börzel 2005). Thus, multiple veto players can have an impact on the ability of domestic actors to attain policy change (Börzel 2005). Secondly, formal institutions can also act as a mediating factor. Facilitating formal institutions “can provide domestic actors with the resources necessary to exploit European opportunities and thus promote domestic adaptation” (Börzel 2005: 53). A focus on the level of 'misfit' between domestic and EU level initiatives is also a focus in rational choice institutionalism (Rees and Connaughton 2009).

According to sociological institutionalists actors are guided by their collective understandings of socially accepted behaviour which in turn influences actor’s beliefs and goals (Börzel and Risse 2003). Sociological institutionalists focus on how institutions create a 'logic of appropriateness' for actors and their behaviour and act as a
mediating factor (Knill 2001; Rees, Quinn and Connaughton 2006). Sociological institutionalists also recognise the importance of actors being “socialised into the norms and rules of the internationalised arena in which they operate” (Rees et al. 2006: 2). Sociological institutionalism (SI) as a result suggests that domestic change occurs as a result of socialisation and learning which results in the internalisation of new norms at domestic level (Börzel and Risse 2003; Radaelli 2003). Börzel and Risse (2003) recognise that 'misfit' is also applicable to the sociological institutionalist perspective. Börzel and Risse (2003: 66) suggest that 'misfit' “constitutes the starting condition of a socialization process”. Börzel and Risse (2003: 67) argue that high 'misfit' between national and EU norms will lead to learning and socialization. For sociological institutionalists this is dependent on two mediating factors being apparent - 'change agents' or norm entrepreneurs or a political culture as well as cooperative informal institutions (Börzel 2005; Börzel and Risse 2003).

Firstly, 'change agents' or norm entrepreneurs aim “to persuade actors to redefine their interests and identities, engaging them in a process of social learning” (Börzel and Risse 2003: 67). Two such norm entrepreneurs are epistemic communities and advocacy or principle issue networks (Börzel and Risse 2003). Secondly, informal institutions “entail collective understandings of appropriate behaviour that strongly influence the ways in which domestic actors respond to Europeanization pressures” (Börzel 2005). For example, “a consensus-oriented or cooperative decision-making culture helps to overcome multiple veto points by rendering their use inappropriate for actors” as well as this “a consensus-orientated political culture allows for a sharing of adaptational costs which facilitates the accommodation of pressure for adaptation” (Börzel and Risse 2003: 68). Within the sociological institutionalism approach learning “involves a process whereby actors, through interaction with broader institutional contexts (norms or discursive structures), acquire new interests and preferences” (Knill 2001: 25). Sociological institutionalism is more focused on less formalised norms rather than formalised norms and their impact at domestic level (Knill 2001). These less formalised norms are based on social interaction amongst actors and processes of learning. Indeed, it is learning that is the mechanism that leads to Europeanization (Radaelli 2008: 239). This focus on the process of learning is also apparent in public policy change analysis literature and as a result Europeanization literature has increasingly referenced public
policy concepts that also focus on change through learning. One such concept is policy transfer.

2.3 Policy Transfer and the European Union

Radaelli (2000); Bomberg and Peterson (2000); Bulmer and Padgett (2005) and Bulmer, Dolowitz, Humphreys and Padgett (2007) are such authors who have endeavoured to explore the usefulness of using policy transfer to assess Europeanization. Bulmer and Padgett (2005) argue that it is expected that different modes of governance and policy making at EU will result in different types of policy transfer at member state level. Consequently, Bulmer and Padgett (2005) distinguish between coercive and voluntary policy transfer. Coercive transfer “occurs via the exercise of transnational or supranational authority; a state is obliged to adopt policy as a condition of membership in an international organization” (Bulmer and Padgett 2005: 105) and corresponds to hierarchical governance, 'hard' law and the traditional Community Method at EU level. In relation to governance by hierarchy “policy transfer occurs vertically through the application of rules, or institutional arrangements, by authoritative supranational actors to lower levels of governance” (Bulmer and Padgett 2005: 107/108). Bulmer and Padgett (2005) hypothesise that governance by hierarchy will result in the strongest form of policy transfer. Voluntary policy transfer corresponds to non-hierarchical governance, 'soft law' and facilitated unilateralism (Bulmer and Padgett 2005). It is expected governance by facilitated unilateralism will generate the weakest form of policy transfer (Bulmer and Padgett 2005). Bulmer and Padgett (2005: 106) assert that

This type of governance occurs in the European Union where member states retain competence, but agree to co-operate and co-ordinate policy within loosely constituted institutional settings….In place of binding rules, it employs guidelines and benchmarks to persuade member states to reassess their policy practices.

Hence, voluntary policy transfer is associated with Europeanization through 'soft law'.

Bulmer et al. (2007) like Bulmer and Padgett (2005) also relate policy transfer to the various forms of governance apparent at EU level. Recent work by Dolowitz and Marsh (2012: 342) highlights the potential of linking policy transfer with governance. They argue that “different ideas about the dominant mode of governance in contemporary politics are related to different approaches to policy transfer”. For Bulmer et al. (2007)
governance by negotiation results in a “largely voluntary policy transfer process, but the availability of qualified majority voting may introduce some forms of coercion” (Bulmer et al. 2007). Next, governance by hierarchy “provides the greatest scope for coercive policy transfer” (Bulmer et al. 2007). Finally, with governance by facilitation “policy transfer will take the form of unilateral, voluntary policy transfer facilitated by the EU” (Bulmer et al. 2007). Furthermore, Bulmer et al. (2007) identify a number of dimensions of policy transfer. For example, there is 'uploading' which happens when for example a policy model at member state level is transferred to the EU level and incorporated into EU policies (Bulmer et al. 2007). 'Downloading' is representative of an instance where a policy model is transferred and incorporated into domestic policy approaches at member state level from the EU (Bulmer et al. 2007). Finally, there is 'horizontal' transfer which is transfer that occurs horizontally between member states (Bulmer et al. 2007).

Bomberg and Peterson (2000) like Bulmer and Padgett (2005) and Bulmer et al. (2007) focus on the distinction between coercive and voluntary transfer when they highlight that the EU can act as a 'schoolmaster' or 'classroom' depending on the policy subsystem. For instance, “in some sectors, Member States are compelled to accept measures established in other Member States and adopted at the EU level” (Bomberg and Peterson 2000: 12). This is where the EU acts as a 'schoolmaster'. In other areas the EU acts not as a schoolmaster, but becomes a classroom where Member States can learn about each other’s practices, policies and methods. In theory, at least, the EU becomes a source of innovative policy by acting as a sort of ideational idea hopper (Bomberg and Peterson 2000: 12).

Bomberg and Peterson (2000) suggest that there is a growing view at EU level that traditional legal policies do not work as efficiently anymore and are thus not being extended to new areas of EU policy making (Bomberg and Peterson 2000). Therefore, it is hoped that policy transfer allows for the Europeanization of policy subsystems that otherwise would not be Europeanized. Bomberg and Peterson (2000) term this the 'Heineken test'. The test is whether policy transfer allows the EU to achieve the Europeanization of domains previously untouched by European integration and where the Community Method cannot now reach (Bomberg and Peterson 2000: 9/10).
Transfer is thus often associated with 'soft law' initiatives and policy subsystems that lie outside the EU’s legal competence. Voluntary policy transfer and Europeanization through 'soft law' promote “a diffusion of solutions that are embraced voluntarily” (Bomberg and Peterson 2000: 19). Hence, Bomberg and Peterson (2000) find policy transfer is mostly associated with being a voluntary process and is therefore very useful in explaining change as a result of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) and new modes of governance. Ultimately Bomberg and Peterson (2000: 13) argue that “voluntary policy transfer in the EU works primarily from the bottom up. It is driven by exchanges between national authorities who share a common concern to solve policy problems, as well as causal understandings and technical expertise”. As a result, EU policy transfer is rarely due to coercion (Bomberg and Peterson 2000). Radaelli (2000) also associates policy transfer with a voluntary rather than a coercive process regarding the EU. Radaelli (2000: 26) argues the EU acts as a “massive transfer platform for dominant countries and/or winning advocacy coalitions”. The European Commission can be viewed as a “policy entrepreneur in this process” in conjunction with other actors such as policy experts, think tanks and pressure groups (Radaelli 2000: 26). An insight into this policy transfer process is discussed in the following sections.

2.3.1 Policy Transfer: An Introduction

Diffusion is generally understood to be the “transmission mechanism linking international norms to domestic change” (Checkel 1999: 83). There are two strands to the policy diffusion literature: policy learning which “implies gradual processes of realization, where cognitive categories are redefined on the basis of a new knowledge. This affects the fundamental ideas that are the basis of different policies” and policy transfer which “denotes a process by which a policy from one polity is explicitly used as a blueprint for drawing-up a policy in another polity” (Nedergaard 2006: 426). Learning often precedes policy transfer and “presupposes pro-activity by a range of actors with an interest in ensuring the spread of a particular policy” (Common 2001: 12). However, focusing on learning alone will not explain policy change as learning “can occur without any policies being adopted but policy transfer becomes an observable process once organisations and actors pick up a policy idea or model” (Common 2001: 14).

Policy transfer is often linked to other terms such as lesson-drawing (Cairney 2012). Policy transfer in particular builds on earlier work by Rose (1991, 1993) on lesson-
drawing. However, lesson-drawing and policy transfer are still distinct. For example, policy transfer can involve both coercive and voluntary actions whereas lesson-drawing is concerned with voluntary activity and implies that the country has a choice (Stone 1999; Rose 1991; Dolowitz, Greenwold and Marsh 1999). Lesson-drawing “starts with scanning programmes in effect elsewhere, and ends with the prospective evaluation of what would happen if a programme already in effect elsewhere were transferred here in future” (Rose 1991: 3). Thus, it is evident with lesson-drawing that a government can actively participate in a process of learning. Lodge (2003: 160) argues that “at the core of the policy transfer literature rests the notion of the application of knowledge of a set of policy instruments of one particular domain in another policy domain, while lesson-drawing focuses more on evaluation”. Policy transfer as a result represents “a distinct focus in its own right” (Benson and Jordan 2011: 367). In contrast to other terms like lesson-drawing policy transfer provides a way of explaining policy change (Cairney 2012).

Policy transfer has become a key aspect to modern policy-making with its occurrence likely to become more common in the future (Dolowitz et al. 1999). Common (1999) thus recognises the increasing occurrence of policy transfer in the political science literature. However, policy transfer is not without its critiques. James and Lodge (2003: 190) argue that policy transfer is of limited use when used on its own and even suggest that “researchers may be better off using alternative theories focusing more directly on the effects of the learning processes or styles of policy-making on policy outcomes”. Evans and Davies (1999); Evans (2009) and Common (2001) suggest that for policy transfer to maintain its usefulness as a meso-level concept it must be incorporated into a multi-level research framework. Policy transfer “provides an opportunity to illuminate the processes of policy change” as well as enhancing the explanatory power of other literature (Hulme 2005: 418). Furthermore, policy transfer provides an analytical tool to integrate debates (Stone 1999: 5). Thus, the value of policy transfer is outlined by Evans and Davies (1999: 363),

It may be viewed as a meso-level concept which can provide a link between the micro-level of analysis, which deals with the role of interests and levels of government in relation to particular policy decisions, and the macro-level of analysis, which is concerned with broader questions concerning the distribution of power within contemporary society
As a result, the potential of policy transfer to act as a meso-level link with Europeanization has been touted in the literature. Policy transfer is defined as “the process by which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political system (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political system” (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 5). Dolowitz (2010) has since offered an updated version of this definition and suggests that policy transfer is a process by which actors become aware of information in one political system and transfer this into another political system where it can be stored for use in that political system. Therefore, it focuses on identifying processes of change. In particular, the policy transfer framework compels “us to examine the origins of ‘new’ knowledge about policy, who supplies such knowledge and the political and practical purposes to which this knowledge is put” (Hulme 2005: 418).

Policy transfer implies that “governments have looked to other countries as a source of policy ideas, institutional reform and even detailed legislation” (Dolowitz et al. 1999: 719). Policy transfer acknowledges the increasing influence different political systems have on each other. Governments transfer a policy or programme in the hope that it will also be successful in their own country (Stone 1999). This can involve fact-finding missions to other countries or collecting evidence in other political settings in order to shape policies in their own country (Stone 1999). These actions relate to voluntary policy transfer. Stone (1999: 52) points out that coercive policy transfer implies a compulsion to conform that is “not a co-operative or voluntary arrangement but a situation where political actors of one country, or international organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) or World Bank, have an impact on the policy affairs of another country”. Dolowitz (2000) has outlined a policy transfer model or framework that can be used to demonstrate cases of policy transfer. The policy transfer model is based on asking a set of key questions:

- Why do actors engage in policy transfer?
- Who are the key actors involved in the transfer process?
- What is transferred?
- From where are lessons drawn?
- What are the different degrees of transfer?
• What restricts or facilitates the policy transfer process?
• How is the process of policy transfer related to policy 'success' or policy 'failure'? (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 8).

These questions provide a policy transfer framework that allows for the analysis of policy change (Greener 2002). For example, “why a lesson is drawn, where a lesson is drawn from and who is involved in the transferring process all affect both whether transfer occurs and whether that transfer is successful” (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 8). Details of the policy transfer model are elaborated in the following sections.

Dolowitz (2000) argues that policy transfer often involves coercive and voluntary aspects. In order to be able to assess why transfer occurred it must be established if it was due to a voluntary and coercive process (Cairney 2012). Thus, Dolowitz and Marsh (2000: 13) suggest viewing policy transfer as lying along a continuum as illustrated in figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Policy Transfer Continuum

Lesson-drawing ← Lesson-drawing (bounded rationality) - Voluntarily but driven by perceived necessity (such as the desire for international acceptance) - Obligated transfer (transfer as a result of treaty obligations, etc.) - Conditionality → Coercive transfer (direct imposition)

This continuum can be utilised by researchers to frame their empirical work as it can be used to explain why political systems engage in the policy transfer process and also reflects the varying degrees of pressure policymakers can be put under (Common 2001). At the voluntary end of the continuum is lesson drawing. This element of the continuum suggests that actors will engage in the policy transfer process in reaction to a “perceived problem” and is a 'rational' and 'conscious' decision (Dolowitz 2000: 13). It is however unlikely and extremely rare they will act in a perfectly rational way as actors can be constrained due to institutional factors, their own views as well as acting with only a limited amount of information (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000; Dolowitz 2000) Thus, actors mostly act within 'bounded rationality' when engaging in voluntary policy transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). Policy transfer can also be driven by perceived necessity, for example if policy makers view themselves as falling behind their competitors in a policy area (Dolowitz 2000). Actors also participate in the policy transfer process as
they believe it will make their decisions and actions more internationally acceptable (Dolowitz 2000). Policy makers hence participate in this type of policy transfer because “it is often the case that the international community ‘agrees’ on a best practice or solution to a particular problem. Thus countries adopting this solution can improve their status within the international community” (Dolowitz 2000: 14).

At the end of the continuum is coercive transfer. Obligated transfer can mean countries are 'pushed' into adopting policies or programmes and engage in policy transfer due to the actions of external events or actors (Dolowitz 2000: 15). Coercive transfer (direct imposition) is an aspect of policy transfer where countries can be forced to adopt policies and programmes by transnational corporations and aid agencies (Dolowitz 2000). For example, transnational corporations can attach conditions in order to decide whether to locate to a particular country as well as international lending agencies attaching conditions to the loans they provide (Dolowitz 2000). Countries can also be forced to participate in policy transfer due to being part of international organisations such as the EU “where member states are required to adapt their national policies to match European regulations and directives as part of their obligations to the Union” (Dolowitz 2000: 15). However, Dolowitz and Marsh (2000: 15) have questioned the use of terming any EU actions coercive as each member state has voluntarily joined the European Union and each member state “has influence over the adoption of all EU policies. As such, they actively and voluntarily shape and adopt the edicts of the Union; it is for this reason it is best viewed as obligated and, to an extent, negotiated transfer”. Thus, it is apparent that political systems can engage in the policy transfer process for a number of reasons that can be both voluntary and coercive in nature.

Who is involved in the policy transfer process is also another key question of the policy transfer framework. It centres on those involved in the policymaking process and categorises people into nine categories, all of which can play a part in policy transfer. These are: elected officials; bureaucrats and civil servants; policy entrepreneurs and experts; consultants; political parties; pressure groups; think tanks; corporations; and both governmental and non-governmental international organizations and institutions (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). While Stone (1999: 55) points out that some actors are more attuned to the transfer of certain elements, for example politicians may engage more in the transfer of 'hard' policy practices and instruments while non-state actors
such as NGOs may be involved in the transfer of 'soft' policy ideas but in reality all actors can engage in both ‘hard’ and 'soft' transfer.

The principal group involved in transfer tend to be government and elected officials as “their values give direction to public policy and their endorsement is needed to legitimate the adoption of programs” (Rose 1993: 52) and “it is probably impossible to implant an idea or policy, regardless of how much merit it may have or how many other countries are pursuing it, if key members of a government are opposed to it” (Dolowitz 2000: 17). These policy makers can be viewed as “social engineers” seeking knowledge (Rose 1991: 5). Regarding policy transfer and the EU Radaelli (2008: 244) points out that policy makers may just want to learn in order to “preserve consensus at home and at the same time tell a convincing story in Brussels” or to make sure that their desired policy approaches are incorporated into EU level initiatives. However, governments and policymakers rarely have the time or knowledge to search for lessons and as a result they engage with other actors to create a policy network (Rose 1991). Such actors include non-governmental organisations (NGOs). An NGOs role is as “knowledge-based actors involved in the export of ideas” (Stone 2000: 2). NGOs are seen as “policy entrepreneurs” who interact with other actors, mainly politicians and civil servants, in order to diffuse knowledge and information and in turn promote policy ideas (Stone 2000). Their main strategies “include identifying problems, networking in policy circles, shaping the terms of policy debates, and building coalitions” (Mintrom 1997: 739). Stone (2000: 22) points out that NGOs can be useful as politicians and bureaucrats can often face a number of constraints,

either they do not have the time or resources to accumulate sufficient evidence to make valid comparisons for lesson-drawing or are confronted by problems of under-supply of knowledge; and secondly, they sometimes need to build acceptance and establish legitimacy before lessons can be introduced or imposed.

Thus, NGOs can act as “resource banks” for policymakers by providing knowledge and expertise (Richards and Smith 2002: 173). NGOs also represent groups of civil society and therefore involving and consulting these NGOs “provides legitimacy for governments in order for the state to not appear as an enormous bureaucracy” (Richards and Smith 2002: 173).
The policy transfer model outlines six general categories of what can be transferred. These are: policies, policy goals, content and instruments; programmes; institutions; ideologies; ideas and attitudes; and negative lessons (Dolowitz 2000). As a result, transfer is not just about the transfer of public policy but can also include the transfer of such categories as institutional structures, administrative arrangements and policy ideas (Dolowitz et al. 1999). Evans and Davies (1999: 382) distinguish between 'soft' transfers such as ideas, concepts and attitudes and 'hard' transfers such as programmes.

It is important to understand that when governments assess where to learn from they can potentially look to three levels – the international, the national and the local level (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). At a national level actors involved in the policy transfer process can draw lessons from lower levels of government and in return lower levels of government can draw lessons from national government (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). It is also evident that lessons can be drawn from other national governments but can also look to the sub-national level and other units of government within other countries (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). It is also clear that lessons can be drawn from as well as being forced upon political systems by the international level (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000).

Common (2001) states that there are a number of degrees of policy transfer that reflect the level of transfer. Dolowitz and Marsh (2000: 13) assert that policy transfer “is not an all-or-nothing process” and should be seen in terms of four different degrees of transfer: copying; emulation; combinations and inspiration. Copying involves direct and complete transfer; emulation involves transfer of the ideas behind the policy or program; combinations which involves mixtures of several different types of policies and inspiration where policy in another jurisdiction may inspire a policy change but where the final outcome does not actually draw upon the original (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000: 13; Dolowitz 2000: 25). Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) argue that politicians are often looking for a 'quick fix' and mostly rely on copying or emulation while bureaucrats would be more interested in mixtures. Dolowitz and Marsh (2000: 13) also point out that the different degrees of transfer are evident at different stages of the policy process, “while emulation is crucial at the agenda-setting stage, copying or combining several different policies or programs may be more applicable at the policy formulation or implementation stage of the policy-making process”. Common (2001:
points out that in reality “instances of actual transfer are exceptional, and mixtures of emulation, learning and copying are more likely to be observed”.

There are also certain factors that can facilitate or restrict the policy transfer process (Dolowitz 2000). For example, if a policy or programme is deemed very complex it will be less likely transferred; if the institutional structures between the two political systems are too different transfer can be restricted; structures within borrowing countries departments and agencies can restrict transfer as can existing legislation and policies within a country and if past or existing relationships between two political systems are fractured this can also have an effect (Dolowitz 2000: 26/27). Common (2001: 20/21) argues there are a number of pre-requisites before policy transfer will occur. For example, if a programme of policy is deemed to be a success elsewhere in another political system it is more likely to be transferred; transfer will most likely occur between similar political systems and it is most likely only part of a programme or policy will be transferred (Common 2001: 20/21). It is also important that what is transferred can be easily evaluated in order to gauge if it has been a success (Common 2001). Another issue is that if governments perceive an immediate policy problem and look for a solution then policy transfer is more likely to occur but less likely that it will be successful as governments can often be acting within a limited timeframe which leads to a limited search for transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) argue that when the search for knowledge or a policy involves not just policymakers but also interest groups there will be fewer implementation problems once the policy is transferred. Dolowitz (2003) further points out that just because a policy did not work in a particular setting in other political systems governments can still learn. For example, by examining why the policy did not work; whether what made that policy fail in one setting can be overcome in another and whether the said failed policy that did not solve a problem in one setting could still be used to solve the problem in another (Dolowitz 2003: 105/106).

---

2For example, if departments or agencies have strongly developed hierarchies and reporting procedures they might find it easier to facilitate transfer (Dolowitz 2000: 26).

3For instance, a political system that has an inimical relationship with another political system will rarely transfer from that system (Dolowitz 2000).
Transfer does not always lead to policy success and can result in failure in the borrowing political system. Dolowitz (2000:10) states that policy transfer failure can lead to three outcomes: uniformed transfer; incomplete transfer and inappropriate transfer. It is important thus to recognise that not all policy transfer is successful as governments often assume just because the policy was successful elsewhere it will be successful in their own country. This can lead to policy failure as the borrowing country may often have insufficient information (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). This is termed uninformed transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). Also, elements that made the policy a success in the other country may not be transferred leading to incomplete transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). As well, the borrowing government may pay insufficient attention to the differences between the social, economic, political and ideological contexts in both political systems (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). This is termed inappropriate transfer (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000). There can be numerous issues when a country transfers policy in relation to how it is transferred. Common (2001) states that this is often apparent with coercive policy transfer.

For example, Dolowitz (2003) argues that coercive policy transfer can often be a not well-thought out process that neglects considerations for the existing systems in the borrowing country. Dolowitz (2003: 104) points out the problem of ideas or policies that are “stumbled across” as this can lead to a lack of analysis of how it will be actually operational in the borrowing political system and what is required for “successful transfer”. Policy makers can make key mistakes such as lack of analysis of a policy to only looking in political systems they deem similar to their own for ideas as they perceive these policies will be the least problematic when it comes to transferring them (Dolowitz 2003). This can often lead to transfer failure. The policy transfer model as a result outlines a framework of useful questions that can be used to guide research. It is also apparent that the policy transfer model could benefit from an increased focus on the wide group of actors it points to being involved in the policy transfer process. The Europeanization literature has pointed to having a greater focus on actors and in particular the beliefs and values that exist at member state level. Radaelli (2003) argues that it is important to assess under which conditions Europeanization leads to change. In particular assessing beliefs and values can help further our understanding of the context that supports Europeanization. One such concept that has increasingly been linked to the Europeanization literature is the Advocacy Coalition Framework as it provides
a framework for the systematic analysis of policy change over a decade of so. It assigns great importance to belief systems and to the balance between endogenous learning dynamics and exogenous shocks. As such, it is suited to an analysis of the interplay between 'exogenous' EU policy and domestic 'endogenous' factors. Furthermore, it provides an integrated framework for the analysis of constellations of actors, by grouping them into a number of coalitions with different belief systems (Radaelli 2033: 50).

The next section explores this relationship between Europeanization and the ACF in the literature more as well as introducing the main features of the ACF.

2.4 The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) and the European Union

Sabatier (1998: 121) argued that, “the ACF should apply well to the increasingly complex set of relationships evolving within the European Union, as European institutions….are increasingly displacing national institutions as the principal loci of policy change”. Within this view the EU and its institutions act as facilitators for the exchange of knowledge and ideas which can in turn be diffused to the domestic level (Lenschow 2004). Furthermore, the EU allows advocacy coalitions made up of actors who share common beliefs to “venue-shop” (Sabatier 1998: 121). Moreover, Europeanization through 'soft law' and voluntary policy transfer is underpinned by a prior process of policy learning amongst a coalition of actors and aims that over a period of time these actors will adopt a shared set of norms at national level due to their participation in supranational arenas such as the EU (Harmsen 2000). These key actors are often viewed as catalysts of Europeanization at a domestic level (Vink and Graziano 2008). Europeanization through 'soft law' aims to trigger change by changing beliefs and expectations held domestically in a member state. The ACF helps explain change by providing a focus on these beliefs and the coalitions of actors who share similar beliefs as change is ultimately a reflection of their beliefs. Furthermore, such coalitions can be seen as linking experts together in a particular policy domain (Rose 1991). The following sections outline the main features of the ACF.
2.4.1 The ACF: An Introduction

Evans and Davies (1999) suggest it is useful to have a greater focus on analysing actors or agents of transfer that are organised into networks to seek their views and interpretations in order to gauge if an idea or an attitude has been transferred. Associated with the idea of policy networks are advocacy coalitions. However, “while networks focus on groups and individuals interacting within a policy domain, advocacy coalitions refer to a small number of groups which enter into strategic alliances based upon deeply shared values or ‘fundamental ideological principles’” (Dolowitz 2000: 21). Within the process of policy transfer advocacy coalitions are “involved in policy formulation and implementation, as well as…in the generation, dissemination and evaluation of policy ideas” (Sabatier 1987: 663). An advocacy coalition can be viewed as an agent of learning (Bennett and Howlett 1992). Furthermore, the ACF can be used to map out key policy actors within a policy domain (Adshead 2011). The mapping of actors involved in a policy subsystem allows us to decipher who is driving policy change and why they wish to do so. The ACF itself was devised as a way of explaining policy change. A policy subsystem is the unit of analysis for understanding change within the ACF (Nohrstedt 2009). It is the unit of analysis “because political systems involve many topics over broad geographical areas that compel actors to specialise in a topic and locale to understand its complexity and to be effective in producing change” (Weible, Sabatier and McQueen 2009: 123).

The subsystem consists of public and private actors who seek to influence public policy formulation and implementation in a particular policy subsystem over a decade or more (Hysing and Olsson 2008; Sabatier 1998). The time span analysed must be at least a decade in order for the programme to “complete as least one cycle of formulation, implementation, and reformulation and to obtain a reasonably accurate portrait of program success and failure” and “that ambitious programs that appeared after a few years to be abject failures received more favourable evaluations when seen in a longer time frame; conversely initial success may evaporate over time” (Sabatier 1993: 16). The ACF assumes that beliefs are the driver for political decisions and actions (Weible et al. 2009). Policy change occurs as a result of the changing beliefs of actors within coalitions (Bennett and Howlett 1992). Thus, Hysing and Olsson (2008: 731) argue that the “ACF seems to be a promising framework for understanding policy change”. While the ACF was developed for use in the United States (US) political system it has been
highlighted as a framework that is applicable to political systems outside the US, in particular the EU which in turn has led to revisions of the ACF (Cairney 2012).

Within a policy subsystem actors are grouped into coalitions of private and public actors who share a set of common beliefs (Sabatier 1993; Sabatier 1998). The value of the ACF is it extends beyond the view that only a small number of groups and government actors are involved in the policy process (Cairney 2012). The ACF suggests that a wider group of actors are involved, such as journalists, academics and those across all levels of government (Cairney 2012: 218). These coalitions compete with each other so as to influence the outcome of a particular policy (Ainuson 2009). Sabatier (1993: 24) argues that policy subsystems are created when “a group of actors become dissatisfied enough with the neglect of a particular problem by existing subsystems to form their own”. An advocacy coalition

consists of actors from a variety of public and private institutions at all levels of government who share a set of basic beliefs (policy goals plus causal and other perceptions) and who seek to manipulate the rules, budgets, and personnel of governmental institutions in order to achieve these goals over time (Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier 1993: 5).

Sabatier (1993: 25) also points out that coalitions often show “a nontrivial degree of coordinated activity over time” and “often act in concert”. However, the importance of the view that coalitions engage in “a nontrivial degree of coordinated activity over time” has been questioned (Cairney 2012). A recent study by Leifeld (2012: 172) points out that belief systems should remain the primary focus of ACF studies as they “are still the primary theoretical factor that structures coalition membership and subsystems”. Leifeld (2012: 172) suggests that there are problems with the coordination element of the ACF as “although coordination may be an interesting feature of coalitions, questionnaires with retrospective questions about coalition structure would fail to generate any meaningful results”.

Within a policy subsystem there may be only one coalition or a number of coalitions (Sabatier 1993). If there is more than one coalition within the policy subsystem there will be one dominating coalition “controlling the executive branch” and a number of minority coalitions “seeking to alter the direction of public policy” (Nohrstedt 2009: 311). Decisions taken by governments are seen as a target for minority coalitions
seeking change in a policy subsystem (Nohrstedt 2009). Non-state actors such as NGOs are usually the key actors in a minority coalition within a policy subsystem (Rose 1991). The various coalitions located within the policy subsystem develop strategies that they feel will further their policy objectives and aims (Sabatier 1993). These coalitions have the “specific intention of engineering policy change” (Evans and Davies 1999: 376). Sabatier (1993) states that conflicts between competing coalitions are often diffused by 'policy brokers' whose principal aim is to find a compromise between coalitions within the subsystem. While it is generally assumed that coalitions remain stable over time Weible et al. (2009) argue that it is important researchers also recognise that defection within coalitions can occur and one should not assume the homogeneity of members of coalitions.

The ACF argues that there are a number of prerequisites for policy change. The two key explanations for policy change are external 'shocks' or crises to the subsystem and policy-orientated learning within and across coalitions (Nohrstedt 2009). Nohrstedt (2009) also argues that they can often work in tandem to bring about change rather being seen as either or incidences. External 'shocks' and crises can provide the impetus for policy change as a political or focusing event can raise the prominence of a policy issue on government agendas and provide an impetus for policy reform or new institutional arrangements (Busenberg 2001). These 'shocks' or external events can include changes in socioeconomic conditions and public opinion as well as changes in governing coalitions (Weible et al. 2009; Sabatier 1998; Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier 1993). Decisions made in other subsystems can also impact other subsystems by creating a 'shock' to another subsystem (Sabatier 1998). These “external shocks can foster change in a subsystem by shifting and augmenting resources, tipping the power of coalitions, and changing beliefs” (Weible et al. 2009: 124). Moreover, these external 'shocks' or crises can be viewed as 'windows of opportunity' for policy learning and policy change (Nohrstedt 2009).

Hysing and Olsson (2008) also argue that policy processes are subject to internal 'shocks' that can lead to change. Crises or disruption within a policy subsystem can happen when new actors enter the subsystem including actors switching from one coalition to another or the redistribution of resources (Nohrstedt 2009). These internal 'shocks' may indicate the failure of policies that are being pursued by dominant coalitions (Nohrstedt 2009). Policy-orientated learning can also act as a prerequisite for
change and can take place within and between coalitions in the subsystem. Learning across coalitions is rare as coalitions will filter out information that suggests that the core beliefs of their coalition may be invalid and/or unattainable, and will regard coalitions with contrasting policy beliefs as less trustworthy and more powerful than they actually are (Hysing and Olsson 2008: 732/733).

Sabatier (1993) argues that actors in one coalition will always “resist information suggesting that their basic beliefs may be invalid or unattainable, and they will use formal policy analyses primarily to buttress and elaborate those beliefs” (Sabatier 1993: 19). As a result, major policy change as a result of learning is rare because coalitions will generally not trust information from another coalition (Ainuson 2009). Policy-orientated learning will thus usually be confined to changing the secondary beliefs of a coalition (Jenkins-Smith and Sabatier 1993; Hysing and Olsson 2008; Weible et al. 2009).

Coalitions are organised around beliefs and seeks to turn these beliefs into policy change (Sabatier 1993). It is this aspect of the ACF that in many ways has the strongest link to Europeanization research. Europeanization through 'soft law' aims to lead to change by changing domestic beliefs and values with Knill and Lehmkuhl (2002: 2T) terming this “Europeanization by framing domestic beliefs and expectation”. Due to the references to beliefs and values in the Europeanization literature it is unsurprising that the link with the ACF has been made. Within the ACF the concept of a belief system provides “a template on which change is measured, both with respect to the beliefs of different coalitions and the actual content of public policy” (Sabatier 1993: 55). A belief system “guides coalition members concerning the problems that should receive the highest priority, the causal factors that need to be examined most closely, and the governmental institutions most likely to be favourably disposed to the coalition’s point of view” (Sabatier 1993: 41). Belief systems within coalitions can be divided into three groupings - deep core, policy core and secondary beliefs (Hysing and Olsson 2008). Deep core beliefs include “basic ontological and normative beliefs, such as the relative valuation of individual freedom versus social equality, which operate across virtually all policy domains” (Sabatier 1998: 103). These beliefs “are the broadest and most stable among the beliefs and are predominately normative” (Weible et al. 2009: 122).
core beliefs are highly resistant to change (Hysing and Olsson 2008; Sabatier 1998). Deep core beliefs generally represent our understanding of key issues. Secondly, there are policy core beliefs that are the ‘glue’ of the coalition “because they represent basic normative and empirical communities within the domain of specialisation of policy elites” (Sabatier 1998: 103).

Policy core beliefs are also generally viewed as being associated with the interests of dominant coalitions as well as being resistant to change but are still more likely to change than deep core beliefs (Adshead 2011). Policy core beliefs in general relate to policy preferences and strategies that are used to achieve deep core beliefs. Finally, there are secondary beliefs which involve “views on specific elements or issues in the policy subsystem such as desirable policy programmes, budget allocations and policy instrument design” (Hysing and Olsson 2008: 732). These are most likely to change over time (Adshead 2011) as “secondary beliefs are more substantively and geographically narrow in scope, and more empirically based” (Weible et al. 2009: 123). Secondary beliefs relate to how certain policies and strategies are implemented. As pointed out earlier in the chapter Europeanization through 'soft law' and voluntary policy transfer are often underpinned by a prior process of learning as they are associated with voluntary processes. Advocacy coalitions engage in policy-orientated learning as they can “document performance gaps in existing governmental programs” and “improve their understanding of the causal reasons for such gaps” (Sabatier 1993: 55). As a result, learning is a central aspect to the ACF.

2.4.2 Learning

This process of learning compels “us to examine the origins of ‘new’ knowledge about policy, who supplies such knowledge and the political and practical purposes to which this knowledge is put” (Hulme 2005). In particular, within Europeanization research learning takes on an added significance in areas where the EU has no legal remit and relies on 'soft law' as a form of policymaking (Bulmer and Radaelli 2014). Dunlop and Radaelli (2013: 599) define “learning as the updating of beliefs based on lived or witnessed experiences, analysis or social interaction”. Checkel (2001: 53) identifies social learning as “a process whereby actors, through interaction with broader institutional contexts (norms or discursive structures), acquire new interests and preferences”. Thus, social learning is apparent when actor’s interests and identities are
changed due to interaction (Checkel 2001). Stone (1999: 52) refers to policy-orientated learning as “the redefinition of interests on the basis of new knowledge which affects the fundamental beliefs and ideas behind policy approaches”. Rose (1991: 10) points out that learning is not “normal” and “dissatisfaction with the status quo” provides the impetus to learn and this puts pressure on policy makers to act (Rose 1991: 3). Governments will participate in policy-orientated learning and even policy transfer if there is a continued belief, for example in public opinion, that they are not performing well in a particular area (Peters 1997). Rose (1991) argues that problems that are unique to only one country are rare or 'abnormal' and that governments face similar problems for example regarding education, healthcare, social security. Thus, many governments are confronted with a similar issue and can seek to learn and draw lessons from other governments in order to address this issue (Rose 1991).

Argyris (1976) has developed a degrees of learning model that recognises triple-loop learning, double-loop learning and single-loop learning. Argyris (1976) argues that in most instances only single-loop learning is evident. Single-loop learning does not require the individual to change “the fundamental design, goals, activities of their organisations” (Argyris 1976: 367) and examines more the effect of an intervention or technique (Cheng, Banks and Allerd 2011). This is seen as first order change (Hall 1993). Double-loop learning is based on “challenging underlying assumptions and beliefs about the system as a whole and the casual relationships between interventions and system responses” (Cheng et al. 2011: 90). Double-loop learning involves reflecting on the assumptions that underlie our actions and focuses on are our assumptions about how the system works valid (Cheng et al. 2011: 90). Double-loop learning can be equated with second order change (Hall 1993). On the other hand triple-loop learning refers to learning that involves questioning whether changes in governing values and institutions are necessary to attain change (Cheng et al. 2011: 90). It is therefore a learning that challenges values and norms that underpin assumptions and actions (Reed, Evely, Cundhill, Fazey and Glass 2010: 3). Hall (1993) terms this third order change. Learning can ultimately affect fundamental beliefs and values about particular policy approaches in a policy subsystem and policy learning can be identified as a path to policy transfer and Europeanization.
2.5 Discourses of Exclusion

The discourses of exclusion provide an insight into the beliefs and values apparent in the subsystem of social inclusion in particular. The discourses represent a number of different approaches that prioritise different ways of combating social exclusion. Firstly, there is the Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED). This is an approach that emphasises redistribution through a progressive tax system and equality. Secondly, there is the Moral Underclass Discourse (MUD). This discourse focuses on the individual characteristics of the socially excluded and the presence of an 'underclass' and suggests that the welfare system encourages 'dependency'. Next, the Social Integrationist Discourse (SID) asserts that employment should be the main means of tackling social exclusion with the rights and responsibilities of citizens a crucial aspect of this discourse. Finally, there is the System Failure Discourse (SFD) which highlights the role functioning systems such as health and education play in combating social exclusion. Each discourse focuses on combatting poverty and social exclusion but advocate different approaches and means of doing this. This discourse asserts that the failure of key systems and services in society leads to the social exclusion of individuals. A number of authors have recognised that different discourses are indeed apparent and can be used to gauge the different approaches evident in a country namely Silver (1994) Levitas (2005), Lister (2004) and Berghman (1995). A detailed insight into these discourses follows.

2.5.1 The Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED)

RED is distinguished by its belief in the redistribution of power and wealth in order to tackle the poverty and inequality present in society (Levitas 2005). RED also places a value on unpaid work (Levitas 2003). A central aspect of the discourse is the role of citizenship and its importance in promoting social inclusion (Levitas 2005). The redistributionist discourse places a value on ensuring social political, cultural and economic citizenship rights (Levitas 2005: 14). The redistribution of resources is viewed as the means to tackle inequality in society with the central issue being whether people have the resources that enable them to have a standard of living comparable to the society in which they live (Levitas 2005). As a result, the discourse finds a basis in the definition of poverty offered by Peter Townshend (1979: 32) when he argued for an emphasis on people’s ability to participate in the customary standard of living of the
society in which they live, “individuals, families and groups can be said to be in poverty when…their resources are so seriously below those commanded by the average individual or family that they are, in effect, excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs and activities”. Room (1995) argues that due to the focus on resources, redistribution lies at the heart of the beliefs of this discourse. Levitas (2005: 9) also asserts that resources are central to the RED approach, “it is inequality that might affect the style in which people participated in some social practices – the lavishness of holidays, or celebrations of birthdays and religious festivals. Poverty and deprivation went beyond this” and thus there “was a level of resources below which, rather than just a reduction in the scale of participation, there was a sudden withdrawal from the community’s style of living: people ‘drop out or are excluded’”.

A central element in the RED approach has been that poverty causes social exclusion and as a result increases in welfare benefits are essential to combating social exclusion (Levitas 2003). Levitas (2005) points out that Townsend (1979) argued for less focus on means-tested benefits and asserted that benefits should be paid as of right to individuals. Townsend (1979) also argued for the recognition of unpaid work and the provision of allowances for example for caring for children which should be paid as of right rather than being means-tested (Levitas 2005). Townshend further argued for a redistributive strategy,

not just through the tax and benefit systems and public services, but through the reduction of earnings differentials, a minimum wage, a minimum income for those unable to work, and financial recognition of unpaid work through at least a conditional participation income, if not an unconditional citizen’s income (Levitas 2005: 11).

Hence, the RED approach refers to a redistributive, egalitarian discourse that embraces notions of citizenship, social rights and social justice (Lister 2004: 77). Within the RED approach the major problem is poverty and social inequality (Aust and Arriba 2004: 21). Crucially poverty and social inequality are not seen as being caused by individual behaviour or disincentives caused by the welfare state but “by the operation of the capitalist market societies which exclude people from the labour market and/or from sufficient access to income and resources through the welfare state” (Aust and Arriba 2004: 21). RED therefore underlines the responsibility of the political system to address
failings that exist in society (Aust and Arriba 2004). It is also clear in this approach that it is not the welfare system that is to blame but external developments such as unemployment (Aust and Arriba 2004). RED also advocates the idea of basic social rights as elements of modern citizenship. Accordingly all people in need have a right to a minimum income because of their human or citizenship rights. The focus rests on the availability of sufficient resources for the recipients to allow them to live a life in dignity (Aust and Arriba 2004: 21).

As a result, within this approach increases in benefits are seen as the primary means of combating poverty and promoting social inclusion (Aust and Arriba 2004). Hence, RED has redistribution, equality and citizenship at its core. Below in table 3 the kind of actions we would expect to be taken if a RED approach was being pursued are outlined.

Table 3: RED in Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of a minimum income</th>
<th>Establishment of a minimum wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increases in welfare benefits</td>
<td>Universal child benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removing the low paid from the tax net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of a basic income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section focuses on the MUD approach which represents a fundamental different way of thinking about social exclusion than RED.

2.5.2 The Moral Underclass Discourse (MUD)

In contrast to RED, MUD is an approach that focuses on the individual behaviour of the poor rather than the structure of the whole society (Levitas 2005). Furthermore, it is a gendered discourse with many forerunners, whose demons are criminally-inclined, unemployable young men and sexually and socially irresponsible single mothers, for whom paid work is necessary as a means of social discipline, but whose (self-) exclusion, and thus potential inclusion, is moral and cultural (Levitas 2005: 7/8).

Furthermore, it suggests the 'underclass' or the socially excluded are in some way distinct from the rest of society (Levitas 2005). MUD emphasises moral and cultural
causes of poverty which is centrally concerned with the moral hazard of “dependency” (Levitas 2003: 2/3). For instance, this approach “posits a strong connection between poverty and social exclusion, but sees the causes of poverty as lying in cultural and moral (self) exclusion rather than the other way around” (Levitas 2003: 4). Thus, MUD places a particular emphasis on peoples’ own individual behaviour (Lister 2004). Furthermore, it uses the terms 'underclass' and the 'dependency culture' in order to depict those who are socially excluded as some way distinct from the rest of society (Lister 2004). MUD as a result is a discourse concerned with social order and moral integration (Levitas 2005: 14).

Levitas (2005: 15) points out that within the MUD approach economic dependence on 'welfare' was constructed as 'dependency', a pathological moral and psychological condition created by the benefit system itself – and fostered by the libertarianism of the 1960s – in which the state was seen as a universal provider, sapping personal initiative, independence and self-respect. Benefits were bad for, rather than good for, their recipients. If this was true of individuals, it was even more true of the poor collectively: welfare spending gave rise to a 'culture of dependency'.

Levitas (2005: 16) suggests that within this approach “the underclass was characterised by low educational attainment or functional illiteracy, that incomplete families were the norm rather than the exception, and that it was culturally distinct from the rest of society”. Furthermore, the 'underclass' “includes a lifestyle of laid-back sloppiness, association in changing groups and gangs, congregation around discos or the like, hostility to middle-class society, particular habits of dress, hairstyle, often drugs or at least alcohol”. The MUD approach in particular views the benefit system as the catalyst for this 'underclass' (Levitas 2005). Levitas (2005) argues its central view is “that groups of people excluded from society as a whole, and especially when dependent on benefit, would develop a distinctive set of morally undesirable attitudes and behaviours, characterised by various forms of parasitism, crime and immorality” (Levitas 2005: 20). Furthermore, in contrast to RED, MUD does not agree with recognising the role of unpaid work (Levitas 2005). The MUD approach ultimately views the benefit system as having created a problem of welfare dependency and as a result
the policy conclusion from this interpretation was to reduce the level and duration of the benefit (“negative activation”) and to make benefits conditional on the participation in welfare-to-work programmes (workfare) (Aust and Arriba 2004: 22).

Ultimately the aim is to make those receiving welfare benefits independent and responsible for themselves (Aust and Arriba 2004). Hence, MUD believes in encouraging self-responsibility as a means of tackling social exclusion. The following table 4 outlines what a MUD approach might look in action if this type of policy approach was pursued

Table 4: MUD in Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capping benefits</th>
<th>Reduction in the duration of benefit payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit payments only maintained if participation on compulsory workfare schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting off of welfare benefits</td>
<td>Reduction in the levels of benefit payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting of supplementary benefits such as housing benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section focuses on another discourse, one in which improving employability goes to the core of the discourse’s approach.

