

IAB-Forschungsbericht

5/2014

Results from the project work of IAB

Patterns of Resilience during Socioeconomic Crises among Households in Europe (RESCuE)

Concept, Objectives and Work Packages of an
EU FP 7 Project

Markus Promberger
Ursula Huws
Hulya Dagdeviren
Lars Meier
Frank Sowa
Marie Boost
Athena Athanasiou
Attila Aytekin
María Arnal
Luís Capucha
Carlos de Castro

Krystyna Faliszek
Jane Gray
Krzysztof Łęcki
Witold Mandrysz
Georgia Petraki
Juan Carlos Revilla
Tarık Şengül
Barbara Słania
Monica Tennberg
Terhi Vuojala-Magga
Kazimiera Wódz

ISSN 2195-2655

Patterns of Resilience during Socioeconomic Crises among Households in Europe (RESCuE)

Concept, Objectives and Work Packages of an EU FP 7 Project

Markus Promberger (IAB)

Ursula Huws (University of Hertfordshire, United Kingdom)

Hulya Dagdeviren (University of Hertfordshire, United Kingdom)

Lars Meier (IAB)

Frank Sowa (IAB)

Marie Boost (IAB)

Athena Athanasiou (Panteion University, Greece)

Attila Aytekin (Middle East Technical University, Turkey)

María Arnal (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain)

Luís Capucha (University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal)

Carlos de Castro (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain)

Krystyna Faliszek (University of Silesia, Poland)

Jane Gray (National University of Ireland Maynooth, Ireland)

Krzysztof Łęcki (University of Silesia, Poland)

Witold Mandrysz (University of Silesia, Poland)

Georgia Petraki (Panteion University, Greece)

Juan Carlos Revilla (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain)

Tarık Şengül (Middle East Technical University, Turkey)

Barbara Słania (University of Silesia, Poland)

Monica Tennberg (University of Lapland, Finland)

Terhi Vuojala-Magga (University of Lapland, Finland)

Kazimiera Wódz (University of Silesia, Poland)

Mit der Publikation von Forschungsberichten will das IAB der Fachöffentlichkeit Einblick in seine laufenden Arbeiten geben. Die Berichte sollen aber auch den Forscherinnen und Forschern einen unkomplizierten und raschen Zugang zum Markt verschaffen. Vor allem längere Zwischen- aber auch Endberichte aus der empirischen Projektarbeit bilden die Basis der Reihe.

By publishing the Forschungsberichte (Research Reports) IAB intends to give professional circles insights into its current work. At the same time the reports are aimed at providing researchers with quick and uncomplicated access to the market.

Contents

Abstract	4
Zusammenfassung	5
1 Introduction	6
2 Concept and project objectives.....	6
2.1 Core concepts	8
2.1.1 Poverty – vulnerability – risk exposure.....	8
2.1.2 Resilience	10
2.2 Broad objectives	12
3 Progress beyond the state-of-the-art	15
4 Considerations for country selection.....	15
4.1 Germany.....	16
4.2 Poland	17
4.3 Spain	17
4.4 United Kingdom	18
4.5 Greece.....	19
4.6 Turkey	20
4.7 Finland.....	21
4.8 Ireland	21
4.9 Portugal	22
5 Work packages	23
5.1 Coordination and management	24
5.2 State-of-the-art report on households’ resilience under conditions of socioeconomic crisis in Europe	24
5.3 Methodology and fieldwork.....	26
5.4 Typology of socioeconomic practices in resilient households	30
5.5 Cultural practices in resilient households	32
5.6 Longitudinal and biographical development of household resilience	33
5.7 The spatial dimension of households’ resilience	35
5.8 Communities, participation and politics	36
5.9 Resilient households and welfare state institutions	38
5.10 Social economy & household resilience	39
5.11 Gender, ethnic and migration aspects of household resilience	41
6 Project outlook.....	43
References	45

Abstract

Since 2008, Europe has been shaken by an ongoing crisis. If relevant parts of populations are exposed to socioeconomic risks, it is a distinctive characteristic of European political ethics that they must not be left alone, but should be subject to support and solidarity by budget support policy, economic development policies and social policy at different levels. But, in analogy with medical and psychological findings, some parts of the vulnerable population, although experiencing the same living conditions as others, are developing resilience, which in our context means that they perform social, economic and cultural practices and habits which protect them from suffer and harm and support sustainable patterns of coping and adaptation. This resilience to socioeconomic crises at household levels is the focus of the project. It can consist of identity patterns, knowledge, family or community relations, cultural and social as well as economic practices, be they formal or informal. Welfare states, labour markets and economic policies at both macro or meso level form the context or 'environment' of those resilience patterns. For reasons of coping with the crisis without leaving the common ground of the implicit European social model (or the unwritten confession to the welfare state) under extremely bad monetary conditions in many countries, and for reasons of maintaining quality of life and improving social policy, it is a highly interesting perspective to learn from emergent processes of resilience development and their preconditions. Thus, the main questions are directed at understanding patterns and dimensions of resilience at micro-/household level in different types of European member and neighbour states accounting for regional varieties, relevant internal and external conditions and resources as well as influences on these patterns by social, economic or labour market policy as well as legal regulations.

Zusammenfassung

Seit 2008 sieht sich Europa mit einer andauernden Wirtschaftskrise konfrontiert. Grundsätzlich ist es ein Charakteristikum der politischen Ethik in Europa, unterstützend und solidarisch einzugreifen, wenn relevante Teile der europäischen Bevölkerung vermehrt sozioökonomischen Risiken ausgesetzt sind. Maßnahmen im Rahmen von Haushaltspolitik, Sozialpolitik und Wirtschaftsförderung auf verschiedenen Ebenen sollen Teilhabe sichern und bedrohte Gruppen vor dem sozialen Abstieg bewahren. Dies geschieht in unterschiedlichem Ausmaß, mit unterschiedlichen Strategien und mit unterschiedlichem Erfolg – und hier ist festzuhalten, dass es den vielzitierten ‚Paradigmenwechseln‘ in der Sozialpolitik bislang nicht gelungen ist, das Ausmaß an Armut und Vulnerabilität in Europa in großem Umfang zu verringern.

Auf der anderen Seite kann – anlehnend an Erkenntnisse aus Medizin und Psychologie – festgestellt werden, dass innerhalb gefährdeter Personengruppen, die in vergleichbaren Lebensverhältnissen leben, kritische Lebensereignisse höchst unterschiedlich verarbeitet werden. So gelingt es manchen Haushalten und Familien, trotz erschwelter Rahmenbedingungen soziale, ökonomische und kulturelle Praktiken und Gewohnheiten auszubilden, die sie vor tieferen Leiden und Schaden schützen und ihnen eine nachhaltige Bewältigung und Anpassung an gegebene Herausforderungen ermöglichen. Die Erforschung solcher Praktiken der Resilienz in Privathaushalten als Antwort auf die Erfahrung sozioökonomischer Krisensituationen ist Gegenstand des Forschungsprojektes. Dabei werden sowohl Identitätsmuster, Wissensstrukturen, familiäre oder kommunale Beziehungsnetzwerke, kulturelle und soziale wie auch ökonomische Praktiken in die Analyse mit einbezogen, seien sie formeller oder informeller Art. Wohlfahrtsstaaten, Arbeitsmärkte und Wirtschaftspolitiken sowohl auf der Makro- wie auch auf der Mikroebene bilden den Rahmen oder die ‚Umwelt‘ für derartige Muster von Resilienz. Das Forschungsprojekt ermöglicht die Analyse dieser Rahmenbedingungen sowie die Beantwortung der Frage, warum bestimmte Personen resiliente Verhaltensmuster in Krisenzeiten entwickeln können, anderen Haushalten dies jedoch nicht gelingt. Im Rahmen dessen wird sowohl auf die schwierige monetäre Situation einer Vielzahl europäischer Länder, als auch auf die Aufrechterhaltung der Lebensqualität und die Weiterentwicklung der Sozialpolitik Bezug genommen, ohne hierbei den gemeinsamen Ausgangspunkt eines impliziten europäischen Sozialstaatsmodells (oder das ungeschriebene Bekenntnis zum Sozialstaat) zu ignorieren. Die zentralen Fragestellungen beziehen sich daher auf ein tieferes Verständnis der Strukturen und Ausprägungen von Resilienz auf der Haushalts- bzw. Mikroebene verschiedener Typen von EU-Mitglieds- und Nachbarstaaten, die darüber hinaus regionale Besonderheiten aufweisen. Darüber hinaus werden interne und externe Bedingungen und Ressourcen von Resilienz ebenso untersucht wie Einflüsse der Sozial-, Wirtschafts- und Arbeitsmarktpolitik und der gesetzlichen Grundlagen.

1 Introduction

From March 2014 to February 2017 the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) in cooperation with University of Silesia (Poland), Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain), University of Hertfordshire (United Kingdom), Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences (Greece), Middle East Technical University (Turkey), University of Lapland (Finland), National University of Ireland Maynooth (Ireland) and University Institute of Lisbon (Portugal) will undertake the collaborative research project “Patterns of Resilience during Socioeconomic Crises among Households in Europe” (RESCuE) within the 7th Framework Programme funded by the European Commission.¹

This report² is intended to document the underlying considerations and concepts of the project. Chapter 2 gives an overview of the core concepts and project objectives. Chapter 3 deals with the progress beyond the state-of-the-art. Chapter 4 presents the considerations for country selection as well as a description of the countries. Chapter 5 addresses the work packages in detail which constitute the work program of the RESCuE-project. This IAB Research Report ends with a brief outlook in Chapter 6.

2 Concept and project objectives

Since 2008, Europe has been going through some turbulent times with an ongoing crisis, like many other parts of the world. Initially, the instabilities appeared as if they were local phenomena, contained within a few countries. After the collapse of Lehman Brothers, it soon became evident that they would spread wider to affect the global economy as a whole. The counteractive sectoral and macroeconomic interventions pursued since then (e. g. government bailouts of banks and monetary expansion) have transformed the financial crisis into a public debt crisis. This socialised the debt of distressed financial institutions and privatised the gains associated with these policies (Stiglitz 2011). The policy prescriptions to solve the sovereign debt crisis in Europe have largely been based on austerity measures involving severe cuts in public employment and government spending, including the social policy budgets. The deep economic recession and rising unemployment (especially among the youth) are now threatening the progress towards an enhanced political and economic integration of the European Union and her neighbours and partners.

Across the Union, the crisis has presented itself, at least, in a fourfold manner: Mediterranean states like Spain and Greece are facing a heavy economic and social crisis with episodes of, in some cases, political turmoil. Ireland and Portugal, heavily

¹ The RESCuE project is a part of a relatively new IAB research strand, focusing on life circumstances of citizens in poverty and long term unemployment, which was established in the wider context of the 2005 German welfare reforms and since then is enhancing the IAB's legal research tasks.

² This report is meant to give an outline and overview on the concepts and structure of the RESCuE project, while results will be an issue of later reporting.

affected as well, have quietly started adapting. Others, like Germany and Poland, as well as the EU's neighbours, like Turkey, do not seem to have been heavily affected, although some of their regions and parts of their populations still bear traces and scars from recent socioeconomic changes – and are facing a rise in social inequality. A fourth group of countries (e. g. United Kingdom (UK), Finland or France) has encountered recessive developments, which show differences along sectors, areas or occupations. Most countries mentioned, no matter how they are performing generally, have some sectors and regions where socioeconomic crisis has been a historical problem (e. g. former mining or manufacturing regions of the UK or in Poland, in north-eastern Germany or Greece, in Turkey's Kurdish regions and in Lapland).

Affording support for any population that is exposed to socioeconomic risks is a distinctive characteristic of European political ethics. This support is usually provided through social policy and economic development instruments at different levels, for different target groups and with different outcomes and results. What is intriguing is that, analogous to the findings in medical and psychological literature, some vulnerable households can be observed to be developing resilience by performing social, economic and cultural practices and habits that effectively protect them from greater suffering and provide sustainable patterns of coping and adaptation, with less than expected or completely without welfare state interventions. This household-level resilience to hardship and socioeconomic crises, about which not much is known at present, is of main interest for RESCuE. It can consist of identity patterns, knowledge, family or community relations, other cultural and social as well as economic resources and practices, be they formal or informal, tacit or explicit. Welfare states, labour and other markets and economic policies at both macro and meso levels form the context or 'environment' of those resilience patterns, which may be enabling, restrictive, neutral or even practically absent.

The RESCuE project is based on the following understandings:

- Governments and welfare-state institutions are not the only mechanisms to provide safety nets against the impact of the socioeconomic crisis. Citizens, their families and households should not be treated as passive social agents who are exposed to unemployment and poverty. Neither should they be considered as passive recipients of benefits from a shrinking welfare state under crisis. At least some of them have access to materially useful assets and resources that have been developed over time, such as knowledge, social networks, strategies, habits and practices that save them from deprivation or reduce their exposure to socioeconomic hardship. Resilience of families and households depends on these accumulated resources.
- Socioeconomic resilience of households is still almost a blank spot of scientific investigation, but the results of such investigation may be crucial for welfare states to develop innovative approaches for maintaining the inclusive principles of the European social model under difficult economic conditions.

- Resilience research in all scientific disciplines suggest that the resilient part of the investigated population may be higher than expected, but certainly not all, and quite likely not even the majority of individuals or households are resilient. In the context of European social ethics, this means that resilience is not an alternative but a complement to the welfare state or a new field of action for it.
- The ability of welfare states to combat increasing poverty in times of deep recession is limited. Their reforms from workfare to activation have not had broadly positive effects for reducing poverty and socioeconomic risks and may even have contributed to exacerbating it. Furthermore, their abilities are heavily under threat from public budget cuts and debt crises and economic slowdown. Despite this, the crisis could also open an opportunity for the institutions of welfare states to learn from the resilience of their citizens, families and households and find new ways of reducing socioeconomic risks, supporting households in their respective practices by creating a positive political framework, and providing aid to those without means of resilience.