2.5.3 The Social Integrationist Discourse (SID)

SID differs again in its approach from both RED and MUD as it places a particular emphasis on employment and the rights and responsibilities of both the political system and citizens. The excluded are those who are viewed as “workless', or, in the case of young people at the risk of becoming so” (Levitas 2003: 2). A central view of the SID approach is that social inclusion is best achieved through employment and paid work. As a result, SID is an approach that focuses on unemployment and believes that social cohesion can be achieved through the promotion of paid work and economic activity (Levitas 2005). SID as a result equates the promotion of social inclusion with participation in paid work (Levitas 2005). The SID approach argues that unpaid work should not be rewarded through the benefit system. It is attachment to the labour market that is a central tenet of the SID approach (Levitas 2003). Levitas (2003) thus asserts that the main cause of social exclusion in the SID approach is unemployment. Lister (2004: 7) also argues that SID, “is preoccupied with social cohesion and, in relation to
policy, is focused primarily, and sometimes exclusively, on exclusion from paid work”. As a result this approach stresses the role of paid work in promoting social cohesion (Levitas 2005) and emphasises “exclusion as exclusion from paid work rather than a broader view of exclusion from social participation, and prescribe integration through paid work” (Levitas 2005: 23). Hence, central issues with SID are economic efficiency and social cohesion (Levitas 2005: 23). A concern with 'solidarity' is also a noticeable element of SID (Levitas 2005). A concern with 'solidarity' is not used to advocate for redistribution but rather it is “the business of each citizen to practice 'neighbourly solidarity’” (Levitas 2005: 25).

The SID approach places a particular emphasis on the welfare state and its role in promoting passive transfers (Aust and Arriba 2004). As a result of the welfare state “welfare recipients are said to be stuck within 'unemployment' or 'poverty traps' which reduced and even eliminated their efforts to actively look for a job” (Aust and Arriba 2004: 22). Aust and Arriba (2004: 22) argue that “the common leitmotif of this discourse is to activate the claimants into the labour market or to use the widespread slogan to transform the welfare state from a 'safety-net' to a 'trampoline’”. The redistribution of income and the increasing of benefits “is seen at least as ambivalent or sometimes even contradictory to the goal of social inclusion” (Aust and Arriba, 2004: 22). SID does contrast with MUD in that it recognises the role of the political system in combating social exclusion. The SID approach underlines social and individual preconditions to enter and succeed in the labour market. The lack of adequate skills and qualification and the insufficient supply of social infrastructure to reconcile family and paid work are often regarded as causes for social assistance dependency. This discourse therefore highlights the need for supportive public interventions to improve individual employability (“positive activation”) and social infrastructure (Aust and Arriba 2004: 22/23).

SID’s favoured policy approach rests on providing in-work benefits for those in low paid jobs so as to encourage them to work and avoid the 'poverty traps' associated with the welfare system (Aust and Arriba 2004: 23). While RED emphasised the rights of citizens SID “argues in favour of a new balance of rights and duties. Recipients of social (assistance) benefits are obliged to use offers given, otherwise they may be sanctioned through the reduction or withdrawal of the benefit” (Aust and Arriba 2004: 23). As a
result, SID emphasises the rights and responsibilities that individuals have. The table below (5) outlines how SID might look in action if it was adopted as a policy approach.

Table 5: SID in Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementing low paid workers through the benefit system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on training and upskilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work placement schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of benefits if rejected reasonable offer of employment or training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next discourse – the System Failure Discourse (SFD) – differs from the other discourses in that it places a particular emphasis on systems and their role in promoting social inclusion.

2.5.4 The System Failure Discourse (SFD)

SFD focuses on the role systems play in society and how the failure of any one of these systems results in social exclusion. Thus, SFD argues that the failure of the democratic and legal system; the failure of the labour market; the failure of the welfare system and the failure of family and community systems results in social exclusion (Berghman 1995). Each system has a fundamental role in combating social exclusion as each promotes integration. For example, the democratic and legal system promotes civic integration (Berghman 1995). The labour market promotes economic integration (Berghman 1995). The welfare system promotes social integration while the family and community system promotes interpersonal integration (Berghman 1995). The SFD recognises the importance of all four systems functioning in order to promote social inclusion. According to Commins (1993: 4),

One’s sense of belonging in society depends on all four systems. Civic integration means being an equal citizen in a democratic system. Economic integration means having a job, having a valued economic function, being able to pay your way. Social integration means being able to avail oneself of the social services provided by the state. Interpersonal integration means having family and friends, neighbours and social networks to provide care and companionship and moral support when these are needed. All four systems are therefore, important. In a way the four systems are complimentary: when one or two are weak the others need to be strong. And the worst off are those for whom all systems have failed…
The SFD as a result recognises that social exclusion refers “to the dynamic process of being shut out, fully or partially, from any of the social, economic, political or cultural systems which determine the social integration of a person in society” (Walker and Walker 1997: 8).

RED citizenship rights are also an element of the SFD. As a result in the SFD approach social exclusion can be “conceived in terms of the denial – or non-realisation – of citizenship rights” (Berghman 1995: 19). The democratic and legal system; the labour market; the welfare system and the family and community system are “major social institutions through which these rights should be materialised” (Berghman 1995: 20). The failure of these systems in society hence leads to social exclusion (Walker and Walker 1997). The SFD recognises that when “participation in decision making and political processes, access to employment and material resources, and integration into common cultural processes” are denied “they create acute forms of exclusion that find a spatial manifestation in particular neighbourhoods” (Maldanipour, Cars and Allen 1998: 2). Moran (2006: 192) terms this a broad understanding of social inclusion as

it refers to a vision or descriptor of an endemically inclusive society, where all members participate fully in the economic, political, cultural and social structures of that society, a state of affairs that depends on and reproduces a substantial degree of economic, cultural and political equality.

As a result, the SFD approach recognises that the functioning and inclusion of people in the main systems in society is key to promoting social inclusion. Table 6 below showcases what a SFD approach might look like in action.

Table 6: SFD in Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to free education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removal of structural barriers to employment for example through the provision of free childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to free healthcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, each of the discourses discussed present a different approach to combating social exclusion and emphasise different means of addressing the issue and in turn
allows for the assessment of beliefs and values regarding the subsystem of social inclusion in a political system.

2.6 Conclusions

The literature review presented in this chapter raises a number of important points. Firstly, it demonstrates that the study of Europeanization has evolved from one that focused on a 'top-down' approach that mainly concentrated on assessing the impact of the EU in areas under its legal remit to an 'interactive' understanding of Europeanization as the field aimed to assess change in areas outside of the EU’s legal competencies. In addition, the literature on Europeanization has increasingly referenced other concepts from public policy analysis, for instance policy transfer and the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF). Their value lies in their ability to pose interesting questions at different levels and in doing so allows for a full analysis of change. Yet, both policy transfer and the ACF have limitations. For example, policy transfer provides a framework for an in-depth analysis of change yet on its own it does not offer a full theoretical framework. The ACF provides a useful means of assessing the micro level and provides a focus on domestic actors within a policy subsystem. Yet, like policy transfer it does not provide a complete framework on its own. In addition, the body of literature on the discourses of RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse), MUD (Moral Underclass Discourse), SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) and SFD (System Failure Discourse) also offered an insight into the literature relevant for understanding the beliefs and values evident within the policy subsystem of social inclusion. Following this literature review of key concepts and bodies of literature the next chapter builds on this and presents the research framework used to guide and frame the research in this thesis.
Chapter 3: Research Design: Theoretical and Methodological Framework

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research framework that is used to guide and frame the research of this project. How to assess Europeanization through 'soft law' has been given relatively little attention in the literature (Kröger 2009: 8). Zeitlin (2009); Keune (2012) and Christiansen, Wiener and Jørgensen (2001) suggest that there is a difficulty in assessing the EU’s role in embedding change at a domestic level through 'soft law'. In order to decipher the potential of the EU to embed change in the areas of Irish politics, polity and policy in the policy subsystem of social inclusion this research proposes a research framework that is based on two strands – a theoretical framework and a methodological framework in order to analyse the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion. The theoretical framework is based on Europeanization as a single concept. This thesis moves beyond using the dominant approach used in Europeanization studies, that of the 'top-down' hierarchical approach, and uses a re-conceptualisation of Europeanization that recognises it as a process involving 'top-down', 'bottom-up' and horizontal processes. The methodological framework is based on a social constructivist approach with the following methods providing the means of gathering data: document analysis, in-depth interviews and Q methodology. The rest of this chapter is outlined as follows: firstly, the theoretical framework along with the research questions, parameters of the research and hypothesis guiding this research are presented followed by the methodological framework that documents the methods used to gather data for this research.

3.2 Theoretical Framework: Europeanization

While the literature has begun to highlight that other concepts such as policy transfer and the ACF can provide an insight into the role of the EU in promoting change domestically this research uses Europeanization as the sole theoretical framework as it is still the dominant means of assessing the role of the EU and change. However, its use in assessing Europeanization through 'soft law' remains underdeveloped. Research has tended to focus on viewing Europeanization as a 'top-down' hierarchical approach. This approach has become the dominant approach as most research has focused on areas
within the EU’s legal competence (Mulcahy 2009). Yet, this approach is insufficient in order to assess the Europeanization of subsystems outside the EU’s legal remit as within these subsystems change can not only result from 'top-down' processes but also 'bottom-up' and horizontal processes. In other words in order to assess Europeanization through 'soft law' it must be recognised that it is an interactive process rather than a one way causal relationship. As a result, Europeanization in this thesis is used to understand the role of the EU in embedding change in the areas of politics, policy and polity within the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland.

This thesis recognises Radaelli’s (2003: 30) definition of Europeanization as a process of

a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then enorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public choices (Radaelli 2003: 30).

This definition paved the way for the recognition that Europeanization can occur through 'soft law'. As a result, it can lead to a re-conceptualisation of

Europeanization as a process that involves not only hierarchical (top-down) processes, but also bottom-up processes, whereby domestic actors seek to upload norms to the European arena, and horizontal processes, whereby norms can be diffused across member states using the EU as a facilitator of norm and policy diffusion (Mulcahy 2009: 23).

Howell (2005: 380) argues that in order to assess Europeanization any analysis needs to recognise and focus on Europeanization that can involve downloading (‘top-down Europeanization), uploading (bottom-up Europeanization) and crossloading (horizontal Europeanization). This is the understanding of Europeanization upon which the research of this thesis is based. By recognising that Europeanization can also occur through more 'soft law' processes based on initiatives such as peer review, reporting, indicators and guidelines as well as the exchange of best practice it gives way to a more 'interactive' conceptualisation of Europeanization which is characterised by horizontal and vertical
diffusion processes between the EU and member states and between member states themselves (Mulcahy 2009: 241). In turn, it recognises that Europeanization through 'soft law' is a “variable, complex and uncertain process” that is based on a “variable and interrelated relationship” between EU and domestic policy (Geyer, mackintosh and Lehmann 2005). The aim of Europeanization through ‘soft law’ “is to influence values and participation patterns at the domestic level in a direction compatible with specific projects or ideas at the European level” (Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999: 4). In addition, it recognises that change is not only apparent when formal rules are changed but Europeanization manifests itself when beliefs and values are changed (Knill and Lehmkuhl 1999; Radaelli 2006; Howell 2005).

3.2.1 Discourses of Exclusion

The discourses of exclusion (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED), Moral Underclass Discourse (MUD), Social Integrationist Discourse (SID) and the System Failure Discourse (SFD)) represent an important part of the theoretical framework as they are used to give an insight into beliefs and values apparent in the policy subsystem of social inclusion as “there are divergent perceptions of what constitutes the problem, what are the perceived causes and which political strategies are implied to deal with the problem” (Aust and Arriba 2004: 20). Levitas (2005: 3) argues that

to talk about the language of politics as a discourse…means that sets of interrelated concepts act together as a matrix through which we understand the social world. As this matrix structures our understanding, so it in turn governs the paths of action which appear open to us.

Therefore, these discourses can be used to assess the types of political approaches pursued and what beliefs and values these political approaches are based on. The discourses are used to gauge the beliefs and values of interviewees (though use of the method Q methodology) during the in-depth interview process. The findings are presented in the final empirical chapter of this thesis, chapter eight, which seeks to further our understanding of the subsystem in Ireland by presenting interviewees views on the role of the EU in conjunction with their views on the subsystem in general and how to combat social exclusion.
3.2.2  Research Questions

In light of the gaps in current knowledge and literature about the EU’s ability to alter politics, policy and polity through 'soft law' as outlined in chapter one and two (Falkner 2008; Zeitlin 2005; Zeitlin 2009; Mulcahy 2009; Kröger 2009; López-Santana 2009) this research has a central aim of assessing the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland in order to further knowledge on the EU’s ability to embed change through 'soft law'. A central issue in assessing this change is specifying the expected outcomes that would infer change has occurred (Zeitlin 2009). By specifying the expected outcomes of change on all three areas of politics, policy and polity “we may identify deeper and more numerous influences” (Zeitlin 2009: 216). Trubek, Cottrell and Nance (2006: 80) argue that Zeitlin’s (2009) outline of the areas we can expect change in is a “valuable heuristic”. Keune (2012: 30) in a recent study also asserts that change “could be differentiated as to its discursive, substantive and procedural effects”. As a result, this research uses Zeitlin’s (2009) framework in order to guide the research questions of this thesis as it specifies the potential changes that researchers should look for in their research. It is important to specify these,

as the outcomes of the process of Europeanization are rarely defined with a sufficient degree of precision and our inability to specify this range…hinders our efforts to identify the empirical puzzles that are relevant to Europeanization. In other words we are uncertain about what the empirical observations that would make us suspect that Europeanization has occurred are (Moumoutizis 2011: 618).

Thus, the following research questions are chosen to guide the research of this thesis as they stipulate the different areas and types of change that would signify that the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland has occurred. As assessing the impact of the EU through 'soft law' is a central aspect of this research the overarching research question addressed by this research is:

**Overarching Research Question: To what extent has the EU embedded change in the areas of politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland?**
This was then subdivided into a number of sub-questions each relating to the areas of politics (Q.1 and Q.2), policy (Q.3) and polity (Q.4). These sub-questions focus on all three domains as Vink and Graziano (2008); Lenschow (2004) and Laffan and O’Mahony (2008) argue that Europeanization research should not restrict itself to just focusing on changes in policy but should also focus on other potential domains that the EU can have an impact on such as politics and polity in order to make a more significant contribution to empirical research. The first and second sub-questions relate to assessing whether the EU has altered politics.

Sub-question 1) Has the EU led to changes in relationships and interactions for domestic actors?

Sub-question 2) Has the EU led to an increase in efforts to tackle a recognised a domestic issue?

The third research sub-question relates to assessing whether Europeanization has led to any changes in policy.

Sub-question 3) Has the EU led to the stimulation of policy change in Ireland?

The final sub-question relates to assessing whether the EU has led to a change in polity.

Sub-question 4) Has the EU led to changes in domestic institutional arrangements?

These research questions form the basis of assessing the role of the EU in embedding change in Irish politics, policy and polity in the subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland in this thesis.

3.2.3 Parameters of Research

This thesis has chosen a specific timeframe for the research. The timeframe of assessing the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland is from 1987 to 2010. The time period before and after is mentioned for example in the context chapter to provide an understanding to events that have helped shape Irish social policy. 1987 is chosen as the starting point for the analysis of the impact of the EU as in Ireland it represents a period where policies on issues relating to social exclusion and poverty began to be shaped for example through social partnership agreements. The year 2010 is chosen as the end point as it marks the end of a period of social partnership agreements.
in Ireland and in addition allows for a full analysis of over ten years of national anti-poverty strategies and national action plans on social inclusion as well as the demise of the Irish economy in 2008 which has had important social ramifications. Likewise this time period is an important one at European level as the late 1980s marked a time when the EU began to engage with combatting poverty and social exclusion through poverty programmes and recommendations while 2010 brings us to the end of the Lisbon strategy and the beginning of Europe 2020. Key events and moments of change are accessed through the analysis of key policy documents as well as secondary literature. Interviewees during the interview process were also questioned on their perception of key events and change and where the incentive for this change came from. This research is limited to a single case study and analysis of a single policy subsystem. While this means the generalizability of the empirical findings are limited, a focus on a single case study and single policy subsystem adds more knowledge to the field of Europeanization through 'soft law' due to the in-depth analysis it allows. In addition, this research will focus on three areas of politics, policy and polity rather than just one dimension.

3.2.4 Hypothesis and Expected Findings

The overarching research question of this research project is:

To what extent has the EU embedded change in the areas of politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland?

Thus, this research is assessing the impact of the EU through 'soft law' in the policy subsystem of social inclusion (which lies outside the EU’s legal remit) in Ireland. Europeanization through 'soft law' primarily aims to trigger change at member state level by changing domestic beliefs and expectations which is “designed to change the domestic political climate by stimulating and strengthening the overall support for broader European reform objectives” (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002: 259). The emergence of such policies based on this Europeanization by framing domestic beliefs and expectations is most likely in policy subsystems where the EU lacks a legal remit (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002) i.e. the policy subsystem under investigation in this research. The question regarding Europeanization through 'soft law' is therefore whether the EU has led to the altering of expectations and beliefs of domestic actors in such a way that leads to domestic change in the areas of politics, policy and polity in the chosen policy subsystem (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002). However, the EU lacks strong adaptational
pressure with 'soft law'. Therefore, change is largely dependent on domestic actors. Knill and Lehmkuhl (1999: 4) argue that Europeanization through 'soft law' is “…designed to change the political climate at the domestic level in order to increase support for domestic reforms that may facilitate future steps towards integration”.

As a result much focus on Europeanization through 'soft law' literature has been on the need to further our knowledge of domestic features and the resulting anticipated effects. Therefore, more research on gaining an insight into the expected outcomes of Europeanization is needed. This is important as many have sought to assess the effects of ‘soft law’ through the same means of assessing Europeanization through 'hard law'. In turn, they have judged the outcome of Europeanization through 'soft law' on the changes it has brought about. However, with Europeanization through 'soft law' the EU can produce different effects that may be seen with Europeanization through 'hard law'. Not recognising this has led to an assessment of 'soft law' as weak in producing change. This thesis aims to assess how Europeanization through 'soft law' may be visible in other ways than those evident through 'hard law'. For example drawing on Knill and Lehmkuhl (1999) work this thesis hypothesises about the outcomes of Europeanization through 'soft law',

In cases of Europeanization through ‘soft law’ the EU will only lead to change by providing a legitimization for domestic content, implementation and reforms rather than leading to significant changes in domestic politics, policy and polity.

As a result, this thesis suggests that as the EU lacks strong adaptational pressure and legal powers the EU will instead be ‘used’ domestically.

3.3 Methodological Framework: An Introduction

In order to answer the research questions outlined previously this section presents the methods of data collection that enabled this research to assess the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity. A number of leading academics have argued for the use of qualitative research when analysing Europeanization through 'soft law'. Vink and Graziano (2008); Armstrong (2005) and Haverland (2008) point out that qualitative research and interviews in particular could be of great use to Europeanization research and there is still a need for detailed empirical case studies. Creswell (2007) argues that qualitative research should be used because a certain problem or issue, such as
Europeanization, needs to be explored and when we need an understanding of this particular issue. A central aspect of any research design is the philosophical assumptions underpinning the research (Creswell 2009). A worldview refers to “a basic set of beliefs that guide action” (Guba 1990: 17). Creswell (2009) outlines that there are four philosophical worldviews that underpin research: postpositivism, social constructionism, advocacy/participatory and pragmatism.

Table 7: Philosophical Worldviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postpositivism</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Determination</td>
<td>• Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reductionism</td>
<td>• Multiple participant meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical Observation and measurement</td>
<td>• Social and historical construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theory verification</td>
<td>• Theory generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy/ Participatory</th>
<th>Pragmatism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Political</td>
<td>• Consequences of actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empowerment Issue-oriented</td>
<td>• Problem-centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative</td>
<td>• Pluralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change-oriented</td>
<td>• Real-world practice oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research seeks to understand Europeanization through 'soft law' and places a particular emphasis on understanding individual’s interpretations of this change and their own subjectivity. As a result, this research is part of a social constructivist worldview. It is an approach that supports a “way of looking at research that honours an inductive style, a focus on individual meaning, and the importance of rendering the complexity of a situation” (Creswell 2009: 4). Haverland (2008: 61) points out constructivists are “typically convinced of the intrinsic advantages of intensive qualitative case studies”. Further to this for social constructivists “the process of qualitative research is largely inductive, with the inquirer generating meaning from the data collected in the field” (Creswell 2009: 9). While Q methodology is often referred to as a mixed methods approach due to the focus on subjectivity in Q methodology Stenner, Watts and Worrell (2008) and Watts and Stenner (2012) argue that Q methodology fits within a constructivist viewpoint and is essentially more of a
qualitative method. Thus, following on from the social constructivist worldview adopted in this research this project is based on gaining an in-depth analysis by focusing on a single case study (Ireland) and a single policy subsystem (social inclusion). The methods used in this research project are document analysis and in-depth interviews in conjunction with Q methodology.

3.3.1 Policy Subsystem Selection

Social inclusion is selected as the policy subsystem for this research as it represents a 'least likely' case for EU integration. Pochet (2005: 37) argues that developments in this policy subsystem, for example the Open Method of Coordination (OMC), were not expected. However, it is evident that member states have agreed this is an area of 'common concern' thus warranting some form of action at EU level (Scharpf 2002). By analysing this policy subsystem knowledge about EU integration based on voluntary cooperation can be furthered (Scharpf 2002). We can also analyse whether we can speak of the Europeanization of sensitive policy issues that lie at the heart of member state sovereignty (Mulcahy 2009). Schelkle (2003: 192) argues that it is “a rather unlikely candidate for policy integration” as it has been a controversial policy subsystem at EU level and due to the principal of subsidiarity in this area we would not expect policy issues relating to social inclusion to be addressed at EU level. However, action has been taken at a supranational level (Pochet 2005). It is as a result an interesting policy subsystem to study as

in recent years the European Union has had an increasing interest and competence in social policy, even though, under subsidiarity, social policies themselves – including policies to maintain and raise social inclusion – have been and still are the responsibility of member states (Atkinson, Marlier and Nolan 2004: 48).

Unlike in other cases where 'soft law' has been used as a precursor to 'hard law', legislation in this policy subsystem is explicitly ruled out at EU level (Scharpf 2002). Therefore, for the foreseeable future the EU will be limited to 'soft law' action in this area. Mulcahy (2009: 29) points out that 'soft law' and NMG “are predicted to play an ever-increasing role in EU policymaking due to the challenges of enlargement and the diversity it brings” and it is thus important to gain a better understanding of these initiatives in order to further our knowledge of non-hierarchical Europeanization in
subsystems where member states are 'least likely' to cede control. By analysing the policy subsystem of social inclusion we can analyse whether we can speak of the meaningful Europeanization of sensitive policy areas that lie at the heart of member state sovereignty (Mulcahy 2009).

3.3.2 Case Study Selection

Haverland (2008) states that while more quantitative studies are needed in Europeanization research case studies should retain an important place in order to establish Europeanization through 'soft law'. In-depth analysis allows for empirical depth which is needed to assess the more subtle processes of 'soft law' (Friedrich 2006). As Gerring (2007: 1) argues “sometimes, in-depth knowledge of an individual example is more helpful than fleeting knowledge about a larger number of examples. We gain better understanding of the whole by focusing on a key part”. Yin (2009) points out that a case study should be used as a research method when your research seeks to understand a phenomenon, especially research that requires an in-depth analysis. A key advantage of the case study research method is the in-depth analysis and thick description it provides (Gerring 2007). Gerring (2007: 19) argues that “for students of political science, the archetypal case is the dominant political unit of our time, the nation-state”.

Hence, Ireland is chosen as the single case of this research project. A single case study is chosen as “the study of more than one case dilutes the overall analysis; the more cases an individual studies, the less the depth in any single case” (Creswell 2007: 76). Ireland also represents an interesting case to assess Europeanization in the policy subsystem of social inclusion as Ireland had to an extent pioneered the approach that would be taken at EU level, particularly in relation to the Open Method of Coordination (O’Donnell and Moss 2005). For instance, Ireland already had a strategy and a reporting process in place as well as a consultation process with different actors and a similar policy approach as the EU by prioritising inclusion through employment (O’ Donnell and Moss 2005; Moran 2006). It is also a member state that has 'uploaded' national policy ideas and approaches to the EU level. As a result, Ireland proves to be an interesting case to look at when and why change does occur and what conditions support change. Additionally, McGowan and Murphy (2003) argue that much research focuses on member states such as France and Germany and neglects Ireland. Hence,
Ireland is an important aspect of future research as it combats the restriction of Europeanization research to the “usual suspects” such as Germany, France and the UK (Vink and Graziano 2008: 17).

3.3.3 Document Analysis

Falkner (2008) argues that to gauge Europeanization through 'soft law' an in-depth analysis rich in detail is required. Documents “form the essential outer framework for political research” and offers researchers the opportunity to develop in-depth accounts of significant events and moments of change (Burnham, Gilland, Grant and Layton-Henry 2004: 172). Documents analysed include National Action Plans and other national reports and communications, joint reports issued by the commission and council, other communications issued by EU institutions, research papers and reports, NGO reports and communications at domestic and EU level, speeches, policy submissions and secondary evidence from the academic literature. These were chosen as they represent a wide range of documents from a number of sources in order to provide a well-balanced analysis. The documents were used to identify the necessary important events and moments of change in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland and if, when and how the EU came into play in order to assess the level of ‘Europeanization’ apparent. They were also used as a means of cross-checking data gathered from interviewees during the interview process.

3.3.4 In-depth Interviews

In-depth semi-structured interviews were chosen as another means of gathering data as they too allowed for an in-depth analysis of beliefs and values as well as an understanding of the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity. Twenty three interviews were conducted in Ireland (see appendix 4 for interview schedule). They were conducted with individuals who had an in-depth knowledge of the policy subsystem in Ireland and represented people with different but well-informed opinions that have been involved in shaping the policy approach that Ireland adopts at different levels, in different sectors in relation to social inclusion. A key factor in deciding who to interview was that the interviewees would be knowledgeable and have demonstrated an interest and expertise in the policy subsystem. Thus, a key selection criteria for picking interviewees was that they would be able to offer knowledge on change in the policy subsystem in Ireland as well as being knowledgeable enough about the policy
subsystem to complete a Q sort which was also part of the interviewing process. This is important as “people who have well-informed opinions will find it easier to do the Q sort and are more likely to do the Q sort and are likely to produce a more robust sort” (Webler, Danielson and Tuler 2009: 9). Prior to contacting interviewees ethical approval was sought from the University of Limerick Research Ethics Governance Committee and was granted (Reference Number: FAHSS_REC566). All interviewees were asked to sign a consent form before participating in the interview (see appendix 6) and emailed an information sheet prior to the interview (see appendix 7). All interviewees were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity and are referred to as Respondent 1, 2 etc. (see consent form appendix 6).

The interviewees included civil servants, those working in advisory government bodies, politicians, those working at local government level, academics as well as those that work in community and voluntary groups and trade unions. Purposive sampling was used to gather the names of interviewees. Purposive sampling is used as a participant recruitment strategy within qualitative research (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey 2011). The purpose of this sampling strategy is that it allows researchers to select people who can provide in-depth knowledge and information that is needed for the research project (Hennink et al. 2011). As well it allows a degree of flexibility in selecting participants as the types of participants recruited can be refined through the data collection process (Hennink et al. 2011). Document analysis was used to draw up a preliminary list of interviewees which was further revised when a pilot interview was conducted with a person who has worked in the policy subsystem in Ireland for over 20 years and is knowledgeable about the different actors in the policy subsystem. A snowball sampling strategy was also employed during the interviews which meant asking interviewees to recommend people to interview. Two interviews were also conducted in Brussels in order to give an insight into the subsystem at EU level. One interview was conducted with a person working in an EU based NGO while the other was conducted with a person working in the European Commission (see appendix 4 for interview schedule). Both are heavily involved in the work of this policy subsystem at EU level and were suggested as interviewees during the snowball strategy employed during the interview process. These interviewees were also given consent forms (appendix 6) and information sheets (appendix 7). Due to the financial limitations of this study more
interviews could not be conducted at EU level nor could a full Q methodology study be undertaken due to the limited number of interviews undertaken.

A semi-structured interview was conducted with each interviewee (see appendix 4 for interview schedule). A list of interview questions were prepared previous to the interviews and were designed in order to answer the research questions of this research project (see appendix 5). These questions acted as an interview guide for each of the interviewees. The interviewees were also asked to complete a Q sort. Both the statements presented to the interviewees to complete the Q sort and the interview questions were kept general and did not reference the EU from the beginning. This was to encourage interviewees to think about the sources of change at domestic level without making it overly obvious that the research was focusing on assessing Europeanization. This allowed for a more accurate assessment of the role of the EU in facilitating change in Ireland from interviewees. As a result interview questions were broad and open in nature so as to encourage the interviewees to discuss what they thought were the greatest changes rather than inferring what the source of the changes were to them and allowed interviewees to bring up other topics and issues that they felt were important also. Each interview lasted on average between 1-2.5 hours. Each of the interviews were recorded and then transcribed. Detailed analysis was achieved by coding the transcripts and assigning codes to pieces of the texts and grouping them into categories that were relevant for the research. After the Q sort was completed or during the Q sort an in-depth interview with the interviewee was conducted. A survey was also given to each interviewee in order to gain an insight into the personal characteristics of those working in the policy subsystem (see appendix 8 for survey and appendix 9 for characteristics of interviewees).

3.3.5 Q Methodology

Q methodology is used in this thesis as part of the in-depth interview process. Q methodology was used to gain a greater insight into the beliefs and values of interviewees. This was deemed important as the policy subsystem of social inclusion has proved to be one where progress has been difficult to achieve. In particular, agreement on how best to combat poverty and social exclusion has proved allusive. Q methodology served as a useful tool during the interviewee process to get interviewees to discuss the subsystem and their views in conjunction with assessing their views on
the impact of the EU through the semi-structured interview process. The findings of the Q methodology are presented in chapter 8. This chapter serves to provide a summation of what these key policy actors feel about social exclusion, how it should be tackled and whose responsibility is it to address it. The Q methodology findings thus serve at the end of this thesis as a point of direction for the future by suggesting points of agreement and points of conflict with which to build on and in turn make progress in the area.

Q methodology has been recognised as a methodological approach that “provides a foundation for the systematic study of subjectivity, a person’s viewpoint, opinion, beliefs, attitude, and the like” (Van Exel and de Graaf 2005: 1). Its central focus is correlating people instead of tests (Stephenson 1935). Q methodology provides a particular insight into the “preferences, values, and interests of individuals or groups involved in making a decision” (Durning and Brown 2006: 538). Brown and Ungs (1970: 128) state that Q methodology lets interviewees display their preferences directly “rather than asking the respondent for information from which to make inferences”. It places the subjective beliefs of interviewees at the centre of analysis (Durning and Brown 2006: 538). As a result, Q methodology allows researchers to gain an insight into the policy preferences of key policy actors within the policy subsystem and “by correlating people, Q factor analysis gives information about similarities and differences in viewpoint on a particular subject” (Van Exel and de Graaf 2005: 1). Hence, “the strength of Q methodology is precisely that it allows individual responses to be collated and correlated, so as to extract 'idealised' forms of discourses latent within the data provided by the individuals involved in the study” (Addams 2000: 15). However, there are a number of limitations with using Q, for example it is based on a small sample which is the case in this study where only 23 q sorts were conducted. In addition, it focuses on current views at that particular moment the Q sort is being conducted rather than former positions as well as replicating views over time (Cross 2005). In addition, it does constrain the responses participants can give as the statements are pre-decided and they do have to be sorted by participants according to a particular distribution (Cross 2005). Also, the development of the concourse and picking of statements lies solely with the researcher and the findings are not generalizable (Cross 2005). Conducting a Q methodological approach involved a number of steps.
3.3.5.1 **Q-Set**

The first methodological step is the development of the statements called the Q-Set. This sample was taken from a collection of items called a concourse which were quotes selected from the academic literature which were then rephrased and refined into statements. They were rephrased and refined in order that statements would represent deep core, policy core as well as secondary beliefs. They were organised around the main themes of this policy subsystem. For example, causes of social exclusion, responsibility to combat social exclusion and issues surrounding work and welfare. Thirty two statements were developed and chosen from the concourse (see appendix 1). Items for the concourse and the subsequent statements for this research project were gathered from the literature on four discourses relevant for this study – RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse), MUD (Moral Underclass Discourse), SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) and System Failure Discourse (SFD) (see appendix 3 for quotes from the literature and the corresponding statement).

These discourses were chosen as each “is differentiated by its understanding of the origins of exclusion and the implicit response or orientation that it contains, signifying the necessary course of action required for its reduction or remedy” (Doherty 2003: 35). For example, the RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse) approach calls for the redistribution of wealth and power and the reduction of inequalities (Levitas 2005: 14). The MUD (Moral Underclass Discourse) approach emphasises individual moral and cultural behaviour as the cause of social exclusion (Levitas 2003). The SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) approach focuses on integration through paid work and the need for supportive public interventions to improve individual employability (Aust and Arriba 2004: 23; Levitas 2005: 25). The SFD (System Failure Discourse) approach emphasises the role that the failure of systems in society can play in excluding individuals (Berghman 1995). Therefore, presenting interviewees with statements based on these discourses can give an insight into similarities and differences in policy preferences of how to combat social exclusion and promote social inclusion and thus an insight into the beliefs and values evident in the policy subsystem in Ireland.
3.3.5.2 Q Sort

The purpose of the Q sort is to be able to access the subjective opinion and point of view of the interviewees on the policy subsystem of social inclusion. The interviewees were required to rank the statements along a continuum from most strongly agree to most strongly disagree as “the fact that the Q sorter is ranking the statements from his or her own point of view is what brings subjectivity into the picture” (Brown 1991: 2). The twenty three interviewees were asked to sort the thirty two statements (Q-set) initially into three piles of whether they 'agreed', 'disagreed' or 'neither agrees, nor disagrees (neutral)'. They were then asked to further sort these individual piles and decide where they felt each statement should be placed along the continuum of preference (Q sort) (Table 8). After the interviewee completed the Q sort the patterns of distribution were recorded. Two interviewees did not put the exact number of statements in each column as set out by the continuum of preference. However every statement was ranked in some column and as Webler, Danielson and Tuler (2009: 24) highlight “Q researchers have found that deviations from the normal distribution do not greatly affect the results, so if a sorter has a great deal of difficulty fitting the statements into the forced distribution, you may allow them to put more or fewer in some categories”.

Table 8: Continuum of Preference for the Q Sort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Disagree</th>
<th>Most Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewees ranked their statements according to a forced distribution with a certain number of statements in each category (see table 9). For example, interviewees were required to put three statements in the most strongly agree column, four statements in the strongly agree column and so on. The forced distribution makes interviewees consider the statements more systematically than they otherwise might (McKeown and Thomas 1988: 34) as well as allowing them to react negatively and positively to the
statements (Webler *et al.* 2009: 18). The main advantage of a forced distribution is it forces Q participants to contemplate the Q statements in a thoughtful way (Webler *et al.* 2009: 19) and by getting them to place statements in relation to each other this will reveal their subjective understanding. The forced distribution focused on putting fewer at the end in order to give strong well-informed opinions by making the interviewees distinguish the statements that they feel are the most important.

Table 9: Forced Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Strongly Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (4)</th>
<th>Disagree (5)</th>
<th>Neutral (8)</th>
<th>Agree (5)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>Most Strongly Agree (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.5.3 *Analysis*

The analysis of results and interpretation of the Q sorts was done once all interviews were completed. The Q sorts were entered for analysis into the software PQ method and were subject to principal component analysis. After this the factors were rotated according to Varimax criteria to reveal the typologies or groupings of people who
shared similar beliefs. In Q methodology the number of factors to proceed with is a subjective process, “there is no one objectively correct number of factors to use, and any number of factors will give you some insight into how people think about the issue” (Webler et al. 2009). The number of factors to proceed with for this research was guided by the criteria set out by Webler et al. (2009) (table 8), that is when deciding how many factors to proceed with using the following criteria to make that decision.

Table 10: Criteria for Deciding on the Final Set of Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Simplicity: All else being equal, fewer factors is better, as it makes the viewpoints at issue easier to understand. Of course, simplicity should not be taken so far that you lose important and interesting information about differences in people’s views.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity: The best solution is one in which each sorter loads highly on one, and only one factor. You should try to minimize the number of “confounders” (people who load on multiple factors) and “non-loaders” (people who did not load on any factor). If a few confounders persist, that indicates those people have truly hybrid views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distinctness: Lower correlations between factors are better, as highly correlated factors are saying similar things. Nevertheless, it is not necessarily bad to have high correlations, as long as the factor is otherwise satisfactory. It may be that two factors agree on many issues, but their points of disagreement are particularly important (e.g. if they disagree about a remedy that is being proposed as the next step at your site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. As you compare the results of using different numbers of factors, you will notice certain groups of people tend to cluster together. This is an indicator that those individuals really do think similarly. A good set of factors will preserve as many as possible of these stable clusters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Using this criteria as part of the decision process, I perceived that two factors or two distinct groupings of people emerged within the policy subsystem in Ireland. Firstly, using two factors produced clearer results. As suggested by the criteria presented in table 10 is it better to have factors that do not have a high level of agreement. Proceeding with two factors provided two clear viewpoints that did not share a high
level of agreement. Also, when three factors were rotated six interviewees did not load on any factor. As outlined by the criteria above this should be avoided. Proceeding with two factors ensured that all interviewees loaded on one factor. As a result, I perceived that for this research two factors with distinct views were evident in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland.

### 3.4 Summary

As outlined in chapter one this research aims to assess Europeanization through 'soft law' by focusing on the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland in order to further empirical knowledge on Europeanization through 'soft law'. It uses a research framework that is based on a theoretical framework as well as a methodological framework. The theoretical framework uses Europeanization as a single theoretical concept as it remains the dominant concept in assessing the interaction between national and EU level and any change that has occurred due to this interaction. The methodological framework is based on an in-depth analysis of a single case study and a single policy subsystem. The methods used to gather data in order to conduct this in-depth analysis are document analysis, in-depth semi-structured interviews and Q methodology. The following chapter, chapter 4, presents details pertaining to social policy and the particular subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland and at EU level. It serves to provide an insight into these areas in order to then fully understand the interaction between Ireland and the EU in relation to the subsystem of social inclusion. Subsequently, the research framework presented in this chapter is used in order to assess the extent and nature of the Europeanization of politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland.
Chapter 4: Introducing Social Policy and the Policy Subsystem of Social Inclusion: Ireland and the European Union

4.1 Introduction

This chapter serves to provide a context for understanding the topic in question in this thesis. It provides an introduction to the wider area of social policy and the subsystem relating to the issues of poverty, social exclusion and social inclusion. It subsequently provides a background to this thesis by reviewing the development and evolution of these areas at Irish and EU level. As outlined previously this research aims to assess the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity in relation to the policy subsystem of social inclusion. In order to establish this it is first necessary to delve deeper into the context surrounding this change and set the scene in the Irish and EU political systems from which then to assess Europeanization. Firstly, the chapter provides an insight into the Irish political system from its historical ties with Britain to the early days of independence and the conservative nature that prevailed with the election of Cumann na nGaedhael. The subsequent election of Fianna Fáil and the beginning of social reforms in the 1930s and 1940s is discussed as is the role the Catholic Church played in social policy developments. The 1960s/1970s era is referenced regarding its importance for social reform in Ireland, in particular in relation to poverty, and the increasing role played by international organisations in Irish social policy. Following this the return of economic recession and a more conservative approach during the 1980s is referenced as is the establishment of the 1986 Commission on Social Welfare and the creation of the social partnership process. The return to economic prosperity, including the 'Celtic Tiger' era, during the late 1990s/early 2000s is also discussed. Significant social policy developments of this time are also examined, for example the introduction of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy in 1997 and its revision in 2002 as well as the inclusion of the community and voluntary pillar in social partnership. Finally, this part of the chapter discusses the most recent economic crisis in Ireland and its implications for social policy.

Secondly, this chapter provides a context to understanding the developments of the subsystem of social inclusion within the broader area of social policy at European level. It firstly focuses on those early decisions and the impact these have had on the EU’s social role, for example during the time of negotiations for the Treaty of Rome. It then
proceeds to discuss the development of the EU’s competencies in the area of social policy during the 1970s/1980s and 1990s and their importance for the policy subsystem of social inclusion. Subsequently, the EU’s engagement specifically with the subsystem of social inclusion is outlined, for instance the establishment of the Social Action Programme and the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. Following this the EU’s introduction of the language social exclusion is referenced as is the EU’s increasing association between promoting social integration through labour market attachment and labour market measures. Next, the Lisbon Period and the creation of the OMCinclusion is outlined as well as the EU’s furthering commitment to active inclusion and labour market attachment as a means of promoting social inclusion. Finally, this chapter discusses the most recent economic crisis at EU level and its impact on social policy.

4.2 The Development of Social Policy in Ireland: Historical Ties

The development of social policy in Ireland, including the development of the policy subsystem of social inclusion, has been characterised by a number of defining features. Irish social policy and its development has been inextricably linked with Britain and the resulting historical legacies (Commission on Social Welfare 1986). Firstly, Ireland’s historical links with Britain have had a major shaping force on Irish social policy. With the Act of Union in 1801 Ireland became bound with Britain with one of the consequences of this union the Poor Relief (Ireland) Act of 1838 which had a lasting legacy on the country right until the 1970s (Commission on Social Welfare 1986). The premise of this Poor Relief Act was to keep any relief offered at a lower standard to that in which a person could achieve through work and in turn hoped to ensure that people would work rather than seek relief (Commission on Social Welfare 1838). This focus on ‘making work pay’ and alignment with a SID approach would come to be a prevalent theme in Ireland through the decades. Ireland’s historical links left a further lasting impression on Irish social policy, as the Poor Relief Act of 1838 was followed by three key acts - the Children Act of 1908 which focused on child care policy, the Old Age Pension Act 1908 which allowed for the introduction of non-contributory pensions and the National Insurance Act 1911 which allowed for the provision of insured benefits. Each of these provided a basis for Irish social policy at the beginning of the 20th century, just before Ireland gained independence. In the early 20th century a number of events occurred that would lead ultimately to Irish independence. As Burke (1999: 25) states
suffice it to say that the Easter Rising of 1916 plus the Unionist rebellion against Home Rule put in process a sequence of events that led to the setting up of Dáil Éireann in Dublin in January 1919, the Government of Ireland Act and partition in 1920, the war of independence in the south and the Treaty of 1921.

As a result of these events the states of Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland emerged. Northern Ireland consisted of six north-eastern counties that remained within the UK. The other twenty-six counties were established as the Free State in 1922 and ultimately became the Republic of Ireland in 1949 (Burke 1999). The Treaty of 1921 led to civil war in Ireland which led to two political parties being established that would remain the dominant parties in the Irish political system – Fianna Fáil and Cumann na nGaedhael (later changed to Fine Gael) (Burke 1999). As a result of Irish independence Irish political parties took control of changes to Irish policy including social policies. However,

The early decades of independence has the hallmarks of a state finding its feet, trying to carve out an identity and attempting to impose order, with few resources available, on social policy. At the same time there was little inclination to progress social policy; not only were the economic conditions limiting, so too was the social and cultural environment in which the new state operated, which was dominated by the Catholic Church and a rural vision for society (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 24).

The Commission on Social Welfare in 1986 argues that “even after independence, developments in Ireland have taken cognisance of developments in Britain” (Commission on Social Welfare 1986: 25). This can be seen in that Cumann na nGaedheal’s approach to policymaking and welfare was similar to Britain, in particular in relation to thinking that was behind the introduction of the Poor Law Act in 1838 (Considine and Dukelow 2009). Cumann na nGaedhael were in power from 1921 – 1932 and retained inherited approaches from colonial rule. Their approach in those first years of independence was to retain a highly centralised approach to policymaking, in particular, it placed the Department of Finance at the centre of this approach (Considine and Dukelow 2009). Crucially “another theme inherited from the previous century was a suspicion of welfare and its effect on character, with government ministers fearful that any expansion of state welfare would make people overly dependent” (Considine and
Dukelow 2009: 25). As a result, the early days of Irish independence laid the foundation for Irish social policy, one that was concerned with ‘making work pay’ and ensuring welfare dependency would not become an issue. These became the hallmarks of Irish welfare policy. Yet, in the coming decades signs of social reform were evident but any reform was heavily dictated by the economic conditions of the time and the dominance of a Catholic Church.

4.2.1 The 1930s and 1940s: The Beginnings of Social Improvements

The 1930s and 1940s mark one of the first period where attempts at social reform were evident. In the 1930s Fianna Fáil came to power and with it some social improvements were made. This decade was a period marked by severe economic depression internationally. This led to a significant rise in unemployment in Ireland (Considine and Dukelow 2009).

However,

while the state of the economy meant that little wealth was generated, Fianna Fáil partly carved out its identity by distinguishing itself from the harsher approach Cumann na nGaedhael took to social policy (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 31).

Fianna Fáil in 1933 introduced the Unemployment Assistance Act (Burke 1999). This act provided for a means-tested weekly allowance for people seeking work who were not within the insurance net or who had exceeded their benefit (Burke 1999). In 1939 the Public Assistance Act was introduced. With this act “outdoor relief was renamed Home Assistance. This was a discretionary means-tested allowance and any adult could apply for it, regardless of age, nationality or place of residence. Need was the only test applied” (Burke 1999: 27). In addition medical assistance was means-tested and discretionary (Burke 1999). While Ireland had secured independence from the UK it continued to be heavily influenced by events in the UK. For instance, in the 1940s with the publication of the Beveridge report following the Second World War. The Beveridge report Social Insurance and Allied Services by William Beveridge outlined a plan that

was, in effect, to build a more equitable society after the War. It set out to rid the country of want – what we would call poverty today. To do that, it proposed a
universal, comprehensive system of social insurance to cover all the hazards of life from cradle to grave (Burke 1999: 27).

As a result, its premise was that people would be cared for throughout their lives through universal provision rather than means testing and was aligned with a RED approach. Its impact was felt worldwide but particularly in Ireland (Burke 1999).

One of the most significant developments during this time in Ireland was the introduction of Children’s Allowances in 1944 (Considine and Dukelow 2009). This allowance was not means-tested but instead echoed the ideas espoused by William Beveridge and was instead offered as a universal payment and was aligned with a RED approach (Considine and Dukelow 2009). Crucially, the introduction of children’s allowances was approved by the Catholic Church (Considine and Dukelow 2009). Even in current times the Beveridge report and aspiration towards the values it outlined are still referenced in Ireland. In 2012 a conference, hosted by Social Justice Ireland, was held on the 70th anniversary of the Beveridge report “which pondered how the future might be mapped out in a manner that would live up to the spirit of Beveridge” (Clifford 2012). Joan Burton, Minister for Social protection and leader of the Labour Party spoke about how the ideals of Beveridge should inform our social policy reform today,

William Beveridge is the founding father of the modern welfare state. His big idea was the creation of a system of benefits to provide social security so that people would be protected from the cradle to the grave….In reforming the welfare state we have to ensure we are the faithful to Beveridge’s founding principles (Burton 2012).

While Beveridge certainly left its imprint on those working in the area of social policy the following decade an event centering on the provision of a Mother and Welfare Child Scheme and the dominance of the Catholic Church was also to have a lasting effect on social policy in Ireland. The Catholic Church was a dominant influence on Irish public policy until the late 20th century when the Church’s influence began to wane. The approval by the Catholic Church of social reforms was not always apparent when further reforms were sought in the subsequent decades, namely the Mother and Child Scheme.
4.2.2 Social Policy Developments and the Catholic Church

The 1950s in Ireland was characterised by a “period of economic stagnation, high unemployment and mass emigration” (Conroy 1999: 34). The focus is this period was an agricultural, domestic based economy (Ó’ Riain 2014). However, socially this period marked

a gradual change away from the economic and social conditions that inhibited social policy developments in the earlier decades of independence. Gradual reform led to the expansion of the main social services together with some recognition of the needs of people and groups who had been neglected by the main actors and interests that had shaped social policy until the 1950s (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 24).

It was the Mother and Child Scheme which planned for a comprehensive health service for mothers and children that dominated the social policy agenda in the early 1950s. In 1951, Minister of Health, Noel Browne proposed a scheme which would introduce a health service for mothers and children that was to be universal. However, this scheme did not reach fruition and was ultimately defeated (Conroy 1999). Both the medical profession and the Catholic Church opposed this reform of Ireland’s health service. The defeat of this proposal had important ramifications for Irish social policy,

The defeat of this attempt to introduce a form of universal national health service for pregnant and nursing mothers and children up to sixteen years was to carry echoes across the subsequent decades. This manifested itself in timidity in relation to introducing radical social changes, however well researched or required, and the absence of a social policy in the first attempts at economic planning (Conroy 1999: 34).

The defeat of the Mother and Child Scheme highlighted the powerful role the medical profession had in shaping policy in relation to health but in particular it demonstrated the influence of the Catholic Church on policy in Ireland (Considine and Dukelow 2009). John A. Costello who was Taoiseach at the time summed up the situation of the time politically, “whatever about fighting the doctors I am not going to fight the bishops, and whatever about fighting the bishops I am not going to fight the bishops and the doctors”. Burke (1999: 30) argues that the defeat of the 1951 scheme in particular
showcased “the power of the Roman Catholic Church as an ideological force and as a key player in shaping Irish social policy”. The Catholic Church in Ireland was a pervasive and dominating force in Irish social policy throughout the 20th century with its role in the defeat of the 1951 Mother and Child Scheme being but one example. Indeed, The Catholic Church saw itself as equal to the state and having a higher authority than any other group in society when it came to commenting on or criticising state activity (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 27).

This dominance of the Catholic Church remained in Ireland until near the end of the 20th century.

4.2.3 Social Reform

While the Mother and Child scheme was defeated the view that current systems and approaches were in need of reform and update gained traction by the 1960s (Ó’Cinnéide 2010). In addition, Ireland also made the transition to a more trade focused economy with a view to increasing foreign direct investment that in turn brought economic growth (Ó’ Riain 2014). As a result, in the 1960s some social improvements were apparent in Ireland such as a Housing Act enacted in 1966 which permitted public investment in housing grants as well as sanctioning the letting of public housing (Conroy 1999). In addition the Minister for Education, Donough O’Malley introduced a free second-level education system as a well as a school transport system for secondary school students (Conroy 1999; Ó’Cinnéide 2010). These were significant social changes that were evident of a SFD approach closely aligned to RED. This period also marked one where Irish social policy was increasingly influenced by international organisations. The role of international organisations in Irish social policy was increasingly evident from the 1950s and 1960s on, for instance the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the Council of Europe. In the 1950s and 1960s Ireland ratified parts of the ILO’s Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention (no. 102) in relation to sickness, unemployment and survivor’s benefit and Convention (no. 118) Concerning Equality of Treatment of Nationals and Non-Nationals in Social Security in relation to medical care, sickness, unemployment, family allowances and employment injury and ratified in full the 1964 ILO Convention (no 121) Concerning Employment and Injury Benefits
Further to this, Ireland ratified the European Social Charter adopted by the Council of Europe in 1961 and subsequently adopted (1964) and ratified (1971) the Council of Europe’s Code of Security. However, there was still no real mention of issues such as poverty as a policy issue (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010). The following decade, the 1970s, would mark a notable shift in Irish social policy concerns, including concerns about poverty.

The year 1973 signified a notable change for the context in which Irish public policymaking would take place as Ireland joined the European Economic Community (EEC) (now the EU). The 1970s while being significant in that Ireland joined the EEC was also an important decade in the development of Irish social policy as “by the early 1970s a growing critique emerged about the continuing failure of government in a number of areas, but primarily in relation to poverty and inequality” (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 50). Conroy (1999: 39) argues that in Ireland the 1970s “was a decade of social movements influencing or trying to impact on social policy”. For instance, the Women’s Trade Movement became more prevalent in Irish society which led to the establishment of the Commission on the Status of Women in 1970 with the focus primarily on equal pay and equal work conditions (Considine and Dukelow 2009). The trade unions in Ireland also began to prioritise social change, for example the discussion document of 1972 by the Irish Congress of Trade Unions highlighted the need for increases in social welfare benefits including children’s allowance and increased spending on providing housing and a health service (Conroy 1999). Furthermore, the beginning of the 1970s marked a period in Ireland when concerns about poverty reached national prominence.

One such example being the Kilkenny Conference of Social Welfare in 1971 organised by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland. At this conference Ó’ Cinnéide read a paper “The Extent of Poverty in Ireland” which established that 24% of population were poor (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 22). This estimation became widely accepted and underpinned the need for “something to be done” about poverty in Ireland (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 22). Subsequently the issue of poverty became a subject of political and public debate in Ireland (Commission on Social Welfare 1986). The early 1970s also marked a period of institutional change as the National Economic and Social Council (NESC) was

---

4 Ireland was a founding member of the Council of Europe.
established due to the emerging structure of social partnership and the information it could provide to decision makers due to the diversity of members and their wide range of interests (Considine and Dukelow 2009). In particular NESC focused on social issues such as public services and redistribution, however the work produced by NESC did not have to be adopted by decision makers (Considine and Dukelow 2009). In 1973 a general election was held in Ireland with Fine Gael and Labour elected. Their manifesto outlined a commitment to tackle poverty and subsequently established the National Committee on Pilot Schemes to Combat Poverty (NCPSCP) (O’Connor and Visser 2010; Ó’Cinnéide 2010). The NCPSCP had the responsibility of recommending schemes to tackle poverty (O’Connor and Visser; Ó’ Cinnéide 2010). By the early 1970s recognition of the poverty and the need for something to be done about this issue came to the fore. However, times of more severe economic conditions were about to return to Ireland.

4.2.4 Economic ‘frailties’ and Social Partnership

By the late 1970s “economic frailties” began to emerge in the Irish economy (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 57). For instance, the 'oil crises' had led to a recession internationally as well as government borrowing now becoming an issue in Ireland (Considine and Dukelow 2009). Fianna Fáil were elected in 1977 and adopted a more conservative approach than was evident in the previous decade (O'Connor and Visser 2010). For instance, the NCPSCP that had been established in the early 1970s to deal with issues such as poverty was dissolved in 1980 (O'Connor and Visser 2010). By the 1980s Ireland’s policy environment was to operate within a different context than the decades before as Ireland “shared in the international debt crisis of the early 1980s (Ó’ Riain 2014: 32). Moran (2009: 4) argues that,

The 1980s were characterised as a period of stagnation both economically and socially, where the Catholic Church wielded its power in a number of publicly fought political campaigns on moral issues such as abortion, contraception and divorce.

The 1980s in Ireland was characterised by high unemployment, cutbacks in social services, high interest and inflation rates (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 57; Ó’ Rian 2014). The 1980s was also a decade where political instability was prevalent, in particular when during 1981/1982 three different governments were elected to power in
Ireland\(^5\) (Considine and Dukelow 2009). In particular high levels of unemployment and its links to poverty became a significant issue,

The connection between unemployment and poverty was clearly exposed, and the shortcomings in social service and welfare provisions became more apparent in the Ireland of the 1980s. The inadequacy of the social infrastructure in place meant that by now it was clear that many social groups continued to live on the margins, due to poverty and a lack of opportunities and the fact that services on which many were reliant belonged to another era (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 58).

As a result of these issues the programme for Government of 1982 outlined a commitment to establish a Commission on Social Welfare (Commission on Social Welfare 1986). A Commission on Social Welfare was established in 1983 and produced a report in 1986, *Report of the Commission on Social Welfare*, based on social welfare reform (Conroy 1999; O’Connor and Visser 2010). In particular the report highlighted the need for adequate social welfare payments and social services (Commission on Social Welfare 1986). While the CSW espoused RED and SFD values it was not officially policy. In addition, the Combat Poverty Agency\(^6\) was established by the Labour Minister for Social Welfare Frank Cluskey. The CPA was to serve as an agency that would inform and influence government policy and increase awareness as well as understanding about poverty in Ireland. The Agency in its magazine article in 1987 outlined the dire situation of the time, “with 1.32 million people receiving welfare payments and 1 in 5 households totally dependent on welfare” (Editorial, Poverty Today 1987: 1). In addition, NESC published a strategy document, *A Strategy for Development 1986-1990* which argued for the importance of public services such as social welfare, housing, health and education (O’Connor and Visser 2010; Connolly 2008). Furthermore, the first poverty survey was conducted in Ireland by the Economic Social Research Institute (ESRI) which again heightened the debate on the extent of poverty (ÓCinnéide 2010).

\(^{5}\) In the June 1981 election a Fine Gael and Labour coalition government was elected. In February 1982 another general election was held which led to a Fianna Fáil minority government with a number of independents. In November 1982 a third general election was held which saw a Fine Gael and Labour coalition government returned to power.

\(^{6}\) The CPA is a statutory agency that was established under the Combat Poverty Agency Act in 1986 which set out four general functions for the agency: policy advice, project support and innovation, research and public education (www.combatpoverty.ie/aboutus/index.htm)
In the 1980s in Ireland unemployment was a major problem facing the government at the time as well as a rising concern about the marginalisation and multiple disadvantage experienced by certain communities in Ireland at the time (Frazer 1994). Michael McDowell (TD of the Progressive Democrats at the time) outlines the mood at the time, “The reality of an increasingly divided society has focused attention on two political concepts – poverty and inequality. For many poverty and inequality are much more than concepts – they are grinding, dehumanising and hopeless realities” (McDowell 1988: 4).

The combat poverty agency argued at the time that

A new consensus appears to be merging in Irish society that a much higher priority should be given to tackling the problem now. Over the past few months in addition to the various voluntary and community groups who have been speaking out about poverty for the last few years we have heard statements from key ‘opinion farmers’ such as several bishops, the Irish congress of Trade Unions, the National Conference of Priests in Ireland, and the society of St. Vincent de Paul (Editorial 1988: 2).

However, the 1980s was also a time of economic crisis and hence there was a focus was on cutting public expenditure (Considine and Dukelow 2009; Moran 2009). In the 1980s it became apparent that there was an emerging view amongst political parties that the range of policy approaches that had been previously applied by Irish governments were proving to be ineffective (Connolly 2008).

Due to this, welfare supports that were to encourage re-entry into the labour market for example the Back To Work Allowance and the Family Income Supplement became more popular (O’Donnell and Moss 2005). Active labour market policies (ALMPs) had become a feature of Irish public policy during the 1970s but came to prominence in the 1980s due to high levels of unemployment. This represented “a trend towards an activist approach to unemployment and employment” (O’Donnell and Moss 2005: 317) as well as a commitment to the SID approach. In addition, social partnership was viewed as a central element in preventing economic calamity in Ireland (Moran 2009). In 1987 the social partners (the government, ICTU, FUE, CII, CIF, IFA, Macra na Feirme and ICOS) agreed the first social partnership agreement, the Programme for National Recovery (PNR) (Considine and Dukelow 2009). All the various groups that took part in social partnership “held a common interest in stopping the vicious circle of economic
stagnation, rising taxes and exploding debt” (Adshead 2011: 80). This first agreement paved the way for an era of social partnership agreements in the 1990s and 2000s that would outline Irish economic and social policy based on a neo-liberal economic model (Conroy 1999; Moran 2009). By the end of the 1980s Ireland was in the grip of deep recession, there was increasing attention being placed on issues such as poverty but this was in many respects due to the high unemployment experienced at the time. This focus on the link between poverty and unemployment and the prioritisation of a SID approach has remained a central tenet of Irish social policy through the decades. The 1990s however brought a change in economic conditions.

4.2.5 Economic Prosperity and Social Policy Development

The 1990s and 2000s were characterised by a change of economic fortunes, a range of institutional changes in Irish policymaking along with the demise of the Catholic Church. In 1993 a Fianna Fáil/ Labour coalition government established the National Economic and Social Forum (NESF) and included traditional social partners such as the trade unions, farmers organisations as well as business and employer groups and members of the Oireachtas and those representing the community and voluntary pillar (O’Donnell and Thomas 2006). The role of NESC was to “analyse and report” to the Taoiseach on issues relating to the development of the economy and furthering social justice (Connolly 2008: 21). In addition, the PESP established 12 companies on a pilot basis to implement an area-based response to long-term unemployment (Lee 1995: 151). Area-based partnerships were created in order to address at local level the issue of high unemployment and disadvantage that became prominent during the 1980s but overtime their remit also included tackling early school leaving, building organisational capacity in disadvantaged communities and to improve the physical environment of such areas including the development of local amenities (Turok 2001: 5). As a result, while area-based partnership started out with a focus on SID they came to address SFD issues as well. During the 1990s three more social partnership agreements were agreed – Programme for Economic and Social Progress (PESP) (1991); Programme for Competitiveness and Work (PCW) (1994) and Partnership 2000 (1996).
Partnership 2000, overseen by the Rainbow Coalition Government (Fine Gael/Labour/Democratic Left) (elected in 1992), in many ways marked a watershed and was “considered by many to be the most ambitious yet and reflected a shift in emphasis” (Adshead and McInerney 2009). It was the first social partnership agreement that outlined a definition of social exclusion,

Cumulative marginalisation: from production (unemployment), from consumption (income poverty), from social networks (community, family and neighbours), from decision making and from an adequate quality of life (Government of Ireland 1996: 12).

The partnership agreement placed a strong emphasis on combatting unemployment, in particular long-term unemployment and committed to increases in social welfare in line with recommendations from the Commission on Social welfare in 1986 (Government of Ireland 1996). As a result, it had a commitment to both a SID and RED approach. It also committed to pay increases, tax reductions and creating an Equality Authority as well as commissions on wage differentials and the family and a review body for special education (Adshead and McInerney 2009: 6). In addition social partnership expanded to include community and voluntary groups and outlined the need for partnership in the workplace (Murphy 2008; Adshead and McInerney 2009). Hence, the social partnership process by the late 1990s had “provided a focus for groups campaigning on issues relating to poverty and inequality” (Connolly 2008: 3). The widening of participation to those from the community and voluntary sector meant that the 1990s became the decade “of the non-governmental organization, as a new agent of service provision, of change and representativeness” (Conroy 1999: 46). Those from the community and voluntary sector pointed out that “participation in the national agreement negotiations is not an end in itself but the test will be whether participation by the platform can lead to the development and delivery of effective policies producing more balanced and equitable development” (Farrell 1996/1997: 10). As a result, Partnership 2000 had placed a greater emphasis on issues such as inequality, long-term unemployment and inequality than other agreements to date (Adshead and McInerney 2009: 5).
Furthermore, the power and influence of the Catholic Church began to demise during the 1990s due to the prevalence of more secular values, influence of outside sources through the media and the role the church played in child sex abuse scandals (Dukelow 2011; Considine and Dukelow 2009). Economically the 1990s saw a change in Ireland’s economic fortunes. The economy grew in terms of both output and exports, tax revenues were buoyant and inflation was low and stable (Conroy 1999: 47). For instance unemployment fell from 12.3 per cent in 1995 to 4.3 per cent in 2000 and Ireland’s economy grew on average of about 7.5 per cent, even exceeding 10 per cent in the later years of the decade (Considine and Dukelow 2009; Kirby 2010). Ireland also saw the advent of a turn from decades of mass emigration to one of immigration (Considine and Dukelow 2009; Kirby 2010. The change in economic circumstances eventually spawned what became known as the ‘Celtic Tiger’. The ‘Celtic Tiger’ was termed so by Kevin Morgan of the Investment Bank Morgan Stanley in 1994 due to the comparison between the Irish economy and the East Asian tiger economies (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 72).

This change in economic circumstances was due to a range of factors including more favourable economic conditions internationally, industrial relations in Ireland had become more stable due to the presence of social partnership and a young and well-educated English speaking workforce was now available in order to attract foreign investment (Considine and Dukelow 2009; Allen 2000). The EU is also credited with contributing to this economic prosperity due to the single market, the European monetary union and the structural and cohesion funds (Considine and Dukelow 2009). As a result the ‘Celtic Tiger’ marked a notable point in Ireland’s economic fortunes with its most notable impact being the ‘employment miracle’ it created which meant that within fifteen years the Irish labour force almost doubled (Ó’Riain 2014: 33). While economic conditions were favourable in Ireland concerns were still being raised about poverty and inequality. For example, in Poverty Today Hugh Frazer, the then Director of the Combat Poverty Agency argued that “the findings of the latest survey on poverty in Ireland, the 1994 Living in Ireland Survey documents the continuing high levels of poverty in Ireland and the deep-seated inequality that underlies this reality” (Frazer 1996/1997: 3) The 1990s would see the one of the most significant initiatives created in order to tackle the issue of poverty and social exclusion.
4.2.6 Social Reform and the Introduction of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy

As a result, of Ireland’s economic success an opportunity for social reform became apparent. Developments in the 1990s such as social welfare reforms that aimed to meet the targets set by the Commission on Social Welfare in 1986 were introduced to counteract cuts that were made in the 1980s and demonstrated a commitment to the RED approach (Considine and Dukelow 2009). A significant initiative was the 1997 National Anti-Poverty Strategy, *Sharing in Progress*. The 1997 NAPS “came on the back of increased rights based community activism which highlighted the structural dimensions of poverty and the state’s failure to respond to social disadvantage in a structured, systematic fashion” (Martin 2009: 2). In particular the Combat Poverty Agency played a role in planting the seed for such a strategy and acted as a resource in Ireland from which research and ideas could be fed from (Respondent 1; Respondent 9).

In turn, prosperous economic conditions in Ireland as well as increasing concerns about poverty and social exclusion particularly amongst community groups coincided with a change in government that would ultimately play a critical role in the establishment of an Irish national anti-poverty strategy. From 1992 to 1997 a Rainbow Coalition of Fine Gael, Labour and the Democratic Left came to power in Ireland which marked a period of reform within the policy subsystem (Murphy 2008). In particular due to the Labour Party being in government and the appointment of Minster de Rossa as minister for social affairs “the pace and volume of policy debate about reform” increased (Murphy 2008: 40). One such example was the introduction of a National Anti-Poverty Strategy in Ireland. Prionsias de Rossa was very committed to the introduction of such a strategy in Ireland (Respondent 9).

Prionsias de Rossa, who was leader of the Democratic Left became Minister for Social Welfare and was subsequently an important catalyst in establishing the Irish national anti-poverty strategy. The UN World Summit of 1995 provided an opportunity for de Rossa to announce Ireland’s intentions to produce a strategy without necessarily having approval from government for such an initiative. De Rossa (2010: 190) outlines the situation at the time,

I had made a commitment at the UN World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen in 1995 to introduce Ireland’s first ever national anti-poverty strategy. I then persuaded my partners in government to implement it.
Persuading everyone of the need for it was relatively simple but persuading all Ministers and their Departments that they all had a responsibility in this area less so.

The NAPS outlined a plan to eradicate poverty with Ireland being the first EU member state to formally do so in a national strategy (Considine and Dukelow 2009). Hugh Frazer, who was Director of the Combat Poverty Agency at the time, stated that “the launch of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) is a critical landmark in the development of economic and social policy in Ireland and a potentially historic development” (Frazer 1997: 4) The NAPS outlined an agreed definition of poverty, a global target to reduce poverty, set targets and objectives and outlined structures that would help implement the strategy (Government of Ireland 2007). The creation of a National Anti-Poverty Strategy in Ireland was based on setting out a policy approach to combating poverty and social exclusion. This involved:

- the preparation of an overview statement setting out in broad terms the nature and extent of poverty, social exclusion and inequality in Ireland;
- the selection of key themes/policy areas to be addressed if poverty, social exclusion and inequality are to be tackled;
- the setting of specific targets within each theme against which progress can be measured (Carroll 1999: 305).

Ireland’s 1997 National Anti-Poverty Strategy also set out a number of targets. It set out a global target to reduce the numbers of consistently poor and targets relating to educational disadvantage; unemployment; income adequacy; disadvantaged urban areas and rural poverty (Government of Ireland 1997).

A key element of the NAPS was the introduction of ‘poverty proofing’. The 1997 NAPS introduced a “system of proofing policies for their impact on poverty to be developed” (NESC 2001: 3). Poverty proofing was

- to act as a tool in the implementation of the Strategy, in particular ensuring and subsequently measuring the degree to which the NAPS targets are being achieved;
to assist Departments to assess the impact of their spending;

- to ensure that policies and programmes do not contribute to greater poverty or inequality;

- to ensure that potential policies and programmes are developed in a way that benefits people living in poverty, particularly the 9-15 per cent of the population identified as consistently poor in the 1994 ESRI Living in Ireland Survey and prevents others at risk of poverty from falling in to poverty; and

- to assist the subsequent monitoring and evaluation of the Strategy (NESC 2001: 3).

The NAPS of 1997 also aimed to further institutional arrangements between different actors at political and administrative level as well as involving more non-state actors and people experiencing poverty and social exclusion. At political level a cabinet sub-committee, chaired by the Taoiseach, as well as including all relevant Minsters to the policy area, was established (Government of Ireland 1997). This was to ensure greater coordination between political actors in different departments with the aim of creating a more 'joined up' approach to horizontal coordination. At administrative level attempts to further horizontal co-ordination were apparent with the continuation of a NAPS Inter-Departmental Policy Committee that was originally involved in developing the NAPS (Adshead and McInerney 2008). It would be chaired by both the Department of the Taoiseach and the Department of Social Welfare. The composition of the Committee was outlined as “senior officers who will have designated as having responsibility for ensuring that the NAPS provisions relevant to their Departments are implemented” (Government of Ireland 1997: 20). As a result, it served to implement a more 'joined up' approach between administrative level actors. Government bodies such as the National Economic and Social Forum and the Combat Poverty Agency undertook monitoring roles of the NAPS (Government of Ireland 1997). In some quarters hope were high with the launch of the NAPS, for example the newly elected Taoiseach of the time, Bertie Ahern,

Given the possibilities offered to us by our economy which is presently performing extremely well, and based on the premise that it would continue to do so, the Fianna Fáil – Progressive Democrat Partnership Government aim to
achieve or exceed the targets contained in the NAPS ten year strategy (1997-2007). We intend embarking with all due vigour on a detailed programme, which will address all those issues effectively (Ahern 1997: 12).

However, in some quarters amongst those who participated in the production of the NAPS doubts were already settling in regarding what the NAPS actually outlined and if it could be effective in tackling poverty and social exclusion (McInerney 1997: 10).

4.2.7 The 'boom years': The 2000s

Favourable economic conditions continued in the early 2000s. The favourable economic conditions meant that investment in social and public services was evident with social expenditure rising from €6.8 billion in 2000 to €12.1 billion in 2005 alone (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 75). A revised NAPS, Building an Inclusive Society was launched in 2002 (Government of Ireland 2002). As highlighted in the 1997 NAPS, its revision in 2002 Building an Inclusive Society did revise the institutional arrangements and sought to improve these arrangements and even create new institutional arrangements (Government of Ireland 2002). For example, at political level a Cabinet Committee on Social Inclusion, chaired by the Taoiseach as well as a Senior Officials Group to support the Cabinet Committee was established (Government of Ireland 2002). In government departments institutional arrangements were also strengthened by the creation of social inclusion units in departments that were responsible for implementing policies relevant to the subsystem (Government of Ireland 2002). The 2002 NAPS outlined in particular the creation of a new Social Inclusion Consultative Group as well as a Social Inclusion Forum to involve those experiencing poverty and social exclusion,.

The 2002 revision also updated the targets set in the original NAPS and added six new themes centring on child poverty; women’s poverty; health and poverty; older people’s poverty; housing and accommodation and ‘new and emerging forms of poverty’, such as Racism (Hanan 2004: 2). At a local level, institutional changes originated from the Better Local Government white paper in 2000 (Adshead and McInerney 2008). Nine social inclusion units were established in local authorities that aimed to bring a social inclusion remit at local level (Government of Ireland 2002). This was furthered by the establishment of thirty-four County/City Development Boards (CDBs). Membership of these boards is made up of actors from state agencies, local government as well as social partners (Adshead and McInerney 2008) (moved from pg. 112 and 113).
However, while the creation of a NAPS was a landmark event in the policy subsystem of social inclusion issues with the NAPS became apparent throughout the 2000s. While an assessment of the NAPS in 2000 by the Combat Poverty Agency pointed out that,

> Although levels of consistent poverty have fallen significantly, relative income poverty has increased. NAPS, while making an important contribution in many areas, has been slow to develop in some respects and needs to be further strengthened if it is to achieve its full potential (Johnston and O’Brien 2000: 5).

Difficulties with the NAPS continued throughout the 2000s with criticisms of a lack of involvement of the community and voluntary sector and a weakening of political support for the strategy as well as difficulties with effective implementation of poverty proofing apparent (Adshead and Millar 2008; NESC 2001).

The NAPS chief architect, Prionsias de Rossa, stated in 1997 his hopes for the NAPS, “The National Anti-Poverty Strategy, in its essence is a mechanism for changing the mindset of the decision-makers in our society; to factor in a consciousness of poverty into all public decisions” (De Rossa 1997: 13). Ultimately this failed to materialise and with it the success of the NAPS. The Green party at the time of the launch of the NAPS touted this failure “The drafting of a National Anti-Poverty Strategy is bound to raise expectations. It is equally inevitable that those expectations will not be filled….The NAPS, therefore, from a Green perspective is worthy but unfocused, distinct and critically devoid of specifics” (Green Party 1997: 13). At the same time as the revision of the NAPS issues around the Community and voluntary pillar’s participation in social partnership became apparent. This resulted in a number of those within the Community and Voluntary pillar walking out of negotiations for the 2002 agreement Programme for Sustaining Progress due to lack of focus on social commitments (Adshead 2011). As a result, of these difficulties those within NESC “looked to develop a policy formulation that could build a positive relationship between increased social spending and the international competitive position of the Irish state the beginning of which was the idea of the developmental welfare state discussed in the NESC report of 2003” (Connolly 2008: 32). Subsequently in 2005 NESC produced a document on the welfare state in Ireland, The Developmental Welfare State.
The significance of this document was that it set out a “vision for the Irish welfare state incorporating three core areas: services, income supports and activist measures” (Considine and Dukelow 2009). As a result it committed to the RED, SID and SFD policy approaches. A further three social partnership agreements were agreed during the 2000s that outlined social and economic policy – the Programme for Prosperity and Fairness (2000); Sustaining Progress (2003) and the final social partnership agreement Towards 2016 (2006). In particular, rising inequality was an issue with Ireland’s continuing economic gains during the ‘Celtic Tiger’ with concerns expressed in particular about unequal income distribution during this period (Nolan and Maître 2007). CORI Justice (2002) argued that,

After a period of unprecedented prosperity in Ireland the scale of poverty has not been tackled effectively, social welfare rates have not kept pace with the improving standard of living in Ireland the and rich/poor gap has widened significantly.

Allen (2000) points out that the ‘Celtic Tiger’ benefited a small minority rather than population as a whole and this led to rising inequality during this period. However, in the late 2000s Ireland saw a return to more severe economic conditions. Ireland as a result had to adjust to being “in one of the most severe economic downturns in the European Union” (Kirby 2010: 32) which was described as being “by international standards…a truly dramatic development” (Barrett, Kearney and Goggin 2009: 32).

4.2.8 The Return of Economic 'frailties'

In the year 2008 Ireland experienced a sever dip in economic growth and entered a period of recession and austerity that was evident internationally. Indeed, Ó’Riain (2014: 33) argues that the “the international crisis found one of its key transmission points in Ireland”. Dukelow (2011: 420/421) describes the situation,

Economic pressures have reached a state of emergency similar to that which prevailed in 1987 via a much faster timeline. This dramatic decline in economic fortunes set off a heavy and precarious dependence on borrowing from international bond markets which ultimately resulted in Ireland having to turn to the EU/IMF for financial assistance as interest rates on the bond markets became prohibitive by late 2010.
This was coupled with high unemployment, increased pressures on social welfare and emigration (Dukelow 2011; Considine and Dukelow 2009). For example, Ireland’s unemployment rate rose from 4.4 per cent unemployment in 2007 to just over 13% in 2010 (Dukelow 2011: 421). In addition, tax revenues fell by €8 billion in 2008 alone and “after years of running a budget surplus the country’s public finances dramatically worsened in 2008 with a deficit that reached 7.1 per cent of GDP” (Kirby 2010: 1). While this most recent economic crisis happened within a broader global and European context (NESC 2013) in particular two aspects of the Irish domestic system lay at the heart of Ireland’s economic decline. Dukelow (2011: 421) argues that this recession was “characterized not so much by a decline in exports than by a largely domestically generated property crash and banking crisis”. This focus on the domestic system is unsurprising as the economic downturn of 2001-2003 “intensified the shift from internationally to nationally driven growth” (Drudy and Collins 2011: 342). In turn in the years 2003-2008 the Irish government had created a ‘bubble economy’ which was characterised by increased government spending with construction and public spending becoming the anchor of increasing employment (O’Riain 2014: 61). Irish banks were able to access funds cheaply on international and European markets (Dudley and Collins 2011).

In addition, Irish governments concentrated on low taxes and high spending while the “financial system had promoted asset speculation over productive investments, with banks accumulating massive portfolios of bad loans linked almost entirely to property” (Ó’ Riain 2014: 237). Drudy and Collins (2011) argue that the ‘Celtic Tiger’ had now come to be replaced by an ‘artificial boom’ that was based on increasing property prices and easy access to cheap money. The crisis of the late 2000s contributed to a significant decline in government revenues and in 2008 the Irish government implemented a blanket guarantee of bank deposits and other liabilities (Dukelow 2011). Crucially, as Ireland had joined the Euro in 2002 it was not in a position to devalue its currency which would have helped contribute to boosting competitiveness (Ó’ Riain 2014: 241). As a result of the economic crash and participation in a bailout programme the Irish government has introduced a series of fiscal adjustments that have led to tax increases, cuts in welfare benefits and in public spending (NESC 2013).
In addition, at this time there were a number of institutional changes such as integrating the CPA into the Office for Social Inclusion as well as the absorption of NESF (National Economic and Social Council) into NESC (National and Economic Social Council) (Dukelow 2011). Other bodies such as the Equality Authority along with many in the community and voluntary sector such as the National Women’s Council of Ireland experienced severe budget cuts (Lynch 2013). The Equality Authority was subsequently merged with the Human Rights Commission. In addition, Fianna Fáil, who had been the dominant political party in Irish politics since the 1930s and in particular in the late 1990s/2000s were voted out of government in 2011 when they lost the general election with a coalition government of Fine Gael and Labour taking control of government (Drudy and Collins 2011). Subsequent harsh budget adjustments have led to increasing levels of poverty and social exclusion with the largest consequence of the crisis the high levels of unemployment evident (NESC 2013). Hence, this most recent economic crisis has had a profound effect on social policy (NESC 2013). In sum, the late 2000s was a marked period of change in Ireland that led to difficult and austere times that will impact on Ireland for years to come as it emerges from this most recent recession.

4.2.9 Summary

In sum, with Ireland this chapter demonstrated that social policy was linked with Britain and our colonial history played an important role in forming the basis of a social policy in Ireland from the 1838 Poor Law Act to Acts created in the early 1900s that focused on children, old age pensions and national insurance. The first Irish government in 1922 in many ways continued with an approach evident in pre-independence Ireland as it adopted a conservative approach to social policy. While our historical ties with Britain cast a shadow over Irish social policy so did the Catholic Church. Indeed, the Catholic Church became a pervasive guardian of Irish public policy, in particular social policy over the decades. Economic conditions too became a defining feature in Irish public policy and social policy approaches. The 1960s and early 1970s however became a period where a willingness to reform social policy was evident in Ireland. This was also significant period in the development of Irish social policy as since the 1950s the input of international organisations was increasingly seen in Ireland, for example by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and the Council of Europe. However, the most significant international influence on Ireland came when Ireland joined the European
Economic Community (EEC) in 1973. The EEC, late the EU, would have a profound effect on all aspects of Irish policy and policymaking, including in the area of social policy as well as poverty and social exclusion. Indeed, the 1970s marked a period when the issue of poverty rose in prominence on the Irish agenda with an impetus 'to do something about it' apparent.

The 1990s and early 2000s marked a time of deep change in Ireland on a number of fronts. For example, improving economic conditions that led to the ‘Celtic Tiger’ being coined to depict the rapid rise of Ireland’s economic fortunes. In addition, the power and influence of the Catholic Church, which had been a dominating feature in Ireland during the 20th century, began to wane in many respects due to the exposure of child sex abuse within the Church. This period also saw the advent of a number of social welfare reforms that had been delayed since the 1980s as well as the establishment of a National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) in 1997. However, the late 2000s saw the return of recessionary times in Ireland. Indeed, the economic crisis of this period has been the most severe since the end of World War Two. It ultimately led Ireland to becoming part of a bailout package with the EU/IMF with severe budgets being implemented that focused on cuts to wages, services and social welfare and was a period characterised by high unemployment and emigration as seen in the 1980s.

4.3 The Context: Development of Social Policy at EU Level

At European level the basis of the subsystem of social inclusion and its consignment to being a policy subsystem where the EU has no legal power has its basis in decision taken early in the history of the EU. This chapter discusses those key decisions from negotiations of the Treaty of Rome which led to economic issues taking precedence over social issues to the introduction of social policy changes in 1980s and 1990s with the Single European Act (1986); the Maastricht Treaty (1992) and the Amsterdam Treaty (1997). These treaties served to increase the social remit of the EU over time from directives relating to worker’s rights to equality issues such as equal pay for women to issues such as poverty and social exclusion that would be addressed through the use of ‘soft law’ measures. In addition, the EU undertook programmes that specifically related to the issue of poverty such as the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes (1974-1990). The EU, in particular through the late 1980s and early 1990s, also issued non-binding resolutions and recommendations regarding the issue of social exclusion. It
was with the Lisbon Council in 2000 that the EU made a concerted effort to tackle social exclusion and promote inclusion through the establishment of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) in the area of social inclusion. Again, this was non-binding in nature and instead centred on peer review, drafting reports, exchange of knowledge and information as well as setting goals and targets and using instruments such as indicators to monitor progress towards said goals and targets.

4.3.1 The Early Decisions

The development of the EU’s involvement in a policy subsystem such as social inclusion has its basis in a number of decisions taken since the founding of the EU within the broader area of social policy. This has had implications for the EU’s engagement with the subsystem and its approach to it. A defining moment in the development of the European social model came in 1956 during negotiations on the Treaty of Rome and the founding of the European Economic Community (EEC). French Prime Minister Guy Mollet supported the harmonisation of social regulations and fiscal burdens as an aspect of the EEC (Scharpf 2002). However, only a political commitment to increase social protection nationally was agreed as many member states did not favour the outright Europeanization of social policy (Scharpf 2002; Falkner, Treib, Hartlapp and Leiber 2005). This is therefore a key time in the development of the European social model as “it allowed economic-policy discourses to frame the European agenda exclusively in terms of market integration and liberalization, and it ensured the privileged access of economic interests to European policy processes” (Scharpf 2002: 646/647). Thus, the only area that the 1957 Treaty of Rome had explicit legislative competence regarding social policy was in relation to the free movement of workers (Falkner et al. 2005).

The Treaty of Rome was also the genesis of social policy in the EU in relation to equal pay between men and women, social security for migrant workers, mobility of labour and the establishment of the European Social Fund (ESF) as these were needed for the achievement of economic objectives (Ó’ Cinnéide 1993). As a result of these early decisions,

EU social policy was predominately a strategy for easing the transition to a common market and constrained by its secondary status, opposition from member state governments that were either opposed to social policies in general
or to creating them at the European level, and resistance of employer groups who were afraid that EU social policies would increase costs and constrain their control over economic policies (Geyer 2000a: 246).

In addition, these decisions have meant that social policies have been secondary to economic policies or in other words social policy has taken on a subordinate role within European policy and has remained an area of member state responsibility, in particular in relation to the welfare state (Ó’ Cinnéide 1993; Falkner 1998; Geyer 2000). A major issue with furthering the Europeanization of social policy during the 1970s was that it was dependent on unanimous Council votes and each member state government could veto social measures (Falkner et al. 2005). However, during the 1980s changes to social policy provisions were introduced at EU level (Falkner et al. 2005). For example, the Single European Act (1986) which allowed the Community to have competence in the areas of free movement of workers, social security co-ordination as well as competence concerning the health and safety of workers as these were linked to the internal market as well as economic and social cohesion (Falkner et al. 2005; Ó’ Cinnéide, 1993). However, member states were not willing to give the Community any greater competence in social policy at this time. Yet, as economic Europe began to progress rapidly, particularly from the 1980s with economic integration further deepened due to the internal market programme; the Single European Act and the creation of the European Monetary Union in the 1990s attempts were made to create a social Europe (Scharpf 2002). For example, the Maastricht Treaty (1992) provided further development in the area of social policy and marked a ‘new era’ regarding the development of social policy at EU level (Geyer and Springer 1998). With this treaty the EU’s competences were extended to areas such as equal treatment between men and women regarding work and labour market opportunities, the integration of persons excluded from the labour market as well as working conditions for workers (Falkner et al. 2005). However, due to UK resistance attempts to agree a new social policy chapter of the treaty proved unsuccessful (Armstrong 2010).

It was with the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty that new competencies in social policy for the EU were set out (Armstrong 2010). Due to the end of the UK’s social policy opt-out in 1997 with the election of a new Labour government many social provisions that had been agreed upon in the Maastricht Treaty could now be incorporated into the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty (Falkner et al. 2005). The 1997 Treaty provided for the coordination
of member states’ employment policies based on guidelines issues by the Commission and the submission of reports by member states through the European Employment Strategy (EES) which would not impinge upon member states legal competencies (Armstrong 2010; Falkner et al. 2005). The EES provided the basis for the establishment of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). Furthermore, Title XI on social policy, education, vocational training and youth ensured combating social exclusion was an objective of the EU (Armstrong 2010). The Nice Treaty further outlined that combating social exclusion was an objective of the EU but it ensured that any legislative initiatives to tackle this issue were explicitly ruled out with only directives establishing minimum requirements in respect of the integration of persons excluded from the labour market permitted (Armstrong 2010: 60). Additionally, Armstrong (2010) argues that unlike the European Employment Strategy (EES) the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) did not have the same institutional status within the treaties. As a result of all these decisions the policy subsystem of social inclusion is one that firmly lies outside the legal competencies of the EU. The 1970s marked the beginning of the EU’s engagement with the issues of poverty and social exclusion.

4.3.2 Europe and the Issue of Poverty and Social Exclusion

During the 1970s there was increased attention on the issue of poverty and it became a recognised policy issue at EU level. At the Paris summit in 1972 an agreement was reached between member states to further the then EEC’s social dimension (Vanhercke 2012). This commitment to a social dimension resulted in the establishment of a European Social Action Programme (1974) (Vanhercke 2012). The European Social Action Programme marked the “first major advance for EU social policy since the Treaties of Paris and Rome” (Geyer 2000a: 248). Social Action Programme that was created in 1973 in order “to assist the Member States in their efforts to ensure that the chronically poor are aided and equipped to increase their share in the economic and social well-being of the Community” (European Economic Community 1973). The European Council also set out a definition of poverty in 1975,

people are said to be living in poverty if their income and resources are so inadequate as to preclude them from having a standard of living considered acceptable in the society in which they live. Because of their poverty they may experience multiple disadvantages through unemployment, low income, poor
housing, inadequate health care and barriers to lifelong learning, culture, sport and recreation. They are often excluded and marginalised from participating in activities (economic, social and cultural) that are the norm for other people and their access to fundamental rights may be restricted (Council of the European Communities 1975).

The focus on income and resources confirms an alignment with the RED and the SFD approaches. The definition also recognised that people could experience multiple disadvantages and be excluded from the customary standard of living in the member state that they lived in. Ó’ Cinnéide (2010: 23) terms this period as the 'rediscovery of poverty' at European level.

The Social Action Programme led to the creation of EU Anti-Poverty Programmes (1975-1994) (Vanhercke 2012). The European Anti-Poverty Programmes, were a series of demonstration and pilot projects designed to identify good practice and potential problems in tackling poverty. They were intended to build small-scale, grassroots projects towards larger prototype projects operating at the level of mainstream agencies. The experience gained and the resultant policy lessons were to be put into practice in mainstream policy initiatives in the Member States (Langford 1999: 91).

The first European Anti-Poverty Programme [1975-1980] financed a series of transnational studies and 50 local projects across Europe (Langford 1999: 91). The second EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1985 to 1989] focused on encouraging activities regarding research and innovation with nine locally based projects (Langford 1999). The first and second EU Anti-Poverty Programmes were centred on the issue of poverty and encouraged member states to address this particular issue. For example, the first EU poverty programme [1975-1980] was a series of demonstration and pilot projects designed to identify good practice and potential problems in tackling poverty. They were intended to build small-scale, grassroots projects towards larger prototype projects operating at the level of mainstream agencies. The experience gained and the resultant policy lessons were to be put into practice in mainstream policy initiatives in the Member States (Langford 1999: 91).
Furthermore, the first EU poverty programme “financed a series of trans-national studies and some 50 local projects across Europe. This programme facilitated an assessment of the dimensions of poverty” (Langford 1999: 91). In addition the second EU poverty programme [1985-1989] “was designed to help member states with their anti-poverty programme; it aimed to propose innovative and universally applicable measures based on field trials and to cast light on the causes of poverty” (Mangan 1993: 79).

This recognition of the multiple disadvantages people experienced became more prevalent in the 1980s. By the late 1980s the term social exclusion began to be used at EU level and in EU institution documents. Poverty as a term and associated policy approaches were becoming increasingly unpopular (Geyer 2000). The 1970s marked an era of national poverty policy studies by EU institutions (Room 1995). However, French researchers became uncomfortable about using the term poverty (Room 1995). As a result of the influence of the French political debate, the European Commission began developing studies and programmes around the theme of 'social exclusion' (Room 1995: 5). During the French Presidency of 1989, the Council of Ministers adopted a 'resolution on combating social exclusion' (Council of the European Communities 1989b). This 1989 resolution “called on the Member States to review their social policies with a view to preventing or combating 'social exclusion’” and it “empowered the Commission to monitor what the Member States would be doing in this regard” (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 26). As a result while the first and second EU Anti-Poverty Programmes had focused on poverty the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme and EU documents of the late 1980s and early 1990s marked a change in terminology and approach at EU level. Berghman (1995: 10) asserts that these, “various programmes, networks and initiatives that were subsequently set up at the European level constitute the framework in which the first attempts took shape to operationalize, analyse and monitor social exclusion”.

The third EU Anti-Poverty Programme introduced the concept of social exclusion into EU discourse. It was originally transferred from France to the EU level. Béland (2007: 132) provides an insight into this adoption of the concept,

Social exclusion as a paradigm, a blueprint and a political discourse has been dispersed throughout Europe and beyond. This diffusion process began in the mid-1980s, when Jacques Delors, then president of the European Commission,
stressed the need for a strong 'social dimension' to the European project. From this perspective, the fight against social exclusion gradually became a European policy paradigm and justification discourse.

Armstrong (2010) argues that a change in linguistics became evident with the establishment of the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme. The third EU Anti-Poverty Programme led to the diffusion of the concept of social exclusion as the combined effect of funding action programmes and of establishing the Observatory [on Policies to Combat Social Exclusion] was to create a means by which the very language of social exclusion might be diffused through a European academic research community and gradually taken up by political actors. It is difficult to imagine that the language of 'social exclusion' could have made the direct leap from French social policy into domestic policy contexts without the mediation of European structures and European programmes (Armstrong 2010: 18).

Respondent 24 (Senior Analyst DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion) points out that social exclusion was used to encompass all policies that would contribute to fighting poverty and social exclusion….for me it has an added value in the sense its highlighting better that it’s a process and secondly it highlights more the multidimensionality. I mean the multidimensionality of poverty had been highlighted before in the sense that in the definitions used in the anti-poverty programmes you would find that lack of access to resources is qualified by saying or is defined as access to all sorts of resources not only income but cultural, social etc.

The Third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994] funded action programmes and established the Observatory on Policies to Combat Social Exclusion (Armstrong 2010). And was concerned with “the integration of the 'least privileged’” (Room 1995: 3) and focused on social exclusion. As well as a difference in terms being used a difference in policy approaches also became evident in the EU at this time, for example in the 1989 Resolution of 29.9.89 on Combating Social Exclusion (Council of the European Communities 1989b). The 1989 resolution suggested that in order to combat social
exclusion access to resources such as education, employment, housing, community services and medical care was needed (Daly 2010). This commitment was consistent with the SFD approach that is closely aligned to RED.

However, the resolution did place a particular emphasis on social exclusion being caused by reduced access to the labour market (Daly 2010). This approach was evident of a SFD approach but one that was closely aligned with the principles of SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) due to its focus on the labour market in particular. This increased focus on SID became much more evident at EU level during the late 1980s. RED was still evident, however it was beginning to take on a more subordinate role.