Therefore, the main objective of RESCuE will be to identify and understand the specific resilience practices of different households at risk and analyse the conditions they require within and around themselves and the institutions, markets and regulations they interact with. This research will be carried out with a comparative focus, involving countries with different welfare state models, rural and urban areas, different types of households and gender, ethnicity and class intersectionalities (Anthias 2005). The investigation will also cover the respective households' internal and external resources and relations, such as family property, knowledge and practices, intra-family relations, their local embedding in communities, neighbourhoods and networks as well as their interactions with governmental and non-governmental welfare institutions.

2.1 Core concepts

2.1.1 Poverty – vulnerability – risk exposure

RESCuE starts with the viewpoint that the main risk for vulnerable households, especially in times of crisis, is that their economic resources, mainly from employment or small-scale business, are depleted, which may lead into poverty, restrict exits from poverty or extend the duration of poverty, with serious consequences for individuals, households and social cohesion. Here it is necessary to start with a clear definition of poverty. Most concepts of poverty operate at a very general level (Lister 2004). Commonly, it is defined as households having less than 60% of the median equivalence net household income. This definition, used by many national governments and supranational authorities, has at least two problems. First, in focusing just on monetary income, it provides no deeper insights into other dimensions of poverty and neglects nonmonetary gains and resources. Second it is statistically linked with income developments in the richer parts of the population. Thus, the poverty line may shift without much change in poor households' actual living situation. Thus, income-based statistical measurements of relative poverty do not always

reflect the status of households in terms of their actual deprivations. Partly as a response to this weakness in the relative poverty measures, the concept of deprivation has entered the public policy and academic debates. This alternative measure is based on a large number of specific indicators of deprivation, such as inability to keep one's own accommodation warm, not having two pairs of allweather shoes, not having a holiday for a week at least once a year, for children not being able to swim at least once a month etc. (Cribb et al. 2012). Georg Simmel demonstrated that poverty is a specific relation between society and the poor. Starting with an individual self-perception of poverty, which is defined simply as having far less than one's respective peers, he argued that being poor in a social sense calls for support from society (Simmel 1906). In this approach, poverty is both a specific perception of the self and a perception of and by the others in society. For identifying poverty, RESCuE will combine formal measurements with the social perception of poverty that is relevant in the respective national and local discourses. This means that³ poverty may mean something different from one place to another. But the common official supranational or national definitions of poverty are also part of the discourse which RESCuE will have to take into account in searching for practices of resilience. The question of resilience in socioeconomic crises, moreover, makes it necessary not only to look at the households that are actually in poverty, but also at those which are vulnerable to it: at the fringe of poverty or at risk of it. If resilience practices are successfully keeping these household out of actual poverty or protecting them from getting deeper into it, then they can provide a rich source of information.

Households in the RESCuE view are also defined in two ways: First, according to economics and social statistics, a household is defined as a local unit of residence where one or more persons live, and, in the case of persons cohabitating, they share at least accommodation and part of their social and economic life, as indicated, for instance, by common meals. Second, this concept both overlaps with and differs from the concept of family as a basic form of human group living, with at least two persons with close intimate relations (for instance a couple, or a child/parent), but can also be understood in a much broader sense, from three-generational to 'patchwork' families, plurilocal families, or families which include wider kinship, whether or not in cohabitation. Other non-familial household patterns include (partly) dependent households of young or elder persons or cohabitation forms which are based on relations with lower or no intimacy or kinship, such as students' shared households, asylums, hospitals or military premises. RESCuE will make parallel (but not synonymous) use of the concepts of 'household' and 'family' according to the specific context, but making a clear distinction between these two concepts.

³ It is widely discussed throughout Europe that the past two decades' labour market and social policy reforms have contributed to an increase in precarious employment, see pars pro toto Castel (1997); Castel/Dörre (2009); Andreß/Lohmann (2008).

2.1.2 Resilience

The concept of 'resilience' has risen rapidly to prominence and is now even a major catchword of the 2013 World Economic Forum in Davos⁴. RESCuE will use a heuristic definition of resilience. That is, some households when exposed to socioeconomic risks, perform social, economic and cultural practices and habits in mobilising economic, social or cultural resources which protect them from suffering and hardship and support sustainable patterns of coping and adaptation. The current social research and literature on resilience during socioeconomic crises is very thin, with the exception of community resilience research (Batty/Cole 2010). The discourse on resilience in the context of poverty has partly emerged as a reaction to the approaches that presented the disadvantages of the poor and vulnerable as if they had no control over circumstances. This, in the view of Canvin et al (2009), created an expectation of failure. Hence, the term resilience has been used to reflect more positive accounts of poverty and vulnerability where individuals turn crisis into opportunities (Harrow 2009), create positive changes from setbacks and survive multiple pressures. Batty and Cole (2010), while recognising the risk of 'burnout', identify three elements in their study of biographies of resilience: Building up family and social networks; developing self-esteem through training or employment; and juggling the budget.

The concept of resilience was first used in the humanities and social sciences in psychological studies, first on concentration camp survivors, then on child poverty and abuse, where it is still actively used (Frankl 1959⁵; Eitinger 1964; Werner 1977; Rutter 1999; McMurray et al. 2008). It then spilled over not only into neuropsychology (Greenberg 2006) but also into other psychological fields such as the adaptive abilities of individuals (Butler et al. 2007; Bonanno 2004) or communities in psychology (Norris et al. 2008; Luthar and Zelazo 2003). Most of this work emphasises the role of social resources for developing resilience (Nettles/Mucherah/Jones 2000). Outside psychology, some early research on the resilience of technical and ecological systems exists (Holling 1973). There is one binational study, mainly on welfare state effects on health developments in poverty, with some side results on resilience (Jones et al. 2006). A considerable body of research exists on resilience in the spatial sciences, e. g. concerning the economic resilience of regions (Simmie and Mar-

⁴ See The Globe and Mail 25/01/13. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/internationalbusiness/world-economic-forum-creating-a-dynamic-resilient-world/article7564083/>

⁵ Victor Frankl, a psychiatrist who survived three Nazi concentration camps and wrote about it is recognised as the discoverer of resilience, although he did not use the term explicitly as far as we know. The case of Frankl demonstrates, that phenomena of resilience surely may exist, while the concept does not necessarily have to. This denotes resilience as an interpretation or a scientific narrative connected to a class of phenomena which possibly can or could have been conceptualised otherwise. Therefore, a history of resilience should for sure in the first order be a history of the concept of resilience, in the second order be a reinterpretation of historical phenomena under the concept of resilience. The second one has to be seen methodologically quite problematic, which may be one reason why there is no 'history of resilience' so far.

tin 2010), the resilience of cities against disaster (Manyena 2006), terrorism (Coaffee/Wood/Rogers 2009), in planning studies (Xiao and Zandt 2012), on environmental issues and in resilient urban planning (Raco and Street 2012). Adger (2000) has demonstrated that insights gained on socio-ecological resilience can also be used for socioeconomic resilience and vice versa. His definition of social resilience as “the ability of groups or communities to cope with external stresses and disturbances as a result of social, political and environmental change” (Adger 2000: 347) is an important reference point for RESCuE.

It is sometimes stated that definitions of resilience are vague and hard to operationalise (Luthar et al. 2000; Mohaupt 2008). In our opinion, the problem is less one of vagueness than of considerable differences in defining resilience: Does it simply mean the ability to undergo a successful adaption to critical external factors and cope with change? Does it mean being able to resist changeable impacts? Or does it mean the ability to jump back into the initial state after being thrown off balance or stressed by a single or repeated event? All these possibilities are suggested not only the semantic origins of the word but also by definitions from current or previous technological, ecosystems and neuropsychological research. Should resilience research following those approaches, look only at individual and group factors enabling resilience to certain specified negative external conditions?⁶ Or should it include within its analysis the mutual influences between individual factors and conditions of the closer and wider socioeconomic, cultural and natural framework? The RESCuE project will include individual and structural factors in a heuristic perspective on resilience: The concepts of ‘adaption’ and ‘coping’, which go beyond the simple concept of ‘jumping back’ make it possible to conceive of external factors as non-influential powers and put the necessity for adaption onto individuals and micro-social groups. This will be counterbalanced by also investigating the structural conditions under which the households act. This makes it possible to include within the analysis the reverse influence of micro actors through resistance and participation as complementary parts of our concept of resilience. This approach also makes it possible to go beyond a definition of resilience as the ability to simply resist crises; it also acknowledges that people are affected by the changes that take place. Therefore, resilience as we understand it, means that the social entities adapt to, cope with or resist changes and critical conditions, by mobilising both their own resources and external resources of different kinds under given and changing structural frameworks through their own strategies, practices and habits, which may either

⁶ Resilience is criticized for being an individualistic concept without referring to structural forces and is therefore supportive with a neoliberal political agenda. It also argued this perspective overemphasises peoples’ resilient abilities while the hidden costs of resilience are undervalued (Harrison 2012).

lead to change of the social entity or not, but, in any way, leads to a better⁷, if not stable or sustainable situation under critical or worsening conditions.

Another issue that conceptually complicates the question of citizens' resilience is the welfare state. Since the mid-19th Century, historical developments have created collective systems of buffering socioeconomic risks through various forms of welfare provision. And, despite significant variations between European countries (see Esping-Andersen 1990 and the subsequent broad debate), the existence of some sort of welfare state is a common denominator of the EU member states. This leads to a situation where most poverty in Europe is alleviated by welfare state activities of various kinds, depth and scope. However successful they may be, these forms of alleviated poverty should not be mistaken for citizens' resilience. The practices that will be studied by RESCuE will be households' resilient practices apart from welfare state interventions, involving their own substantial contributions to the avoidance or reduction of the socioeconomic risks imposed by crises, regardless of whether these are combined with or excluded from welfare state activities. RESCuE will also analyse the role of transformed welfare states (Lessenich 2008; Boltanski and Chiapello 2003) in market economies (Harvey 1990) with institutions that might ignore, restrict or enable practices of resilience. In doing so, peoples' everyday practices, institutional practices, welfare state regimes and socioeconomic transformations will be analysed as intertwined.

2.2 Broad objectives

RESCuE aims:

1. To analyse the impact of the crisis on households and to examine resilient practices for successfully coping with these impacts of the crisis: The impact of the current crisis are widely debated and it is clear that rising rates of poverty and unemployment can be identified in general across EU27 countries but with huge differences between countries. These have not been extensively mapped. Certainly missing is a more detailed analysis of the impact of crisis on living conditions and the life nexus of households in general and of vulnerable households in particular. It

⁷ See Mohaupt 2008: 65. This outcome aspect of resilience introduces the problem of perspectivity and normativity, as practices which are resilient for the respective household may not necessarily be resilient from a political, jurisdictional or other point of view – which counts for informal, illegal and deviant practices. Preliminarily, this will be operationalized by regarding practices which are likely to be sanctioned by authorities or other relevant actors will not be considered as resilient. But it can be expected that this definition will have to be adopted during the research process.

is here that RESCuE will contribute. More specifically, RESCuE will analyse households' everyday practices of resilience against the crisis.⁸

2. To deepen the understanding of resilience and contribute to a sociological concept of resilience: From the insights gained during RESCuE's fieldwork, an advanced sociological concept of resilience will be developed and tested. Although the need for such a concept is evidently becoming more urgent in the context of current debates on resilience in socioeconomic and political contexts, it is currently lacking. To achieve this aim, RESCuE will also make use of existing concepts of resilience gained in research on disasters, communities and in psychological studies.

3. To explore everyday practices of resilience through ethnographic research and the development of innovative qualitative methods: RESCuE will develop innovative qualitative methods to analyse resilience. Its innovative features will include a combination of visual methods with more established research methods such as focus group interviews, ethnographic interviews and episodic interviews. To realise the objective of gaining deep insights into resilience, RESCuE's work will use the methodological principles of grounded theory and ethnography.

4. To develop a holistic analytical strategy encompassing economy, society and culture in order to develop a complex understanding of citizens' resilience: The core sources of households' resilience lie in accessible economic, social, cultural and personal resources and the abilities to mobilise them in everyday practice. Drawing on concepts from social theory (including Bourdieu's concept of 'social capital') and various psychological and anthropological insights, the project will focus on social, economic and cultural practices of the household members and their respective habits, conceiving them as actors in a framework of social, cultural, economic and political fields, structures and actors. This analytical framework encompasses strategies and practices in both the formal and informal economy, social relations at different levels, and cultural practices.

⁸ For RESCuE, crisis is of interest not in the first instance as an abstract economic force causally influencing the households concerned. The project will rather view the crisis through the lens of its influence on the living conditions of the investigated households and the development in their practices, experiences and narratives, drawing also on the perspective of experts in poverty and social policy. Although there may be evidence of the 'causal' type (which would be summarised in the RESCuE state-of-the-art reporting), the project's main focus lies on how vulnerable households can develop adaptation, coping and resilience strategies if their basic means of living and participation are endangered (according to their own or experts' perceptions). Evidence on resilience may technically speaking even prove to run counter to statistical probabilities, in case only a minority is able to develop resilient patterns of living under conditions of hardship, which cannot easily be depicted with means of statistical causal analysis (see Solga et al. 2013).

5. To evaluate the role of welfare state institutions and interventions for the resilience of households (as supportive, negligent, or restrictive): To better understand resilience, households are considered as embedded into a specific welfare state with specific institutions and rules. RESCuE will analyse the role of local welfare state institutions in shaping household practices of resilience. The research will examine if and how institutions may support, ignore or restrict household resilience.

6. To consider resilience as the outcome of practices of individuals, households, and communities: RESCuE will put its focus especially on households, but will also consider households members as individuals who are also members of communities. RESCuE will therefore analyse how the resilience practices of households both interfere with and are interconnected within a community.