The *Recommendation from the Council of the 24th June 1992 (92/441/CEE) on Common Criteria Concerning Sufficient Resources and Social Assistance in Social Protection Systems* (Council of the European Union 1992) advocated that member states should make a commitment to minimum income schemes and provisions (Daly 2010). It is also known as the Minimum Income Recommendation (Nolan 1995). Minimum income schemes are a central element of a redistributive policy approach. This emphasis on RED was furthered when the Recommendation also stated that every worker in the European Community should have the right to adequate social protection and an adequate level of social security benefits (Council of the European Union 1992). However, the emphasis on 'workers' rather than citizens was evident of a shift towards a more social integrationist approach (Daly 2010). The 1992 Recommendation also highlighted the need for the social and economic integration of those excluded (Daly 2010). This recommendation was non-binding but nonetheless the aim was to put pressure on member states to assess and adapt their social protection systems (Nolan 1995). In addition, the EU Structural Funds were reformed in 1988. This was significant as,

> For the first time, the European Commission had a real opportunity to network with a much wider range of policy interests including sub-national public and private sectors actors within the member states (Mokken, Payne, Stokman and Wasseur 2000: 42).

The EU Structural Funds fund structural operations at domestic level that also require national agreements between member states and the European Commission (Harvey 2003). The Structural Funds were to support economic development of regions across
the EU as well as social development by being used to address poverty and social exclusion.

4.3.3 Social Integration and Active Inclusion

Plans to develop a fourth EU Anti-Poverty Programme in 1993 were unsuccessful as “the programme hit a brick wall in the Council...In April 1994 the Council, spearheaded by German opposition, rejected the poverty programme” (Geyer 1999: 161). This rejection of a fourth EU Anti-Poverty Programme had important implications for the development of future EU poverty and social exclusion policy. For example, since the rejection of the fourth programme, “anti-exclusion policy has been quietly redirected towards the more traditional areas of vocational training, mobility enhancement and employment promotion” (Geyer 1999: 161). This can be seen in that from the 1990s onwards a discourse advocating social integration and labour market attachment as a crucial aspect of combating social exclusion became more evident at EU level (Levitas 2003). Geyer (1999: 161) argues that “anti-exclusion policy, once linked to anti-poverty policy, had now become employment policy”. This commitment to a SID approach is apparent in the 1993 European Commission’s White paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment (COM (93) 700) (European Commission 1993) The 1993 White Paper advocated the social agenda being more aligned with the concepts and principles of job creation, employability and the labour force (Daly 2006).

The 1994 White Paper on Social Policy (COM (94) 333) (European Commission 1994) “represented the next ‘big moment’ in the history of the relationship between the concept of social exclusion and the EU” (Daly 2010: 7). The 1994 paper was once again focused on the labour market and labour market measures (Daly 2010). The 1994 White Paper also outlined a commitment to what would become known as activation policy and in particular a focus on social exclusion from the labour market (Daly 2010). Regarding the European Social Fund the 1994 White Paper on Social Policy outlined that “on a Union-wide basis the Social Fund is focused on combating long-term unemployment and exclusion from the labour market” (European Commission 1994: 18). Thus, the Social Fund was also aligned with the principles of SID (Social Integrationist Discourse). For example, the 1994 paper outlined that as far as the Social Fund was concerned the Commission was
promoting a targeted approach primarily based on prioritising improving access to and quality of initial training and education, increasing competitiveness and preventing unemployment by adapting the workforce to the challenge of change through a systematic approach to continuing training (European Commission 1994: 19).

The Commission was also committed to improving the employment opportunities of those exposed to long-term unemployment and exclusion, through the development of a package of measures which form a pathway to reintegration (European Commission 1994: 19).

The 1994 *White Paper on Social Policy* furthered the EU’s commitment to SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) when it outlined that

> there needs to be a move away from more passive income maintenance measures towards active labour market measures designed to ensure the economic and social integration of all people. This means giving a top priority to employment, securing new links between employment and social policies by developing a 'trampoline' safety net, and recognising that those who are not in the labour market also have a useful role in the labour market (European Commission 1994: 35).

The 1994 White Paper further promoted the linking of economic and social policies and recommended employment promotion and an active employment policy in conjunction with social protection, in particular the guarantee of a minimum level of resources (European Commission 1994: 36). The focus on social protection is consistent with RED but it is viewed in tangent with a focus on employment rather than being advocated as a sole policy approach. The paper also recognised that social exclusion was a multidimensional process and as a result when addressing social exclusion access to services as well as a focus on unemployment and income are important (European Commission 1994). This focus on access to services, active employment policies and income was representative of what would become as active inclusion. The White Paper did reiterate that the focus should be primarily on active labour market measures that maintain financial incentives for people to get a job (European Commission 1994: 38).
The 1994 *White Paper on Social Policy* also set out recommendations regarding institutional arrangements at member state level. The 1994 paper encouraged more cooperation between different levels of government and groups including NGOS, local government as well as social partners (European Commission 1994). The next significant document at EU level was the *Social Action Programme 1998-2000* (Commission of the European Communities 1998). This document outlined a commitment to a renewal of European social policy (Commission of the European Communities 1998: 1). It argued that “social policy should promote a decent quality of life and standard of living for all in an active, inclusive and healthy society that encourages access to employment, good working conditions, and equality of opportunity” (Commission of the European Communities 1998: 3). However, this commitment to a renewal of EU social policy was premised again on the central role that employment has within achieving this objective,

employment is central to fulfilling this vision, because it is a Europe at work that will sustain the core values of the European social model. At the same time, social policy...has an important role to play in helping promote an inclusive society and to equip individuals for the changing world of work… (Commission of the European Communities 1998: 3).

As a result, the last significant document of the 1990s framed its policy proposals – that of jobs, skills and mobility, the changing world of work and an inclusive society in the light of employment policy (Geyer 2000a: 253). The early 2000s marked the next significant stage of the EU’s engagement with the policy subsystem of social inclusion.

4.3.4 The Lisbon Period and the Open Method of Coordination Social Inclusion

The 2000s marked a new era for social inclusion at EU level. Daly (2010: 15) argues that “the first decade of the new century was a time when the EU made one of the most concerted attempts anywhere in recent history to engage with poverty and social exclusion”. At this time many international organisations were launching “ambitious strategies putting forward long-term goals like the reduction of poverty, social-economic development or improving competitiveness” (Borràs and Radaelli 2010: 43). It was the Lisbon European Council (March 2000) that marked a key turning point in the EU’s history to tackle poverty and social exclusion. The Lisbon European Council stated that the aim was to make the EU “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-
based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” (European Council 2000). It was also noticeable at this time that “economic, employment and social policy were formally brought together in what became known as the 'Lisbon Triangle’” (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 166). Featherstone, Kornelakis and Zartaloudis (2012) argue that the Lisbon Strategy was introduced in order to address areas of weakness at member state level. For instance, areas such as education, training, employment policy, social protection and social inclusion (Featherstone et al. 2012).

The Lisbon Strategy agreed “on the need to take steps to make a decisive impact on the eradication of poverty” (Council of the European Union 2002: 4). Further to this social inclusion became embedded as one of the declared objectives of the EU with the Lisbon Council in 2000 (Atkinson, Cantillon, Marlier and Nolan 2005). Of further importance was the establishment of the new mode of governance, the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) in the area of social inclusion by the Lisbon European Council. The OMC was to act as an “instrument for policy learning” (Radaelli 2008: 241). Borrás and Radaelli (2010: 6) describe the OMC as a method of European Union (EU) policy-making that facilitates the voluntary coordination of national policies through a series of interconnected steps, including European-level definition of common goals, definition of national reform programmes implementing these goals, regular national reporting, and EU-level monitoring of national progress.

Table 11: Features of the Open Method of Coordination

| Fixing guidelines for the Union, combined with specific timetables for achieving the goals that they set in the short, medium and long terms. |
| Establishing, where appropriate, quantitative and qualitative indicators and benchmarks against the best in the world, tailored to the needs of different member states and sectors as a means of comparing best practice. |
| Translating these European guidelines into national and regional policies by setting specific targets and adopting measures, taking into account national and regional differences. |
| Periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review organized as mutual learning |
The Lisbon period and the creation of the OMC social inclusion outlined a clear commitment to the Social Integrationist Approach (SID) and active inclusion with elements of the Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED) and the System Failure Discourse (SFD) apparent. Armstrong (2005: 11) argues that social policy at EU level has been part of a virtuous 'circle' of economic and social progress at EU-level that is expressed as the Lisbon 'triangle' of economic policy, employment policy and social policy co-ordination. For example, the Nice Council in 2000 presented a set of criteria to drive the social inclusion agenda at EU level. A prioritisation of SID was apparent amongst these criteria, for instance the first objective was facilitating participation in employment (Levitas 2003). The second objective was ensuring access by all to resources, goods and services (Levitas 2003). This is a policy approach that resonates with the SFD but is one that aligns itself with the principles of RED. The EAPN (2011: 26) does highlight that access to public services such as health, housing, transport, schools, childcare and training have long been recognised by the Open Method of Coordination. Levitas (2003) argues that this ordering of objectives thus prioritised the SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) approach and integration through employment. Armstrong (2005: 8) points to this when he states “certainly in terms of the meaning to be attached to the EU discourse on social inclusion, the OMC process adds some support to Levitas’ claim that it is preoccupied with the issue of inclusion in the labour market”. The Nice Criteria of 2000 also included the objectives to prevent the risks of exclusion; to help the most vulnerable and to mobilise all relevant bodies which were objectives open to interpretation by member states (Daly 2006).

The prioritisation of SID remained the dominant policy approach at EU level throughout the 2000s. For example, in the Joint Reports issued by the European Commission and Council as part of the OMC process. The 2004 Joint Report on Social Inclusion stated that “employment stands as the main objective in fighting poverty and social exclusion” (Nilssen 2006: 10). The report also advocated for national action plans on social inclusion to be coordinated with national action plans on employment in order to ensure tackling social exclusion was achieved, in particular through participation in the labour market (Nilssen 2006). Therefore, it is evident there was a continued commitment to SID and due to the focus on the labour market and integration into said
market a SFD approach closely aligned to the principles of SID. Furthermore, activation is suggested as the best approach in order to tackle social exclusion for people at risk of poverty and social exclusion (Nilssen 2006). The 2004 report also highlighted the need to target specific groups who are most in need and most likely to experience poverty and social exclusion for example children, immigrants and ethnic minorities (Nilssen 2006). Nilssen (2006: 19) argues that “by the concept of targeting we generally understand a kind of welfare policies emphasising that welfare measures as far as possible should reach the persons in most need of help” (Nilssen 2006: 19) and “targeting is interpreted as an effective means in the attempt to get people activated” (Nilssen 2006: 19). Hence, regarding the EU targeting approach, its purpose was to activate people and get them working. Key priorities as set out in the Joint Report of 2004 were active labour market measures (Nilssen 2006).

While active inclusion has a three prong approach that focuses on work, welfare and services it is clear the primary focus at EU level is on employment and this is an approach consistent with the principles of SID. This was further evident as the 2004 Joint report outlined that another priority was ensuring that social protection schemes were adequate but these social protection schemes were to provide effective work incentives for those who are able to work (Nilssen 2006). The *Joint Report on Social Inclusion* of 2004 therefore highlighted and recognised the role played by social transfers yet

> the political message delivered in the Report is that social protection systems are not a durable means of eluding poverty and that access to public services and integration into the labour market are necessary to promote 'individual self-sufficiency' (Armstrong 2005: 8).

Furthermore, the 2004 Report identified the development of an inclusive labour market and the promotion of employment as a 'right and opportunity for all' as the first 'core challenge' facing member states (Armstrong 2005: 8). Thus, the clear priority was a SID (Social Integrationist Discourse) approach. Moran (2006) also argues that the EU has located its social inclusion approach within an approach that focuses on jobs and efficiency in the economy. For instance, while the key policy priorities outlined by the 2005 *Joint Report on Social protection and Social Inclusion* included increasing labour market participation which was consistent with SID; modernising social protection
schemes which was aligned with RED approach and improving access to quality services which was evident of a SFD approach (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 10). These three elements together point to an active inclusion strategy approach. However, the report of 2005 *Joint Report on Social protection and Social Inclusion* reiterated that in particular access to employment and services were crucial, “poverty and material deprivation are often compounded by an inability to participate fully in social life, as a result of an inadequate access to employment, education and training, housing, transport or healthcare” (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 9). The focus on employment, education and training draws on the beliefs and values of SID while the focus on access to services such as housing, transport and healthcare is representative of SFD. The report also promoted the idea of a positive interaction between economic, employment and social policies (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 7) and it is noteworthy that in the report employment is a key factor for social inclusion, not only because it generates income but also because it can promote social participation and personal development and contributes to maintaining adequate living standards in old age through the accrual of entitlement to pension benefits” (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 9).

The 2005 Joint Report also encouraged “an agenda based on a balanced development of rights, obligations and responsibilities is required” (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 11). This focus on rights and responsibilities is evident of a SID approach. Nilssen (2006: 12) as a result argues that in the Joint Report of 2005 “the major trends are affirmed. Employment is confirmed as a key factor for social inclusion”.

EAPN (2011:8) furthers this argument by stating that “the EU’s response, since 2005, has been to refocus on ‘growth and jobs’, with the assumption that increasing economic growth and employment would automatically lead to less poverty or exclusion”. Respondent 25 (policy coordinator EU NGO) argued that “…we would say the whole question of distribution, redistribution of resources is fundamental. You can’t talk about poverty without talking about inequality so that for us is one of the major narrative messages that we’re trying to work with at EU level”. However, respondent 24 (senior analyst DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion) outlined how a RED approach
based on guaranteeing individuals a basic income, in welfare benefits or in work, as a right of citizenship is “not the position of my institution [European Commission]”. After the review by the High Level Group (2004) and streamlining of the OMC process after 2005 the “…impulse for reform was dissatisfaction with the performance of the Lisbon Strategy, especially in terms of whether it was (capable of) fulfilling its objectives on growth and jobs” (Daly 2007: 3). This focus on jobs is indicative once again of a SID approach. The report also encouraged better co-ordination across different Government branches and levels (i.e., national, regional, local) and improving mechanisms for involving stakeholders (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 11). It urged member states to focus on key issues and set more ambitious targets and stated that member states should identify the issues that are crucial for them and set quantified outcome targets for each of these (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 11). It further encouraged member states to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of policies as “key to better delivery will be putting in place more effective arrangements for monitoring and evaluating policy impact, involving all stakeholders including the social partners, and developing more timely and relevant data” (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 12). However, this revision of the Lisbon process in 2005 had important social ramifications as it now implied that rather than social cohesion being on a par with economic growth and job creation, it now implied that economic growth and job creation led to social cohesion (Copeland and Daly 2012: 274).

The 1992 Recommendation on Common Criteria Concerning Sufficient Resources and Social Assistance in Social Protection Systems (Council of the European Union 1992) was further developed as part of the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) process which led to the Commission Recommendation of 3 October 2008 on the Active Inclusion of People Excluded from the Labour Market (Commission of the European Communities 2008a) (Walsh 2010). The 2008 Recommendation argued for member states to “facilitate the integration into sustainable quality employment of those who can work and provide resources which are sufficient to live in dignity, together with support for social participation, for those who cannot” (Commission of the European Communities 2008a: 2). The prioritisation of the SID approach and active inclusion was evident again in the European Commission’s 2008 Recommendation on Active Inclusion of People Excluded from the Labour Market (European Commission 2008). It recommended that member states should design and implement an integrated
comprehensive strategy for the active inclusion of people excluded from the labour market which is indicative of the SID approach; adequate income support which is indicative of a RED approach; inclusive labour markets and access to quality services which is indicative of a SFD approach that is closely aligned to both the principles of SID and RED. As a result, the 2008 recommendation advocated an activation inclusion strategy due to its focus on all three pillars of employment, adequate income and access to services. Furthermore it is evident that the European Commission in its Active Inclusion Recommendation in 2008 gave a clear role to Structural Funds in delivering active inclusion, which is in line with previous funding at EU level for social exclusion being directed at labour market programmes (EAPN 2011: 54; Levitas 2003: 3). It is noticeable at EU level that RED has over time come to play a subordinate role to SID. Elements of RED remain but SID is the prioritised approach. SFD is a prevalent theme throughout the years at EU level. The EAPN (2011:26/27) highlight the role of services as part of the activation approach,

the development of the Active Inclusion Strategy gave new importance to public services as pre-requisites for helping people into work, or social participation. The Active Inclusion Recommendation highlighted the importance of a coordinated response between health and social services, education/training and employment services to help people move towards the labour market. Whilst for those who could not work, quality services was acknowledged as essential to provide a foundation for participation and to ensure the could still lead a dignified life. However, until recently it has been the least developed of the three pillars of active inclusion…and the services which are seen as particularly important are employment, training and counselling services, housing support and social housing, childcare, long-term care services and health services.

As a result, while SFD has remained part of the EU’s approach to tackling social exclusion, those aspects of the discourse most related to SID are prioritised.

4.3.5 Europe in Crisis

The late 2000s was also a significant period as it marked the beginning of an international economic crisis, but more importantly for Europe a Eurozone crisis. Internationally, this most current recession is the most severe since the Second World
War and for the EU the most severe it has ever faced (NESC 2013; Caritas 2013). Issues began to arise for the EU as there was a

loss of confidence in the soundness of European banks, bank-runs, the prospect of failure of cross-border and domestic financial institutions which required recapitalization measures and even the financial collapse of an entire country – Iceland – which was part of the EU single financial market as a member of the European Economic Area (EEA) (Teixeira 2011: 9/10).

Problems began for the EU when in 2009 due to the unsustainability of Greek debt and subsequent rising interest rates EU leaders contemplated the prospect of Greece defaulting on its debt (Bochel 2014). This sovereign debt crisis in one member state subsequently spread to others, for instance Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy (Teixeira 2011). Ultimately in 2010 with growing concerns over the sustainability of Greece’s funding Euro leaders offered the member state a bailout package worth 80 billion euros in conjunction with the IMF which provided 110 billion euros (Teixeira 2011). Subsequently, a European Financial Stability Facility and a European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism (totalling up to 500 billion euros) were established in order to provide further financial assistance to member states that may need it such as Ireland and Portugal (Teixeira 2011: 21).

The bailout terms were based on neo-liberal reforms that included public sector cuts, state asset sell-offs and weakening of labour market regulation (Duffy 2012). This neo-liberal approach has had a serious impact as it “took little account of effect on poverty from reductions in wages and working conditions, higher unemployment and service cuts” (O’Duffy 2012: 25). One of the most noticeable consequences of this crisis in Europe has been consistently high unemployment rates, in particular amongst younger people with reduced access to the labour market and in addition worsening job quality (Caritas 2013; O’Duffy 2012). The European Commission has described this issue as “the most important social issue of our time” (European Commission 2012: 26). In particular there has been an increase in households with a low work intensity as well as increases in the number of children living in poverty or social exclusion (NESC 2013; European Commission 2012a). Other noticeable features have been increasing levels of in-work poverty, as well as the high level of over-indebtedness of people across the EU and severe cuts to services (NESC 2013; O’Duffy 2012). As in Ireland youth
unemployment has been a significant social consequence of the crisis in the EU. For instance, unemployment amongst those aged between 15 and 24 rose from 16% in 2007 to 23.5% in 2013 (Spotlight 2013). This has become the “most serious social consequence of the crisis” (Caritas 2013).

The 2009 and 2010 *Joint Reports on Social Protection and Social Inclusion* were written in the context of the financial crisis and in turn recognised the significant social impact the crisis was having in EU member states (Commission of the European Communities 2009; Commission of the European Communities 2010). Once again the reports demonstrate a commitment to an active inclusion strategy at a EU level as they suggest the crisis is likely to impact most on those furthest from the labour market so again the emphasis is on labour market attachment (SID) (Commission of the European Communities 2009; Commission of the European Communities 2010). The reports also recognise the importance of services (SFD) also as well as the need for an adequate income (RED), as these elements can support the goal of labour market attachment (Commission of the European Communities 2009; Commission of the European Communities 2010). While there is a “recognition of the importance and availability of a range of social services” at EU level,

those furthest from the labour market are seen to be particularly high risk of exclusion; the concern with child poverty reflects an understanding of the long-term effects and inter-generational transmission of poverty; the emphasis on housing and other services is underpinned by a recognition that income on its own is an insufficient cause of and response to exclusion (Daly 2010: 11).

Activation at EU level has been seen to embrace the objective of promoting employment in particular (Nilssen 2006: 18). This approach has continued in the EU with the financial crisis. Respondent 25 (policy coordinator EU NGO) stated that the view that employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals is “what the EU sees completely at the moment”.

The EU has based its response to the crisis on the premise that no bank should fail and austerity measures should be used to tackle deficits (Caritas 2013). Indeed,

the European Central Bank, in particular has taken the view that if banks defaulted there would be a serious risk of contagion. Of course, contagion has
not been contained, despite this approach as lack of market confidence became an issue in one country after another and the focus of the crisis moved from Greece, to Ireland, Portugal and more recently Spain and Italy (Caritas 2013: 8).

While the financial crisis has “made for a political environment in which financial stability and fiscal sustainability dominated the political agenda” (Copeland and Daly 2012: 274) in 2010 the EU set out a new strategy, Europe 2020, which aimed to significantly reduce the number of those living in poverty. Europe 2020 follows on from the Lisbon Strategy of 2000 and is the latest strategy from the EU with a view to tackling poverty and social exclusion. However, showing the strained relationship the EU has with furthering social policy the negotiations around inserting a poverty target were “highly contentious” with the politic “complicated” (Copeland and Daly 2012: 282). A group of member states, including Ireland, initially opposed the poverty target being proposed by Europe 2020 and questioned the EU’s legal competence within the area of social inclusion (Copeland and Daly 2012).

This demonstrates that the questioning of the EU’s right to act in this area by member states has not wavered since plans for a fourth poverty programme were scrapped in the 1990s. By allowing member states to choose which indicator in the target to focus on or picking their own indicator if they could demonstrate that it linked with the EU target agreement was reached (Copeland and Daly 2012). The 2020 strategy aims “to turn the EU into a smart, sustainable and inclusive economy delivering high levels of employment, productivity and social cohesion” (European Commission 2010: 3). It aimed to have 2 million less people at risk of poverty by 2020 (European Commission 2010). In addition, it advocated for greater involvement of stakeholder in the preparation and drafting of reports (O’Duffy 2012). It is based on coordinated policy reform with EU institutions having a monitoring role (O’Duffy 2012: 34). The premise of the strategy is based on setting out EU goals that should be translated into national goals as well as country reporting (European Commission 2010: 3). The 2020 strategy and in particular its commitment to lift at least 20 million people out of poverty was a significant step forward for the EU (European Commission 2012a), yet it is too early to

---

7 The indicators are: 1). At risk of poverty – that is, people living on less than 60% of the national median equivalized income; 2). Sever material deprivation – that is, people who experience at least four out of nine defined constituents of deprivation; and (3) people living in jobless households – that is, the population defined in relation to zero or very low work intensity in their households during the income reference period (Copeland and Daly 2012: 279).
judge how successful it will be, in particular following the recent economic crisis, by 2020.

4.3.6 Summary

In sum, in the 1970s and 1980s in the EU the most common approach apparent was a focus on income and access to resources. Poverty became an issue on the political agenda at EU level and ultimately led to the poverty programmes that were focused on information exchange and evaluation as well as involving a range wide of actors. During the late 1980s the term social exclusion came to prominence and there was a particular emphasis on structural factors in combating social exclusion, in particular regarding the labour market and access to resources. Employment was also seen as crucial to combating social exclusion. A focus on adequate minimum incomes and adequate social welfare benefits was apparent during the 1990s at EU level. However, from the mid-1990s onwards a focus on employment and the labour market became ever more prevalent. During the mid-1990s there was increased attention on labour market attachment with the social agenda of the EU focusing on jobs and employment as well as labour market measures and activation. The European Social Fund itself focused on employment, training and education. It was also evident that there was a push for a move away from passive income measures with employment becoming a top priority as well as evidence of the encouragement of the linking of social and economic policies. Furthermore, exclusion was recognised as multidimensional and not just linked to employment and income but also to access to services.

There was at the time at EU level also a call for closer cooperation between government departments, social partners and local authorities. During the 2000s the top priorities were facilitating participation in employment and access by all to resources, goods and services as well as a call to mobilise all relevant bodies. Employment was viewed as the main objective in combating poverty and exclusion. The promotion of an activate inclusion strategy continued with a particular emphasis on employment and targeting. The role of social transfers was recognised but the primary focus was on access to services and the labour market. The encouragement of the linking of economic, employment and social inclusion policies as well as the promotion of coordination between all levels of government and the involvement of social partners was also apparent at EU level during the 2000s. The EU also encouraged the setting of targets,
monitoring and evaluations of policy. By the late 2000s active inclusion strategies that focused on employment, income and services were again promoted. However, at EU level there is a clear prioritisation of an approach that focused on employment and the labour market. The recent economic crisis has only served to enshrine this approach regarding the subsystem at EU level.

4.4 Conclusions

This chapter introduced the reader to the context of understanding social policy and within that area the subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland and at EU level. Through this chapter it becomes apparent that both the domestic and EU level are dominated by features that have shaped the approach taken towards combatting social exclusion and poverty and the promotion of social inclusion. In Ireland, social policy has been dominated by a conservative nature that has meant that while periods of social progress are evident it is clear it is a struggle for social policy issues to be top of the political agenda. Ireland has been characterized by a conservative nature since independence, a social policy heavily influenced by the Catholic Church and periods of economic crises that have shaped Ireland’s approach to social policy and the subsystem of social inclusion. Likewise, at EU level there have been notable periods of social progress but it too since its founding days has been characterised by a reluctance of member states to give more power to the EU in the area of social policy including the subsystem of social inclusion. This has meant that the EU has been confined to ‘soft law’ actions. The EU’s approach has also been heavily influenced by the economic conditions of the time. The most recent economic recession has had serious consequences for the combatting of poverty and social exclusion. This chapter provides a basis to understanding the context of the development of social policy and the subsystem of social inclusion at Irish and EU level. The following chapters build on this context setting chapter to explore the interaction between the Irish and EU political systems and ultimately explore the Europeanization of politics, policy and polity. Chapter 5 focuses on the Europeanization of politics, chapter 6 concentrates on the Europeanization of policy while chapter 7 centres on assessing the Europeanization of polity.
Chapter 5: The Europeanization of Politics

5.1 Introduction: Assessing the Impact of the European Union on Irish Politics

This chapter, the first of three empirical chapters exploring the interaction between the Irish and EU level in relation to the subsystem of social inclusion, seeks to understand the role the EU has played in domestic politics within the subsystem. The EU has the potential through 'soft law' mechanisms to alter politics within a subsystem. As a result, this chapter seeks to understand the Europeanization of politics within the subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. In this research, this involves assessing has the EU led to changes in relationships and interactions for domestic actors and has the EU led to an increase in efforts to tackle a recognised domestic issues. This chapter found that the EU did not lead to major change in the domain of politics of Ireland. It nevertheless played a role through anti-poverty programmes, the OMC process as well as through various funding and transnational projects. The findings of this chapter suggest change in the area of politics in Ireland is restricted to minor changes and that often participation in the EU does not lead to change but instead constitutes a place of 'usage' for domestic actors.

5.2 'Usages' of Europe

Erhel, Mandin and Palier (2005) assert that Europeanization is not just about incidences of actual transfer but it can also be about the 'usage' of Europe by domestic actors. As stated earlier on in the literature review learning is a key element of 'interactive' Europeanization and Europeanization through 'soft law'. The EU provides a classroom in which a wide group of actors can learn. While learning does not mean change has occurred it is important to acknowledge that the EU can provide an important arena for knowledge and information exchange which informed domestic actors in Ireland. For example, participation in the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes led to increased efforts to tackle the issue of poverty in Ireland as well as leading to its increased prominence on the national political agenda. Concerns about poverty were already becoming evident at domestic level in Ireland before we joined the EU. The 1971 Kilkenny conference on poverty marked a key moment in the policy subsystem in Ireland. Séamus Pattison, Minister of State at the Department of Social Welfare (1983-1987) stated that it was “a major focal point in highlighting and bringing to public attention the existence and
extent of poverty in Ireland” (Pattison 1985). It was the estimate that nearly a quarter of Irish people were living in poverty that “aroused serious concern among statutory agencies, voluntary bodies, academic institutions and others concerned with poverty” (Pattison 1985). This concern can also be seen in political manifestos of the time. In 1973 Fine Gael (FG) and Labour won the general election and outlined in their manifesto that, the elimination of poverty and the ending of social injustice will be a major priority in the next government’s programme. It is conservatively estimated that under Fianna Fáil a quarter of our people live in poverty. The social policy of the new government will bring immediate assistance to those in need and lay the foundations of long-term policy that will root out the causes of low incomes, bad housing and poor educational facilities (Labour Party 1973).

Furthermore, the Labour party set up a study group to assess the issue of poverty in Ireland (Sammon 1982). Thus, by 1973 poverty had been designated an issue by the political parties of the time in Ireland as well as by a wider group of actors such as those working in the community and voluntary sector and in academia. The 1970s also marked a period where poverty rose in prominence on the European political agenda. The worsening economic conditions of the time as well as a crisis of the welfare state meant that the EU had to acknowledge poverty was a policy issue that required action at EU level (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 23).

This 'rediscovery' of poverty at EU level had a distinct Irish influence and is a case of Irish 'uploading'. Respondent 14 (civil servant) stated that when Ireland joined the EEC in 1973 “the only poor country was Ireland” and at European level “no one seemed to know anything about poverty. They didn’t even acknowledge it exists”. The end result was the “the Irish poverty agenda connected with the European agenda in the Social Action Programme when the Irish government persuaded the European Commission to launch the First European Poverty Programme in July 1975” (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 23).

As outlined earlier this research conceptualises Europeanization as an 'interactive' process that consists of uploading, downloading and horizontal processes. Hence, the policy subsystem under investigation in this research, social inclusion, is an instance where Ireland 'uploaded' a domestic issue to the European level. Ó’ Cinnéide (2010: 23) as a result argues that “the Irish initiative on poverty may be one of the few examples of
European policy being influenced by Irish preoccupation”. The end result was the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes [1975-1994]. The use of the concept poverty was central to the first [1975-1980] and second poverty programmes [1984-1988] as well as Council decisions of the time (Room 1995). This use of poverty,

had its origins in a liberal vision prevalent in Britain in the late nineteenth century. Within this paradigm, society was viewed as a set of individuals engaged in economic competition, which resulted in some having incomes large in relation to their needs while others risked destitution. Policy aimed to ensure that those in the latter category, occupying the lowest position in the distribution of income to needs ratios, had the minimum resources necessary for survival (Walker 1995: 102/103).

Room (1995: 6) argues that the use of the term poverty at EU level centred on the ideas promoted by Peter Townshend which centred “on the resources that individuals need to have at their command” as well as distributional issues. Poverty was as a result a concept associated with the distribution of income and the minimum resources needed to live and in turn was associated with a RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse) approach to policy.

In Ireland the poverty programme funded nine projects (Langford 1999) as well as encouraging research “with an emphasis on improving the information available and ensuring, as far as possible, that comparable data and methods were used in measuring poverty” (Nolan 1994: 298). As a result of the EU poverty programmes the issue of poverty and tackling of said issue in Ireland received “great impetus from the various EU Anti-Poverty Programmes” (Kiely 1999: 7). This is evidence of horizontal Europeanization where the EU acted as a 'classroom' that facilitated the diffusion of knowledge that led Ireland to increase efforts to address a national issue due to participation in the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. Martin (2010) as well as Considine and Dukelow (2009) also assert that the first and second EU poverty programmes contributed to raising the profile of poverty in Ireland. Hence, the EU did led Ireland to increase efforts to tackle a recognised issue at domestic level. In Ireland it was evident that due to participation in the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes knowledge used in one political system, the EU, was used in another political system, Ireland by those at national level as well as those at community level, which led to increased efforts to
tackle the said issue. However, the issue of poverty was already a widely recognised issue at domestic level. Domestic actors in Ireland were already aware of poverty and wanted to combat it. As a result, domestic actors 'used' the EU as it helped address an issue they were trying to solve. It also demonstrates the 'interactive' nature of the Europeanization process. Ireland first 'uploaded' the issue to EU level which subsequently led Ireland to increase efforts to tackle said issue.

Another instance of when the EU acted as a learning arena was through peer reviews which are an element of the Open method of Coordination (OMC). Peer reviews “are mutual learning processes based on the systematic evaluation of good practices and assessment of selected policies or institutional arrangements presented in the NAPs/Inclusion of the Member States” (Hamel and Vanhercke 2009:104). Peer reviews as a result can be 'used' by domestic actors in order to further knowledge and information exchange on something they are interested in learning about. Peer reviews are hosted by a member state that may want to showcase an example of best practice or even seek input from other member states on how to improve the presented initiatives (Armstrong 2010). Hamel and Vanhercke (2009:104) state that “by participating in peer reviews, actors should eventually learn from other countries’ ‘good practices’”. This can lead to shifts in national policy thinking or national policy agendas.

Ireland participated in a peer review hosted by Italy in 2005 on Policies Preventing the Risks of Exclusion of Families with Difficulties in Italy (Italy 2005). Ireland demonstrated an interest in the system presented by Italy involving public and private stakeholders,

in a period when direct public expenditure is becoming very problematic, relying on local resources and pooling, rationalizing and integrating them is an important success factor; anyway, most countries underlined, a clear definition of roles is needed: public actors have to keep basic functions (control, steering, criteria arrangement, evaluation, accreditation, final responsibility). In Ireland, where a similar model of community-level social work has been established, transferability of good practices would not present any significant problem, especially when they provide interesting cases of partnership planning and are needs-led rather than services-led (Italy 2005: 37).
The Irish representative (Ireland 2005) further outlined that transfer of any policy measures would not represent an issue as Ireland at the time was reviewing its Family Support Services. In other peer reviews, Ireland also highlighted the potential for transfer of measures (e.g. from Portugal 2005\textsuperscript{8}) and demonstrated an interest in receiving more details on schemes presented by host countries (e.g. France 2004\textsuperscript{9}) at peer reviews.  Ireland outlined learning from the French approach on Social Inclusion Cross Cutting Policy Tools for example the operation of various structures as part of the decentralised process (Ireland 2006) as well as learning from the Swedish approach to Integrating and Co-ordinating Services for Disabled People regarding co-ordinated implementation. Ireland outlined that the Swedish DELTA project could be used to address coordinated implementation by overcoming demarcation problems and improving cooperation amongst actors (Ireland 2006a: 3).

Hence, peer reviews have tended to highlight learning and transferability rather than demonstrate actual change. For example, respondent 10 (trade union official) who participated in a peer review “through an invitation from the Department of Social Protection” on in-work poverty pointed out that

they are good in terms of knowing what is going on in other countries. They’re good learning spaces but I suppose the EU has only that role in the area of social inclusion. It doesn’t have a real intervention model that it can work on so I find them useful but…I haven’t have had any further interaction with others outside the country on it but it was useful.

Respondent 20 (civil servant) highlighted that regarding the Irish led peer review on debt management,

it was a very simple pragmatic issue which found a chord among a number of other member states and that was an Irish led issue. It was never intended to become a main issue on the policy table, it was never necessary to have it discussed by ministers but it was a good thing that you had people learning from one another about how in pragmatic terms how you can handle such an issue.

\textsuperscript{8}The meeting set out to review the achievement and performance of two innovative measures for support to social development at local level, whose main objective is to mobilise all relevant stakeholders and promote the participation of people suffering social exclusion (Portugal 2005: 3)

\textsuperscript{9}Peer review on Reception and Integration of Newly Arrived Immigrants – the High Council for Integration in France (France 2004)
That’s what it was. You could make a longer list of issues that became important in that way.

Respondent 20 (civil servant) did point out the benefit of participating in peer reviews, I mean at a lower level …you had issues which came up not so much as big political issues at the level of the process as a whole but issues within the framework of the peer review learning activities were ones that people were able to come up with and deal with it. And there are some interesting examples of that. You know there’s one on rough sleeping on homeless people which came up not as a policy issue at the level but it was a rare example of the open method of coordination opening up to a dialogue at the sub national level…and there was some very good exchanges around that (Respondent 20 civil servant). As a result, the EU could be used by domestic actors to further their learning on particular issues that were of concern domestically. The literature has highlighted that “there is so far limited evidence of policy transfer following from the exchange of best practice in the OMC. However, this does not mean that there is no collective learning going on” (Jacobsson 2005: 108). Indeed, in Ireland there is no concrete evidence of actual transfer as a result of participation in peer reviews but without doubt they provided a platform for learning and knowledge exchange. Armstrong (2010: 177) in his study of the United Kingdom (UK) also found that peer reviews amounted to “contextualised learning”.

Initiatives or tools at EU level can also “produce a 'leverage effect', i.e. accelerate, legitimate or impede the developments of certain policy options” (Erhel, Mandin and Palier 2005: 229) without actual transfer occurring as well. For example, at local government level the European Years provide an important 'leverage effect' for social inclusion units and were often adopted as the theme of the social inclusion week held by local governments as “it’s a useful way of getting legitimacy…because what's coming from the European year is always nominally acknowledged by the government” (Respondent 11 local government official). The designation of European Years began in 1983. The purpose of the European Years was to increase awareness of certain issues and to encourage those at EU and national level to further commit to addressing said issues (Bassett and Walsh 2011). Respondent 11 (local government official) pointed out that the European Years at EU level give their work at local government level
a legitimacy and I always believe in linkages is very important – EU, central government, local government, the community and point those linkages out to counter cynicism…and say this is a European wide thing, whatever you think about it politically this is coming from Europe, central government believe in it.

Respondent 11 (local government official) also highlighted that the European year is “a vehicle in my view from legitimising and reinventing social inclusion for the current year. It’s current and keeping it alive so I use it as a vehicle for that really”. The EU as a result is not just an arena that facilitates change but it can also be 'used' by domestic actors for learning and exchange of knowledge as well as a legitimisation tool for increasing efforts to tackle national issues and raise their prominence on the political agenda.

5.3 **Domestic Actors and the EU**

In Ireland the EU also had an important impact on domestic actors themselves as well as on their engagement and interactions. For instance, due to the OMC and the Social Protection Committee (SPC) engagement between officials was boosted. Ireland played a key role in establishing the SPC at European level,

Ireland also proposed a basis in the treaty for a social protection committee to co-ordinate the co-operation process in the fields of social protection and social inclusion. This proposal was also adopted and is included as a new Article 144 in the Treaty of Nice (Ahern 2002).

At a domestic level Respondent 20 (civil servant) highlighted that the SPC led to increased consultation and interaction between officials from different departments, “there were important moments there obviously exchanging amongst ourselves but there were important moments when you tried to do work together with the employment committee or with the economic policy committee around issues”. The OMC also provided a means for increased consultation and interaction between social affairs and finance government ministers. This had important implications as

it was marking out the responsibilities of the social affairs ministries for this area and saying to the employment and the finance ministries well you’re not the only ones with things to say about these things. There were important moments when you’d try and ensure the views of the social policy community or the
social policy ministries would be taken into account and what’s interesting I
guess is to remember back on those days it was always very easy to get ministers
for social protection to agree among themselves. We needed to bang on the
tables of the finance ministries to tell them we’re here. They [ministers for social
protection] were emboldened when they came together in Brussels to be more
assertive of the importance of a social policy dimension in a way they wouldn’t
necessarily be in their own capitals (Respondent 20 civil servant).

As a result, the OMC served to empower ministers and officials from social affairs
departments and gave them an opportunity to put forward their issues to finance
ministers and officials or in other words ‘use' the EU to strengthen their position. This
was important as “obviously a social affairs minister is not as powerful as a finance
minister in Dublin or anywhere else” (Respondent 20 civil servant).

Furthermore, the EU led to increased consultation and interaction between those
experiencing poverty and social exclusion and those that work with them such as NGOs
and other actors in the policymaking process as a result of the reporting process that was
part of the OMC inclusion. This has been evident in other member states such as Sweden
(Jacobsson and Johansson 2009). The NAPS of 2002 Building an Inclusive Society set
out the establishment of a consultation process prior to the drafting of the NAPincl
(Adshead and Millar 2008). For example, prior to the National Action Plan Against
Poverty and Social Exclusion 2003-2005 an extensive processes of consultation at
national, local and regional level was undertaken (Government of Ireland 2003a). The
actors involved in this consultation process were officials from Government
Departments as well as State Agencies, officials and elected members of local
authorities, actors from community and voluntary groups, national NGOS and people
who were experiencing poverty and social exclusion (Government of Ireland 2003a: 46).
Furthermore, consultation for the NAPincl 2003-2005 took place through the Social
Inclusion Forum (Government of Ireland 2003a). The Social Inclusion Forum “is seen
as an important mechanism to facilitate consultation with all those who have a stake in
the NAPS process” (Office for Social Inclusion 2004: 9). Consultation and interaction
with various actors was again evident in preparation for the National Report for Ireland
on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion (2006-2008). The first stage of
the consultation process involved collecting submissions from community and
voluntary groups at national and local level, from public bodies, local authorities, third-
level institutions, individuals, religious bodies and trade unions (Government of Ireland 2006a: 72). Following on from the submission process regional and national seminars were held,

The seminars were designed to support the participation within the NAP/inclusion process of those with direct experience of poverty and social exclusion or those who work with individuals, groups or communities affected by this problem. A total of 512 people attended the seminars countrywide, including representatives from government departments, state agencies, the community and voluntary sector, as well as members of the general public. The seminars sought participant’s views on the local, regional and national implementation of the NAP/inclusion policies and measures and were structured in workshop format to elicit participant’s views on the implementation and success to date of the current plan (Government of Ireland 2006a: 72).

A seminar was also held with local authorities to obtain their views and input to feed into following action plans (Government of Ireland 2006a). As a result, participation in the OMC/inclusion didn’t lead to any new institutional arrangements as Johnson (2009: 1) points out that prior to the OMC Ireland had “a very effective system for involving stakeholders in the formation of policy on social issues”. This lack of impact is further unsurprising given that the “participatory concept” of the OMC was built on the Irish model of involving a wider set of actors, in particular those from the community and voluntary sector (De la Porte 2010: 28). However, as a result of drafting reports for the OMC/inclusion there was increased consultation and interaction between actors in particular through existing domestic arrangements such as the Social Inclusion Forum.

This increased consultation and interaction helped further a more ‘joined up’ approach within the policy subsystem in Ireland that was first established with the National Anti-Poverty Strategy of 1997. For example, for the National Report for Ireland on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion (2006-2008) “the strategic approach taken in the preparation of the plan ensures that actions are co-ordinated in a ‘joined up’ way, with a view to achieving more effective outcomes” (Government of Ireland 2006a: 72/73). Hardiman (2006: 364) also draws attention to this aspect of the OMC reporting process,
The overlapping consultative and reporting mechanisms that link OMC with social partnership committees help, as several participants note, to keep a focus on 'joined-up' government, to maintain a 'whole-of-government' perspective on multi-agency problems, and to build consensus on problems, targets and methods.

Respondent 6 (civil servant) also highlighted the role of the OMC in encouraging cross-cutting approaches. Mangan (2010: 57) points out as a result that the OMC promotes and facilitates debate and discussion...It draws in all relevant actors to the debate by demonstrating both the economic as well as the social consequences of poverty. This can greatly help in promoting greater understanding and ownership across society of the strategies to be pursued.

This boost in inter-ministerial cooperation has also been apparent in other member states such as France (Preunkert and Zirra 2009).

Another EU mechanism that led to increased consultation and interaction in Ireland were the European Years, particularly the 2010 European Year. The European Years began in 1983 “to encourage debate and dialogue within and between European Countries” (Europa b 2013). The year 2010 was designated the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion which aimed to raise public awareness about poverty and social exclusion as well as encouraging a renewed political commitment to the issues (Europa a 2013). In particular the role of the 2010 European Year was “to give voice to the concerns of people who have to live with poverty and social exclusion, and to inspire every European citizen and other stakeholders to engage with these important issues” (Europa a 2013). The European Year for Poverty and Combating Social Exclusion provided a much needed impetus to increased participation at a time when Ireland was criticised for a lack of consultation (Commission of the European Communities 2005). While extensive consultation and interaction was undertaken prior to previous NAPincl this was not apparent before the drafting of the 2008-2010 national action plan (Johnson 2009). EAPN Ireland (2008) highlighted the lack of consultation in the development of the 2008-2010 NAPincl, in particular with people in poverty and organisations representing them. However, consultation and interaction between actors at domestic level was an important element of the 2010 European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion (Mangan 2010).
As a result of the European Year Against Poverty and Social Exclusion in 2010 a National Implementation Body (NIB) was established in 2008, “its role was to coordinate the development of the Programme for the 2010 European Year and to oversee its implementation and management” (Bassett and Walsh 2011: 16). The National Implementation Body involved representatives from the Office for Social Inclusion, the Combat Poverty Agency and after their integration representatives from the Social Inclusion Division (Bassett and Walsh 2011). Furthermore, a National Advisory Body (NAC) was established in order to advise the National Implementation Body on the 2010 European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion (Bassett and Walsh 2011). It involved stakeholders from government departments, statutory agencies, local authorities and social partners (including trade unions, employer organisations and some national voluntary sector organisations) (Bassett and Walsh 2011: 17). The NAC met six times over the years 2009 and 2010 (Bassett and Walsh 2011). There was also extensive consultation with people experiencing poverty and social exclusion as well as with the organisations that represent them through workshops (Bassett and Walsh 2011). Bilateral meetings with government departments and agencies at national and local levels were also held (Bassett and Walsh 2011: 18). Hence, the European Year provided an impetus for increased consultation and interaction at domestic level at a time when there was a lack of consultation in Ireland within the policy subsystem of social inclusion. Again, this emphasises that EU does not always necessarily lead to transfer but instead can be used at domestic level to give impetus, for example in this case providing an impetus to consult and engage with a wide range of actors.