7. To examine differences and similarities of resilience in urban and rural areas: Urban and rural areas are classically seen as having different social rules with an effect on social encounters, social control, community life and cultural diversity (Simmel 1903/1995; Sennett 1997; Watson 2006; Frers/Meier 2007). Moreover, there are considerable differences between rural and urban poverty, as well as on social, economic and cultural resources. There might be other features of the local political and economic environment that are important for resilience. RESCuE will examine if and how resilience might differ between urban and rural areas, indicating a diversity of frameworks, conditions and practices of resilience, in order to gain a better understanding of how socioeconomic resilience can develop.

8. To identify and reconstruct different patterns of resilience in a comparative typology: With its comparative perspective on analysing resilience in different countries and localities under different welfare state institutions and in different socioeconomic environments, RESCuE aims to synthesise those differences and diversities into a comparative typology of resilience and explore the sources of difference.

9. To deepen the understanding of how intersecting social inequalities like gender, ethnicity and class are of relevance for the resilient practices of vulnerable households: RESCuE will explore the influence of intersecting social inequalities like gender, ethnicity or class on the development and effects of resilient practices. It will explore the extent to which resources, as well as the abilities to mobilise them, are unequally distributed, which might not necessarily follow the typical inequality patterns of modern post-industrial market societies.

10. To disseminate the research results to the public, policy stakeholders and the scientific community: RESCuE will devote a large effort to spread its results to the public, policy stakeholders, and the scientific community. A core element of this dissemination will be a poly-lingual, visual, internet-based exhibition of the photographic and interviewing fieldwork. Special care will be taken to disseminate the results to journalists and other stakeholders through public-oriented workshops and

local publication outlets. In addition, results will be published through academic books and academic journal articles in internationally renowned publishing media.

3 Progress beyond the state-of-the-art

In brief terms, the state-of-the-art shows strong traditions in both in-depth research on poverty and hardship, and in statistical research on the poverty population. But there is limited research on keeping poverty at bay. Also, the recent and ongoing socioeconomic crisis is still fairly under-researched: There is some initial research on the consequences of the crisis for social security, hardship and poverty in different European countries (Pilkauskas/Currie/Garfinkel 2012), and there is some scattered research on socioeconomic resilience, as mentioned above. But there is still a huge lack of both in depth and internationally comparative research on households' living conditions and their coping mechanisms for the impact of the crisis, especially considering resilience in a socioeconomic understanding. There is a need for qualitative research that deepens insights into the social facts and processes behind statistical figures. These are the major gaps RESCuE aims to fill with its innovative conceptual and empirical design. The following section will show how RESCuE will achieve a progress beyond the state-of-the-art. This will be argued in two steps. First, we summarise some considerations on selecting the partner countries that will participate in RESCuE. Second, we present a synopsis of the effects of the crisis and the previous research in those countries up to now, which we hope is itself some progress beyond the state-of-the-art, but will also indicate how our case studies will generate the desired progress. As the general design of RESCuE is also innovative in the way it combines different methods and levels of analysis.

4 Considerations for country selection

Esping-Anderson's (1990, 1996) typology of welfare states (see Ebbinghaus 2012 for a general overview) has been criticised for several reasons. These include its neglect of a 'Mediterranean' type (Ferrera 1996; Leibfried 1992, Rhodes 1997), its lack of attention to gender and role model issues (Berninger 2009), and its wide disregard for spatial differences and questions of space and place in policy-oriented welfare state research. In contrast, a wide range of literature indicates the relevance of local, community and space-related differences (Batty and Cole 2010; Minigione 1996; Häußermann/Kronauer/Siebel 2004), informal or irregular economical practices (Mollona 2009) and the role of groups, subcultures, differences in urban-rural communities and neighbourhoods (Willisch 2012; Rogaly and Taylor 2009; Wacquant 2003; Venkatesh 2008; Lupton/Power 2002; Lister 2004: 69 ff.) in shaping patterns of poverty. Another criticism of the Esping-Anderson typology is that it appears to have contributed more to the identification of policy patterns, structures and traditions than the explanation of policy outcomes, where the evidence is ambiguous. For example, on the one hand poor persons in different welfare state models may be exposed to rather different treatment quality by front office actors (Jones et al. 2006 for UK and Sweden), on the other hand, the welfare state types do not differ strongly in their aggregate outcomes, like the size of population in poverty,

apart from different accounting structures (Erlinghagen/Knuth 2010; Andreß/Lohmann 2008; Promberger 2010b). Nevertheless, the Esping-Andersen typology is still well respected and can be seen as a still valid categorical approximation for analysing the differences in some European welfare states. Moreover, it can be amended and enhanced, as has been done in the literature (Arts/Gelissen 2002) by the addition of a Mediterranean (Ferrera 1996) and a Post-Socialist (Aidukaite 2004) type. RESCuE's country selection, therefore, is inspired by contrasting criteria derived from an enhanced Esping-Andersen typology of conservative (Germany), liberal (UK and Ireland), social-democratic (Finland), post socialist (Poland) and Mediterranean (Spain, Portugal, Greece) welfare states, as well as by the notion that Europe as a cultural and historical body consists of more than the EU member states or the Euro Zone, and EU affairs are closely entwined with the affairs of partner and neighbouring countries like Turkey.

4.1 Germany

Germany is considered to be less affected and partly a winner of the crisis, with the German economy even experiencing some growth and shrinking unemployment rates and numbers. But beyond general numbers, social problems like precarious labour, long-term unemployment, working poverty, spatially differentiated social inequality with locally high unemployment and poverty rates, depopulating areas, close relations between joblessness and educational poverty as well as endangered biographical passages into and out of active employment are on the rise and are hardening into what can be called a multi-layered social divide. The number of persons in nonstandard labour has risen considerably during the last decade, now covering about one quarter of the active population (Promberger 2012a; Wingerter 2012; Waltermann 2010), which is problematic in many respects (Castel/Dörre 2009; Promberger 2012a; Bude 2008). During the last decades social inequality has sharply risen in Germany, partly caused by a rise in higher incomes, and class borders are seen to be harder to cross (Groh-Samberg 2008). Especially women, women with children and migrants are at a heightened risk of poverty. Poverty rates are higher in the east and north and lower in the south of Germany, concentrating in some inner city (Kronauer 2002) or remote rural or de-industrialised areas, even in the prosperous south (Blien et al. 2011). There are quite a lot of qualitative studies giving insights in living conditions and experiences in poverty, due to a vivid tradition of mixed-methods and qualitative unemployment and poverty research in the German-speaking countries (Jahoda et al. 1932; Mutz et al 1995; Leibfried et al. 1995; Hirsland/Ramos Lobato 2010; Bude et al. 2011; Hirsland/Promberger/Wenzel 2007). Research on exiting poverty sustainably is just beginning (e. g. Achatz/Trappmann 2011), and there is no substantial research on resilient practices in households at risk of poverty so far. RESCuE in Germany will put a particular focus on groups in poverty for a longer time. The rural case study will take place in a small village in Eastern Germany, characterised by three decades of deindustrialisation and strong intra-national emigration. Through their rural situation and long term unemployment experiences, households and families are experienced in gardening

and breeding domestic animals. Common feasts are important and at least some of the inhabitants are deeply involved in regular meetings and activities of volunteer and cultural associations. Berlin, with its over 3.5 million inhabitants and its social and cultural diversity and inequality, is a complex ground for the urban case study. Since unification it has lost lots of regular jobs, and with many people falling into unemployment and more than 40% of inhabitants not living on their own income, Berlin is said to be the transfer income capital of Germany. Nonetheless, Berlin attracts many young and qualified persons to work here or to set up small creative businesses, often with poor economic success. RESCuE will focus on unemployed households in the outskirts, and well qualified younger people living in the centre of Berlin on precarious labour or self-employment in creative industries.