The EU also provides an arena and funding for NGOs, Local Authorities and government agencies to participate in transnational networks or projects. For example, Cork county Council participated in an EU transnational exchange programme the 'Local Communities in the European Strategy for Social Inclusion' based around sharing exchanging experiences on how to combat social exclusion in order to better inform themselves how to tackle the issues. For NGOS there are a number of EU networks in which they can participate. Some interviewees were very positive about EU networks such as FEANSTA (Respondent 8 community and voluntary sector) as it led to learning that was fed into the national system for example (development of an ETHOS
typology\textsuperscript{10}). As a result, the network provides access to knowledge and learning. However, others were not so positive about the usefulness of EU level networks, “The EU, it’s hard to say on block yeah the EU is always helpful, sometimes it is, sometimes it isn’t depends on the policy area. You could just get distracted by loads of activity and it’s of no benefit to your work here in Ireland” (Respondent 3 community and voluntary sector). In addition, some Irish based NGOs rely on EAPN Ireland to access EU related information and knowledge rather than finding it useful to participate in networks at EU level, “We’re a member of the EAPN so if you like we’ve outsourced all our European responsibility to them” (Respondent 12 community and voluntary sector).

The EU has also acted as an arena where agencies such as the CPA and the Equality Authority could receive funding to participate in projects and feed in learning and ideas at the national level, as well as providing opportunities for meeting with similar agencies in other countries in order to exchange knowledge and ideas. For example, the Equality Authority has through PROGRESS and the European Social Fund maintained an Equality Mainstreaming Unit that fed learning into the Irish political system on mainstreaming equality and the effectiveness of equality legislation in Ireland as well focusing on combatting inequality and discrimination with a wide range of organisations including NGOS, business groups as well as trade unions at national level (Equality Authority 2012). The EU also promoted interaction and engagement at EU level for the Equality Authority, for example with EQUINET, the European network of Equality bodies as well as the European Commission’s Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities between Men and Women. The 2007 European Year of Equal Opportunities for All: A National Strategy for Ireland also promoted interaction and consultation between NGOs, government departments, social partners and state agencies as well as the European Network against Racism (Equality Authority 2007).

The CPA and its participation in EU projects has also led to learning and in some cases this has fed into the national agenda. For example, the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme provided a basis for learning that in many ways planted the seed for the development of a National Anti-Poverty Strategy in Ireland. For example, the emphasis in the programme on not just social welfare being used to combat poverty and social

\textsuperscript{10} FEANSTA (The European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homelessness) developed an ETHOS (European Typology of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion) structure for understanding homelessness due to the conceptual differences on what homelessness was in different countries.
exclusion but by a range of policies that involved a wide range of government departments (Respondent 9, government advisory body). The objective of mainstreaming inclusion can also be seen at EU level. At the time of the Lisbon summit both the EAPN and the European Commission stated there was a need for an initiative to assist member states combat poverty and social exclusion such as mainstreaming (EAPN et al. 2004). Objective four, which deals with the mobilisation of all actors, of the Nice objectives that underpin the OMC argued for in effect mainstreaming as it calls for the mainstreaming of the fight against exclusion into overall policy (EAPN et al. 2004: iii). The EU’s commitment to promoting mainstreaming inclusion at domestic level can be seen in its EU Trans-national Exchange Project on Mainstreaming Social Inclusion. In 2002 the Combat Poverty Agency in Ireland secured funding for a mainstreaming inclusion project and became the lead partner (EAPN et al. 2004: 2; OSI 2006).

The aim of the Transnational Exchange Programme, of which the Mainstreaming Inclusion Programme was part of, was to encourage mutual learning between member states (EAPN et al. 2004). It led to an exchange of ideas and knowledge,

I mean a lot of the stuff was around how to get local experience, you know the consultation mechanisms you use to enable people to feed into policy and there was a lot of different models employed by the different countries and certainly we would have had the social inclusion forum here. Our partner countries thought that was a very good model but we went and saw others had a much more locally grounded process of engaging with people and how that fed up and down again and so I think we would have learnt from that (Respondent 9 government advisory body).

The project partners were comprised of NGOs working with people experiencing poverty, policymakers in the social inclusion area and research institutes in the poverty and social exclusion areas with participating partner countries/region including Portugal, France, Northern Ireland and Ireland (EAPN et al.: ii). In Ireland the Office for Social Inclusion (OSI) in the Department of Social and Family Affairs (DFSA); NESF and CPA were involved. The project centred on examining mainstreaming social inclusion processes in other partner countries and unsurprisingly found that in most European countries a fundamental shift was required to ensure mainstreaming of social
inclusion was evident at a political, institutional and service delivery level (OSI 2006; EAPN et al. 2004). While this project again demonstrates the role the EU has to play in promoting learning across EU member states the project led by the CPA failed to have any connection to actually promoting change in many respects due to the lack of involvement of governments or the European Commission (EAPN et al. 2004: 78).

The late 2000s, a period of economic depression, has seen a number of changes in relation to the functioning of such agencies as the CPA and Equality Authority, for example budget cuts and their integration into the Office for Social Inclusion (CPA) and merging with the Human Rights Commission (Equality Authority). In many respects the setting up of these bodies as well as the subsequent changes has been a contentious political issue. In particular the CPA, “It was always bit political. It was set up because the coalition government wanted to set it up and then Fianna Fáil said they weren’t going to go ahead with it. Fianna Fáil were always wary of this whole area” (Respondent 14 civil servant). Also, the CPA was viewed as “very critical on government policy” (Respondent 14 civil servant). The integration of the CPA into the Office for Social Inclusion and the merging of the Equality Authority with the Human Rights Commission, essentially bodies that represented independent voices on issues such as poverty and social exclusion, drew much criticism. The former CPA director Hugh Frazer argued that these changes were part of a “wider systematic political effort to silence or marginalise independent and critical voices on issues of human rights, racism, poverty and inequality” (Frazer 1999). Niall Crowley, CEO of the Equality Authority pointed out that “There is a perspective in parts of the government and of the statutory sector that suggests that people should be grateful for the services provided. People have to be deserving, not demanding of public support – it cannot be a matter of rights” (Crowley 2010: 112). For instance Michael McDowell (Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform 2002- 2007, Progressive Democrats) stated in an interview in 2004 that inequality was a necessary aspect of the economy because it incentivised people to work (McDowell 2004). In addition, social partnership which had been at the centre of Irish policymaking since 1987 “lost most of its policy-making powers and retreated back to a simple tripartite wage-bargening process” and as a result “stopped being the main national policy forum….and became a less formal and non-binding process of ‘social dialog’” (Stafford 2011: 78). These changes served to undermine the provision of questioning as well as advising government policy, especially on inequality.
and social inclusion, and the ability of interest-groups to influence government policy (Stafford 2011). Thus, it is evident that while the EU supports bodies such as the CPA and Equality Authority in accessing funding in order to learn and exchange knowledge it cannot overcome national politics.

This national politics issue could also be seen with the NAPS in Ireland. The NAPS was clearly aligned with the Rainbow Coalition coming to power in Ireland,

On the one hand, the NAPS was quite clearly an initiative spawned by a centre-left government, and the imprint of this government’s ideas could be seen in other major policy initiatives that complemented and augmented the NAPS. The insertion of articles 136 and 137 into the Amsterdam Treaty, enshrining the first unambiguous EU reference to combatting social exclusion, during the Irish hosting of the EU Presidency is but one example” (Adshead and Millar 2008: 13).

This demonstrates the EU could support a national political desire to implement an initiative. However, the introduction and engagement with the NAPS was very dependent on the political environment of the time,

…because de Rossa was Minister and very positive towards it and unusually for Minister for Social Welfare he had a lot of influence because he was party leader. He was able to push it because he had a very favourable view of the CPA. He involved them very directly in it so the start of the process involved a lot of people and groups and from that emerged the launch of the NAPS (Respondent 14 civil servant).

However, once the Rainbow Coalition left power this changed with much of the interaction between actors that was there during the formation of the NAPS in abeyance (Respondent 9 government advisory body). In addition, support for such initiatives was largely dependent on independent civil servants who may nor may not be interested in the area “some were very open to meeting with us, looking for ideas and engagement. Other times they were less open to that” and that “there may be a person at senior level that’s keen on social inclusion and very emphatic towards the area but it’s not common” (Respondent 14 civil servant; Respondent 13 local government official). In Ireland there was also an issue amongst other political parties as well as civil servants about cross-
department work, “Other political parties, civil servants, in different departments were not keen on the idea that some other department would be looking over their shoulder in terms of what they were doing on issues they didn’t regards themselves as having any responsibility for” (Respondent 14 civil servant). Respondent 1 (government advisory body) argues that in Ireland “there was a relationship between the political and administrative system which encouraged civil servants to be cautious” with recommendations on policy only welcomed if they were within the existing policy frame”. There was also an issue with views held about the subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland,

I mean a lot of politicians on the right in Ireland and elsewhere consider it a burden….They (government departments) bought into it eventually, but then we left government shortly after. Unfortunately when the government changed the ministers that came into office at that point tended not to have that kind of vision. They looked it as purely a financial sort of balancing of the books…that the rising tide would life all boats (Respondent 17 politician)

In addition, Ireland’s participation at EU level was also an issue, “I mean it’s been recognised we didn’t really engage with the EU. We didn’t go to meetings and engage and listen” (Respondent 14 civil servant). Respondent 1 also pointed out “during the Fianna Fáil later years we didn’t really engage very much on issue in Europe”. Therefore, it is apparent that the EU through ‘soft law’ is largely dependent on domestic circumstances and tends not to be able to overcome domestic politics.

5.4 Conclusions

In sum, this chapter sought to assess the impact of the EU, if any, on Irish politics within the subsystem of social inclusion. The above findings show that the EU did not lead to any major changes however its impact was still noticeable. Firstly, it is apparent that through participation in the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes, the knowledge gained and funding supplied the EU led to an increased effort to tackle an already recognised issue at domestic level – poverty. This built upon existing domestic concerns about the issue as poverty had already been raised as a significant issue in Ireland. The EU was also a place of ‘usage’ for domestic actors through the peer review process as well as the European Years which did not necessarily result in change but instead the EU constituted a place of knowledge and information exchange for domestic actors as well
as a legitimisation tool to push domestic agendas at local level. The EU also had an important effect on domestic actors as it led to increased consultation and interactions between domestic actors as well as providing these actors with opportunities to participate in transnational projects and networks at EU level. This in turn facilitated learning that was fed into the national level. However, this chapter showcases that the EU was unable to change or overcome national politics for example surrounding support for initiatives in relation to social inclusion. As a result, while 'soft law' mechanisms can play an important role domestically they are dependent on national actors and their willingness to engage and therefore cannot overcome resistance to implementing social inclusion initiatives domestically. This next chapter follows on from this assessment of the Europeanization of politics and assesses the EU’s ability to embed change in the area of policy.
Chapter 6: The Europeanization of Policy

6.1 Introduction: Assessing the Impact of the European Union on Irish Policy

The EU has the potential through 'soft law' to “contribute to shifts in specific national policies” (Hamel and Vanherke 2009: 85). This chapter as a result seeks to understand the extent to which the EU has led to the stimulation of policy change within the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. This involves assessing the extent of the Europeanization of national policies and programmes. This chapter found that the EU did not lead to any major change in the domain of policy in Ireland. The findings of this chapter suggest that as in the previous chapter major change is limited however the EU nonetheless played an important role at domestic level. For example, the EU led to the transfer of policy lessons regarding combating poverty and social exclusion as well as the introduction of the policy language of social exclusion and inclusion. In other instances the EU was used to validate domestic approaches taken in the areas of social protection systems and employment supports in particular regarding an ‘activation’ approach. The EU also came into play domestically as a result of the reporting process adopted in Ireland due to participation in the Open Method of Coordination (OMC).

6.2 Social Exclusion and Social Inclusion

The introduction of policy language such as social exclusion and social inclusion from the mid-1990s onwards is evidence of Europeanization through ‘soft law’ in Ireland. Social exclusion is a term which has French origins,

it derives from the idea of a society as a status hierarchy comprising people bound together by rights and obligations that reflect, and are defined with respect to, a shared moral order. Exclusion is the state of detachment from this moral order and can be brought about by many factors, including limited income (Walker 1995: 103).

During the 1970s René Lenoir published a book entitled Les exclus: Un frainçais sur dix [The excluded: One Frenchman Out of Ten]. In this book,

the excluded are those citizens who are separated from mainstream society because of factors like disability, mental illness and poverty...Focusing on social and economic conditions rather than personal responsibility to explain
social problems, Lenoir thus defines social exclusion in an extremely broad manner (Béland 2007: 126).

This book came to be viewed as the 'founding document' of the discourse of social exclusion (Béland 2007: 127). The introduction of the concept social exclusion marks a different approach as it refers more to a process of multi-dimensional disadvantage as well as inadequate social participation of individuals (Nolan and Whelan 1996: 191). As a result, the move to social exclusion was an important linguistic turn that went beyond just income and distribution of said income that was prevalent in discussions about poverty and as a result a RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse) approach.

Social inclusion became popular at EU level with the creation of the OMCinclusion in 2000. What is interesting about the adoption of these terms by the EU is what they imply in contrast to poverty. Discussions on poverty typically focus on income and the resources needed by people in relation to the society in which they live. The adoption of policy concepts such as social exclusion and social inclusion meant the focus switched to social integration which is primarily achieved through paid work (Lister 2004). Martin (2010:4) asserts that the EU social inclusion strategy is consistent with policies designed to advance the market and as 'flanking' measures to ensure 'solidarity' with those at the margins of society. Thus,

the cornerstone of the social inclusion approach emphasises paid employment, employability and training as the key to overcoming poverty and social exclusion, targeting those furthest from the labour market. This requires tax benefit system reforms to enhance employability to 'make work pay', often described as a shift from 'welfare' to 'work' (Martin 2010: 4).

Hence, social exclusion and social inclusion tend to be concepts more associated with the Social Integrationist Discourse (SID). Crucially, the concepts social exclusion and social inclusion are particularly associated with EU social initiatives (Coakley 2004; Ó’Cinnéide 2010; Lister 2004). Considine and Dukelow (2009) argue that the introduction of concepts such as social exclusion and inclusion into Irish social policy discourse was furthered due to the approach taken by the EU in relation to social policy.
Firstly, participation in the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme led to the transfer of the concept of social exclusion to Ireland from the EU. This conforms to an understanding of horizontal Europeanization “whereby norms can be diffused across member states using the EU as a facilitator of norm and policy diffusion” (Mulcahy 2009: 23). Langford (1999) states that the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994] introduced the concept of social exclusion to Irish national policy thinking. In order to combat social exclusion in the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme promoted the establishment of large, area-based programmes (Nolan 1994). Regarding Ireland, Bergman (1995) asserts that the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme led to the concept of social exclusion becoming part of Irish policy discourse. In Ireland, the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme ultimately became “an important vehicle for applying and popularising the concept” (Berghman 1995: 26). For example, Irish participants of the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme in Ireland found that by 1993 the concept social exclusion was being used in policy discussions (Commins 1993). Interviewees also offered an understanding into this Europeanization. Respondent 20 (civil servant) point out that regarding the transfer of EU concepts such as social exclusion and social inclusion “Ireland was learning from Europe very much so. The phrase inclusion, exclusion is French….Ireland bought into that, I think not without a discussion but I think it won the day in the Irish discourse”. Ó’ Cinnéide (2010: 28) also outlines the extent of the transfer and who was involved in this transfer, “the term 'social exclusion' came to be widely used in Ireland not just by academics, but also by policy campaigners and by policy makers, including politicians”. Respondent 20 (civil servant) further gave an insight into the 'who' was involved in adopting these policy concepts,

it had a huge influence around the academic discussion around poverty, on the NGOs and slowly, maybe more slowly on the politics and people in sociology…very influential then in spreading a particular worldview with the NGOs but then also influencing the policy attitude within the Department of Social Welfare. I think in that context it became dominant in Ireland and I think that’s definitely to do with Europe…there was a learning through these European processes.

Respondent 4 (civil servant) confirmed the role of the EU in this change, “it’s kind of a subtle one…in terms of the language like the whole concept of social exclusion is a European concept and that clearly has a very strong resonance in Ireland”. As a result, it
is apparent the concept of social exclusion was transferred from the EU political system and used in another political system, Ireland.

In addition, Considine and Dukelow (2009) point out that the impact on terminology in Ireland by the EU has been significant in terms of developing the use of the concept of social inclusion in the country. The year 2000 marked another point in time where the EU came into play at domestic level. With the Lisbon Strategy and the creation of the Open Method of Coordination social inclusion became a popular concept along with social exclusion and poverty. In Ireland “…it is likely the EU was a very strong positive influence that moved Ireland from a traditional, Catholic, anti-poverty ethos to a social policy which promoted social inclusion if not equality” (Murphy 2008: 34). Respondent 6 (civil servant) pointed out that participation in the Social Protection Committee (SPC) at EU level had an important impact regarding pushing the use of the concept of social inclusion in Ireland, “certainly the EU would have had a significant impact with the social protection committee and the emphasis on social inclusion”. The Social Protection Committee (SPC) is viewed as an important learning place by civil servants “there were lots of people in the Irish context who invested in it, who got things out of it, who thought it was good, who learned, who contributed” (Respondent 20). Interestingly, Ireland was originally involved in the establishment of the SPC at EU level. Ireland’s ‘uploading’ to the EU level in turn was used by Ireland for learning and for knowledge exchange that led to the transfer of the term social inclusion again demonstrating the 'interactive' nature of the Europeanization process.

It is evident that the concepts of social exclusion and social inclusion have permeated policy documents and programmes in Ireland at national level and local level. This permeation is demonstrative of horizontal Europeanization whereby the diffusion of these concepts was facilitated by the EU. In this instance, concepts used at EU level were transferred and used in the Irish political system due to participation in EU level programmes and initiatives. For example, the Report by the Commission on Social Welfare in 1986 stemmed from the discussion on poverty at the Kilkenny Conference held in 1971. This report focused on the prevention of poverty and inequality and no mention was made to social exclusion and social inclusion. The 1987 social partnership agreement Programme for National Recovery as well as the 1991 social partnership agreement Programme for Economic and Social Progress (PESP) and the Programme for Competitiveness and Work (PCW) (1994) focused on social equity and again no
reference was made to social exclusion or inclusion (Government of Ireland 1994). However, after the 1994 social partnership agreement the terms social exclusion and social inclusion in tangent with poverty became ever more prevalent in Irish policy documents, programmes and institutions demonstrating the transfer of these concepts into Irish policy thinking. For example, in the social partnership agreement Partnership 2000 (1996) the terms social exclusion and social inclusion are used (Government of Ireland 1996). Partnership 2000 outlined for the first time a definition of social exclusion (Government of Ireland 1996) while the use of social exclusion and social inclusion is again noticeable in the 2000 social partnership agreement Programme for Prosperity and Fairness (Government of Ireland 2000). The National Anti-Poverty Strategy of 1997 also referred to social exclusion as well as poverty (Government of Ireland 1997). As a result, it is evident that there is a marked change in Irish terminology from the early 1980s by the 2000s. Poverty remains a used concept but increasingly social exclusion and social inclusion were becoming the more dominant terms.

The revision of the 1997 NAPS, Building an Inclusive Society (2002) marks a clear commitment to tackling the challenge of poverty and social exclusion while promoting social inclusion with 'building an inclusive society' outlined as a “key priority of government” (Government of Ireland 2002: 1). Delivering a fair and inclusive society was a key goal of the 2003 social partnership agreement Sustaining Progress (Government of Ireland 2003). The National Action Plan for Social Inclusion 2007-2016 unsurprisingly due to its title again outlined social inclusion as a key priority with combating poverty and social exclusion outlined as challenges. It affirms that “social inclusion is firmly on the public policy agenda” (Government of Ireland 2007: 13). This demonstrates that the concepts of social exclusion and inclusion that were first used at EU level have become the dominant terminology within Irish documents and programmes gradually moving away from conversations solely about poverty to conversations about social inclusion. Langford (1999) and Martin (2010) point out that these EU concepts have also permeated and diffused through Irish institutions. For example, regarding institutional arrangements to oversee the policy subsystem there was firstly an Office for Social Inclusion which later became the Social inclusion Division when the Combat Poverty Agency was integrated with the Office for Social Inclusion; a Social Inclusion forum was also established as well as a Social Inclusion Consultative
Committee and a Senior Officials Group on Social Inclusion. A Local Government Social Inclusion Steering Group and Social Inclusion Units were also established at Local Government level as “social inclusion is a tenet of what they [the government] believe and what their espousing, that’s why we’ve a social inclusion unit in the organisation, that’s why I’m in my job” (Respondent 11 local government official). Hence, it is evident that national programmes and strategies in Ireland which outlined the policies relevant for the area as well as the institutions charged with overseeing the subsystem adopted the terminology of the EU. This Europeanization was also apparent in other member states such as Germany (Preunkert and Zirra 2009). Furthermore, the transfer of EU language had an important impact amongst domestic actors and the way that Ireland would progress with this policy subsystem.

This section of the chapter argues that a change in policy concepts and language can also have an important impact on domestic actors and the different policy approaches that were being advocated for in Ireland. Ó’ Cinnéide (2010: 28) points to this when he outlines the different reasons for adopting the new terms,

perhaps they saw it as being advantageous to adopt the language of the EU itself and to make national initiatives accord with European objectives and strategies.

Or it may be the term 'social exclusion' was seen to be a softer, less threatening term than 'poverty' by those who did not want to acknowledge the extensiveness and persistence of poverty.

Berghman (1995) states that originally the reason for the shift in language at EU level would seem to be due to reservations about using the term poverty. Social exclusion on the other hand was a “less accusing expression to designate to the existing problems and definitions” (Berghman 1995: 16). It would seem that while social exclusion might well have been seen as a more amiable term than poverty, it is also valid to say that adopting the concepts of the EU might well have served the policy pursuits of certain domestic actors. Social exclusion was adopted in Ireland as part of a socialization process whereby EU concepts were diffused horizontally. As part of this diffusion process, “one of the tests for national and European policies would become their capacity or incapacity to prevent or combat social exclusion” (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 26). The socialization process as a result can lead to domestic actors developing
a specific form of understanding that participates in the construction of both social problems and the policy responses to them. From this perspective, the concept of social exclusion helps experts and policymakers make sense of the social world and design policies aimed at solving the social problems they deem important (Béland 2007: 125).

However, Béland (2007: 125) further argues that “any policy paradigm comes with specific intellectual 'blind spots', as the focus on certain social problems relegates others to the periphery of the policy agenda”. Thus, social exclusion and social inclusion “can become the centrepiece of reform blueprints….the discourse about social exclusion and inclusion, can become an effective framing tool to justify the 'need to reform' and promote specific policy alternatives” (Béland 2007: 125). Marlier, Atkinson, Cantillon and Nolan (2007) and Armstrong (2010) also point out that the shift to social exclusion implied that deprivation is more than about just low income, that it is multi-dimensional.

However, the transfer of these concepts had a wider implication than just a change in terminology in Ireland, “it alerted policymakers and researchers to factors that were previously overlooked, as having to do with causes and not just results” (Ó’ Cinnéide 2010: 28). This socialisation of Irish actors was instrumental in “highlighting the structural dimensions of poverty, developing greater understanding of the causes of poverty and introducing the concept of social exclusion” (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 184). Ó’ Cinnéide (1993: 18) points to this in Ireland,

the EC emphasis on the notion of 'social exclusion', especially since 1989, provides a useful perspective from which to view our own social problems. It makes us shift our focus from 'the poor', whom we are apt to consider as a static group, a small disadvantaged minority, to the processes by which people become poor, the processes by which people are excluded.

For instance, poverty is mainly focused on distribution and lack of resources while social exclusion concentrates on a lack of social integration (Room 1995). With social exclusion society is seen by intellectual and political elites as a status hierarchy or as a number of collectivities, bound together by sets of mutual rights and obligations.
that are rooted in some broader moral order. Social exclusion is the process of becoming detached from this moral order (Room 1995: 6).

Furthermore, social exclusion highlights “processes of generalised and persisting disadvantage” and as a result an important element of combating social exclusion is education, training, employment and housing (Room 1995: 7). Berghman (1995: 18) outlined that poverty is associated with a lack of resources and income while social exclusion is “much more than money”. Thus, there is a fundamental difference between the two concepts. During the 1980s, due to the growing unemployment, lack of social integration came to be associated with limited access to the labour market (Béland 2007). Thus, “from the perspective of the emerging social exclusion paradigm, long-term unemployment is a major source of social isolation” (Béland 2007: 127). This corresponds with a view held in Ireland during the 1980s due to the presence of problems such as high unemployment and economic recession. As pointed out in chapter four at this time in Ireland a shift had begun to occur in approaches due to the economic crisis of the time towards a focus on the labour market and increasing access to employment as a means of achieving social integration.

Béland (2007: 127) points out that social exclusion is conceptualised

as a horizontal, spatial metaphor rather than a vertical model of inequality focusing mainly on income disparities. From the perspective of the social exclusion paradigm, people are more 'in' or 'out' of mainstream society than 'up' or down' the class or distribution structure.

This can cause the political and social agenda in a country to move away from a focus on distribution and income as well as class inequality (Béland 2007). Hence, “when long-term unemployment and social isolation become the centre of attention, class and income inequality increasingly moves to the outskirts of the policy agenda” (Béland 2007: 127/128). Thus, social exclusion and social inclusion can act as a blueprint for reform (Béland 2007: 128). Therefore,

social exclusion is not only a term that refers to a set of social and economic problems; it also constitutes a powerful political and normative discourse about the welfare state and the reforms necessary to adapt it to changing social and economic conditions. For this reason, the discourse on social exclusion
participates in the 'social construction of the need to reform' and can legitimise path-departing reforms in the name of 'national solidarity' and social citizenship. Yet, because these reforms reduce the role of social insurance schemes and focus mainly on the 'truly needy' at the expense of other forms of inequality, they are compatible with neoliberal assumptions about economic and social regulation (Béland 2007: 130).

Langford (1999) suggests that a change in terminology can have an influence on policy approaches within a country. This can be seen in that with the use of the concept social exclusion at both EU and Irish level a focus on employment became associated with the combating of social exclusion (Langford 1999).

The late 1980s in Ireland there was a shift in views amongst the political elite that current policy approaches were not working. As a result Active Labour Market Policies (ALMPs) increasingly became a preferred policy approach, in particular due to rising unemployment and the economic crisis Ireland was experiencing at the time. A move towards a more activist approach with a particular focus on unemployment as a result became the prevalent policy approach in Ireland in order to achieve social equity. Hence, the adoption of the concepts of social exclusion and social inclusion and their focus on a move away from just looking at income alone suited the policy preferences of the dominant coalition in Ireland. The adoption of EU terminology coincided with a shift towards a more Social Integrationist Approach (SID) that was already happening at domestic level due to deteriorating economic conditions. While the literature does point to the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) being used as a legitimising tool for national actors in countries such as France (Erhel, Mandin and Palier 2005) the findings presented above suggest this was apparent from the time of the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. The transfer of concepts such as social exclusion and social inclusion from the EU marked a change in national policy thinking and led to new concepts arising on the domestic political agenda. In addition concepts such as social exclusion and social inclusion from the EU served to legitimise an already existing domestic approach that of a social integrationist approach.

The EU also led to the transfer of actual policy lessons on how to combat poverty and social exclusion. These lessons were used to further domestic approaches. Prior to joining the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973 poverty was already a
prevalent issue on the domestic agenda in Ireland. It is not surprising therefore, that it is very much a domestic driven agenda policy wise. Respondent 4 (civil servant) referred to this,

There’s always been a strong commitment on the issues of poverty in Ireland. You go back to 1970 when you had that work report done by S. O’ Cinnéide on effectively discovering the issue of poverty and then you had the Bishop’s conference in 1971 which kind of gathered a lot of public opinion about the issue of poverty….So like there’s been an indigenous concern about the issue of poverty.

Not only was it domestically driven it was subsequently 'uploaded' to the EU level. Respondent 2 (community and voluntary sector worker) reiterated the influence of Ireland at EU level regarding the introduction of the poverty programmes,

back in 1973 when we joined the EU first it was Ireland that pushed the first poverty programme, it was actually Frank Clusky and a couple of advisors. Then they talked to Paddy Hillery who was Commissioner at the time but they were the people who came up with the idea for national anti-poverty programmes at European level even though we just joined the EU. They promoted the idea, they got it going and then it became a big EU wide strategy but it came from one country and that would have been inconceivable to start with a poverty strategy at home in the same way because it would have cost too much money. A European funded one was quite acceptable.

Hence, the EU was used to further domestic issues and developments rather than being the catalyst for them. Domestic actors used the EU level to create programmes in order to address an existing domestic issue. However the EU through the European Anti-Poverty Programmes still facilitated change. In 1974 the agreed EU Social Action Programme “included a commitment to implement, in cooperation with Member States, specific measures to combat poverty” (Langford 1999: 91). As a result of the EU Social Action Programme three European Anti-Poverty Programmes were ultimately established. The poverty programmes of the EU centred on “promoting transfers of knowledge and enhancing the domestic policy efforts” (Armstrong 2010: 8).
The first instance where the EU came into play in the domain of policy was through the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. Four projects were funded as part of the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994]. Three were area-based and large-scale model action projects in Craigavon (Brownlow Community Trust), northwest Connemara (FORUM) and Limerick city (PAUL) with an emphasis on combating rural exclusion and long-term unemployment as well as a smaller project working with Travellers in Dublin (DTEDG) (Conference on European Programme 1995). These EU funded projects centred on identifying good practice, encouraging policy development as well as encouraging public debate on anti-poverty action (Bruton 1995: 83). As a result, “they were focused on responding to the broad nature of social exclusion, and they achieved a great deal in their own localities and in raising policy lessons of national significance” (Bruton 1995: 83). Thus, the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes provided the foundation for the transfer of policy lessons. Mangan (1993: 79) highlights the importance of the learning opportunities that the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes provided, “the major impact of these programmes is not really in the direct aid provided but in their roles as vehicles for exchange of information and experience and in raising awareness of the issues involved”. Important policy lessons were indeed learnt and transferred as a result of Ireland’s participation in the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. The accountability sought by the EU regarding the actions to be taken and the nature of policy problems to be addressed led to the transfer of such policy lessons, policy 'learning' and 'experimentation' have been a more diffuse outcome of EU membership, but in social policy terms this has been important, both in terms of 'modernising' and developing new approaches to social issues and social problems, and the learning and expertise garnered by policymakers and actors/interest groups alike (Considine and Dukelow 2009: 185).

For example, “the outcome of the second programme [1985-1989] was the important acknowledgement of the structural causes underlying the existence of poverty” (De Rossa 1995: 93). This acknowledgment ensured looking at the causes of poverty rather than trying to treat the symptoms of poverty.

This approach to combating to poverty was furthered with the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994]. The third EU Anti-Poverty Programme provided important policy lessons as “combating exclusion under the third programme meant addressing
causes of poverty rather than dealing with its symptoms” (Langford 1999: 94). In particular the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme brought about “the beginnings of a questioning of the prevailing philosophies and approaches to poverty” (De Rossa 1995: 92). Respondent 14 (civil servant) highlighted the main policy lesson learnt in particular from the third poverty programme,

essentially it was looking at poverty in the round. You see we never looked at poverty in the round...They looked at poverty and said why is it people are poor. They said okay it is partly because income isn’t sufficient, they haven’t employment, they’ve child dependents, they lack education, they lack adequate services you know...so if you look at the whole thing and then they’re living in a disadvantaged community and that reinforces it. So they were kind of saying that poverty is multi-dimensional.

Therefore, the policy lesson transferred from the EU involved looking beyond policy approaches based on just income support to combat social exclusion, “if you needed to tackle it [social exclusion] you needed a multi policy response. So it isn’t a question of just income support, you need education, training” (Respondent 14 civil servant). Participation in the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994] meant that domestic actors had to evaluate current policy approaches and programmes and not just focus on income but also unemployment, education and training as a means of combating poverty and social exclusion. The transfer of such policy lessons from the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes is representative of horizontal Europeanization with the EU acting as a facilitator for the diffusion of these policy lessons.

Ireland’s participation in the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994] altered national practices due to the establishment of projects which were part of the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes and led to local partnerships to have an increased influence on the policy agenda in Ireland. For example,

the projects of the third Anti-Poverty Programme led to specific changes in certain Government Programmes and to new approaches....the PAUL project in Limerick influenced thinking behind the setting up the Community Employment Scheme and specific requirements of participants on those schemes for retention of secondary benefits. PAUL’s work also gave new insights into the needs of lone parents and the problems of indebtedness. The policy decisions taken on the
basis of these insights are reflected in the various improvements in the social security provisions for lone parents and in the development of the Money Advice and Budgeting Programme funded by the Department of Social, Community and Family Affairs (Langford 1999:91).

Respondent 4 (civil servant) did highlight that the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes did not result in “big policy change”. Their role was “less about funding and more about the policy experimentation” and “they’ve been more at the micro-level” and “on the fringe”. This can be seen in that at local and partnership companies level transfer was apparent as a result of learning due to participation in EU transnational networks. This is again evidence of horizontal Europeanization whereby norms were diffused across member states with the EU acting as a facilitator of this diffusion (Mulcahy 2009: 23).

For example, the Belgian Plato small business initiative was transferred by the Tallaght Partnership. The Plato Programme was

originally devised in Belgium, the programme provides a mentoring and support services for small and medium enterprises. This initiative has since been extended nationwide under the sponsorship of IBEC, the employers’ organisation (Walsh, Craig and McCafferty 1998: 79).

Also, the Dutch model of a tailored employment service was transferred by the Northside Partnership (Walsh et al. 1998: 62). This transfer at local and partnership level demonstrates horizontal Europeanization where initiatives in other countries were used in the application of programmes in Ireland. This transfer does not represent a major shift or change at domestic level but instead was used to help implement existing policy preferences at domestic level. This can also be seen in relation to Ireland’s social protection system and employment support preferences.

6.3 Social Protection Systems and Employment Supports

A key moment in Ireland was the establishment of a minimum income. In 1992 the Council of the European Communities issued a Recommendation on Common Criteria Concerning Sufficient Resources and Social Assistance in Social Protection Systems (Council of the European Union 1992). It is also known as the Minimum Income Recommendation (Nolan 1995). It recommended member states “to recognize the basic right of a person to sufficient resources and social assistance to live in a manner
compatible with human dignity as part of a comprehensive and consistent drive to combat social exclusion, and to adapt their social protection systems, as necessary” (Council of the European Union 1992). This recommendation was non-binding but nonetheless the aim was to put pressure on member states to assess and adapt their social protection systems (Nolan 1995). Nolan (1995: 5/6) points out that in Ireland due to the schemes already in operation the ability of the 1992 Recommendation to lead to change would be limited, “in the case of the minimum income Recommendation the countries most affected are the four southern Member states which do not have a national safety-net minimum income scheme”. This chapter demonstrates that while the EU had the potential to alter policy approaches in Member States regarding minimum incomes in Ireland this ability was mitigated as Nolan (1995) pointed out due to the existence of minimum income schemes in Ireland. Murphy (2006) also argues that the EU recommendation did not lead to major change in Ireland. Walsh (2010) attests that the Irish debate on minimum incomes precedes that of the EU debate. Indeed, Ireland pre-empted two key steps taken by the EU in relation to minimum income schemes, firstly regarding the provision of minimum income schemes and secondly with the broadening of minimum income schemes to include an activation element.

Indeed the issue of minimum incomes and social assistance schemes appeared on the domestic political agenda in the 1970s. In 1975 legislation was introduced which set out “a new, nationally administered, means-tested scheme in Supplementary Welfare Allowance (SWA)” (Daly 2009: 5). Further to this, policy debates in Ireland during the early and mid-1980s increased attention on providing a minimum level of resources or income and in particular provided a focus on the levels of payments and the impact of having these payments means-tested (Nolan 1995). The report of the 1986 Commission on Social Welfare was a key juncture in the domain of policy within this policy subsystem. It stemmed from domestic developments connected with the organisation of the 1971 Kilkenny Conference on Poverty. The Commission on Social Welfare “proposed a minimum income benchmark based on prevailing living standards and the prevention of poverty” (Walsh 2010: 67). The provision of a minimum income scheme in Ireland consists of over twenty different programmes (Daly 2009). For example, there is the Supplementary Welfare Allowance (SWA) as well as targeted minimum income schemes for lone parents, the ill or disabled, the unemployed as well as carers, pensioners and low-paid workers as well as additional means-tested benefits such as
school clothing and footwear, winter fuel and GP healthcare (Daly 2009; Walsh 2010). Domestic issues were the catalyst for concerns regarding the provisions of minimum income schemes in the 1970s and 1980s as

The need to standardise and harmonise the administration of the system, and particularly the mean test and payment levels, across different localities and reduce the element of discretion, with greater emphasis on rights, was a primary factor in the policy debate with respect to the safety-net scheme at that time (Nolan 1995: 10).

As well, a concern with the existence of high levels of poverty in the 1970s led to the issue of minimum incomes being addressed in Ireland (Nolan 1995).

The 2008 Recommendation argued for member states to “facilitate the integration into sustainable quality employment of those who can work and provide resources which are sufficient to live in dignity, together with support for social participation, for those who cannot” (Commission of the European Communities 2008a: 2). However, the debate in Ireland once again preceded the European debate as by the late 1980s onwards the political debate in Ireland was focused on the disincentive effects of the benefit system as well as poverty and unemployment traps (Nolan 1995: 12). The driving force behind this was the high level of long-term unemployment in Ireland and the burden this placed on the social security system as well as the policy problem of “how to deliver adequate levels of support while alleviating poverty and unemployment traps and facilitating re-insertion into paid employment” (Nolan 1995: 12). Nolan (1995: 70) points out that in Ireland by the early 1990s

efforts to reduce unemployment and to target measures to assist reintegration of the long-term unemployed dominate discussions of employment policy. Combating unemployment is the single most important issue in current debates about economic policy at media and political level.

Daly (2009: 13) argues that Ireland has thus pursued a strategy based on

increasing the flexibility of the benefit system and its generosity towards earned income; improving the human capital and skills base of recipients (especially unemployed claimants); applying an early intervention and activation approach; making work pay (by benefit and taxation changes and incentives).
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As a result, the provision of a minimum income was a central element of the social protection system in Ireland (Walsh 2010). The EU also “has placed considerable emphasis on the role of minimum income schemes in tackling poverty and promoting social inclusion” (Walsh 2010: 66). Yet, the EU did not lead to any substantial change as minimum income schemes were already part of Irish policy by the time the issue was raised at EU level. However, the EU has played a role in Ireland regarding approaches taken towards social protection systems and employment supports in particular regarding an activation approach.

A critical juncture in the area of policy was the creation of social partnership in 1987. Kiely (1999) argues that social partnership “was a watershed in Irish social policy as it marked the beginning of partnership as a new approach”. The second social partnership agreement *The Programme for Economic and Social Progress* (PESP) in particular signalled the arrival of a new policy approach in Ireland which included an “assault on long-term unemployment and a restructuring of the social services, in particular social welfare, the health services, education and housing” (Kiely 1999: 5). Social Partnership “appeared to have developed and institutionalised a set of policies as a response to the crisis of the 1980s” (Connolly 2008: 9). O’Donnell and Moss (2005: 313) also argue that “faced with a severe economic and employment crisis, and an attendant increase in poverty, the years after 1987 were ones of significant policy innovation on many fronts”. During the 1990s the economic fortunes of Ireland improved and subsequently led to the 'Celtic Tiger' and unprecedented economic growth and job creation. Murphy (2006) argues that this economic growth as well as employment growth was the source of a change in policy priorities in Ireland. As a result, in the 1990s in Ireland “the focus shifted from unemployment to alleviating labour market shortages” (Murphy 2006: 216). In particular work incentive issues came to prominence on the domestic political agenda in the 1990s (Murphy 2006). Concern was raised about unemployment rates and disincentives to take up work (Murphy 2006). Furthermore, concerns were raised about “the plight of jobless economic growth” (Murphy 2006: 228). This focus on providing incentives to work was a key element of Ireland's competitiveness strategy which was influenced in particular by the OECD Jobs Study (European Commission 1994) (Murphy 2006). The *White Paper on Competitiveness, Growth and Inclusion* (1993) at EU level to a lesser extent was an influence but it itself was based on the OECD Jobs Study (Murphy 2006). Murphy (2006; 2008) points that domestic issues such as
changes in government in the 1990s as well as the establishment of working groups, in
particular the 1993 Expert Working Group on Integration of Social Welfare and
Taxation Integration led to a commitment to 'systematic engagement' and 'proactive
conditionality' in Ireland. As a result, since the 1990s Ireland engaged in an approach
that can be termed a 'systematic activation approach' that was based on easing “the
transition from benefit receipt to employment” (Daly 2009: 13). For example, the Back
to Work Allowance Scheme.

During this period at EU level, the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty enshrined combating social
exclusion as an objective of the EU (Armstrong 2010) and established the European
Employment Strategy which provided the genesis for the Open Method of
Coordination. There is an aspect of Ireland’s influence again in this instance. Dermot
Ahern, former Minister for Social, Community and Family Affairs (1997-2002) states
that

during the negotiations on the Treaty of Amsterdam an Irish proposal enabling
the Council to adopt measures designed to encourage co-operation between
member states to combat social exclusion was adopted and is now included as
the last sub-paragraph of Article 137(2) of the Treaty (Ahern 2002).

Murphy (2008) suggests that it was the European Employment Strategy through the
1997 National Employment Action Plan (NEAP) that played a role in shaping Ireland’s
policy approaches to social protection systems and employment supports. Murphy
(2006: 239) argues that these events “clearly influenced the pace and type of
development of policies relating to activation and conditionality in Ireland”. The 1997
NEAP and the associated co-ordinating process provided a “window of opportunity” for
more 'systematic engagement' (Murphy 2008: 18). By this time Ireland was already
engaged and committed to a process of 'systematic engagement'. The introduction of a
coor-ordinating process specifically in the area of social inclusion and Ireland’s
engagement with it marked the next moment where the EU came into play domestically.
Furthermore, Ireland aimed to further the EU’s role in the area of social protection by
extending the use of coordinated processes in the subsystem,

an Irish proposal in the negotiations on the Treaty of Nice that this co-ordination
process be extended to modernising social protection was adopted and is now
included as paragraph 1(K) or a revised Article 137 in the Nice Treaty (Ahern 2002).

Martin (2010: 3) states that indeed “events were to take a new turn when Ireland aligned itself to EU co-ordinating processes which saw the NAPS being subsumed into the EU social inclusion strategy, and an Irish commitment to orient key policies toward the European Lisbon Strategy”. The OMC in the area of social inclusion was established in 2000. The OMCinclusion can facilitate change in the domain of policy in a member state as it
does exert a certain pressure on the Member States. As a minimum, governments have to actively defend their positions if they are not willing to conform to the common norms and they have to 'think twice' before introducing measures that go against the common norms (Jacobsson 2005: 133).

A number of interviewees highlighted the role the EU can have as a learning arena through the OMCinclusion.

For example, Respondent 14 (civil servant) stated that the OMCinclusion “helped in making us aware of what other countries were doing”. Respondent 9 (Government advisory body official) pointed out that the “exchange of information, experience and knowledge I think has been really helpful”. Respondent 15 (academic) stated that while Ireland “moved further ahead than many countries did…nevertheless we have higher levels of poverty than other countries”. Thus, the EU

as much as anything else it’s an educational system, policymakers from each country get to see what their counterparts are doing in other countries and there is a lot of exchange at European level about these things….so it has made the policy system much more aware of alternatives (Respondent 15 academic).

This is important as Europeanization through 'soft law' is often underpinned by a prior process of learning. Mangan (2010) points out that learning as a result of the OMC process in particular encourages learning about social protection systems and employment supports. Crucially, the OSI Report of 2004 outlined that the OMC is a process subject to domestic interpretation,
it is also an open process which leaves Member States free to choose the mix of policies and priorities which they consider is best suited to meet the agreed set of common objectives. There is no blueprint under open co-ordination to which Member States must adhere, but through participation in the process they can learn in detail how other Member States are meeting the common challenges, and have their approaches evaluated by the Commission and other Member States (Office for Social Inclusion 2004: 13).

As a result, EU co-ordinating processes could be interpreted to suit domestic approaches. Martin (2010: 4) argues that “Ireland’s adaptation to the EU framework helped strengthen and give direction to Irish social policy development”. In particular this can be seen in relation to the dominant approach prevalent in Ireland regarding activation. Kirby and Murphy (2008: 136) assert that the EU encourages member states to promote activation policies and that the link “between national and international interests is a factor determining policy choice”. Activation is a policy approach that the European Commission and Council have advocated member states to address since 2001 as part of the OMC reporting process (Hamel and Vanhercke 2009). Hamel and Vanhercke (2009) argue that in France the increasing prominence of activation in policy approaches is due to European level debates.

Mangan (2010: 57) points to the role of the OMCinclusion on such policy choices in Ireland as it “promotes and facilitates debate and discussion in a comparative EU context on the directions we, as a society, wish to go in working to achieve greater social cohesion” (Mangan 2010: 57). In Ireland, one such example of this was activation policies in order to encourage and support people back into work (Mangan 2010) Respondent 15 (academic) also confirmed the impact of the EU on policy choices,

I think the EU has had quite a lot of influence over the years…. So the fundamental architecture of the system hasn’t been changed that much by the European Union but a lot of individual elements have been influenced… More recently the whole question of activation…. I think that is at least partly determined what you might broadly call the Open Method of Coordination.

This focus on activation however had begun in Ireland a number of years before developments at EU level. During the late 1980s Ireland committed to Active Labour Market Policies (ALMP) and employment, training and education as key mechanisms to
combat poverty and social exclusion. O’Donnell and Moss (2005) stated this represented a move towards a more ‘activist’ approach. Funding from the EU has served to reinforce this dominant domestic policy approach as EU structural funds promoted activation and active inclusion (Commission of the European Communities 2008). O’Donnell and Moss (2005: 315) state that structural funds were “a stimulus to policy innovation and stimulation”. Respondent 4 (civil servant) argued that the EU “has provided funding for policies the government wants to do. It’s a funding vehicle”. In Ireland, EU funding was used to fund labour market programmes, education and training (O’Donnell and Moss 2005: 315). Langford (1999) outlines that EU funding resulted in Ireland adopting a disciplined programmatic approach to tackling unemployment and social exclusion. This required the EU and national programmes to be specific about what the obstacles were and how the programmes would alleviate them (Langford 1999: 108).

National Reports by member states recognised that

the ESF plays a key role in promoting active inclusion. While income support schemes fall outside the scope of ESF, it can contribute significantly to the other two pillars of active inclusion by enhancing inclusive labour markets and access to quality services. In this context, the main focus of ESF interventions is on developing pathways to integration and re-entry into the labour market for disadvantaged people. Actions in this field include providing access to vocational training, the development of the social economy, improving access to social and other services, and fighting discrimination (Commission of the European Communities 2009: 59).

As a result, EU initiatives have served as a means of furthering dominant domestic approaches that can be traced back to the 1980s. Walsh et al. (1998: 9) asserts that “in most instances the motivation for policy reform has been indigenous and reflects a growing localism in Irish public policy a means of responding to the concentrated incidence of unemployment and poverty in the 1980s”. Murphy (2006: 24) argues that “citation of international policy examples is more a case of selective amplification, international examples are cited not to learn from but because they support a particular policy agenda”. Hence, in relation to the core issues of social protection systems and
employment supports the EU has a served as a means of validating and legitimising the dominant domestic approach. Again, as seen in the previous chapter the EU and EU level initiatives were 'used' at member state level to push domestic agendas being pursued.

Due to the crisis of the late 2000s Ireland had to take a bailout from the Troika (EU/IMF/ECB), who became involved in fiscal policy oversight, and in turn undertook “a policy response to the crisis that was distinctive for the degree to which it focused on fiscal consolidation or ‘austerity’” (Ó’ Riain 2014: 241). The current European strategy in the wake of the crisis involves a series of measures:

- Reducing deficits throughout the EU through fiscal consolidation;
- Lending to distressed countries and requiring they undertake structural adjustment programmes in return;
- Promoting ‘re-balancing’ through ‘internal devaluation’ in those countries with current account deficits to increase ‘competitiveness’;
- Creating a banking union to centralise regulation of European banks and provide a banking resolution scheme;
- Creating supervisory structures for the European Commission and other member states to monitor member state’s budgets and macroeconomic indicators; and the writing of a fiscal rule into the law of each member state (Social Justice Ireland 2014: 26).

As previously outlined, the EU has promoted an ‘activation’ approach based on a provision of an adequate income, access to services and to decent jobs. However, EAPN Ireland and Social Justice Ireland argue that in reality EU instiutions have encouraged a tightening of eligibility for benefits as well as cuts in income maintenance, health, housing and support services (Hanan 2012; Social Justice Ireland 2014).

As a result of the economic crash and participation in a bailout programme the Irish government has introduced a series of fiscal adjustments that have led to tax increases, cuts in welfare benefits and in public spending (NESC 2013). Leading up to the crisis, the percentage of the population at risk of poverty, in consistent poverty and the deprivation rate all declined following a sustained commitment of government to increase social security payments to the most vulnerable during the period between
2004 and 2008. This progress has partially been reversed during the recession, as wages and social welfare payments have fallen (Social Justice Ireland 2014: 32). By 2010, it was clear the Irish government was choosing ‘austerity’ programmes centered on cuts in benefits and services (Hanan 2012: 19). Such austerity policies have ensured that the poverty and inequality gap has widened (Hanan 2012). In addition, in Ireland there has been increasing need for basic essentials such as food and housing with health services waiting lists also increasing (Hanan 2012). In particular it has been youth unemployment that has become one of the biggest social consequences of this crisis (NESC 2013). Ireland during this most recent recession witnessed a sharp increase in youth unemployment (amongst those aged 15-24) as it has risen from 9% in 2007 to 28% in September 2013 (Spotlight 2013). From more recent data in 2014 it is apparent that youth unemployment has dropped to 25%, however within this statistic lies the issue of those on the live register for over a year or in other words those who are now viewed as being long-term unemployed. Recent data released shows that 24,000 of young people on the live register have been on it for more than a year (McCarthy 2014).

This social consequence of the crisis has been a priority for the government. While in general benefit payments have been reduced, in particular benefit payments to young people have been curtailed with the focus on initiatives to get young people and those long-term unemployed back to work (Spotlight 2013). The focus on jobs and moving people into employment has been the prioritised policy approach in Ireland since the 1980s recession. This has been further cemented with the recent economic crisis and subsequent bailout. Hanan (2012: 18) argues that due to pressure from the IMF and the ECB as part of our bailout priority has been

Given to reducing employment protection by increased flexibility of working time, lowering standards in working conditions, making hiring and firing easier and limiting workers’ rights. This adds up to a clear strategy to reduce wages and employment costs generally, in order to encourage export-led growth, but at the risk of increasing poverty among marginal workers.

In the government’s plan Pathways to Work 2013 long-term unemployment is described as a “scourge” that “represents one of the greatest threats to Ireland’s recovery” (Government of Ireland 2013: 5). The focus in this recession by the government is to ensure that
people will no longer remain on the Live Register for lengthy periods without an appropriate offer of assistance from the state. In return, individuals will be made aware of their responsibility to commit to job-search and/or other employment, education and training activities or risk losing welfare entitlement (Government of Ireland 2012: 5/6).

Furthermore, the government in its 2012 policy statement on Labour Market Activation argues that in the past Ireland has taken too passive an approach in supporting the unemployed (Government of Ireland 2012). As a result, initiatives have focused on the activation of unemployed people such as internship schemes such as JobBridge, further education and training (Government of Ireland 2011).

As a result, while the recent financial crisis and subsequent bailout from the Troika introduced a programme of austerity and fiscal consolidation it is important to note that while certain measures were required as part of the bailout programme actual specific choices on what to actually cut and approaches to be taken are reflective of national political choices (NESC 2013). Thus, the crisis represents again a period where EU focus on austerity has been used to implement an already exiting Irish policy approach. In the future the EU is set to play a large part in Ireland’s public finances. Firstly, there is the need to meet mandatory EU obligations in terms of maintaining sound domestic public finances in relation to targets in government borrowing and national GDP (Bradley 2013). Secondly, there is the Europe 2020 Strategy which outlines policy goals for ember states in the areas of: creating more employment; increasing investment in R&D; sustainable energy; addressing poverty and social exclusion; fostering competitiveness (Bradley 2013: 5). These measures, while too early to assess their impact at member state level, while shape Irish domestic policies in the years to come.

6.4 Reports and Strategies

Another aspect of the role of the EU in domestic policy has been a reporting and strategy process. For example, the EU OMC process places a focus on a reporting and strategy process. However, respondent 6 (civil servant) stated that “we would have been at that time much further ahead of other EU states and would very much have been congratulated for our strategic approach”. For example the Irish NAP of 1997 “was highly unusual in having a number of key outcome targets at its centre” (Nolan 2006: 185). Respondent 9 (Government advisory body official) highlighted that “Ireland was
the first country in Europe to have poverty targets which was quite far reaching”. Respondent 4 (civil servant) also suggested that “Ireland has a fairly advanced approach to the issue of poverty. Other European countries are way behind so like the impact of the European poverty target has been much more pronounced in those countries than it would be here because we had a target”. As a result Europeanization has been mitigated by the pre-existence of domestic evaluation and monitoring mechanisms. Nonetheless, this research has noted a number of instances where the EU came into play in the policy subsystem in Ireland. For instance, evaluation and monitoring mechanisms apparent at EU level have been transferred and used domestically in Ireland. Again, this is an instance of horizontal Europeanization where the EU has facilitated the diffusion of mechanisms across Europe. The first instance of transfer came about due to participation in the OMC. Mangan (2010: 56/57) points out that

a strategy requires a good knowledge of the trends impacting on the achievement of social inclusion and, in particular, on the different challenges to be met. The OMC has greatly assisted in identifying, documenting and reporting on these trends in both the economic and social spheres and in relating them comparatively to those in other Member States.

In particular EU monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were used to assess recognised domestic issues such as activation policies and combating child poverty (Mangan 2010).

For example, EU indicators have played a role in monitoring progress on targets set at national level. Indicators became part of the EU process in 2001 in order that member states progress in achieving objectives could be monitored (Nolan 2006). Indicators are used as part of the OMCinclusion as a way of problem identification and for assessing policy instruments and their outcomes (Armstrong 2010: 177). Indicators can help in assessing progress in achieving goals and targets as well as being used to identify solutions aimed at solving these problems (Armstrong 2010; Considine and Dukelow 2009). Since 2003 EU indicators have been used in the preparation of Irish National Action Plans. This marked

a fundamental sea-change in the way policy with respect to social inclusion is framed. It provides policy-makers for the first time with a basis on which the starting positions and progress over time in the different Member States in terms of key areas of social concern can be reliably compared (Nolan 2003: 12).
The Irish NAPS of 2002 outlined that “social indicators agreed at EU level will be utilised to monitor progress in relation to the targets set out in this Strategy” (Government of Ireland 2002: 27). The Joint Report issued by the Commission and Council in 2009 stated that Ireland is a member state that enhanced its use of [EU] indicators for monitoring purposes (Commission of the European Communities 2009: 72). For instance, using EU indicators “to monitor progress towards the policy objectives they have set” (Commission of the European Communities 2009: 72).

Regarding EU indicators Respondent 6 (civil servant) stated that “I think it certainly influenced on the broader front as well just in terms of an emphasis on evaluation”. Respondent 2 (community and voluntary sector worker) pointed out that they were effective in that “we knew how things were progressing”. Further to the EU indicators that were part of the OMCinclusion the EU’s Survey on Income and Living Conditions (EU SILC) was also used to monitor progress at domestic level. For example by those in government as well as by external stakeholders,

its findings have greatly assisted in informing not just government but all stakeholders on the outcomes being achieved in terms of poverty levels and, in particular, the priorities that should be pursued in relation both to policies and vulnerable groups (Mangan 2010: 56/57).

The NAPS 2002 outlined that EU SILC data was a cornerstone of data collection (Government of Ireland 2002: 27). As well, the National Action Plan for Social Inclusion of 2007 stated that it will use the EU-SILC data to monitor trends for the future (Government of Ireland 2007: 25). This use of EU-SILC data and the furthering of the statistical capacity of member states corresponds with findings from other member states such as Belgium (Hamel and Vanhercke 2009). Hence, this section demonstrated the transfer of EU evaluation and monitoring mechanisms that were used at a national level, by those in government and stakeholders in order to assess and monitor progress in the domain of policy. Thus, Ireland had committed to producing national strategies that outlined the policy approach to be taken. From the 2000s onwards it was also noticeable in the subsystem in Ireland that a reporting process had been introduced domestically as a result of Ireland’s participation in the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). The principle of drafting reports and strategies was not a new initiative at domestic level by the time it was developed at EU level. Nonetheless, the
reporting process associated with the OMC did lead to a reporting process being developed at national level due to participation in the OMC.

An important element of the OMC was the production of reports (NAPincl) by member states and the evaluation of these reports by the European Commission and Council in Joint Reports. The reporting process involved a number of steps. For example,

the Commission arranges for a thorough analysis of each Plan to be performed. As part of this process, representatives of each Member State meet with Commission officials to discuss the Plan. The Plans are also examined by the Member States in a peer review process organised by the Social Protection Committee (SPC). A draft Commission analysis of the Action Plans is then produced for discussion by the SPC. This forms the basis for a Joint Inclusion Report on all the Action Plans agreed by the SPC. This report is then submitted to the Council of Ministers for approval before being submitted to the European Council (Office for Social Inclusion 2004: 14).

In 2001 Ireland submitted its first report for evaluation. This marked another moment in time where the EU came into play in Ireland. Armstrong (2010: 162) argues that member states producing reports was “a form of socialization within a community of officials operating at both national and EU levels”. Armstrong (2010: 161) points out that member states “…voluntarily complied with the request to produce NAPincls” (Armstrong 2010: 161). Thus, the writing of reports by member states represents “less of a shadow of hierarchy and more of a shadowy hierarchy: a learned response from doing business with Brussels” (Armstrong 2010: 162). Armstrong states that rather than looking for a direct effect on policies thus “the point to emphasise is that the initial effect to be judged lies at the level of adopting a NAPincl and its consequential impact on the domestic strategic environment rather than looking immediately for an effect directly on substantive domestic policy” (Armstrong 2010: 162). Thus, where Member States did not already have such strategic plans, then self-evidently, production of such a plan would indicate a strong Europeanization effect. Where states already possessed a strategic plan, then the Europeanization effect would be measured not just in terms of the mere adoption of the NAPincl and the existing domestic strategy. One effect could be the coexistence of the
NAPincl and the domestic strategy. A more dramatic effect would be if the NAPincl replaced existing domestic plans and strategies (Armstrong 2010: 162).

In other words the level of Europeanization depends on the level of 'fit' between EU and national level. The greater the level of 'misfit' the more likely the EU will lead to change.

Ireland’s engagement with the reporting aspect of the OMC process provides a key insight into the EU’s role in embedding change within the policy subsystem of social inclusion. Participation in the OMC did lead to the transfer of a reporting process from the EU level which led Ireland to draft reports and submit these to the EU for review. These reports acted as a policy instrument that outlined policy goals and objectives. The Joint Report issued in 2005 argued that “the development and implementation of NAPs/inclusion by all Member States clearly shows the intention to increase efforts to tackle poverty and social exclusion” (Commission of the European Communities 2005: 11). Further to this, the Office for Social Inclusion in 2004 stated that “it is serving to greatly improve understanding of the causes and new emerging forms of poverty and to identify how best these can be addressed while maintaining economic competitiveness and continuing to achieve high levels of employment” (Office for Social Inclusion 2004: 14). Respondent 4 (civil servant) highlighted that “the main thing is that it [the OMC reporting process] does put on an obligation on the government to account for what it’s doing”. The NAPincl of 2003-2005 pointed out that in the particular the OMC reporting process has served to assist in planning to achieve goals such as creating jobs, achieving social cohesion and tackling poverty (Government of Ireland 2003a). Respondent 6 (civil servant) also pointed out that “I always think on one hand it’s [the reporting process] a tick box exercise on the other it actually forces you to reflect on well what have we achieved, what haven’t we achieved and what do we have to do to get there. So it is a way of pushing the agenda”. As a result, the reporting process associated with the EU mainly served as an evaluation of existing policy approaches and how successful these were in combating poverty and social exclusion.

The EU also set out objectives as part of the OMC reporting process. These objectives “set out the framework within which Member States were requested to set out their strategies and priorities for action” (Armstrong 2010: 164). Within Ireland EU objectives and targets set as part of the OMC process have played an important role in
“operationalising' high level goals. The objectives clarify the outcomes to be achieved. The OMC greatly assists in providing a basis for this” (Mangan 2010: 57). Respondent 14 (civil servant) also pointed to their importance,

it did get us up to a point thinking strategically so we did think what is our goal. We did think through objectives. We did set out measures so I mean we set out plans. Okay so that’s our goal. That’s our objective. There’s transparency. That’s what we’re doing to realise it. That hadn’t been done before you see.

Hence, the OMC reporting process acted as a way of assessing secondary aspects associated with policy design. This was further evident in the approach taken by Ireland in drafting reports to submit to the EU. The reports submitted to the EU provided “an opportunity for review and evaluation of the effectiveness” of the National Anti-Poverty Strategies that was instigated in 1997” (Government of Ireland 2001: 10). The NAPS of 1997 outlined the key areas for attention within this policy subsystem. These were educational disadvantage; unemployment; income adequacy; disadvantaged urban areas and rural poverty (Government of Ireland 1997). The first three of these areas were outlined as the most important (Government of Ireland 1997).

The first NAPincl submitted to the EU adopted the objectives associated with the OMC, that is facilitating participation in employment; access by all to resources, rights, goods and services; to prevent the risks of exclusion; to help the most vulnerable and to mobilise all relevant bodies (Government of Ireland 2001). However, it highlighted that the key features of the 1997 NAPS formed the basis of the first NAPincl submitted to the EU, for example:

a consensual definition of poverty and social exclusion; the fundamental importance of promoting employment opportunities and participation in the labour market as the best protection against poverty and social exclusion; an examination of poverty and social exclusion, including its measurement, in a multi-faceted way, beyond concentration on income alone; a number of specific target areas but avoiding proliferation of targets; strengthening of political and societal consensus that there is a need to reduce levels of poverty in Ireland; co-ordination and consultation around poverty issues; institutional structures to underpin the NAPS process; the potential for inequality and discrimination to cause poverty; a process to monitor policy at design stage to determine its
potential impact on the poor/excluded, through a system of poverty proofing (Government of Ireland 2001: 10/11).

The NAPincl 2001-2003 was also described as being based on the national social partnership agreement The Programme for Prosperity and Fairness (2000) and the National Development Plan as well as being a reflection of what was outlined in the NAPS of 1997 (Government of Ireland 2001). Hence, the first Irish NAPincl was a reflection of domestic strategies. The NAPincl of 2001-2003 further outlined that plans submitted to the EU in the future were to be “consistent with, and contingent upon, the findings of the NAPS review and will also reflect EU developments in this area” (Government of Ireland 2001: 1). The revised NAPS of 2002 Building an Inclusive Society furthered this by highlighting that “the NAPS and NAPincl processes will now merge and future plans submitted to the European Union will be consistent with the revised NAPS” (Government of Ireland 2002: 5). Thus, rather than EU reports being the primary means of setting out national contributions to tackle poverty and social exclusion, national reports remained the primary means of setting out policy goals and approaches with the EU reports based on national agreements and strategies.

This premise was furthered again when Building an Inclusive Society (2002) stated that “we believe that this strategy, which now sets out Ireland’s national contribution to the EU initiative on poverty and social exclusion, is the most ambitious possible plan to end poverty in our country” (Government of Ireland 2002: 2). The key objectives of the NAPS 2002 were to reduce and ideally eliminate, consistent poverty; build an inclusive society; and develop social capital – particularly for disadvantaged communities (Government of Ireland 2002: 8). The strategy further outlined a number of themes relevant “for example consistent poverty, income adequacy, employment and unemployment, health, housing and accommodation, vulnerable groups, urban poverty, rural disadvantage, access to services and mobilising all sectors” (Government of Ireland 2002). This strategy represented the primary means of outlining aims and objectives and did not reference specific EU objectives. The Irish 2003-2005 NAPincl did use EU objectives when outlining the strategic approach and policy measures, that is:

- to facilitate participation in employment
- to facilitate access by all to resources, rights, goods and services
to prevent the risks of exclusion
- to help the most vulnerable
- to mobilise all relevant bodies (Government of Ireland 2003a).

However, the 2003-2005 NAPincl is built on what was agreed as part of the preceding social partnership agreement processes (Government of Ireland 2003a: 2). The core objective of the 2003-2005 NAPincl is the same as the one set in Sustaining Progress that is “to build a fair and inclusive society and ensure that people have the resources and opportunities to live life with dignity and have access to the quality public services that underpin life changes and experiences” (Government of Ireland 2003a: 22). The 2003-2005 NAPincl also outlined that the priorities outlined for attention were identified in the partnership agreement Sustaining Progress for example, ending child poverty, tackling educational disadvantage, the long-term unemployed, vulnerable workers and those who have been made redundant, children, people with disabilities and older people, migration and interculturalism, housing and accommodation, alcohol/drug misuse and including everyone in the information society (Government of Ireland 2003a: 22). Again, this demonstrates how EU reports were based on pre-existing national strategies.

The Office for Social Inclusion’s Report in 2004 referred to both national and EU objectives. For example, it referenced the overall objective from the National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) which was “to reduce substantially and, ideally, eliminate poverty in Ireland and to build a socially inclusive society” (Office for Social Inclusion 2004). The Office for Social Inclusion (2004) report also used EU objectives to frame the report. For example, facilitate participation in employment; to facilitate access to resources, rights, goods and services for all; to prevent the risks of exclusion and to help the most vulnerable (Office for Social Inclusion 2004: 73). The National Report for Ireland on Strategies for Social Protection and Inclusion (NSSPI)(2006-2008) that was submitted to the EU was again like other plans and was based upon the latest domestic social partnership agreement, Towards 2016 (Government of Ireland 2006a). As a result, Ireland is a member state that has produced its EU reports in line with other longer term national strategies (Commission of the European Communities 2009: 72) with the reports submitted as part of the OMC process not superseding national strategies and reports. Therefore, it is apparent that reports and strategies submitted as
part of the OMC process are essentially drafted based on existing information and
dominant policy goals in national agreements due to the presence of a pre-existing
national reporting process.

EU reports were also used to showcase and legitimise domestic initiatives. _Towards 2016_ outlined

a new framework within which to address key social challenges, has been
developed around the ‘lifecycle’ approach which offers a streamlined, cross-
cutting and visible approach to tackling poverty and social exclusion as well as
developing greater social protection. The key lifecycle stages are identified as:
Children, People of Working Age, Older People, and People with Disabilities
(Government of Ireland 2006: 9).

The introduction of a lifecycle approach marked a change in policy approach in the
policy subsystem in Ireland. For example,

experience in many countries has shown that focusing individually on various
policies such as income support, employment supports, education and training
etc. (the 'silo' approach) may not be as effective in terms of outcomes as those
achievable with greater coordination and integration across relevant policy
areas….The OMC endeavours to encourage instead a process that has the
strategy at the centre guiding and driving the development of policies on an
integrated basis, with the focus on outcomes to be achieved for the various
categories at risk of poverty and social exclusion. Ireland has sought to foster
this through a life cycle approach – children, people of working age, older
people, with two further categories – people with disabilities and communities
which includes areas of urban and rural disadvantage (Mangan 2010: 58).

The 2007 Joint Report supported the lifecycle approach as the “areas identified are all in
need of significant attention and fit well with EU priorities” (Commission of the
European Communities 2007: 222). As a result, the OMC process provided a way of
validating a new domestic policy approach at domestic level rather than being the
impetus for the change.
It is apparent that the reporting process associated with the EU has not replaced the national reporting process. As pointed out by Respondent 4 (civil servant) “they were variations or adaptations of the national policy. So I think they’ve been reporting mechanisms rather than anything else”. Similarly, Armstrong (2010: 186) also found in the UK “…its character remains principally that of a mechanism than as a direct means of influencing domestic strategies or policies”. In 2007 EAPN Ireland summed up the reporting process,

Ireland currently has two National Action Plans for Social Inclusion which have different origins and structures. However, both are linked with a lot of similarity in content and targets. The targets and actions outlined in both strategies were agreed as part of the Social Partnership discussion in 2006 are outlined in the agreement Towards 2016. The National Action Plan for Social Inclusion (NAPinclusion) 2007-2016 contains greater detail than the Irish National Report on Strategies for Social Protection and Social Inclusion (NSSPSI) 2006-2008 which has been developed as part of the EU inclusion Strategy (EAPN Ireland 2007: 1).

Analysis of national documents suggests that national social partnership agreements and NAPS remained the dominant reporting process in Ireland. As Respondent 4 (civil servant) highlighted “it’s more kind of trying to see what we’re doing fits in with the European agenda”. Respondent 6 (civil servant) pointed out “you use the EU agenda to do what you want to do at national level”. In the case of Ireland, the pre-existing reporting process remained the dominant one with the EU reporting process used to assess and validate dominant domestic policy approaches.

Due to the existence of a national anti-poverty strategy prior to developments at EU level the EU did not result in a significant change in domestic reporting processes. Nolan (2006: 185) argues that concerning the development of anti-poverty strategies, Ireland

was among the most advanced in this respect, the initiative to develop a formal National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) having being put in train in the mid-1990s. This meant that meeting the merging demands of the EU’s Social Inclusion Process in terms of framing National Action Plans against Poverty and
Social Exclusion (NAP/incl) has meant in the Irish case adapting the pre-existing NAPS (Nolan 2006: 185).

Respondent 4 (civil servant) confirmed this view,

now again for Ireland we’ve always been slightly ahead of the game compared to other countries. So what the EU has required we’ve always been ahead of it. I think we’ve always had that commitment and we’ve always had a strong voluntary community sector focus….you had the church organisations…SVP, CORI, Social Justice Ireland and there’s always been a political dimension as well kind of a labour party stroke trade union element which has been very committed to this.

Respondent 2 (community and voluntary sector worker) also highlighted that “the national action plans on inclusion ….a lot of that was almost a copy of the Irish National Anti-Poverty Strategy”. Nonetheless participation in the OMC did lead to some change in Ireland. For example, it led to a bi-yearly reporting process being transferred to domestic level. This reporting process never usurped the national reporting process but accompanied it. The reporting process associated with the OMC served as a mechanism to outline policy goals and approaches by those working at national level. This transfer is evident of horizontal Europeanization which is “whereby norms can be diffused across member states using the EU as a facilitator of norm and policy diffusion” (Mulcahy 2009: 23). In this case the OMC was a facilitator of policy diffusion in the form of a reporting process which was transferred and required Ireland to set out its policy goals and approaches on a more regular basis than that of the NAPS and provided an opportunity for Irish policymakers to re-assess how best to achieve policy goals and objectives. As a result, it is apparent that the EU didn’t lead to major change in Irish policy within the subsystem but nonetheless led Ireland to engage in a reporting process more often than was planned for nationally.
6.5 Conclusions

This chapter was based on answering the research question - has the EU led to the stimulation of policy change in Ireland? The above analysis leads to the conclusion that the EU has not lead to major policy changes in the domain of policy within the subsystem of social inclusion. Ireland had in many instances pre-empted steps taken at EU level as well as instances of 'uploading' by Ireland also prevalent. However, there was some evidence of Europeanization. For example, policy language and policy lessons as a result of participation in the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes were transferred in addition to an EU reporting process established in Ireland due to participation in the OMCinclusion. EU evaluation and monitoring mechanisms were also transferred to the domestic level in order to assess and monitor progress as well as improving the statistical capacity of Ireland. An interesting insight gained from this analysis was that the EU in many instances led to no change in policy, for example regarding minimum incomes and commitment to an activation approach. Instead, the EU acted as a means of supporting a policy approach that was dominant at domestic level and was used by domestic actors as a way of validating this approach. Again, the EU was used as a 'leverage' domestically. Hamel and Vanhercke (2009: 85) in their study also referred to the EU being used to legitimise preferences and advance agendas at domestic level.
Chapter 7: The Europeanization of Polity

7.1 Introduction: Assessing the Impact of the European Union on Irish Polity

This chapter seeks to assess whether the EU has led to changes in the domain of polity. As a result, this chapter sought to answer the research question has the EU led to changes in domestic institutional arrangements within the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland? As in chapter five and chapter six the EU did not lead to any major change in Ireland within the domain of polity. However, the assessment of the Europeanization of Irish polity found that the EU nonetheless played a role domestically. The chapter firstly discusses the institutional arrangements that were set up within Ireland as part of the NAPS process and social partnership process. It then explores the role of the EU in this area and while the EU’s role is evident it served to in some cases strengthen existing institutional arrangements rather than being the impetus for new institutional structures. However, it is also evident that the EU has been unable to overcome the lack of implementation and engagement domestically with institutional arrangements associated with the NAPS, for example with poverty proofing. This chapter also outlines the role the EU has played in developing partnership in Ireland. Domestically there has been a strong commitment to the principle of partnership but the EU has built on this to further its development even more. For example, the impact of the EU Structural Fund reforms that established Monitoring Committees is discussed along with the community initiative OPLURD and other initiatives such as INTERREG, EQUAL, URBAN and PEACE that also contributed to developing partnership in Ireland. In addition, the role in Ireland of the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes that were created to further the principles of partnership in particular in the subsystem under investigation in this research is presented.

7.2 Institutional arrangements

The first section of this chapter discusses institutional arrangements within Ireland and the role the EU has played. The social partnership process was set up in 1987 in Ireland and as a result “since 1987, Irish economic and social policy has been conducted by a form of negotiated governance” (O’Donnell 2008: 73). Social partnership was created in an effort to solve the economic crisis that faced Ireland at the time (Adshead and
McInerney 2009). The 1987 social partnership agreement the Programme for National Recovery (PNR) asserted that

The Government, the ICTU, the FUE, the CII, the CIF, the IFA, Macra na Feirme and the ICOS, conscious of the grave state of our economic and social life, have agreed on this Programme to seek to regenerate our economy and improve the social equity of our society through their combined efforts (Government of Ireland 1987: 68).

All the various groups that took part in social partnership “held a common interest in stopping the vicious circle of economic stagnation, rising taxes and exploding debt” (Adshead 2011: 80). Furthermore, the original set of social partners were in agreement that the purpose of the social partnership agreement was to set pay (Adshead 2011). Allen (2000: 59) states that “1987 was supposed to be the start of a new era when management and unions co-operated to get the Irish economy out of the doldrums and share the wealth between them”. The creation of social partnership in 1987 was a key juncture in Irish policymaking. Connolly (2008: 8) argues that “there is a consensus in the literature on social partnership that the first agreement in 1987 did institute the beginning of a new departure in the institutional form of policymaking”. Considine and Dukelow (2009) also argue that the creation of social partnership marked a new era in policymaking in Ireland. Connolly (2008: 8) describes social partnership as a “web of governance that involved multiple sets of engagements between government departments and civil society actors”. Social Partnership was driven by a Fianna Fáil government that wished to establish a national agreement due to the economic crisis facing Ireland in the 1980s (Considine and Dukelow 2009).

While the Community and Voluntary pillar became part of the social partnership process in 1994 they proved to have issues with the process. The community and voluntary pillar’s primary concern lay with issues such as poverty and inequality, however the basis of social partnership had been about setting pay (Adshead 2011). As a result, they lacked a shared common concern with other partners with all social partnership partners becoming frustrated in particular by negotiations for the 2002 agreement Programme for Sustaining Progress (Adshead 2011). Other social partners bemoaned that the community and voluntary pillar failed to acknowledge that compromise and negotiation were important elements (Adshead 2011). During
negotiations sixteen members of the social partnership agreement voted against the agreement due to the lack of social commitments evident. Hence, some of the community and voluntary pillar such as the Community Platform, the National Women’s Council of Ireland and the Simon Community walked out of negotiations while others such as SVP, CORI and the INOU remained despite reservations they had (Connolly 2008). The leaving of certain groups of the community and voluntary pillar did not stall negotiations and ultimately a new partnership agreement Sustaining Progress was drafted in 2003, signalling social partnership would continue with or without them.

Another key moment domestically in the domain of polity within the policy subsystem of social inclusion was the creation of the 1997 National Anti-Poverty Strategy Sharing in Progress (NAPS). The institutional arrangements outlined built on those established during the social partnership model established in the 1980s in Ireland (O’Donnell and Moss 2005; Adshead and McInerney 2008). The NAPS resulted from concerns raised about the shortcoming of approaches in Ireland to combat poverty and social exclusion and was occasioned by a change in government in 1992 which brought the Rainbow Coalition to power. It was with the 1997 National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) Sharing in Progress that institutional arrangements relevant to the subsystem were clearly outlined as part of a national strategy. The creation of institutional arrangements was highlighted in the 1997 strategy, “the need for strong institutional structures to underpin the development of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy was identified early on in the formulation of the strategy” (Government of Ireland 1997: 20). The 1997 strategy pointed out that a review of the effectiveness of these institutional arrangements would be carried out after three years of implementation of the strategy and furthermore asserted that new arrangements could be introduced (Government of Ireland 1997). The NAPS of 1997 aimed to further institutional arrangements between different actors at political and administrative level as well as involving more non-state actors and people experiencing poverty and social exclusion in policymaking. At political level a Cabinet Sub-Committee, chaired by the Taoiseach, as well as including all relevant Minsters to the policy area\textsuperscript{11}, was established (Government of Ireland 1997). This was to ensure

\textsuperscript{11} Taoiseach; Tánaiste and Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment; Minister for Finance; Minister for Health and Children; Minister for the Environment and Local Government; Minister for Social, Community and Family Affairs; Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform; Minister for Education and Science; Minister for Tourism, Sport and Recreation; Attorney General; Minister of State at the
greater coordination between different departments with the aim of creating a more 'joined up' approach to horizontal coordination.

At administrative level attempts to further horizontal co-ordination were apparent with the continuation of a NAPS Inter-Departmental Policy Committee that was originally involved in developing the NAPS and would have the role of monitoring day to day it’s roll-out (Adshead and McInerney 2008). It would be chaired by both the Department of the Taoiseach and the Department of Social Welfare. The composition of the Committee was outlined as “senior officers who will have designated as having responsibility for ensuring that the NAPS provisions relevant to their Departments are implemented” (Government of Ireland 1997: 20). As a result, it served to implement a more 'joined up' approach between administrative level actors. However, a number of anti-poverty organisations suggested this would be better placed in the Department of an Táoiseach (Adshead and McInerney 2008: 238). Government bodies such as the National Economic and Social Forum and the Combat Poverty Agency undertook monitoring roles of the NAPS with NESF reporting on progress and the CPA overseeing implementation as well as information and advice to government departments and other government structures at local and regional level (Government of Ireland 1997; Adshead and McInerney 2008: 241). A NAPS Unit was also established in Department of Social, Community and Family Affairs and was tasked with co-ordinating and implementing cross-departmental actions regarding the NAPS (Combat Poverty Agency 2000: 38). In addition, representatives from other relevant government departments were to be part of the NAPS staffing (Combat Poverty Agency 2000). The revision of the 1997 NAPS in 2002 Building an Inclusive Society sought to improve and create new institutional arrangements. For example, a Cabinet Committee was established which was to be chaired by the Taoiseach as well as a Senior Officials Group to support the Cabinet Committee. The Senior Officials group served to bring a more 'joined up' approach to policy making,

I know I worked very closely with lone parent’s policy proposals and we had people from education and we had people from health and we had people from environment trying to pull together. I cannot say we achieved it but we certainly

Department of Health and Children (with special responsibility for children); Minister of State at the Department of Agriculture and Food (with special responsibility for Rural Development); Minister of State at the Department of Tourism, Sport and Recreation (with special responsibility for Local Development).
moved it on in terms of trying to build a common approach to services. The
difficulty here sometimes and in the past, less so now, we were always very
focused on income supports but we were never able to influence the services and
I think that was a change as well (Respondent 6 civil servant).

Furthermore, an Office for Social Inclusion was established to oversee policies relating
to poverty, social exclusion and social inclusion\(^\text{12}\).

In government departments institutional arrangements were also strengthened by the
creation of social inclusion units in departments that were responsible for implementing
policies relevant to the subsystem (Government of Ireland 2002). The Combat Poverty
Agency (CPA) and The National Economic and Social Forum (NESF) continued their
role of monitoring the social inclusion element of national strategies and agreements
(Government of Ireland 2002). The commitment to involving a wider groups of actors
and in particular those experiencing poverty and social exclusion was again furthered
(Government of Ireland 2002). The 2002 NAPS outlined in particular the creation of a
new Social Inclusion Consultative Group as well as a Social Inclusion Forum to involve
those experiencing poverty and social exclusion,

A new Social Inclusion Consultative Group involving the social partners and
anti-poverty experts will meet twice a year to offer its advice and observations
on the process as it develops. This will strengthen the involvement of the social
partners. However, it is also considered vital that individual members and
representatives of the community and voluntary and other sectors have an
opportunity to contribute to the process (Government of Ireland 2002: 24).

NESF were also to convene an annual Social Inclusion Forum that would facilitate the
participation of those experiencing poverty and social exclusion as well as those that
work with them (Adshead and McInerney 2008: 26). At a local level, institutional
changes originated from the Better Local Government white paper in 2000 (Adshead
and McInerney 2008). Social inclusion units were established in local authorities that
aimed to bring a social inclusion remit at local level (Government of Ireland 2002). This
was furthered by the establishment of thirty-four County/City Development Boards

\(^{12}\text{In July 2010 the Combat Poverty Agency (CPA) integrated into the Office for Social Inclusion and}
became known as the Social Inclusion Division}
(CDBs). Membership of these boards is made up of actors from state agencies, local government as well as social partners (Adshead and McInerney 2008).

An assessment of the NAPS by the CPA highlighted the achievement of establishing the institutional arrangements outlined above (Combat Poverty Agency 2000). However, there have been criticisms of the implementation of these institutional arrangements. For example, the failure to appoint representatives from other departments to the NAPS Unit with Liaison Officers only being appointed to departments whose remit covered poverty issues (Adshead and McInerney 2008: 239). In another report the institutional mechanisms established were described as ‘patchy’ across different levels of government with a view that “most of the anti-poverty work is done by locally based organisations that are not directly under the auspices or control of the local authority system” and as a result a prominent view was that the role and functioning of social inclusion units operating in a number of local authorities as well as the City and County Development Boards needed to be improved (O’ Kelly 2007: 95). Under resourcing has been an issue in the functioning of the NAPS Inter-Departmental Policy Committee as well as the NAPS Unit (Combat Poverty Agency 2000). While involvement of the community and voluntary sector was a central aspect of the development of the strategy this has become one of the main criticisms of the functioning and delivery of the NAPS (Combat Poverty Agency 2000). It was envisioned that this role of the community and voluntary sector would continue in further developing the NAPS (Adshead and Millar 2008).

However, the Combat Poverty Agency (2000: 40) noted in an assessment of the NAPS that ‘the involvement of the community and voluntary sector in the implementation of the Strategy has been limited’. Furthermore, involvement of the community and voluntary sector in two NAPS-led cross-departmental literacy initiatives was limited to information exchange and such initiatives proved to be an exception (Adshead and Millar 2008: 26). In addition, regarding seven National Anti-Poverty Networks\(^{13}\), which existed prior to the creation of the NAPS, “there appeared to be no direct, formal or consistent mechanism for their involvement within the NAPS” with their only link to the NAPS coming as a result of the CPA’s interaction with them (Adshead and Millar 2008: 26).

\(^{13}\) The Irish National Organisation for the Unemployed (INOU); the Community Workers Cooperative (CWC); the Irish Rural Link (IRL); the European Anti-Poverty Network (EAPN); the Forum of People with Disabilities (Forum); the Irish Travellers Movement (ITM); and the One Parent Exchange Network (OPEN) (Adshead and Millar 2008: 26).
The involvement of the community and voluntary sector did not improve after the 2002 revision of the NAPS with Adshead and Millar (2008: 27) suggesting that “its participation seems to have largely been collapsed into the social partnership structure” which has left “the community and voluntary sector’s input into policy is conspicuously circumscribed and constrained” (Adshead and McInerney 2008: 242). In addition, social partnership was dominated by those with economic rather than social interests and as discussed earlier in this chapter the community and voluntary pillar that participated in social partnership had issues with the process which ultimately led to a number of groups leaving partnership negotiations ( Adshead and McInerney 2009: 15). The Social Inclusion Forum while being introduced as a means of involving those who experience poverty and social exclusion themselves and those that work with them there has been no evidence of a reporting back process to participants in order to gauge the input of the forum to the policy process (Adshead and McInerney 2009). The lack of their involvement in the implementation of the NAPS has also been criticised (Combat Poverty Agency 2000).

The EU through the OMC process has sought to influence institutional arrangements at domestic level. In particular this process served to strengthen existing institutional structures rather than being the impetus for new arrangements. A key objective of the OMC was to encourage member states to mobilise all relevant bodies when combating poverty and social exclusion. Respondent 6 (civil servant) highlighted that as a result the strengthening of institutional arrangements was driven by the EU “putting in the structural changes at official level that would have been an achievement…Some of that would have been EU driven in terms of national action plans”. Murphy (2008: 30) also suggests the institutional arrangements were driven by the EU,

most recently the Office for Social Inclusion was established to support engagement with the various National Anti-Poverty Strategy and National Social Inclusion Action Plans including the NAPincl and other policy processes associated with the EU Open Method of Coordination.

Furthermore, it helped strengthen a 'joined-up' approach that was established with the Senior Officials Group as part of the 1997 NAPS, “I think certainly in the beginning it was very much about reporting, trying to develop targets, trying to put processes in place but I think it did lead to significant changes in terms of the way we developed
cross-cutting approaches” (Respondent 6). In between the development of the two National Anti-Poverty Strategies in 1997 and 2002 in Ireland a report was submitted for review to the EU as part of the OMC process.

The NAPincl of 2001-2003 demonstrated a commitment to mobilising different actors (Government of Ireland 2001). However, its purpose, rather than being the catalyst for change in institutional arrangements itself instead provided a description of the institutional arrangements already in existence in Ireland such as the social partnership process (Government of Ireland 2001). The NAPincl also referred to key elements of the NAPS of 1997

the NAPS principles include ensuring equal access and encouraging participation for all, the development of the partnership approach building on national and local partnership processes and actively involving the Community and Voluntary Sector (Government of Ireland 2001: 31).

The 2003-2005 NAPincl submitted to the EU also referred to institutional arrangements already in existence. Furthermore, it asserted that any revisions to institutional arrangements were committed to in the Social Partnership agreement, *Programme for Prosperity and Fairness* (2000) (Government of Ireland 2003a). This was further apparent when the 2003-2005 NAPincl stated that,

A range of institutional structures have been established already in the context of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy to harness resources across all Government Departments and to ensure that a coherent crosscutting and co-ordinated approach is adopted to tackling the multi-dimensional and complex nature of poverty. These structures will also support the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the NAPs/incl. (Government of Ireland 2003a: 47).

Thus, the NAPincl served as a reporting mechanism that outlined domestic institutional arrangements already in place. As a result, the OMCinclination did not lead to significant changes in polity in Ireland. Any revision to institutional arrangements was a domestically driven agenda. The OMCinclination did serve to strengthen commitments to existing domestic approaches rather than being an impetus for change This demonstrates that while the EU might not lead to significant changes in institutional
arrangements it can provide a pressure to continue with domestic institutional arrangements.

The EAPN et al. (2004) argue that one the main achievements of the NAPS was raising awareness of the issue of poverty within the administrative system, in particular the introduction of poverty proofing. Poverty proofing was first introduced in 1998 as a result of a commitment to introducing the process that was contained in the 1997 NAPS, the question of impact on poverty will be a key consideration when decisions are being made about spending priorities in the context of the national budgetary process and the allocation of the EU structural funds (Government of Ireland 1997: 20/21).

Poverty proofing was subsequently outlined as the main tool for mainstreaming social inclusion at government level in the Irish National Action Plan against Poverty and Social Exclusion 2003-2005 (Government of Ireland 2003a) with further commitments evident in reports such as the OSI first annual report in 2004 (Office for Social Inclusion 2004). Poverty proofing is geared towards incorporating a poverty perspective into all major policy proposals. It is not about redirecting resources or all policies towards social inclusion and anti-poverty measures. Rather it is intended to identify the impact of the policy proposal on excluded people so that this can be given proper consideration in designing policy (EAPN et al. 2004: viii).

Poverty proofing was mandated to be used in the preparation of the following:

- In the preparation of Strategic Management Initiative\(^1\) (SMI) Statements of Strategy and Annual Business Plans
- In designing policies and preparing Memoranda to Government (Cabinet Submissions) on significant policy proposals
- In the preparation of the Estimates and Annual Budget proposals – this will also include expenditure reviews and programme evaluations

\(^1\) This is the main planning and development mechanism at national government level (Hanan 2004: 2).
• In the preparation of the National Development Plan and other relevant EU Plans and Programmes and in the preparation of legislation. (NESC 2001: 7; Hanan 2004: 2; EAPN et al. 2004: 60).

The aim of poverty proofing was to ensure that assessing the impact on poverty would become part of the policy process (EAPN et al. 2004).

While poverty proofing has increased awareness amongst decision makers about the impact of their policy decisions on those experiencing poverty and social exclusion there have been criticisms of the impact and compliance with poverty proofing in Ireland (EAPN et al. 2004; OSI 2006). In particular, there have been criticisms regarding the poverty proofing of fiscal policies and budgets (Hanan 2004). The Combat Poverty Agency expressed concern that the process had not been inadequately developed and employed (CPA 2000: 66). EAPN et al. (2004: 59) suggest that Ireland has achieved ‘passive’ mainstreaming of poverty elimination and social inclusion as poverty reduction/elimination forms part of the government priorities alongside other competing priorities rather than leading to new anti-poverty policies (EAPN et al. 2004: 59). A NESC review of the poverty proofing process in Ireland found a high level of compliance, yet this did not necessarily mean that this had any significant impact on the policy making (NESC 2001; OSI 2006). A separate review by the OSI noted that certain measures have been put in place (OSI 2006). For example, the following were examples of being poverty proofed by the Community and Voluntary sector, for instance, *The Report of the Working Group Examining The Treatment of Married, Cohabiting and One-Parent Families Under the Tax and Social Welfare Codes and the Review of the One-Parent Family Payment*. (NESC 2001:16).

Yet, the OSI report noted that it is not used widely enough across all of government (OSI 2006). While there have been positive examples of poverty proofing as mentioned above there have also been instances where policy areas of significant importance to tackling poverty and social exclusion have not been poverty proofed, for example the introduction of a basic subsistence regime called ‘direct provision’ for asylum seekers (Hanan 2004: 4). The NESC (2001: 14) report argues that “there is little direct evidence that the process has seriously influenced the policy formation process and none that it has altered the distribution of resources”. In turn, the Community and Voluntary Sector have criticised that lack of
transparency in the process, the absence of demonstrable impact on policy output and the absence of integrated proofing of the budgetary package. It was argued that the Guidelines have been applied only in areas that are self-evidently poverty action areas and in instances where the outcome would be positive (NESC 2001: 15).

Hanan (2004: 4) argues that ultimately the poverty proofing process remains a highly “secretive and internal government system”. Hence, while the introduction of poverty proofing and the premise of mainstreaming social inclusion has been an innovative initiative it’s impact on policymaking has proved to be less successful than what was envisaged when the NAPS was being drafted.

Indeed, while mainstreaming social inclusion and poverty proofing has risen on the EU agenda it seems to have not had any real effect on Ireland’s implementation of the process. Ireland’s commitment to poverty proofing has been noted in a number of Joint Reports. The Joint Reports of 2003 and 2004 acknowledged that Ireland had introduced “mechanisms for ensuring that a concern with poverty and social exclusion is taken into account when policies are being proposed or reviewed such as poverty proofing in Ireland” (Commission of the European Communities 2003: 112) but that the impact of poverty proofing on the budget process remained unclear (Commission of European Communities 2004). A commitment to poverty proofing seems to be a domestically driven agenda with Ireland once again preceeding the debate at European level. There is no evidence of the EU having a significant impact in Ireland on this issue with its role limited to supporting the poverty proofing process through the NAPS/incl reporting process. However, this support has failed to overcome the issues associated with the implementation of poverty proofing in Ireland.