4.2 Poland

Since autumn 2008, Polish opinion polls have shown growing concern among citizens about the financial crisis, mainly in fear of deprivation and a lack of resources. Despite ongoing improvements, 42% of Polish citizens still live below the poverty line. One of the most important poverty factors in Poland is unemployment, but there is also considerable in-work poverty. The groups most at risk of poverty include children and youths under 18, farmers' families, single parent families and pensioners. Moreover, poverty risks are concentrated in towns and villages (Szukielojć-Bieńkuńska 2009), and particularly in the economically weak regions of northern Poland and along the eastern border. There is a broad tradition of qualitative and mixed methods research into poverty in Poland, including longitudinal and psychological aspects (Warzywoda-Kruszyńska 1999; Grotowska-Leder 2002; Wódz/Łęcki 1999, 2001, 2003; Golinowska 1996, 1997; Tarkowska 2007, 2000). However, studies on ways out of poverty, avoiding poverty if at risk, and resilience are limited (Kozarzewski 2005), as the majority of research focuses issues like marginalisation and exclusion. The Polish case study will be carried out in the Śląskie Voivodeship. Two research sites – urban and rural – will be selected, which will enable comparative analysis.

4.3 Spain

The harsh current economic situation in Spain – with a dramatic GDP decline and the loss of more than 3 million jobs in the last four years and presently 5,778,100 unemployed people – deepens a number of structural weaknesses in the Spanish economy and its labour market (OECD 2012; EPA; INE 2012) and has had profound social effects. While the unemployment rate itself is already alarming, unemployed people's purchasing power has been eroded in the last decade (INE 2012). Therefore the number of people receiving unemployment benefits has increased by almost 1.5 million from 2007 to 2011 (SEPE 2012). Forecasts suggest that the situation is likely to worsen in the coming years (Fundación 1º de Mayo 2012). These trends have rendered it difficult for a large number of people to earn any type of income and to access necessary economic and social resources, so new strategies of social reproduction can be expected to develop in the sectors of the population

hardest hit by the crisis (lower and middle-class households, youth, women, immigrants). According to existing research, the crisis-related strategies developed by different household types include “adjustment strategies” and “overtaken by the crisis” (Laparra 2011; Cáritas Española 2012). There is some research into the crisis, poverty and resilience, discourses and attitudes (Laparra and Eransus 2010; Cáritas Española 2012; Pedreño and Riquelme 2006; Serrano et al. 2012; Alonso and Fernández 2011) However, there is little up-to-date qualitative research into the processes behind statistical figures. The Spanish RESCuE case studies put a specific focus on the “working new poor”, which include the “working poor” and the unemployed who have lost their jobs and entered poverty and precariousness. The “disqualifying poverty” (Paugam 2007) exemplified by these groups can affect previously integrated populations and “destabilise” stable workers (Castel 1997). RESCuE will compare the situation of these groups in two areas that differ regarding the availability of formal and informal jobs, access to social services and family and neighbourhood networks and other resources. A smaller town belonging to wider Madrid will serve as the urban case study, with the remote region of La Mancha, characterised by above-average unemployment and poverty (growth) rates, and a diversified labour market with lots of informal employment in sectors like agriculture, the crashing construction business, food industry and tourism, serving as the rural case study. It can be hypothesised that resilient practices in La Mancha include informal labour and small agriculture as well as the use of family and neighbourhood networks.

4.4 United Kingdom

In no other period have poverty trends been as dynamic as it has been after the 2008 crisis. Job insecurity in the form of temporary contracts and irregular work has risen by 60% after the crisis. The number of people becoming new claimants for benefits twice within a period of six months rose from less than 225 thousand to close to 350 thousand from 2006 to 2009. As argued by Newman (2011) employment does not always lead out of poverty or out of it permanently. Poverty amongst working age adults without children grew from around 18 to 20%. When child poverty is measured by ‘material deprivations index’, the changes have been negative after the crisis. While there were 3.1 million (24.3%) materially deprived children in 2006-07, this figure went up to 3.6 million (28%) in 2010. In most regions, around 1/5 of pensioners are classified as income poor and London has the greatest proportion of materially deprived pensioners (Cribb et al. 2012). A study by Fenge et al. (2012) on the impact of the crisis on elderly found that although many of them were just about able to cover the cost of essentials such as food, household repairs, transport and utility, they were cutting down on leisure activities. Those with tight budgets feared getting into debt in cases of unexpected costs. AgeUK (2013) found that 24% of older people reported deterioration in their quality of life over the past several years. Valuable insights are also offered by Giuntoli et al (2011) on the mental health effects of unemployment in Bradford after the crisis. The participants reported difficulty in paying rent, bills and running their car. In this study, the emotional

distress caused by loss of jobs and financial strain has been described in four categories: loss of time structure in the day; loss of social role; anger and frustration; stigma attached to being unemployed. Furthermore, there are considerable regional differences in poverty levels in the UK (Gripaios/Bishop 2005; Hossain et al. 2011). Giuntoli et al. (2011) found that the resilience of the unemployed participants in Bradford depended on their personal material and other resources and the support that they received from their family and friends. Given that background and evidence, RESCuE will focus on England and Wales. Prior to the crisis, social policy in England and Wales largely emphasised vulnerable population such as children and pensioners. It is likely that the recession and the associated counteractive policies have changed the composition of vulnerable population as a result of increasing unemployment, cuts in public sector employment and spending. Therefore, the research in England and Wales will investigate: 1. the impact of the crisis on adults of working age as well as children and pensioners. 2. The individual, social and institutional coping mechanisms of vulnerable population. The investigation will be carried out in districts where unemployment, poverty and vulnerability have increased after the crisis. Two boroughs in London as well as two smaller towns in Merseyside and Wales have been identified as possible candidates for such studies, as the 2010 statistics from the Department of Work and Pensions indicate that these districts have experienced disproportionately higher unemployment and employment with minimum wages.