7.3 Partnership

A national concern with unemployment in the 1980s and the resulting poverty and disadvantage along with EU structural fund reforms from the end of the 1980s led to partnerships becoming part of the structure of Irish governance (Connolly 2007). The creation of area-based partnerships (ABP) represented a shift in polity in Ireland. During the 1980s in Ireland unemployment was a major problem facing the government at the time as well as a rising concern about the marginalisation and multiple disadvantage experienced by certain communities in Ireland at the time (Frazer 1994).
Subsequently, in 1987 the Combat Poverty Agency (CPA) outlined a strategic plan which suggested a role for “pilot community development projects” (Connolly 2008a: 11). This strategy was based on the work that had been undertaken by voluntary and community groups in Ireland previously (Zappone 1998: 53). Connolly (2008a: 11) argues that as a result “when an area-based policy approach was proposed by NESC in its strategy report 'A Strategy for the Nineties', this was picking up on an already established discourse”. The 1990 NESC Strategy asserted that a targeted response focused particularly on combatting long term unemployment was needed (Connolly 2008a) although their remit widened over time to include tackling issues such as early school leaving and development of local areas (Turok 2001). This was particularly evident with the National Development Plan 1994-99 which was crucial “in formalising government commitment to local development” and expanding their role in areas such as those mentioned above (Turok 2001: 5). This area-based approach was further advocated in the 1991 social partnership agreement The Programme for Economic and Social Progress (PESP) (Craig 1994; Connolly 2008a). Langford (1999: 97) argues that

In 1990, the negotiated social partnership agreement, the Programme for Economic and Social Progress (PESP, 1990-93), initiated an experimental new approach to long-term unemployment. Partnership companies were established on a pilot basis in twelve disadvantaged areas in order to design and implement a more coordinated and multidimensional approach to social exclusion.

This adoption of a new approach demonstrated a strong commitment by government and social partners to an area-based partnership approach (Walsh et al. 1998). As a result, the PESP set out a commitment to an area-based approach with local communities central to this approach (Government of Ireland 1991). Subsequently, twelve area-based partnerships were established in Ireland (Bruton 1995). Walsh et al. (1998: 6) define a local partnership as

a formal organisational framework for policy-making and implementation, which mobilises a coalition of interests and the commitment of a range of partners, around a common agenda and multi-dimensional action programme, to combat social exclusion and promote social inclusion.

Walsh et al. (1998) argues that the local partnership approach evident in Ireland reflects domestic influences from the community and voluntary sector, Combat Poverty Agency
(CPA), National Economic and Social Council (NESC), the government and social partners. Turok (2001:4) suggests that the creation of area-based partnerships in Ireland is one that marks the intersection of the “availability of European funds, encouragement from the community/voluntary sector and unions, and support within central government” in order to support the creation of such partnerships. Thus, while the creation of area-based partnerships represented a shift in polity in Ireland with the source for change arising out of domestic developments the EU nonetheless played a role within this area of polity.

Following EU structural fund reforms in 1988 “Irish governments were obliged to reorganise policy processes, giving greater voice to a wide range of stakeholders identified by the reforms” (Adhead and McInerney 2008: 237). The EU structural Funds required changes in the way that Irish administration approached public expenditure, for example rather than just focusing on has expenditure been spent in line with regulations to focusing on how effective this expenditure has been (Rees and Paraskevopoulos 2006). Ireland was also required to submit a National Development Plan (NDP) to the European Commission and one of the most significant subsequent changes has been related to the EU’s impact on partnerships with the EU structural funds supporting the extension of the partnership process in Ireland (O’Donnell and Moss 2005). For example, the establishment of monitoring committees for instance the Community Support Framework (CSF) at overall plan level as well as at operational programme level (Adshead and McInerney 2009: 3). With the reforms of EU structural funds many community and voluntary organisation requested representation on the structural fund monitoring committees (Acheson, Harvey, Kearney and Williamson 2004: 106). Indeed, the EU required not just representation on those committees of the trade unions and business and framing organisations but also organisations from the community and voluntary sector (Adshead and Mcinerney 2009). Thus, a significant impact of the EU structural funds was the creation of Monitoring Committees that furthered the partnership principle as they brought “together European Commission, national government and regional and local officials and representatives of the social partners in a ‘vertical’ form of partnership relationship” (Geddes and Benington 2001: 30). Fitzgerald (1998: 11) suggests that the involvement of the European Commission in such ‘vertical’ partnerships has helped in bringing continuity to decision making. These monitoring committees led to the community and voluntary sector being introduced to
the partnership process with others such as the trade unions and business and farming organizations for the first time as well as bringing them into contact with European Commission officials (Adshead and McInerney 2009). As a result, the EU structural funds through monitoring committees provided a basis for contact between EU officials and the community and voluntary sector as well as acting as a precursor to national social partnership and the involvement of the community and voluntary sector in this.

The EU also had an effect through other funding initiatives. For instance, one of the EU-funded Community Support Framework’s (1994-99) OPLURD (Operational Programmes for Local Urban and Rural Development). Its principal objective was to tackle disadvantage as well as supporting and involving local communities in the development of their areas (Meldon, Walsh and Kenny 2000). The OPLURD acknowledged the role of area based initiatives (Haase and McKeown 2003). OPLURD led to the creation of 38 local partnership companies (20 in urban areas and 18 rural), plus 33 community groups in non-priority areas (Turok 2001). The partnerships had to submit to ADM (Area Development Management Ltd) a strategic plan in order to get their budgets approved (Turok 2001). Development of this strategy required the partnerships to consult with those living in the community as well as groups that represented those living in disadvantaged areas (Turok 2001). The OPLURD in particular acknowledged the need for participation in planning and implementation local initiatives (Meldon, Walsh and Kenny 2000: 9/10). Participation was achieved through partnership structures and the boards of these partnerships (Turok 2001). The Boards include representatives from a multiplicity of sectors and social partner organisations including state agencies, local authorities, employers’ organisations, trade unions, farming organisations as well as voluntary and community based organisations (Meldon, Walsh and Kenny 2000: 9/10).

OPLURD made a significant contribution in Ireland in that the partnerships supported local networks and the building of linkages between communities as well as giving a voice to local communities experiencing poverty and social exclusion,

All of these are important elements in creating the conditions for the development of a more coherent community sector that is able to develop and articulate strategies and access decisionmaking and policy-influencing structures. Today, the Partnerships have become one of the primary institutional
frameworks within which community concerns can be transmitted to the relevant Government departments and state agencies (Haase and McKeown 2003: 12).

In addition, the designation of partnership areas in response to preparing for the OPLURD and the formal establishment of partnerships was also a significant achievement of the programme (Haase and McKeown 2003). However, partnerships have lacked support (Turok 2001). Haase and McKeown (2003: 15) argue that partnership have received mixed messages regarding their role,

On the one hand, the Irish Government prides itself on the achievements of the Partnerships with regard to the hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged individuals who have benefited from local initiatives. On the other hand, however, state institutions seem to be reluctant to actually learn from this experience. This ambiguity is also visible at the institutional level: on the one hand, the language of partnership has been incorporated into the various institutional layers of the State - e.g. CDBs, Local Authorities etc. - whilst the organisations which have been at the forefront of developing the partnership approach are often either dismissed or viewed as competitors by these organisations.

Evaluations of OPLURD have found a reluctance within local authorities to acknowledge the learning that can be achieved from partnerships (Haase and McKewon 2003). Other community initiatives such as LEADER, INTERREG, EQUAL, URBAN and the PEACE Programmes have also been important in developing the principle of partnership. Such programmes have led to cross-border co-operation and partnerships, transnational partnerships as well as local partnerships and area based leader companies and the establishment of monitoring committees (Geddes and Benington 2001; Phinnemore, McGowan, McCall and McLoughlin 2012). These ultimately helped improve the capacity of local actors and the disadvantaged communities they represented (Connolly 2007). Ireland is typified by a centralised government that was modified in certain aspects as a result of EU structural funds. Ireland was able to change on a gradual basis in order to deal with the structural funds as in general “EC business has been successfully grafted on the normal business of the various government departments” (Rees and Paraskevopoulos 2006: 184; Rees et al. 2002). However, there
has still been a reluctance in Ireland to devolve powers from national level (Rees and Paraskevopoulos 2006: 198). Rees, Quinn and Connaughton (2006: 8) argue that structural fund reforms which pushed for greater participation and partnership at member state level “reinforced and supported the consensual approach to policy-making in Ireland and has legitimised and entrenched the culture of concertation at both national and local levels”. While these EU funded programmes had poverty and social exclusion alleviation as aspects of them (Connolly 2007) it has been the EU funded Anti-Poverty Programmes that explicitly target poverty and social exclusion. These anti-poverty programmes coincided with a national drive to create area based partnerships that led to the development of area-based partnerships.

An EU initiative, the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes, in particular the third Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994] also reinforced domestic approaches. For example, the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes “wanted to engage the community and local communities and various voluntary groups and local government and so on” (Respondent 14 civil servant). The EU Anti-Poverty Programmes represented an important learning phase in Ireland for a wide range of actors,

they [the poverty programmes] had a profile in Ireland both among politicians, the NGO community and the officials I think learned a lot from that. I definitely think we were definitely in a learning mode….It seemed to have been an important learning curve (Respondent 20 civil servant).

Bruton (1995) stated that the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1990-1994] built on the twelve area-based partnerships that were set up in the social partnership agreement the PESP. As a result, Walsh et al. (2008) suggests that the local partnership approach established in Ireland reflects both domestic and EU influences. Furthermore, Walsh et al. (1998: 6) points out that the application of the local partnership approach being espoused by the EU in Ireland “was relatively straightforward given the strong government commitment for local partnerships as a policy instruments”. Thus, the most accurate description of the creation of the partnership model in Ireland is “…the local partnership model has emerged as a national policy construct for tackling social exclusion, within a broader EU context” (Walsh et al. 1998: xiii/xiv).
In particular the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme “meant that the actions required were not to be confined to one or two Government departments or agencies and it meant that agencies had to collaborate actively through partnership structures” (Langford 1999: 94). In Ireland, three projects were established: People Action Against Unemployment Limited, (PAUL), in Limerick; Forum in north west Connemara and the Dublin Travellers’ Education and Development Group (DTEDG) (Combat Poverty Agency 1995: 1). The key principles of the 3rd Anti-Poverty Programme were:

- Partnership: various public and private organisations agreeing jointly to engage in the implementation of a coherent strategy for the integration of less privileged groups in a chosen area;

- Participation involving the population of the selected area in the work of the partnership (Combat Poverty Agency 1995: 1).

The CPA outlined that the key lessons learnt in Ireland were,

- an awareness of the need for and the value of partnership between all of the interests involved in addressing the problem;

- an awareness of the need for participation by those who experience disadvantage and poverty in drawing up and implementing policies if these are to be successful (Combat Poverty Agency 1995: 10).

Considine and Dukelow (2009) argue that the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme was crucial in developing the idea of participation in Ireland. Participation meant “the least privileged groups were to be enabled to take part in decisions affecting them” (Langford 1999: 93). The third EU Anti-Poverty Programme [1989-1994] promoted participation but also used the idea of ‘partnership’ as one of its defining characteristics (O’ Flynn 2009:5). Partnership meant “structures were to be established to combine the efforts of key players in combating exclusion” (Langford 1999: 94).

The third EU Anti-Poverty Programme built on existing domestic innovations rather than introducing new institutional structures. However, the EU through the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme did lead to a transfer of knowledge that promoted a 'way of doing things' domestically, in relation to the principles of partnership and participation. This is again representative of horizontal Europeanization whereby the EU facilitated
the diffusion of this knowledge. Lee (1995) points out that prior to the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme partnership was a term that was never used and became “a central concept in anti-poverty and local development strategies” (Lee 1995: 151). O’Flynn (2009: 5) further argues that “terms such as ‘consultation’, ‘participation’, ‘partnership’, ‘community engagement’ and ‘community involvement’ are frequently used in Irish public administration since the implementation of the European Poverty Programmes”. As a result of the third EU poverty programme Langford (1999: 101) suggest that “certain institutional arrangements have been put in place which reflect the value put by the Irish Government on participation, partnership…as a means of tackling social exclusion”. Considine and Dukelow (2009: 185) state that

the establishment of the National Economic and Social Forum (NESF), the emergence of the National Anti-Poverty Strategy (NAPS) and the broadening of participation in the national social partnership process to include the community and voluntary pillar

are examples of the permeation of the concepts of partnership and participation in Irish polity. Further to this, Langford (1999: 103) outlines that the social partnership agreement of 1996 Partnership 2000 “is evidence of the extent to which the concepts of partnership participation …..have permeated Irish social policy”. For example, Partnership 2000 commits to “partnership, that is involving all social partners, and participation, that is all participate in drawing up an agreed strategic plan and in quarterly monitoring” (Langford 1999: 103). In sum, the impact of the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme can be seen in that “it facilitated the development of the role of the community/voluntary sector in mainstream planning initiatives” (Combat Poverty Agency 1995: 6) and ensured that the idea of participation and partnership between a wider range of actors became an accepted element of policymaking. As a result of the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes, and in particular the third programme, concepts such as participation and participation and the values that they espoused were transferred by those at national and local level but it built upon existing domestic developments and commitments to involving a wider group of actors. Thus, the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes were used to assist in implementing a domestic approach rather than being the impetus for a major change in polity.
7.4 Conclusions

The EU has the potential to lead to changes in institutional arrangements at domestic level. As illustrated in this chapter the Europeanization of Irish polity was limited as in the areas of policy and politics. However, the EU still played a role in changing polity in the subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. The EU did have an impact through supporting the development of partnerships through community initiatives such as OPLURD and the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes. The EU Structural Funds led to the creation of monitoring committees that also furthered the partnership principle. The OMC failed to have a real impact with a set of national institutional arrangements in place since the 1997 NAPS. As Mangan (2010: 59) asserts “…Ireland would be recognised as having one of the more developed consultation processes among EU countries” that developed from the 1980s in Ireland. Instead the OMC served to provide a pressure and support to continue with existing domestic institutional arrangements rather than being the impetus for the creation of new institutional arrangements. However, as this and other chapters have demonstrated the EU through ‘soft law’ has lacked an ability to ensure that these institutional arrangements have been properly implemented as can be seen with poverty proofing. The following chapter serves as a final empirical chapter that builds upon the assessment of the Europeanization of politics, policy and polity in the previous three chapters by providing an insight into respondent’s views on the subsystem and their views on the role of the EU domestically.
Chapter 8: Insights into Social Inclusion in Ireland

8.1 Introduction

As has been evident through the analysis presented in this thesis the policy subsystem of social inclusion is one that has proved difficult to make significant progress or change in as demonstrated by the high levels of poverty and social exclusion that still exist in Ireland. Hence, this chapter serves to increase our understanding of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland and the role the EU has played. The central focus of this thesis is assessing the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity. This chapter serves to build on this assessment and further our understanding of the role of the EU domestically by correlating respondent’s views on the subsystem and their views on the role of the EU. It is hoped this chapter can contribute to further our understanding of the views of respondents on the role of the EU in changing politics, policy and polity with their understandings of social exclusion and inclusion and the subsystem in general in Ireland. The chapter uses semi-structured in-depth interviews and Q methodology (that was part of the in-depth interview process) as a means of conducting this assessment. Q methodology is used to gain us an insight into people’s views on how social exclusion should be combatted and social inclusion promoted. In-depth interviews give an insight into any similarities or differences on their views of change as a result of the EU, their perceptions of the EU in this area and on the subsystem in general.

8.2 Means of Analysis: Q methodology and In-Depth Interviews

The findings of this chapter are based on the analysis of interviewees Q sorts and their in-depth interviews. This chapter is focused on the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland and insights that can be gained from key policy actors\(^\text{15}\). There can often be a difficulty in assessing what people’s beliefs and values are and the views that exist about a subsystem. In this chapter Q methodology is used as a methodological approach in order to assess what people’s beliefs and values are in relation to the subsystem in conjunction with semi-structured in-depth interviews in order to assess respondent’s views on the role of the EU in changing politics, policy and polity and the subsystem in general.

\(^{15}\) See appendix 9 for characteristics of interviewees.
Twenty-three in depth interviews were conducted with the Q methodology conducted during the interview process. Following the analysis of the Q sorts in the PQ method software the factors were rotated revealing two typologies or groupings of people who shared similar beliefs, factor one and factor two\textsuperscript{16} amongst the Q sorts of the interviewees who participated in this research. The correlation factor score “represents the level of (dis)agreement between the individual sorts, that is, the degree of (dis) similarity in points of view between the individual Q sorters” (Van Exel and de Graaf 2005: 8). If the correlation factor score of the two factors is very similar it would indicate a level of agreement. However, as is evident by the dissimilar factor score of the two factors in table twelve these factors do not share a high level of agreement. Thus, as a result of the factor analysis carried out on interviewees Q sorts two typologies (groupings of people with similar beliefs) with a high level of disagreement emerged as demonstrated by the correlation factor score below (table 12).

Table 12: Correlation Factor Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1:</th>
<th>Factor 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.4843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4843</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 presents the factor loadings, that is, which people agreed with each factor and by how much (Webler et al. 2009: 31).

Table 13: Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q sort</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Interviewee Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9052X</td>
<td>0.1132</td>
<td>Government Advisory Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8642X</td>
<td>0.1380</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7824X</td>
<td>0.1706</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7488X</td>
<td>0.3115</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8810X</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0433</td>
<td>0.7460X</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7844X</td>
<td>0.0926</td>
<td>Local Government Official</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16}A factor in this case represents a group of persons who have ranked the statements in essentially the same order – people who have displayed a common attitude (Brown and Ungs 1970: 518/519).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q sort</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Interviewee Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.7187X</td>
<td>0.4662</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7438X</td>
<td>0.3246</td>
<td>Government Advisory Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7048X</td>
<td>0.3039</td>
<td>Trade Union Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.7718X</td>
<td>0.0785</td>
<td>Local Government Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.8486X</td>
<td>0.2843</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6506X</td>
<td>0.3599</td>
<td>Local Government Official</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1131</td>
<td>0.7935X</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7126X</td>
<td>0.5023</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.5448</td>
<td>0.5473X</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7180X</td>
<td>0.3188</td>
<td>Politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.7814X</td>
<td>0.0981</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1015</td>
<td>0.6488X</td>
<td>Community and Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7807X</td>
<td>0.3114</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.6345X</td>
<td>0.2056</td>
<td>Politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6267X</td>
<td>0.2882</td>
<td>Politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3519</td>
<td>0.6597X</td>
<td>Civil Servant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The X beside a particular Q sort demonstrates that that individual Q sort contributed to the make-up of that factor. Each factor is thus a “weighted average of only those sorts flagged as loading on that factor” (Webler et al. 2009: 30). Each factor outlined in table 13 “represents a conceptual template derived from placements of statements in comparison with all the other statements. All participants who load significantly on a factor hold a similar understanding” (Selden, Brewer and Brundy 1999: 183). As well as this the “factor loading for each Q-sort indicates its correlation with the factor” (Selden et al. 1999: 183/184). Appendix 2 presents the factor arrays. The factor array “is calculated by merging the individual’s significant sort loadings” which then produces the average factor scores (Selden et al. 1999: 184). These average factor scores represent the average response by statement, for example in this case it is evident in appendix two that on average individuals loading on factor 1 placed statement 1 in the +2 column or the strongly agree column and factor two placed it in the 0 column or neutral column. This section outlines that two competing viewpoints emerged in Ireland based on what interviewees most strongly agreed/strongly agreed with and most
strongly disagreed/strongly disagreed with from the Q sorts conducted during in-depth interviews. The first viewpoint discussed is the redistributive point of view followed by the social integrationist viewpoint.

8.3 The Redistributive Viewpoint

The first viewpoint represents a group of interviewees who shared similar beliefs (herein termed factor one). This factor or group of people primarily believes and prioritises a redistribution approach as demonstrated by the statements this group of people placed in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns. This concurs with the findings from the document analysis illustrated earlier.

Table 14: Key Agreement Statements for Factor One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Core Belief</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 23</td>
<td>A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 25</td>
<td>The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 31</td>
<td>The political system should address social exclusion through a progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners.</td>
<td>Policy core belief</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>The political system should implement an adequate minimum income scheme to tackle social exclusion.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 22</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of social, economic, political and cultural systems in society.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society.</td>
<td>Policy core belief</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 14</td>
<td>Supportive public interventions should be used to improve individual employability.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>SID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor one primarily advocated for the redistribution of income in order to promote the idea of social justice in society (statement 23). This statement represents a RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse) approach to tackling social exclusion and a deep core belief. Thus, this factor or grouping or people believed the redistribution of income should be the prioritised approach to tackling social exclusion as evidenced by their placing of this statement in the most strongly agree column. Their prioritisation of a redistributionist approach is further evident by their placing of the policy core belief that we should have a tax system that places the burden on higher earners (statement 31) in the most strongly agree column as well. This factor further prioritised the RED approach by placing the secondary belief that an adequate minimum income scheme should be used to tackle social exclusion (statement 1) in the strongly agree column.

A number of statements from the System Failure Discourse (SFD) were also a key element of the agreement statements of this factor. For example, to combat social exclusion everyone should have access to public services such as health, housing and education (statement 25). This statement was placed in the most strongly agree column and depicted a secondary belief of the SFD approach. This group of people also believed that the failure of systems in society has led to the social exclusion of people in society (statement 22). This was placed in the strongly agree column and equated with a deep core belief of SFD. A policy core belief that asserted that supportive work, welfare and community systems also need to be provided (statement 12) was placed in the strongly agree column. This represents a SFD approach. This factor did think that a secondary belief that represented a SID approach was important to combating social exclusion. For instance, the belief that public interventions should be used to improve individual employability (statement 14). This statement was placed in the strongly agree column.

It is also important to discuss what statements factor one placed in the most strongly disagree and strongly disagree columns.
Table 15: Key Disagreement Statements for Factor One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Belief Type</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 11</td>
<td>The excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>SID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 18</td>
<td>The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>MUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 26</td>
<td>The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion.</td>
<td>Policy core belief</td>
<td>MUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 7</td>
<td>Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves.</td>
<td>Policy core belief</td>
<td>MUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 24</td>
<td>Benefit payments should only be maintained if unemployed benefit recipients participate on compulsory workfare schemes.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>MUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 30</td>
<td>The welfare state and welfare spending has created a 'culture of dependency'.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>MUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 32</td>
<td>The self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>MUD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor one most strongly disagreed with the view that those who are excluded are people who are able to work but simply don’t want to work (statement 11). This statement corresponded with a deep core belief of the SID approach. Factor one also disagreed with the policy approach of incremental cutting of benefits that unemployed welfare recipients receive (statement 18) and the belief that the political system has no role to play in combating social exclusion (statement 26). Statement 18 is a secondary belief of MUD while statement 26 depicted a policy core belief of MUD. Both of these statements were placed in the most strongly disagree column. This disagreement of factor one with the principles of MUD was evident again by looking at the statements the factor placed in the strongly disagree column. Factor one strongly disagreed with the view that cutting off benefits for unemployed welfare recipients in order to encourage responsibility and independence of these recipients (statement 7) is a valid policy.
This statement represented a policy core belief of MUD. This factor also strongly disagreed with the policy approach of making unemployed welfare benefit recipients participate on compulsory workfare schemes (statement 24). This statement is a secondary belief of the MUD approach. The factor further strongly disagreed with the deep core beliefs of MUD that asserts a 'culture of dependency' has been created by the welfare state and welfare spending (statement 30) and that the excluded are self-excluded and demonstrate a lack of work ethic and are characterised by low educational attainment (statement 32).

8.4 The Social Integrationist Viewpoint

The second group of interviewees who share similar beliefs (herein termed factor two) primarily believes in and prioritises a social integrationist approach as demonstrated by the most strongly agree and strongly agree statements of this factor.

Table 16: Key Agreement Statements for Factor Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Core Belief</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>Employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>SID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 10</td>
<td>Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>SID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 12</td>
<td>To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society.</td>
<td>Policy core belief</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>The benefit system results in disincentives and 'poverty traps' for welfare recipients.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>SID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 13</td>
<td>Unemployed welfare benefit recipients should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving these benefits.</td>
<td>Policy core belief</td>
<td>SID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 23</td>
<td>A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society.</td>
<td>Deep core belief</td>
<td>RED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 25</td>
<td>The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion.</td>
<td>Secondary belief</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor two prioritised a Social Integrationist Approach (SID) approach that views employment as the central route out of social exclusion (statement 2). This factor placed this statement in the most strongly agree column and it represents a deep core belief of SID. Factor two also most strongly agreed with the secondary belief of the SID approach that advocated that to combat social exclusion the benefit system should supplement the wages of those on low pay (statement 10). A statement representing a policy core belief of the System Failure Discourse (SFD) was also prioritised by factor two and placed in the most strongly agree column. This policy core belief argues that supportive work, welfare and community systems in society are needed to combat social exclusion (statement 12). Factor two also believed that the benefit system can result in disincentives for people receiving benefits (statement 5). This is a deep core belief of SID and was placed in the strongly agree column.

This factor also asserted that it is important for unemployed welfare recipients to show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving said benefits (statement 13). This was placed in the strongly agree column by factor two and represents a policy core belief of SID. Factor two also placed a secondary belief from the SFD approach in the strongly agree column. Factor two recognised the need for access to public services such as health housing and education for all in order to combat social exclusion (statement 25). Factor two did prioritise one RED (Redistributionist approach which was a need for a more equitable redistribution of income in order to tackle social exclusion (statement 23). This was placed in the strongly agree column by factor two and represented a deep core belief of RED.
As outlined for factor one, this section outlines the statements factor two placed in the most strongly disagree/strongly disagree columns.

Table 17: Key Disagreement Statements for Factor Two

| Statement 7 | Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves. | Policy core belief | MUD |
| Statement 18 | The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months. | Secondary belief | MUD |
| Statement 26 | The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion. | Policy core belief | MUD |
| Statement 4 | To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment. | Secondary belief | SFD |
| Statement 8 | Workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system. | Secondary belief | RED |
| Statement 9 | The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the labour market. | Deep core belief | SFD |
| Statement 11 | The excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work. | Deep core belief | SID |

Factor two primarily disagreed with the view that welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point (statement 7). This was placed in the most strongly disagree column and represented a policy core of MUD (Moral Underclass Discourse). Factor two also disagreed with the secondary belief of MUD that argued benefits for unemployed benefit recipients should be reduced at a certain time (statement 18) as well as disagreeing with the policy core belief of MUD that states the political system has no responsibility to combat social exclusion as that is the responsibility of individuals (statement 26). Both of these statements were placed in the most strongly disagree column by factor two. Factor two placed statements 4, 8, 9 and 11 in the strongly disagree column. Thus, factor two rejects the belief that the labour
market needs to be reformed to combat social exclusion and that an individual’s exclusion is a result of the labour market (statements 4 and 9). Statement 4 is a secondary belief of the SFD approach while statement 9 represents a deep core belief of the SFD. Factor two also strongly disagreed with the view that people earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system (statement 8) and that the excluded are those who don’t want to work even though they are able to work (statement 11). Statement 8 represented a secondary belief of RED while statement 11 was indicative of a deep core belief of SID.

8.5 Interpretation of Findings

It is evident from the above findings based on the statements placed in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns that in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland two distinct policy approaches are apparent. It is noticeable that there was a number of differing beliefs and views between factor one and factor two. For example, the two factors differed in a number of statements i.e. only one factor placed these statements in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns. Factor 1 placed statements 31, 1, 22 and 14 in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns. These are statements that prioritised a progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners (statement 31); an adequate minimum income scheme (statement 1); that the social exclusion of individuals is the result of the failure of systems in society (statement 22) and that supportive public interventions should be made available to individuals to improve their employability (statement 14). These are statements from the RED (statements 31 and 1), SFD (statement 22) and SID (statement 14) approaches. Yet factor two did not place these statements in these columns. In fact factor two placed statement 31 in the agree column; statement 1 in the neutral column; statement 22 in the neutral column and statement 14 in the agree column. Thus, it is evident that factor two did not place the most strongly agree and strongly statements of factor one in the disagree piles but tended to agree with them or place them in the neutral as outlined in table 18 below.
Table 18: Differing Views on Factor Ones Agreement Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. The political system should address social exclusion through a</td>
<td>Most Strongly Agree Column</td>
<td>Agree Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The political system should implement an adequate minimum income</td>
<td>Strongly Agree Column</td>
<td>Neutral Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheme to tackle social exclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of</td>
<td>Strongly Agree Column</td>
<td>Neutral Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social, economic, political and cultural systems in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supportive public interventions should be used to improve individual</td>
<td>Strongly agree Column</td>
<td>Agree Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead factor two differed in that it placed statements 2, 10, 5 and 13 in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns. These were statements that prioritised employment as the central route out of social exclusion (statement 2); that low paid workers should be supplemented through the benefit system (statement 10); that the benefit system leads to disincentives and 'poverty traps' for people (statement 5) and that those who are unemployed and receiving benefits should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes (statement 13). Respondent 6 (civil servant) who loaded on factor two described these statements, particularly statement 13 as being part of a 'rights and responsibilities debate' and the importance of individuals taking responsibility themselves as well. However, factor one placed statement 2 in the neutral column; statement 10 in the agree column; statement 5 in the neutral column and statement 13 in the neutral column thus demonstrating that factor one did not disagree with any of the statements that factor two placed in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns.
agree columns as demonstrated in table 19 below. Statements 2, 10, 5 and 13 are all statements from the Social Integrationist Discourse (SID).

Table 19: Differing Views on Factor Twos Agreement Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals.</td>
<td>Neutral Column</td>
<td>Most Strongly Agree Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system.</td>
<td>Agree Column</td>
<td>Most Strongly Agree Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The benefit system results in disincentives and 'poverty traps' for welfare recipients.</td>
<td>Neutral Column</td>
<td>Strongly Agree Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Unemployed welfare benefit recipients should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving these benefits.</td>
<td>Neutral Column</td>
<td>Strongly Agree Column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is evident in what interviewees that loaded on factor one said during the Q sort process. For example, respondent 5 (community and voluntary sector worker) stated that while employment has a major role to play…it’s not the central route. The central route should be through first securing income for everyone, sufficient income and the second component of the route out of social exclusion has to be the provision of adequate services in education, health, accommodation, public transport and infrastructure.

Interviewees loading on factor one also spoke about a broader concept of employment “work and employment are not the same thing. Employment is part of work but a lot of people are working even if they don’t have a job” (Respondent 5 – community and voluntary sector worker). The two factors do have a number of statements in common regarding their most strongly agree and strongly agree statements. Both factors placed
statements 12 (SID), 23 (RED) and 25 (SFD) in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns. However, factor one placed statement 23 and 25 which prioritised the redistribution of income and providing access to all to public services in the most strongly agree column while factor two placed these statements in the strongly agree column. Factor two instead placed statement 12 which prioritised the need for supportive work, welfare and community systems in society in the most strongly agree column whereas factor one placed this in the strongly agree column. These statements are all statements that relate to the RED and SFD approaches.

Table 20: Statements both Factors Placed in the Most Strongly Agree/Strongly Agree Columns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society.</td>
<td>Most strongly agree column</td>
<td>Strongly agree column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion.</td>
<td>Most strongly agree column</td>
<td>Strongly agree column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society.</td>
<td>Strongly agree column</td>
<td>Most strongly agree column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, it is evident that from all the statements ranked in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns factor one prioritised a redistribution approach to tackling social exclusion with elements of SFD and SID. Factor two prioritised SID with
elements of SFD and RED. This prioritisation of two different approaches – the RED and the SID - is apparent in the Z-scores attributed to each statement\textsuperscript{17}.

For instance for factor 1 the highest positive Z-score was attributed to statement 23 (1.676), followed by 25 (1.556), 31(1.463), 22 (1.368) and 12 (1.060) (see table 21 below).

Table 21: Agreement Statements and Corresponding Z scores: Factor One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society.</td>
<td>1.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion.</td>
<td>1.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The political system should address social exclusion through a progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners.</td>
<td>1.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of social, economic, political, cultural systems in society.</td>
<td>1.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To combat Social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society.</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17}Statements with a Z score larger than 1 (or smaller than -1) are referred to as characterizing for that factor (Van Exel and De Graaf 2005: 19).
For factor two the highest positive Z score was attributed to statement 2 (1.989) followed by statement 12 (1.745), 10 (1.488), 13 (1.388), 23 (1.013) and 5 (1.005) (see table 22 below).

Table 22: Agreement Statements and Corresponding Z-scores: Factor two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals.</td>
<td>1.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society.</td>
<td>1.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system.</td>
<td>1.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Unemployed welfare benefit recipients should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving these benefits.</td>
<td>1.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society.</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The benefit system results in disincentives and 'poverty traps' for welfare recipients.</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to recognise that both factors recognised the role systems play in combating social exclusion; however their prioritisation of these SFD statements differed. Both factors prioritised elements of both the RED and SID and no factor placed any statements from the MUD approach in the most strongly agree and strongly agree columns. It is also noticeable that no factor placed the high ranking agree statements of the other factor in their disagreement columns. Both factors placed a deep core, policy core and secondary belief in their most strongly agree column suggesting that it is not just deep core beliefs that actors feel strongly on. However, there is a distinction between the two factors in that factor one clearly prioritised a more redistributionist approach and the role of income while factor two tends to focus on the social integrationist approach and the role employment plays in combating social exclusion.
The statements that the two factors placed in the most strongly disagree and strongly disagree columns also provided an insight into the policy approaches that are not advocated in the policy subsystem in Ireland. From the findings outlined earlier there is some disagreement between the two factors on what should not be done regards combating social exclusion as well as some agreement. For example, factor one placed statements 30 and 32 in the strongly disagree column. These are statements that stated that the welfare state and welfare spending has created a 'culture of dependency' (statement 30) and that the self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic (statement 32). Factor two however placed statements 30 and 32 in the agree column.

Table 23: Differing Views on Factor Ones Disagreement Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. The welfare state and welfare spending has created a 'culture of dependency'.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree column</td>
<td>Agree column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree column</td>
<td>Agree column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor two placed statements 4 and 8 in the strongly disagree column. These are statements that advocate the combating of social exclusion through the deep systemic change of the labour market which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment (statement 4) and the view that workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system (statement 8). Factor one on the other hand placed statement 4 and statement 8 in the neutral column.
Table 24: Differing Views on Factor Twos Disagreement Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment.</td>
<td>Neutral column</td>
<td>Strongly disagree column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system.</td>
<td>Neutral column</td>
<td>Strongly disagree column</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewees offered an insight into these differing views. Respondent 17 (politician) who loaded on factor one felt that “I think there is a strong argument for having a threshold for having income tax to be fixed at the level of the minimum wage because after all the minimum wage is set at a figure which is generally assumed to be the least one can live on while working”. While respondent 6 (civil servant) who loaded on factor two on the other hand stated that “I actually believe everyone should pay some minimum amount of tax….I think we’re all part of society and we all have a role to play”. There was some communality between the factors regarding the statements that were placed in the most strongly disagree and strongly disagree columns. For example, both factors placed the statements 11, 18, 26 and 7 in the most strongly disagree and strongly disagree columns.
Both factors placed statements 18 and 26 in the most strongly disagree columns. These statements that both factors most strongly disagreed with advocated the views that the level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months (statement 18) and that the political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion (statement 26). As respondent 14 (civil servant), who loaded on factor two, stated that regarding statement 18,

the first assumption is that benefits are generous which they’re not really….the basic social welfare payments are not overly generous and so you wouldn’t be long putting people below the breadline. I think the incentive should be to get people in training, education rather than just reducing the benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factor One</th>
<th>Factor Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The excluded are those who are to work but don’t want to work.</td>
<td>Most strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months.</td>
<td>Most strongly disagree</td>
<td>Most strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion.</td>
<td>Most strongly disagree</td>
<td>Most strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves.</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Most strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor one most strongly disagreed with the statement that the excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work (statement 11) while factor two placed this in the strongly disagree column. As respondent 6 (civil servant) who loaded on factor two pointed out “I think that’s [statement 11] far too sweeping. I think possibly people are. There are certainly people who don’t want to work but not as blanket as that”. Respondent 17 (politician) who loaded on factor one stated that

I’ve come across very few people who don’t want to work. They may have reached a point because of long-term unemployment they’re incapable of working...The big problem for those long-term unemployed is the more unemployed they are the more out of date their skills become and of course the long-term unemployed also tend to be those who had very poor education attainments for various reasons either because of family circumstances, poor family background, lack of facilities and so on.

Respondent 21 (politician) who loaded on factor one also spoke about the fact that “there will always be a small cohort of people who for a variety of reasons, social, health, education, literacy, families, religions, culture you might even say don’t want to work….but such people can’t be excluded from society. They have to be as far as possible brought back into active participation in society”.

Factor two placed the statement that advocated the belief that welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves (statement 7) in the most strongly disagree column while factor one placed this in the strongly disagree column. Respondent 6 (civil servant) who loaded on factor two said “I think that’s [statement 7] too black and white that benefits should be cut off. I do believe we should look at things like tapering or you know incentives but I don’t think any society should cut off benefits”. While respondent 5 (community and voluntary sector worker) who loaded on factor one stated that “the idea behind this kind of statement is that in some way or other people need to be incentivised or encouraged to take up a job…There’s no evidence to support that. In fact all of the evidence supports the opposite thesis”. Therefore, it is evident from all the statements ranked in the most strongly disagree and strongly disagree columns factor one most disagreed with many of beliefs attributed to MUD as well as an element of SID. This is evident in the data as for factor one the highest
negative Z-score was attributed to statement 26 (-1.974) followed by 11 (-1.458), 18 (-1.434), 7 (-1.423), 24 (-1.246), 32 (-1.191) and statement 30 (-1.168).

Table 26: Disagreement Statements and Corresponding Z scores: Factor One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion.</td>
<td>-1.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work.</td>
<td>-1.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months.</td>
<td>-1.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves.</td>
<td>-1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Benefit payments should only be maintained if unemployed benefit recipients participate on compulsory workfare schemes.</td>
<td>-1.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic.</td>
<td>-1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The welfare state and welfare spending has created a 'culture of dependency'.</td>
<td>-1.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor two had a more diverse range of statements in the most strongly disagree and strongly disagree columns. However, they too most disagreed with many of the approaches advocated by MUD. This is in evident in the data in the fact that the highest negative Z-score for factor two was attributed to statement 7 (-1.586) followed by statement 26 (-1.532) and statement 18 (-1.386). Factor two also disagreed with certain aspects of the SFD approach. This is evident in the fact that high negative Z-scores were also attributed to statement 9 (-1.344) and 4 (-1.226). It does appear that there is a consensus over the MUD approach as an approach that should not be pursued regarding combating social exclusion in Ireland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Z-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves.</td>
<td>-1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion.</td>
<td>-1.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients should be reduced every three months.</td>
<td>-1.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the labour market.</td>
<td>-1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment.</td>
<td>-1.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from analysis of interviewees Q sorts that there are two competing approaches evident in the policy subsystem in Ireland. There is a grouping of people within the subsystem that prioritise a Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse (RED) approach. There is then a second grouping of people that prioritise a Social Integrationist Discourse (SID). The System Failure Discourse (SFD) approach is a constant theme throughout the decades in Ireland and the Moral Underclass Discourse approach (MUD) remains an approach on the fringes. Hence, in Ireland it is clear there have been two clear approaches pushed for in Ireland that are distinct in what they believe. One coalition of actors favours redistribution as a means of combating social exclusion (RED) while another coalition centres on employment as the central means of combating social exclusion (SID). One important element apparent in Irish beliefs and values is the emphasis on functioning systems in society in promoting social inclusion (SFD). The next section of this chapter focuses on views expressed by interviewees during the in-depth interview process. These views serve to compliment the Q analysis and provide an insight into what interviewees lading on different factors (who had
different views about approaches to be pursued) felt about the role of the EU in leading to change, perceptions of the EU and influencing policy in Ireland.

8.6 Role of the EU and Views on the Subsystem

The previous section of this chapter presented findings that suggest two competing viewpoints exist in Ireland within the subsystem of social inclusion. The majority of interviewees, mainly made up of those from the community and voluntary sector, advocated a RED/SFD approach while a minority, mainly made up of civil servants, advocated a SID/SFD approach. This part of the chapter explores more fully their views on change, in particular the impact of the EU, perceptions about the EU in this area and on the subsystem in general in Ireland.

Civil servants are a key group of people in any policy making system. The in-depth interviews with a number of civil servants for this study gave an interesting insight into their views and perceptions. The civil servants interviewed for this research were represented in both factor 1 and factor 2 of the Q sort analysis. As a result, some civil servants were more aligned with the RED/SFD while others were more aligned with the SID/SFD approach. Firstly, a recurring theme of the interviews of civil servants from those in both factor one and factor two was the focus on the indigenous concern and strong commitment to poverty that already existed in Ireland by the time we had joined the EEC. Indeed they spoke about how Ireland had an advanced approach to the issue of poverty with other countries lagging behind Ireland regarding the issue of poverty and as a result the impact of the EU has been more pronounced in those countries. In addition, civil servants spoke about the influence Ireland had on the poverty agenda at European level, particularly in relation to the setting up of the poverty programmes. This coincided with a view amongst civil servants that Ireland has been ahead of what the EU has set out to combat poverty due to the pre-existing concerns with the issue in Ireland from the early 1970s (Respondent 4, factor 1, Respondent 14, factor 2 and Respondent 4, factor 1). Other elements that civil servants focused on, in particular those from factor 1, was the importance of the transfer of language and the importance of learning from Europe, for example through the peer reviews (Respondent 20, factor 1 and Respondent 4, factor 1).
Those civil servants that loaded on factor two also recognised the importance of learning for example through the SPC but in addition focused on the EU’s impact in terms of increased consultation and interaction between officials and different government departments (Respondent 6, factor 2). A civil servant loading on factor two also spoke about the role the EU played in strengthening institutional arrangements and cross-cutting approaches (Respondent 6, factor 2). As well, civil servants represented on factor two noted how the EU impacted on policy through the poverty programmes as it led to looking at poverty as a multi-dimensional issue (Respondent 14, factor 2). Those civil servants loading on factor two placed an emphasis on aspects of the OMC, for example the usefulness of EU indicators in terms of emphasis and evaluation (Respondent 6, factor 2). Civil servants loading on factor two also highlighted how the OMC inclusion made them more aware of what other countries were doing (Respondent 14, factor 2). Civil servants that loaded on both factors recognised the value of the OMC reporting process as it put an obligation on those in government to reflect on what they were doing and as well as pushing the agenda regarding setting out goals but recognised that its impact didn’t extend to directly changing actual policy (Respondent 4, factor 1 and Respondent 6, factor 2). In addition a civil servant loading on factor two felt that the EU agenda was used to address issues that were already prevalent (Respondent 6, factor 2). In sum, civil servants that loaded on both factors placed an emphasis on the commitment to poverty prior to joining the EEC in Ireland and in turn our influence on the EU level regarding the subsystem. Those civil servants that loaded on factor one placed a particular emphasis on the importance of learning from Europe. Those loading on factor two also recognised the importance of learning from Europe but in addition pointed out the role it has played in strengthening institutional arrangements, increasing consultation and interaction as well as its influence on poverty thinking and how they viewed poverty. The role of the OMC was recognised by civil servants loading on both factors but it was pointed out that the EU was used to assist with issues that were already prevalent nationally.

In common with civil servants those from the community and voluntary sector that loaded on factor 1 also reiterated the influence of Ireland at EU level, in particular with the creation of the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes and again spoke about how Ireland had an advanced approach regarding focusing on poverty and the need to combat it in comparison to other EU member states (Respondent 2, factor 1). Again, in common
with civil servants loading on factor 2 those from the community and voluntary sector recognised the role of EU indicators in measuring our progress towards goals and objectives (Respondent 2, factor 1). Those from the community and voluntary sector also focused on the importance of being linked to networks at EU level, for example FEANSTA and the benefits of empirical research at EU level in winning an argument domestically (Respondent 8, factor 1). Those from local government level who also loaded on factor one spoke about European years being used as a ‘leverage’ and for legitimacy for focusing on issues such as social inclusion (Respondent 11, factor 1). In common with civil servants those from the community and voluntary sector and those from government advisory bodies also highlighted the role of the EU in facilitating the exchange of information, knowledge and experience (Respondent 9, factor 1 and Respondent 15, factor 1). Like civil servants (loading on factor 1 and factor 2) those from government advisory bodies (loaded on factor 1) also highlighted that the EU hasn’t changed the fundamental architecture of system but pointed out certain elements have been influenced and highlighted the role the EU has played in promoting 'activation' (Respondent 15, factor 1). Hence, views from the community and voluntary sector, local government and government advisory bodies pointed out that Ireland had a more advanced approach in relation to tackling poverty prior to joining the EEC as well as the value of participating in EU networks and EU features such as indicators as well as the value of the EU acting as a 'leverage' to achieve progress on domestic issues. As a result, similar views on the role of the EU leading to change are evident across the RED/SFD and SID/SFD divide. In particular a prevalent view held across different groups and beliefs and values groupings was the view that regarding this subsystem Ireland has a more advanced approach and often pre-empted steps taken at EU level and as a result the EU was often ‘used’ to implement and achieve domestic goals and objectives.

When interviewees were asked about their views on the impact of the EU in Ireland on the subsystem of social inclusion many spoke about their views of the European Union in this area both positive and negative in particular regarding its limitations due to its ability to only act through 'soft law'. Regarding a negative view the lack of power the EU holds in this area in comparison to economic policies was mentioned with a scepticism about European action in this area evident from those within the community and voluntary sector loading on factor 1,
It’s basically trying to pretend their serious about the social side just as they are about the economic side. They are not in actual fact. They can impose particular standards and developments and initiatives on economic development. They can’t do that for social development. Now they argue that countries don’t want it and so on but certainly the Open Method of Coordination I would find has achieved little. It’s not giving anything remotely close to the attention required to social inclusion or to anti-poverty policy strategies or to equality strategies. It has a rhetoric that pretends it’s doing it. The evidence is different and I would be very disappointed with the huge failure as I would see it of the European Commission in this area and the European parliament to a lesser extent (Respondent 5, factor 1, community and voluntary sector).

Indeed some interviewees from the local government sector who loaded on factor 1 found that because of this lack of power of the EU in the area there was a scepticism around the EU’s role, “you find scepticism when you talk about a European project, basically it comes down to the fact that at European level the policies that are there are soft policies” (Respondent 13, factor, local government official). Others in the community and voluntary sector spoke about the role the EU plays in their work and how it can often serve as a distraction rather than being useful in their work,

The EU, it’s hard to say yes the EU is always helpful, sometimes it is, sometimes it isn’t, depends on the policy area. Sometimes they take initiatives that are a great help but you could just get distracted by loads of activity and it’s of no benefit to your work here in Ireland (Respondent 3, factor 1, community and voluntary sector).

Scepticism about the peer review process was also evident as it involved member states assessing other member states rather than being an objective process “In the end it [peer reviews] never really worked that well…what it was doing was relying on other countries…Other countries would examine them you see and kind of scratch my back and I’ll scratch yours” (Respondent 14, factor 2, civil servant). There were also reference to the issue of Irish politicians not engaging with the OMC “I would say that Irish officials did yes. Politicians yes and no” (Respondent 20, factor 1, civil servant) with respondent 20 stating that “Ireland inc will choose to ignore or embrace” aspects of EU initiatives in this area (Respondent 16, factor 2, community and voluntary sector).
Therefore, there were negative views expressed about the role of the EU in the subsystem of social inclusion in many respects in relation to its ‘soft’ power in the area.

There were also positive views of the EU expressed from those in working in government advisory bodies who loaded on factor 1 regarding absorbing ideas through the OMC, “the OMC is quite a soft process in a way you notice it is over a longish period of time. People absorb ideas that they hear” (Respondent 1, factor 1, government advisory body). Those from the community and voluntary sector who loaded on factor 1 also mentioned the value of the OMC,

The OMC means a lot….I think at European level there’s been a lot of influence there particularly on social inclusion and the EU social inclusion process and the whole idea of having poverty targets. The Open Method of Coordination personally I think has been a very useful mechanism…I think it’s been useful because the principles have been set and you can apply them at your own level but also that exchange of information, experience and knowledge I think has been really helpful (Respondent 9, factor 1, community and voluntary sector).

Funding that the EU has provided as well as the opportunities it provides for networking in addition to using the EU as a ‘leverage’ to achieve action on domestic goals were also highlighted by those working in government advisory bodies and in local government who loaded on factor 1 (Respondent 9, factor 1, community and voluntary sector; Respondent 13, factor 1, local government official; Respondent 11, factor 1, local government official). Those loading on factor two also highlighted that the EU has had a significant impact and the benefit of participating in European projects which provide an opportunity to exchange knowledge and ideas (Respondent 14, factor 2, civil servant; Respondent 6, factor 2; civil servant). Hence, while positive views of the EU were expressed it is clear that in particular those from the community and voluntary sector who loaded on factor 1 feel the role of the EU is not strong enough in the subsystem of social inclusion due to its limitation to acting through ‘soft law’.

A prominent feature that was evident in interviews when asking about the role of the EU was the issue in securing change in Ireland, regardless of the EU. For example, regarding difficulties in getting a focus on an issue such as social inclusion nationally, “it’s not what counts for them [politicians] when they are trying to deal with their constituents, that’s not what is been asked of them on the doorstep” (Respondent 10,
factor 1, trade union official). Interviewees particularly from factor 1 spoke about the difficulty in actually securing any change within the Ireland, “it’s always difficult to get change….It’s often about small things and it’s often really hard to get really small things across” (Respondent 8, factor 1, community and voluntary sector). Indeed, the issue of path dependence and the legacy from pre-independence was spoken about as a reason why big change is so difficult in Ireland,

There is always the view in social policy analysis that path dependence has a big influence. In other words you are where you are today because of where you’ve come from and you can’t alter where you’ve come from and it’s very hard to suddenly jump onto a completely different way of doing things having developed your system in a certain way. We’ve always been very influenced by the British system, maybe less so now than used to be the case. Again this is where the path dependence element of it comes into play. Since the expansion of welfare states in the 1940s and 1950s Irish policymakers always looked very closely to what was going on in Britain, there was always a question of if Britain did anything we should do the same thing so there was much less awareness of what was going on in continental Europe. Now that has changed a bit since the European Union came along but only to a degree because by then we had adopted a lot of the characteristics of the British style system. We were on a certain channel therefore a lot of the systems used in other countries were not relevant because they came from a different tradition (Respondent 15, factor 1, academic).

Interviewees from both factors pointed to the issue of getting people to pay high taxes in Ireland (Respondent 14, factor 2, civil servant; Respondent 21, factor 1, politician) and the problem this creates for deciding on policies, “I think there’s a tension there really about whether to have a more universal system to pay more tax so we want to have the universal system but we don’t want to pay more tax for it” (Respondent 9, factor 1, government advisory body), “I think there’s probably a fear in the Irish government, both in the administrative system and the politicians with regard Scandinavia because of the inherent higher tax regime” (Respondent 12, factor 1, community and voluntary sector). Other interviewees referenced this issue in Ireland in comparison to other member states, “the people in places like Belgium, France and Germany and so on don’t resist paying their taxes or social contributions because they know they are going to get
it back because they know the care is there for them if they need it” (Respondent 17, factor 1). As well as problems surrounding a lack of desire to introduce higher taxes for political reasons those from government advisory bodies also argued that there was and is a conservatism within Irish politics,

People were always happy if we recommended detailed recommendation within the given policy frame…there was a relationship between the political and administrative system which encouraged civil servants to be cautious. There was always this ambiguous Irish thing that everyone is in favour of tackling poverty and social inclusion and we must do more about poverty and in so far as ministers get resources to do more about poverty they would in sort of a gentle way but they wouldn’t look at inequalities and other things that are going on, economic or tax policy creating a lot of the problems so it was like you had two separate worlds and you did your best to get as much resources as you could out of the Department of Finance but you didn’t really change the fundamental architecture of the system in which we operated. So I think that made the civil service over time more cautious and essentially apart from a very short period you didn’t have big changes in government. You had a dominant FF view with a PD link to it for quite a long period and even FG wasn’t that different. You tended to have rather a conservative economic model and people got comfortable with that and operating within the parameters of that (Respondent 1, factor 1, government advisory body).

In addition, interviewees pointed to the difficulty of vagueness surrounding what social inclusion is and convincing others to address it,

I’d say certainly from my own experience when I would have started off in the social inclusion area I mean people wouldn’t have known what social inclusion was….It’s a huge challenge and it’s not just in social inclusion. It’s a huge challenge on any cross-departmental working because people come to it with their own hats on any type of area like that so I think social inclusion suffers sometimes because of the nature of the policy area, it’s hard to measure (Respondent 6, factor 2, civil servant).

In addition, civil servants spoke about the lack of influence on the policy agenda of the community and voluntary groups,
I mean certainly when we had social partnership you would have said the unions and the employers were very influential, the community and voluntary sector less so…I don’t think agencies themselves were hugely influential in getting items on the agenda. I think it came more from the political system itself and possibly the lobby groups. The community groups would talk about the officials or the departments being stuck in their silos but in actual fact the community groups are pretty much the same (Respondent 6, factor 2, civil servant).

As a result, it is clear that interviewees had strong views on why it is difficult to get change or make progress in the subsystem regardless of the EU due to domestic situations such as conservatism within the political system, lack of understanding of what social inclusion means as a well as the lack of influence of the community and voluntary sector.

8.7 Conclusions

This chapter presented findings from the analysis of interviewees Q sorts and in-depth interviews. The aim was to provide an insight into the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland by assessing interviewees views on combating social exclusion in conjunction with their views on the role of the EU and the subsystem in general. Analysis of interviewees Q sorts found two different approaches being advocated for within the subsystem in Ireland. One approach argued for an approach based on a RED/SFD approach while another advocated a SID/SFD approach. It is evident that a common priority amongst both groups was the need for a commitment to SFD values. However, there was also a clear distinction between the two groups. For example, those who loaded on factor one prioritised combating social exclusion through redistribution mechanisms while those who loaded on factor two focused on employment as a favoured means of combating social exclusion. Secondly, views from interviewees during the in-depth interview process were presented. Interviewees highlighted that the EU, while never having any major impact on the subsystem in Ireland, still played an important role. This was evident from those from a variety of different sectors and who loaded on different factors.
The role of the EU in promoting learning as well as knowledge exchange was highlighted, in particular through the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes and the OMC. In addition, the usefulness of EU indicators as well as the importance of being able to participate in EU networks was noted as was the increased consultation and interaction amongst actors and the strengthening of institutional arrangements. The EU was also highlighted as playing an important role as acting as a 'leverage' or as legitimisation to pursue domestic approaches being advocated for at domestic level. A number of interviewees pointed out that this was a subsystem in which Ireland was influential at EU level and as a result Ireland often pre-empted the EU in this area thus mitigating the impact of the EU. In addition interviewees spoke about their perception of the EU within this subsystem discussing both negative and positive aspects. Those from the community and voluntary sector who loaded on factor 1 in particular spoke about the limitations of EU ‘soft law’ and its application to social policy. As well as issues with securing change due to conservatism within the Irish political system, a reluctance towards having high taxes and the lack of influence of the community and voluntary sector were also highlighted. Thus, regardless of the EU this is a subsystem that has proved difficult to make significant progress or change in as demonstrated by the continuing high levels of poverty and social exclusion that still exist in Ireland.
Chapter 9: Conclusions: The Europeanization of Irish Politics, Policy and Polity?

9.1 Summary

The introduction to this thesis argued that more research was needed on assessing the impact of 'soft law' at member state level rather than on its genesis at EU level. Hence, this research primarily aimed to seek to understand the EU’s ability to embed change at domestic level in Ireland through 'soft law'. This was deemed important as the EU has increasingly used 'soft law' initiatives in order to encourage change at domestic level in member states and that this is likely to continue due to the challenges that continuing enlargement brings (Mulcahy 2009). However, this research recognised that there continued to be a lack of knowledge surrounding the EU’s ability to embed change through 'soft law' at member state level. As a result, this research aimed to further our knowledge of Europeanization through 'soft law'. This research was guided by the following overarching research question and four sub-questions in order to guide the empirical aspect of this research:

Overarching Research Question: To what extent has the EU embedded change in the areas of politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland?

Sub-Research Question 1) Has the EU led to changes in relationships and interactions for domestic actors?

Sub-Research Question 2) Has the EU led to an increase in efforts to tackle a recognised domestic issue?

Sub-Research Question 3) Has the EU led to the stimulation of policy change in Ireland?

Sub-Research Question 4) Has the EU led to changes in domestic institutional arrangements?

To address these research questions a research framework was employed to guide and frame the research. The theoretical aspect of the framework was based on using Europeanization as a single concept while the methodological framework was based on gaining an in-depth analysis and used semi-structured in-depth interviews, document
analysis and Q methodology to achieve this. Social inclusion was chosen as the policy subsystem under investigation while Ireland represented the case chosen in order to investigate the Europeanization of this subsystem. The focus in the thesis was on the time period of 1987 to 2010. This research hypothesised about the expected outcomes of Europeanization through ‘soft law’ and stated that, in cases of Europeanization through ‘soft law’ the EU will only lead to change by providing a legitimization for domestic content, implementation and reforms rather than leading to significant changes in domestic politics, policy and polity.

Following this summary of the research, this concluding chapter proceeds to give an overview of the main findings of the research project and following this the contribution this research has made to the literature is outlined. Finally, the limitations of the study are presented and subsequently suggestions for future research are offered.

9.2 Key Findings

This research assessed the Europeanization of Irish politics, policy and polity in the policy subsystem of social inclusion. As pointed out in the introduction of this thesis, this research aimed to assess the EU’s ability to embed change in the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. In response to this assessment a number of empirical findings from the research emerged which serve to offer an insight into the role of the EU in a subsystem governed by ‘soft law’ and in turn serves to increase our understanding of the extent of Europeanization.

For instance, chapter five assessed the EU’s ability to embed change in Irish politics in the policy subsystem of social inclusion. For this research, this chapter sought to understand whether the EU led to changes in relationships and interactions for domestic actors and whether the EU has led to an increase in efforts to tackle a recognised domestic issue? This chapter found that the EU did lead to increased efforts to tackle a recognised national issue, in this case poverty due to the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes in the 1970s and 1980s. Poverty was already a recognised issue in Ireland, in particular since the 1971 Poverty Conference that was held. In Ireland it was apparent knowledge from the EU political system was transferred to Ireland and was used to increase efforts to tackle a nationally recognised issue – poverty. The EU Anti-Poverty Programmes served to raise the profile of the issue of poverty as well as increase efforts to tackle it through the funding of projects, research and the promotion of knowledge exchange. It
also became apparent through the assessment of the Europeanization of politics that the EU can be a place of information and knowledge exchange for domestic actors. The EU can be a place of 'usage' for domestic actors.

For example, while there is no evidence that peer reviews held as part of the Open Method of Coordination led to change domestically they did serve as an important source of learning and information for domestic actors. For example, peer reviews held as part of the OMC process served to increase domestic actors awareness of what is going on in other countries. The European Years also had a 'leverage effect' domestically. Particularly at local government level they were used to legitimise a focus on social exclusion and social inclusion and were used to further the agenda on these issues in local level programmes and plans. The EU also had an important effect on domestic actors as it led to increased consultation and interactions between domestic actors as well as providing these actors with opportunities to participate in transnational projects and networks at EU level. This in turn facilitated learning that was fed into the national level. Thus, the EU did not led to an significant change in Irish politics but in many respects was ‘used’ by domestic actors to tackle domestic issues and for access to knowledge and learning exchange. This chapter also showcases that the EU was unable to change or overcome national politics for example surrounding support for initiatives in relation to social inclusion. As a result, while ‘soft law’ mechanisms can play an important role domestically they are dependent on national actors and their willingness to engage and therefore cannot overcome resistance to implementing social inclusion initiatives domestically.

Chapter six outlined the EU’s ability to embed change in Irish policy in the policy subsystem of social inclusion. This chapter assessed whether the EU led to the stimulation of policy change in Ireland? The EU Anti-Poverty Programmes served as a vehicle for the transfer of policy language. For instance, participation in the third Anti-Poverty Programme by Ireland led to the transfer of the concept of social exclusion into Irish policy discourse. The concept was adopted by policy campaigners, policymakers, researchers, NGOs, academics and even politicians. Further to this it permeated Irish policy documents and programmes and institutions. The Open Method of Coordination led to the transfer of the concept of social inclusion into policy discourse and institutions in Ireland. Like social exclusion this has become a widely used concept in Irish social policy. As well as introducing a change in linguistics that led to new
concepts arising on the policy agenda within the Irish political system EU concepts such as social exclusion and social inclusion served to validate and legitimise the dominant policy approach being pursued in Ireland. Through the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes the EU did lead to the transfer of policy lessons regarding combating poverty and social exclusion. For example, that in order to tackle poverty the causes of poverty needed to be addressed rather than the symptoms. This led to a focus on the structural causes of poverty in policy responses in Ireland. In addition, projects established in Ireland due to the third EU Anti-Poverty Programme led to specific changes in policy practices in Ireland.

For example, the PAUL project in Limerick informed the setting up of the Community Employment Scheme. The Tallaght Partnership transferred the Belgian Plato Small Business initiative which provided a support service for small and medium businesses while the Northside Partnership transferred the Dutch model of a tailored employment service. The EU, particularly through the OMC, and EU structural funds has served to reinforce and validate a policy approach based on activation in Ireland. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms were also transferred from the EU, for example EU indicators as part of the OMC process and the EU Survey on Income and Living Conditions (EU SILC) which were used to assess and monitor progress in Ireland. Participation by Ireland in the OMC also led Ireland to introducing a reporting process. This however did not replace the existing reporting and strategy process already in operation at domestic level but the EU reporting process did serve to act as a review and evaluation process of national strategies at a more frequent pace than would otherwise have been. As a result, the EU did not lead to major changes in the area of policy. In addition, it is apparent that domestic actors 'used' the EU to legitimise domestic approaches taken, for example in relation to activation. Again the pre-empting by Ireland of many approaches taken at EU level meant that change was again limited to minor change with the EU also acting as a means of validation for domestic approaches.

Chapter seven sought to assess the Europeanization of polity and was focused on gauging whether the EU has led to change in domestic institutional arrangements? The EU had little impact on institutional arrangements due to the establishment of a comprehensive institutional framework with the creation of social partnership and the 1997 and 2002 NAPS. Participation in the OMC did lead Ireland to strengthen these existing institutional arrangements and a 'joined-up' approach to policymaking at
government level and provided a pressure to continue with domestic institutional arrangements. However, the EU failed to be able to overcome issues with implementation and commitment to these arrangements by domestic actors, for example regarding poverty proofing. The EU did have an impact through supporting the development of partnerships through community initiatives such as OPLURD as well as LEADER, INTERREG, EQUAL, URVAN and the PEACE Programmes. The EU Structural Fund reforms of the late 1980s that led to the establishment of Monitoring Committees also furthered the principle of partnership in Ireland. The EU Anti-Poverty Programmes, which were created with a view to promoting change in the subsystem of social inclusion specifically, also contributed to furthering the principle of partnership in Ireland through the creation of partnerships and the learning the programmes promoted. These initiatives built on existing ideas and commitments within the Irish political system to promote the principal of partnership.

Chapter five, six, and seven assessed the Europeanization of politics, policy and polity. Chapter 8 built on these assessments and furthered our knowledge of the subsystem of social inclusion by assessing interviewee’s views on combatting social exclusion in conjunction with their views on the role of the EU and the subsystem in general. Analysis of interviewees Q sorts found two different approaches being advocated for within the subsystem in Ireland. One approach advocated for a RED/SFD approach while another advocated for a SID/SFD approach. It is evident that a common priority amongst both groups was the need for a commitment to SFD values. However, there was also a clear distinction between the two groups. For example, those who loaded on factor one prioritised combatting social exclusion through redistribution mechanisms while those who loaded on factor two focused on employment as a favoured means of combatting social exclusion. Secondly, views from interviewees during the in-depth interview process were presented. Interviewees highlighted that the EU, while never having any major impact on the subsystem in Ireland, still played an important role. This was evident from those from a variety of different sectors and who loaded on different factors. The role of the EU in promoting learning as well as knowledge exchange was highlighted, in particular through the EU Anti-Poverty Programmes and the OMC. In addition, the usefulness of EU indicators as well as the importance of being able to participate in EU networks was noted as was the increased consultation and interaction amongst actors and the strengthening of institutional arrangements.
The EU was also highlighted as having played an important role in acting as a leverage or as legitimisation to pursue domestic approaches being advocated for at domestic level. A number of interviewees pointed out that this was subsystem in which Ireland was influential at EU level and as a result Ireland often pre-empted the EU in this area thus mitigating the impact of the EU. In addition interviewees spoke about their perception of the EU within this subsystem discussing both negative and positive aspects. Those from the community and voluntary sector who loaded on factor 1 in particular spoke about the limitations of EU ‘soft law’ and its application to social policy. As well as issues around securing change due to conservatism within the Irish political system, a reluctance towards having high taxes and the lack of influence of the community and voluntary sector were also highlighted as significant issues within the policy subsystem in Ireland. Thus, regardless of the EU this is a subsystem that has proved difficult to make significant progress or change in as demonstrated by the continuing high levels of poverty and social exclusion that still exist in Ireland. It is hoped that the four empirical chapter (chapters five, six, seven and eight) of this thesis shed light on the role of the EU and its influence through 'soft law' but also issues domestically that have contributed to this being a subsystem in which progress is difficult to achieve.

The findings presented in this thesis demonstrate that Europeanization through 'soft law' manifests itself in a variety of ways differing, as expected, from outcomes evident through 'hard law'. The hypothesis of this research argued that:

In cases of Europeanization through 'soft law' the EU will only lead to change by providing a legitimization for domestic content, implementation and reforms rather than leading to significant changes in domestic politics, policy and polity.

Indeed, this thesis did find that change through 'soft law' was evident in Ireland in cases where it could be used to address already existing domestic issues, goals and objectives rather than being the impetus for any new initiatives in politics, policy and polity.
9.3 Contribution of the Research

The introduction to this thesis pointed out that research into Europeanization through 'soft law' and the impact of the EU on policy subsystems that lie outside of the EU’s legal competencies remains under-researched (Mulcahy 2009; Zeitlin 2009; Zeitlin 2005). Indeed, much literature has focused on the genesis of ‘soft law’ rather than its role in furthering the EU’s interaction with member states. This was identified as a gap that this research could contribute to. In Ireland, it has been widely recognised that the EU played a significant role in the area of social policy regarding women’s and worker’s rights. However, these are areas where the EU has had some legal remit in order to force member states to adapt domestic policies. This research instead chose a subsystem that is hugely important at Irish and EU level but is one that has been debated and contested continuously with progress difficult to achieve. The importance of research into this subsystem has only been more highlighted with the recent economic crisis and the proliferation of social problems such as poverty and social exclusion. This most recent economic crisis has demonstrated that is a policy subsystem that requires much more attention at domestic and EU level as well as amongst researchers.

This research has thus contributed to studies focusing on the role of the EU in subsystems outside the EU’s legal remit. This gives us an insight into the extent of the EU’s impact as well as an insight into the important role the EU can play other than through legal mechanisms. As mentioned previously in the thesis this is important as the EU’s use of 'soft law' mechanisms is likely to increase and it already uses these mechanisms in a number of policy subsystems that fall outside its legal remit. In addition, it did not just focus on one domain but rather all three domains of change – politics, policy and polity in order to give a more accurate assessment of the extent of Europeanization through 'soft law'. As was highlighted in chapter one other research has been conducted on the impact of the EU on this particular subsystem in Ireland but due to the timing of this research (i.e. ten years after the inception of the OMC) it presents a more accurate empirical assessment of the Europeanization of social inclusion in Ireland. Unlike other research it also assessed the Europeanization of this policy subsystem over an extended period of time rather than just focusing on the period covering the Open Method of Coordination (OMC). The insight into key policy actors’ beliefs and values within this policy subsystem using the discourse of RED (Redistributionist Egalitarian Discourse), MUD (Moral Underclass Discourse), SID
(Social Integrationist Discourse) and SFD (System Failure Discourse) is a unique source of data that has not been gathered and assessed before. Therefore, the assessment of interviewees Q sorts also represents a contribution to empirical knowledge on some of the approaches apparent within the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. In addition, this knowledge generated from the Q sorts has the potential to be used for consensus building within the subsystem in order to further efforts to promote social inclusion.

9.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This research does however have its limitations as well as suggestions for future research. Firstly, there are a number of limitations to this research. For example, twenty three interviews in Ireland and two interviews at EU level were conducted. However, Q methodology was undertaken with the twenty three interviewees in Ireland but not with those at EU level. Due to financial constraints only a short research trip to Brussels was permitted that only allowed for interviews to be conducted with two interviewees at EU level. This is too small a number to conduct an accurate Q methodological study. In addition, Q methodology does allow for the assessment of actors beliefs and values but only at one point of time rather than allowing for the assessment of beliefs and values over a longer period of time. This study was also limited to a single case study and a single policy subsystem. This limitation in case and policy subsystem selection does mean the generalisability of the study is affected however on the other hand it allowed for an in-depth analysis which was deemed essential to understanding the more subtle process of Europeanization through 'soft law'.

Secondly, this research used Europeanization as a single framework in this thesis. However, as highlighted in the literature review of this thesis the Europeanization literature has increasingly highlighted the benefits of linking Europeanization with public policy concepts such as policy transfer and the ACF. There remains an opportunity to develop and employ a framework using a multi-concept framework that links Europeanization with public policy concepts in order to assess Europeanization. It would be particularly useful for assessing Europeanization through 'soft law' due to the more subtle process of change associated with 'soft law' mechanisms. As a result, there is much potential for future research to apply this multi-concept research framework to other member states as well as other policy subsystems. Such further research would
contribute significantly to providing a more comprehensive evaluation of Europeanization through 'soft law' throughout the European Union.

This research was limited to assessing the Europeanization of the policy subsystem of social inclusion in Ireland. Ireland represents a case study that is often neglected by Europeanization research that tends to focus on larger member states. However, it is still a member state that has been part of the EU for forty years therefore more research is needed on new member states and the role of 'soft law' in leading to change in those countries (De la Porte 2010). The research was also limited in the policy subsystem it investigated. This research focused on a single policy subsystem of social inclusion, which again was advantageous as it allowed for an in-depth analysis. However, it would be interesting to assess a wider range of policy subsystems as well. For instance, other policy subsystems that are governed by the Open Method of Coordination such as pensions and health, which have so far been largely neglected in the literature or indeed areas governed by 'soft law' mechanisms other than the Open Method of Coordination. As a result, there is much research to be completed before we can assess the extent of Europeanization through 'soft law'.

Furthermore, the use of Q methodology within the social sciences remains an underdeveloped area and could be used more in order to assess views with positions held as well as being used as an addition to the traditional 'R' approach. In particular there is the potential for Q methodology to be employed by research using the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) due to the important role that assessing beliefs and values plays in applying the ACF and its role in public policy change analysis. In addition, it is apparent that at Irish level the view that employment should be the primary means of combating social exclusion exists. As a result, more research is needed on the actual effectiveness of measures associated with the social inclusion through employment approach. This is important as poverty and social exclusion remain constant and persistent policy problems and in particular there is an ever increasing issue of in-work poverty which suggests that the value of the inclusion through employment approach needs to be assessed in light of this. In sum, this research highlights many fruitful avenues for future research. As referenced to in the introduction to this research it is hoped that this research along with the pursuit of the research avenues pointed out above will contribute to the wider discussion on how to ensure a fair, just and inclusive society for all within Ireland and the wider European Union.
Appendices

Appendix 1  List of Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>RED</th>
<th>MUD</th>
<th>SID</th>
<th>SFD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The concentration of resources in higher socioeconomic groups leads to poverty and social exclusion (statement 6)</td>
<td>The primary division in society is between a self-excluded 'underclass' and the included majority (statement 3)</td>
<td>Social exclusion is caused by exclusion from paid work (statement 27)</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is the result of the failure of social, economic, political and cultural systems in society (statement 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>Social Exclusion is not the result of individual behaviour (statement 16)</td>
<td>Individual behaviour leads to self-social exclusion (statement 20)</td>
<td>The excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work (statement 11)</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the democratic and legal system (statement 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Generally speaking unpaid work should be acknowledged (statement 29)</td>
<td>The self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic (statement 32)</td>
<td>Employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals (statement 2)</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the labour market (statement 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society (statement 23)</td>
<td>The welfare state and welfare spending has created a 'culture of dependency' (statement 30)</td>
<td>The benefit system results in disincentives and 'poverty traps' for welfare recipients (statement 5)</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the welfare system (statement 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Core</strong></td>
<td>The political system should address social exclusion through a progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners <em>(statement 31)</em></td>
<td>The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion <em>(statement 26)</em></td>
<td>To combat social exclusion the political system should improve the functioning of the labour market. In turn the unemployed individual receiving welfare benefits should in turn show a commitment to gaining paid employment <em>(statement 19)</em></td>
<td>To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society <em>(statement 12)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Their main strategies and policy preferences)</em></td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work and Welfare</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong> <em>(How they would like beliefs to be implemented)</em></td>
<td><strong>Work and Welfare</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Individuals should be guaranteed a basic income, in welfare benefits or in work, as a right of citizenship <em>(statement 21)</em></td>
<td>Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves <em>(statement 7)</em></td>
<td>Unemployed welfare benefit recipients should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving these benefits <em>(statement 13)</em></td>
<td>To combat the social exclusion of individuals a reform of the labour market is needed <em>(statement 15)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work and Welfare</strong></td>
<td>The political system should implement an adequate minimum income scheme to tackle social exclusion <em>(statement 1)</em></td>
<td>Benefit payments should only be maintained if unemployed benefit recipients participate on compulsory workfare schemes <em>(statement 24)</em></td>
<td>Supportive public interventions should be used to improve individual employability <em>(statement 14)</em></td>
<td>The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion <em>(statement 25)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>SFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work and Welfare</strong></td>
<td>Workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system <em>(statement 8)</em></td>
<td>The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months <em>(statement 18)</em></td>
<td>Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system <em>(statement 10)</em></td>
<td>To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment <em>(statement 4)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement 8**: Workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system.

**Statement 18**: The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months.

**Statement 10**: Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system.

**Statement 4**: To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment.
## Appendix 2: Factor Arrays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Number:</th>
<th>Classification:</th>
<th>Belief Type:</th>
<th>Statement:</th>
<th>Factor One:</th>
<th>Factor Two:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>The political system should implement an adequate minimum income scheme to tackle social exclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>Employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The primary division in society is between a self-excluded 'underclass' and the included majority</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The benefit system results in disincentives and 'poverty traps' for welfare recipients</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Belief Type</td>
<td>Statement:</td>
<td>Factor One</td>
<td>Factor Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The concentration of resources in higher socioeconomic groups leads to poverty and social exclusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the labour market</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number:</td>
<td>Classification:</td>
<td>Belief Type:</td>
<td>Statement:</td>
<td>Factor One:</td>
<td>Factor Two:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>Unemployed welfare benefit recipients should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving these benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Supportive public interventions should be used to improve individual employability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>To combat the social exclusion of individuals a reform of the labour market is needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>Social exclusion is not the result of individual behaviour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the welfare system</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number:</td>
<td>Classification:</td>
<td>Belief Type:</td>
<td>Statement:</td>
<td>Factor One:</td>
<td>Factor Two:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>To combat social exclusion the political system should improve the functioning of the labour market. In turn the unemployed individual receiving welfare benefits should in turn show a commitment to gaining paid employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>Individual behaviour leads to self-social exclusion</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>Individuals should be guaranteed a basic income, in welfare benefits or in work, as a right of citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is the result of the failure of social, economic, political and cultural systems in society</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number:</td>
<td>Classification:</td>
<td>Belief Type:</td>
<td>Statement:</td>
<td>Factor One:</td>
<td>Factor Two:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Benefit payments should only be maintained if unemployed benefit recipients participate on compulsory workfare schemes</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>Social exclusion is caused by exclusion from paid work</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Number:</td>
<td>Classification:</td>
<td>Belief Type:</td>
<td>Statement:</td>
<td>Factor One:</td>
<td>Factor Two:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SFD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the democratic and legal system</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>Generally speaking unpaid work should be acknowledged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The welfare state and welfare spending has created a 'culture of dependency'</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Policy Core</td>
<td>The political system should address social exclusion through a progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>Deep Core</td>
<td>The self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Quotes from the Literature (Concourse) and Corresponding Statements

Statement 1 (RED): The political system should implement an adequate minimum income scheme to tackle social exclusion

➢ He (Townshend) argues once again for a redistributive strategy, not just through the tax and benefit systems and public services, but through the reduction of earnings differentials, a minimum wage, a minimum income for those unable to work (Levitas 2005: 11).

Statement 2 (SID): Employment should be viewed as the central route out of social exclusion for unemployed individuals

➢ Employment is widely recognised as a central route out of poverty (Moran 2006: 183) and employment is in itself inclusive (Moran 2006: 183).

Statement 3 (MUD): The primary division in society is between a self-excluded “underclass” and the included majority

➢ It [MUD] presents the underclass or socially excluded as culturally distinct from the “mainstream” (Levitas 2005: 21)

Statement 4 (SID): To combat the social exclusion of individuals the labour market needs to be first subject to deep systemic change which leads to the removal of structural barriers to employment

➢ This problem is not perceived as having been caused by individual behaviour or disincentives of the welfare state but by the operation of the capitalist market societies which exclude people from the labour market (Aust and Arriba 2004: 21)

Statement 5 (SID): The benefit system results in disincentives and “poverty traps” for welfare recipients

➢ The major problem within the social inclusion discourse is seen to be the institutional arrangement of the welfare state which has focused on passive transfers and created wrong incentives. Welfare recipients are said to be stuck within “unemployment” or “poverty traps” (Aust and Arriba 2002: 22)
Statement 6 (RED): The concentration of resources in higher socioeconomic groups leads to poverty and social exclusion

- RED broadens out from its concern with poverty into a critique of inequality, and contrasts exclusion with a version of citizenship which calls for substantial redistribution of power and wealth (Levitas 2005: 7). It implies a radical reduction of inequalities, and a redistribution of resources and of power (Levitas 2005: 14)

Statement 7 (MUD): Welfare benefits for unemployed welfare recipients should be cut off at a certain point so as to encourage them to become independent and responsible for themselves

- The policy conclusion from this interpretation was to reduce the level and duration of the benefit (Aust and Arriba 2004: 22)

Statement 8 (RED): Workers earning the minimum wage should be removed from the tax system

- He (Townshend) argues once again for a redistributive strategy, not just through the tax and benefit systems and public services, but through the reduction of earnings differentials, a minimum wage (Levitas 2005: 11)

Statement 9 (SFD): The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the labour market

- “…social exclusion should be defined in terms of the failure of one or more of the following…the labour market, which promotes economic integration” (Berghman 1995: 19)

Statement 10 (SID): Low paid workers should have their wages supplemented through the benefit system

- In order to give financial incentive for low qualified people in-work benefits for low wage jobs are regarded as useful instruments to reduce the welfare state induced traps (Aust and Arriba 2002: 23)
Statement 11 (SID): The excluded are those who are able to work but don’t want to work

- The excluded are those who are “workless” (Levitas 2003: 2)

Statement 12 (SFD): To combat social exclusion the political system needs to provide supportive work, welfare and community systems in society

- According to Commins (1993: 4) One’s sense of belonging in society depends on all four systems. Civic integration means being an equal citizen in a democratic system. Economic integration means having a job, having a valued economic function, being able to pay your way. Social integration means being able to avail oneself of the social services provided by the state. Interpersonal integration means having family and friends, neighbours and social networks to provide care and companionship and moral support when they are needed

Statement 13 (SID): Unemployed welfare benefit recipients should show a commitment to participating in work placement schemes while receiving these benefits

- SID argues in favour of a new balance of rights and duties. Recipients of social (assistance) benefits are obliged to use the offers given, otherwise they may be sanctioned through the reduction or withdrawal of the benefit (Aust and Arriba 2004: 23)

Statement 14 (SID): Supportive public interventions should be used to improve individual employability

- The lack of adequate skills and qualifications and the insufficient supply of social infrastructure to reconcile family and paid work are often regarded as causes for social assistance dependency. This discourse therefore highlights the need for supportive public interventions to improve individual employability (‘positive activation’) and social infrastructure (Aust and Arriba 2002: 22/23)
Statement 15 (SFD): To combat the social exclusion of individuals a reform of the labour market is needed
➢ “…social exclusion should be defined in terms of the failure of one or more of the following…the labour market, which promotes economic integration” (Berghman 1995: 19)

Statement 16 (RED): Social Exclusion is not the result of individual behaviour
➢ ….this problem is not perceived as having been caused by individual behaviour…” (Aust and Arriba 2002: 21)

Statement 17 (SFD): The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the welfare system
➢ “…social exclusion should be defined in terms of the failure of one or more of the following…the welfare system, promoting what might be called social integration” (Berghman 1995: 19)

Statement 18 (MUD): The level and duration of benefits unemployed welfare recipients receive should be reduced every three months
➢ The policy conclusion from this interpretation was to reduce the level and duration of the benefit (Aust and Arriba 2002: 22)

Statement 19 (SID): To combat social exclusion the political system should improve the functioning of the labour market. In turn the unemployed individual receiving welfare benefits should in turn show a commitment to gaining paid employment
➢ The common leitmotif of this discourse is to activate the claimants into the labour market…the social integration discourse underlines social and individual preconditions to enter and succeed in the labour market. This discourse therefore highlights the need for supportive public interventions to improve the individual employability….SID argues in favour of a new balance of rights and duties. Recipients of social (assistance) benefits are obliged to use offers given, otherwise they may be sanctioned through the reduction or withdrawal of benefits (Aust and Arriba 2004: 22/23)
Statement 20 (MUD): Individual behaviour leads to self-social exclusion

- MUD…sees the causes of poverty as lying in cultural and moral (self) exclusion rather than the other way around (Levitas 2003: 4). It emphasises individual values and behaviour (Lister 2004: 77). It focuses on the behaviour of the poor rather than the other way around (Levitas 2003: 4)

Statement 21 (RED): Individuals should be guaranteed a basic income, in welfare benefits or in work, as a right of citizenship

- …idea of basic social rights as elements of modern citizenship. Accordingly all people in need have a right to minimum income because of their human and citizenship rights. The focus rests on the availability of sufficient resources for the recipients to allow them live a life if dignity (Aust and Arriba 2004: 21). He (Townshend) argued once again for a redistributive strategy, not just through the tax and benefit systems and public services, but…a minimum income for those unable to work, and financial recognition of unpaid work through at least a conditional participation income, if not an unconditional citizen’s income (Levitas 2005: 11)

Statement 22 (SFD): The social exclusion of individuals is the result of the failure of social, economic, political and cultural systems in society

- The broad version of inclusion may be distinguished from the narrow version in that it refers to a vision or descriptor of an endemically inclusive society, where all members participate fully in the economic, political, cultural and social structure of that society, a state of affairs that depends on and reproduces a substantial degree of economic, cultural and political equality (Moran 2006: 192)

…social exclusion as a more comprehensive formulation which refers to the dynamic process of being shut out, fully or partially, from any of the social, economic, political or cultural systems which determine the social integration of a person in society. Social exclusion may, therefore, be seen as the denial (or non-realisation) of the civil, political and social rights of citizenship (Walker and Walker 1997: 8)
Statement 23 (RED): A more equitable redistribution of income is necessary to promote social justice in society

- RED refers to a redistributive, egalitarian discourse that embraces notions of citizenship, social rights and social justice (Lister 2004: 77)

Statement 24 (MUD): Benefit payments should only be maintained if unemployed benefit recipients participate on compulsory workfare schemes

- The policy conclusion from this interpretation was to...make benefits conditional on the participation in welfare-to-work programmes (workfare) (Aust and Arriba 2002: 22)

Statement 25 (SFD): The state needs to make adequate investment in providing access for all to social services such as health, housing and education to combat social exclusion

- ...the indicators of social exclusion might include environmental degradation, a decaying housing stock, the withdrawal of local services...overstretched public services and the collapse of local support networks (Percy-Smith 2000: 10)

Statement 26 (MUD): The political system has no responsibility to address social exclusion as individuals should address their own self-exclusion

- The focus had shifted from the structural basis of poverty to the moral and cultural character of the poor themselves (Levitas 2005: 15)

Statement 27 (SID): Social exclusion is caused by exclusion from paid work

- It narrows the definition of social exclusion/inclusion to participation in paid work (Levitas 2005: 26)

Statement 28 (SFD): The social exclusion of individuals is a result of the failure of the democratic and legal system

- “...social exclusion should be defined in terms of the failure of...the democratic and legal system, which promotes civic integration” (Berghman 2005: 19)
Statement 29 (RED): Generally speaking unpaid work should be acknowledged

➢ It [RED] is potentially able to valorise paid work (Levitas 2005: 14)

Statement 30 (MUD): The welfare state and welfare spending has created a “culture of dependency”

➢ Economic dependence on “welfare” was constructed as “dependency”, a pathological moral and psychological condition created by the benefit system itself...in which the state was seen as a universal provider, sapping personal initiative, independence and self-respect. Benefits were bad for, rather than good for, their recipients. If this was true of individuals, it was even more true of the poor collectively: welfare spending gave rise to a “culture of dependency” (Levitas 2005: 15)

Statement 31 (RED): The political system should address social exclusion through a progressive tax system which places the burden on higher earners

➢ RED broadens out from its concern with poverty into a critique of inequality, and contrasts exclusion with a version of citizenship which calls for substantial redistribution of power and wealth (Levitas 2005: 7). It implies a radical reduction of inequalities, and a redistribution of resources and power (Levitas 2005: 14). He (Townshend) argued once again for a redistributive strategy, not just through the tax and benefit systems and public services, but through the reduction of earnings differentials (Levitas 2005: 11). RED...underlines the responsibility of politics to alleviate the social consequences of market and social failures (Aust and Arriba 2004: 21)

Statement 32 (MUD): The self-excluded are typified by low educational attainment and a lack of work ethic

➢ The “excluded” are understood in this discourse [MUD] to be typified by illiteracy, low educational attainment, single motherhood, delinquency, crime alcoholism, substance abuse, hostility, mental illness and laziness (Moran 2006: 186)
### Appendix 4  Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>06/06/2012</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14/06/2012</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24/10/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19/06/2012</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01/08/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17/07/2012</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12/09/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18/07/2012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26/10/2012</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26/07/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>09/08/2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30/10/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27/06/2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>02/08/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>02/07/2012</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14/11/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24/07/2012</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13/07/2012</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30/10/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>05/07/2012</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31/10/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>08/08/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14/11/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30/10/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31/10/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5  Sample Interview Questions

1). Who do you collaborate with/work with?

2). According to you who are the most important people, apart from in your own organisation, in the area?

3). Do you think there have been any significant policy changes in the area since you have worked in this area?

4). If so, where did the incentive for change come from?

5). Do you think there have been any significant changes in policymaking processes since you worked in this area?

6). If so, where did the incentive for change come from?

7). Do you think there have been any changes in politics for example:
   (i). A change in language or concepts used
   (ii). Any new issues that have arisen in the policy domain?
   (iii). An increased impetus to tackle a long-recognised national issue?

8). If so, where did the incentive for change come from?
Appendix 6 Ethics Consent Form

FACULTY OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
CONSENT FORM

Consent Section:
I, the undersigned, declare that I am willing to take part in research for the project entitled “Explaining Change in the Area of Social Inclusion in Ireland”

- I declare that I have been fully briefed on the nature of this study and my role in it and have been given the opportunity to ask questions before agreeing to participate.
- The nature of my participation has been explained to me and I have full knowledge of how the information collected will be used.
- I am also aware that my participation in this study may be recorded (video/audio) and I agree to this. However, should I feel uncomfortable at any time I can request that the recording equipment be switched off. I am entitled to copies of all recordings made and am fully informed as to what will happen to these recordings once the study is completed.
- I fully understand that there is no obligation on me to participate in this study.
- I fully understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without having to explain or give a reason.
- I am also entitled to full confidentiality in terms of my participation and personal details.

____________________________________         __________________________
Signature of participant                                               Date
Appendix 7  Information Sheet for Interviewees

FACULTY OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

INFORMATION SHEET

I am a PhD student in the Department of Politics and Public Administration in the University of Limerick. I am doing a research project based on analysing the policy area of social inclusion in Ireland and change within this area. The purpose of this research is to further our understanding of change in the area of social inclusion.

In order to undertake this research project I wish to conduct interviews with people who I recognise as important people within this policy area. This will involve asking you to share your thoughts and understanding of change within the area of social inclusion. The interviews should last for on average one hour. The interviews will take place at a location convenient to you the participant.

This research project will help us better understand social inclusion policy and policymaking in Ireland. Participation in this study is an opportunity for reflection and an expression of your own understanding. There are no known risks associated with this study.

All information will be anonymised and I will remove all identifiable information relating to you from the typed account of the interview. In order to ensure confidentiality, the audio recording and transcription of the interview will be kept in a locked cabinet. All electronic data files will be password protected on my computer. You will be very welcome to view a copy of the typed account of our interview if you wish to check any details and that I have successfully protected your identity.
During the interview you can decline to answer any question that you like and you can withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason. Your participation is entirely voluntary. You can contact the UL Research Ethics Governance (ULREG) Committee if you have any concerns about participating in the research.

If you have any questions about this project, or about participating in it, you can contact me Mary Ellen Lyons, email: mary.lyons@ul.ie, phone at 061 213061 or Dr. Maura Adshead, email: Maura.adshead@ul.ie, phone at 061 213429 or Dr. Bernadette Connaughton, email: Bernadette.connaughton@ul.ie, phone at 061 202792 or the Chairperson of ULREG, c/o Anne O’Dwyer, Castletroy, Limerick, email: Anne.ODwyer@ul.ie, phone at 061 202672.
Appendix 8  Survey

Respondent:

Date:

Q. 1 Are you  □ male  □ female  □

Q. 2 What age are you?
  □ 18-33
  □ 34-44
  □ 45-54
  □ 55-64
  □ 65+

Q. 3 What is the highest level of education you have completed to date so far?
  □ No formal education
  □ Completed Primary Education
  □ Junior certificate or equivalent
  □ Leaving Certificate or equivalent
  □ Diploma or Certificate
  □ Primary Degree or Equivalent
  □ Postgraduate Certificate or Diploma or equivalent
  □ Masters
  □ Doctorate (PhD)
Q. 4 Are you originally from a rural  [ ]  or urban  [ ] area?

Q. 5 In political matters people talk of “the left” and the “right”. How would you place your views on this scale, generally speaking? (1 being most left and 10 being most right)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

Q. 6 What do you perceive your social class to be when you were born based on your fathers occupation?

☐ Upper middle class (higher managerial, administrative or professional)

☐ Middle class (intermediate managerial, administrative or professional)

☐ Lower middle class (supervisory or clerical, junior managerial, administrative or professional)

☐ Skilled working class (skilled manual workers)

☐ Working Class (semi and unskilled workers)

☐ Those at the lowest level of subsistence (state pensioners or widows, casual or lowest grade workers)
Q. 7 What do you perceive your present social class to be based on your current position?

☐ Upper middle class (higher managerial, administrative or professional)

☐ Middle class (intermediate managerial, administrative or professional)

☐ Lower middle class (supervisory or clerical, junior managerial, administrative or professional)

☐ Skilled working class (skilled manual workers)

☐ Working Class (semi and unskilled worker)

☐ Those at the lowest level of subsistence (state pensioners or widows, casual or lowest grade workers)

Q. 8 How long have you worked in your current role or your most current role if retired?

☐ Less than 6 months

☐ 6 months – 1 year

☐ 1-2 years

☐ 3-5 years

☐ More than 5 years
Q. 9 What type of an organisation do you work for?

☐ Community and Voluntary

☐ Government

☐ Business and Employers

☐ Trade Union

☐ Environmental

☐ Farming

☐ University

☐ Other, Please specify ____________________

Q. 10 Have you ever participated in social partnership negotiations?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q. 11 How would you describe your current status?

☐ In a paid position

☐ In an unpaid position

☐ Retired
## Appendix 9 Characteristics of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-44</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (highest level completed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate or equivalent</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Degree or equivalent</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate or Diploma or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate (PhD)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current area of residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of “left” to “right” (from 1 to 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class when born</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle Class</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Working Class</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those at the lowest level of subsistence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle Class</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in current role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months: 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years: 12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 years: 16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years: 68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Voluntary: 36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government: 48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions: 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University: 8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: 4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in social partnership negotiations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a paid position: 92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired: 8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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