4.5 Greece

During the last three years, Greece has been in a severe debt crisis, consisting in the 2010 EU/IMF “bailout” and subsequent austerity measures. In this context of crisis, poverty is rapidly expanding, with the poverty level at 25-30% of the total population, jobs are being taken away, with an estimated 1.3 million unemployed out of a total active population of 4.5 million (based on official statistics), and hopes seem to diminish among the general population. Economic precarity in the forms of temporary, low-paid and insecure jobs in combination with cuts of welfare provision is the dominant paradigm of everyday life. At the same time, however, new and unpredictable forms of resilience, practices of solidarity, ideas and enactments of collective responsibility and reciprocity, and new political subjectivities seeking to reclaim democracy are emerging. In many streets in the big cities besides closed shops are mushrooming stores that buy jewellery from citizens in need. Migration, communal or church assistance, popular soup kitchens but also new forms of self-organising of solidarity networks, new practices of no-market forms of exchange and cooperatives forms of business also draw our attention. At a time of extreme and prolonged crisis, and despite their multiple hardships, people seek to counteract the sense of helplessness. Kassimati 1998 has analysed the dimensions and stages of social exclusion in Greece (critical see Petraki 1998; Alexiou 1999). Papadopoulou 2012 argues that there is a lack of study on the social reality of social exclusion today. RESCuE will explore various aspects of everyday life in crisis Greece, focusing especially on such emergent practices of resilience. Young men and even more

young women are particularly vulnerable in the crisis and will be in the focus of RESCuE. The following questions are of interest within the project: How are households with one or no salary facing unemployment? How are household resources reorganised and what strategies like migration, informal work or farming are developed or enacted? How do migrant families cope with the crisis (remigration)? Besides some selected urban quarters in Athens, RESCuE will focus on a small city near Athens.

4.6 Turkey

Contrary to the relatively good situation of the financial sector and budget figures, economic growth, domestic saving and unemployment figures show that Turkey has suffered the global economic crisis (Boratav 2011). Since 2008, unemployment has either increased or fallen only marginally. Workforce participation is well below OECD and EU averages. The falling GDP from 2008 to 2010 hit disadvantaged groups hard. Moreover, since the recovery in 2011-2012 took the form of jobless growth (Voyvoda 2009), which increased the economic woes of less developed regions in particular, the economic imbalance among geographical regions in Turkey is widening. Economic constraints, especially the structural conditions of the labour market, have a large impact on living standards of poorer households (Eroğlu 2011). It is thus easy to imagine that macroeconomic deterioration during crises has a direct and significant impact upon the economic deprivation of households in poor neighbourhoods. RESCuE will focus on 4 regions: Diyarbakir, Mersin, Istanbul and Zonguldak, adding an ethno-political contrast and deindustrialisation aspects to the urban-rural dimension. In the first two regions, our attention will be on Kurdish households, who came to these cities as victims of forced migration, whereas in the latter two, we plan to consider how poor households without an ethnic distinction cope with economic crisis. Diyarbakir's population has increased almost twofold in recent years, with the growth of slums and unemployment, poverty, precarious work and the absence of social security posing great problems for migrants. In Mersin, migrants moreover face social exclusion and even racism. Istanbul, which attracts a significant portion of rural immigrants, seems to offer more opportunities than other cities, but is also characterised by unemployment, poverty, and a large income gap between the richest and poorest neighbourhoods. By focusing on non-Kurdish poor households in one of the slum areas of the city, we hope to see whether strategies of coping with the crisis developed by poor households differ between big and smaller cities. RESCuE will also look into the state of the rural poor in Zonguldak. On the one hand, the province of Zonguldak has been an important industrial centre since mid-19th century, as it houses the biggest coalfield in the country. Despite the decline of coalmining from the 1980s onwards, the industry is still the most important economic activity in the city and the province (Şengül/Aytekin 2011). On the other hand, as a non-urbanised area where people engage in forestry and fishing as well as mining, Zonguldak can serve to investigate which methods rural households develop cope with the crisis, and whether food production for self-consumption is a viable coping strategy (Tekgüç 2010).

4.7 Finland

The crisis took Finland into a new recession. The number of households in trouble rose to 650.000, an increase of 50.000 just in 2009, in part due to the growing number of retired households with problems. However, compared to 2003, the percentage of households in trouble is almost 11% lower, and the proportion of households doing well was 21% in 2009. Economic recessions, particularly since the 1990s, have led to rising income inequalities between households in what has traditionally been a country with quite an equal distribution of income. In 2008, the OECD reported that "the gap between rich and poor has widened more in Finland than in any other wealthy industrialised country over the past decade" and that "Finland is also one of the few countries where inequality of incomes has grown between the rich and the middle-class, and not only between rich and poor". In general, it seems that most of the research in Finland is focused on causes and consequences of economic recession at the macro-level. There is no easily accessible knowledge on the household level, other than through social security considerations (social benefits, social services, income levels). The Finnish RESCuE case studies will focus on Lapland, the northernmost region of the European Union. Lapland (183.000 inhabitants) is characterised by the oldest inhabitants in Finland, one of the lowest population densities of Europe with, with the 1990 economic crisis leading to a further loss of population, especially among the young, and a greater need for social security benefits and services than elsewhere in the country. Because of traditions of subsistence economies, Lappish culture has been recognised as a culture of poverty, where people might not have high income but are less vulnerable thanks to traditional hunting, herding and gathering practices (Hyppönen et al. 2010). However, there is a new problem with increasing predator population affecting reindeer herding in a negative way herding for the first time in its history (Kainulainen 2011; Pakkanen et al. 2011; Vaarala et al. 2012). Additionally, there is a long tradition of domestic self-repair and handicraft for personal use. From the Lappish perspective, the RESCuE question crystallises around how to stay resilient under conditions of long-term unemployment and endangered herding practices. The Finnish RESCuE team will put focus on one city and the region of Sápmi (Sámi homeland) of reindeer herders.

4.8 Ireland

The experience of poverty in Ireland must be placed in the context of the long economic boom, widely known as the 'Celtic Tiger', which led to sustained increases in income and employment from 1994 until the onset of the global fiscal crisis in 2008. Most commentators distinguish between the 'catchup' phase of export-oriented growth between 1994 and 2000, when Ireland's national income converged with that of the richest EU and OECD countries (Nolan and Smeeding 2005: 538) and a second 'artificial' phase of growth between 2000 and 2008, which was driven by a property bubble (Drudy and Collins 2011: 4). Compared to other European countries, two social groups in Ireland have distinctively high rates of both relative and consistent poverty: lone parents (Murphy 2012: 34) and those excluded from the labour force,

either through unemployment or through illness or disability. Jobless and low work-intensity households in Ireland are considerably more likely to contain children, which is an important factor in explaining the high rate of poverty amongst children (Watson et al. 2012: 39). Almost one in five children was at risk of poverty in 2010 (CSO 2012) and the consistent poverty rate was 8.1% for children. While the urban/rural divide is not associated with differences in rates of consistent poverty, there is some evidence of regional differences in the experience of poverty in Ireland (Corcoran/Gray/Peillon 2010; Kitchin et al. 2010). Recent research suggests that there have been significant increases in unemployment and deprivation in areas at the outer edges of the commuter belt (Irish Times, "Rich Land, Poor Land," January 5th 2013). There has been little research on resilience to poverty in Ireland. However, there is considerable evidence that Irish people rely to a considerable extent on extended family networks for informal social support, including childcare. One qualitative report found some evidence of support from relatives amongst a very poor study sample (Daly and Leonard 2002). The Irish case study will focus on the town of Mullingar and its rural environs. Mullingar is (by Irish standards) a medium-sized provincial town (population ca. 20.000) and its rural environs that became part of the long-distance commuter hinterland for the greater Dublin area (population 1.8 million) during the Celtic Tiger period. The town, originally an agricultural market town, comprises a traditional working-class urban core surrounded by a suburban ring the population of which has more than doubled since 1996. Parts of its urban core are classified as 'very disadvantaged' (Haase and Pratschke 2012). A 'baseline' community study was carried out there at the height of the boom (Corcoran/Gray/Peillon 2010). The rural case study will focus on a small village, where more than one quarter of households are headed by farmers. The area has seen an increase in unemployment to 10% in 2011, together with a corresponding increase in deprivation. There are interesting life stage differences across the study areas, with the rural district having an old-age dependency ratio that is twice that of the suburban district.

4.9 Portugal

As of September 2012, the Portuguese economy had registered eight consecutive quarters of negative GDP growth rates, going back to the last quarter of 2010. Rising interest rates on Portuguese public debt have meant that the Portuguese Government was forced to apply for a financial "rescue package" from the IMF, the ECB and the European Commission, who in turn called for severe austerity measures to be implemented in Portugal: steep increases on regular taxation over salaries and consumption; creation of extraordinary taxes on salaries, and public expenditure reduction, which translated mostly in cuts in the salaries in the public sector, in public health services, education, pensions and other social security transfers – with anti-poverty measures being severely affected. A first trend is closely tied to rampant unemployment. As nearly 50% of the registered unemployed were not entitled to any unemployment benefit, a strong poverty growth is most likely to result. The second trend is related to the steep increase in indirect taxes and welfare cuts. Portugal has the lowest median net equivalent income in the 'old' EU-15 of 8.410 €/year

in 2011, just about 75% of Greece's, the closest country in this regard. Furthermore, 15% of population were already very close to or below to threshold of poverty. Hence the twin pressure of cuts in social security transfers and increasing taxes on consumption – such as VAT – cannot but push those who were previously merely at risk of it into poverty. One result of these trends can already be seen in the forceful return of emigration, a traditional phenomenon in Portuguese society that had been greatly reduced during the 1990s and 2000s. The repressive nature of the authoritarian regime that ruled Portugal between 1926 and 1974 hindered scientific research on the subject of poverty for a long time. Later, the concept of “poverty ways of life” (Almeida et al. 1992; Capucha 2005) was developed as a key theoretical tool for understanding the diversity and heterogeneousness of poverty in Portuguese society. “Poverty ways of life” refer to the complex interaction of factors that shape how poverty is lived by those affected by it – such as spatial context, consumption patterns, family organisation models, subjective perception of one's social standing, life strategies and representations of one's past and future. Poverty in Portugal may encompass marginal groups like drug addicts or ex-prisoners, classical risk groups like lone parents, poor pensioners or people with disabilities, ethnical groups and immigrants, but also the “working poor” – low-skilled low pay workers in precarious jobs, and even the “new poor” resulting from the impoverishment of former lower middle class families. Capucha (2009) suggests that poverty risk seems to be decreasing amongst immigrants and peasants, mainly due to the rapid increase of returning amongst immigrants that has been taking place since the beginning of the crisis, on the one hand, and also the declining demographic importance of peasantry in Portugal, on the other. Yet for the working poor, the new poor and the elderly, poverty risk seems to have sharply risen since the beginning of the crisis. RESCuE will select two parishes from a rural area and another two from the metropolitan area of Lisbon. In the rural setting the focus will be on families, representing the following categories: peasants; precarious workers, unemployed, inactive. In the urban context the focus will be on immigrants, precarious workers, and the unemployed and inactive.

5 Work packages

The RESCuE project consists of the following work packages (WP) which are to be presented in detail: Coordination and management (WP 1), State-of-the-art report on households' resilience under conditions of socioeconomic crisis in Europe (WP 2), Methodology and fieldwork (WP 3), Typology of socioeconomic practices in resilient households (WP 4), Cultural practices in resilient households (WP 5), Longitudinal and biographical development of household resilience (WP 6), The spatial dimension of households' resilience (WP 7), Communities, participation and politics (WP 8), Resilient households and welfare state institutions (WP 9), Social economy & household resilience (WP 10) and Gender, ethnic and migration aspects of household resilience (WP 11). The work packages Synthesis of reports (WP 12), Policy recommendations (WP 13) and Dissemination (WP 14) are not part of this research report.

Figure 1
Overview of Work Packages

Number	Work Package Title
WP 1	Coordination and management
WP 2	State-of-the-art report on households' resilience under conditions of socioeconomic crisis in Europe
WP 3	Methodology and fieldwork
WP 4	Typology of socioeconomic practices in resilient households
WP 5	Cultural practices in resilient households
WP 6	Longitudinal and biographical development of household resilience
WP 7	The spatial dimension of households' resilience
WP 8	Communities, participation and politics
WP 9	Resilient households and welfare state institutions
WP 10	Social economy & household resilience
WP 11	Gender, ethnic and migration aspects of household resilience
WP 12	Synthesis of reports
WP 13	Policy recommendations
WP 14	Dissemination

Source: Own illustration

5.1 Coordination and management

IAB, the project co-ordinator, will carry out all coordination and management roles⁹, in association with partners.

5.2 State-of-the-art report on households' resilience under conditions of socioeconomic crisis in Europe

Work package 2 has three interrelated major tasks: *First*, the state-of-the-art report will review and describe the socioeconomic situation in the respective countries during the present and foregoing crises. Special attention will be paid to the general socioeconomic framework and its changes as well as to the settings of political actors and action levels in anti-poverty policies, which frame the living conditions and

⁹ These roles include enabling and stimulating content and administration related communication between the partners through email, telephone, video conferencing and skype as well as by an internal blog; setting up and maintaining the international RESCuE project website; issuing a sequence of internal email newsletters on administrative issues, timelines, common activities and project progress; budgeting and accounting on the coordinators side; coordination and steering; organising audit procedures (coordinators side) as necessary; reporting and communicating with the EC project officer and EC administrative, financial and scientific issues staff; final quality control, if necessary also steering the potential involvement of Scientific Advisory Board and external referees; controlling timelines and quality; organising project meetings; taking an overview of conferences and workshops: Although conferences will be organised under the dissemination WPs 13 and 14, the coordinator will monitor the preparations; managing advisory boards (IAB initiates and organises; boards cooperate; other partners support).

patterns of households at risk. The research will also examine ongoing changes in this political field, in particular concerning the growing importance of EU norms and the involvement of institutions, policies and funding.

Second, it will focus on the life nexus and everyday reality of households at risk (or in vulnerability). Here, national situations in their inner heterogeneity will be investigated and compared through extensive literature analysis, including national poverty reports, their critique, scientific literature, and public and policy discourses about the topic.

Third, it will provide a comprehensive overview of the literature and scientific debate on the resilience of vulnerable households in socioeconomic crises in both theoretical and empirical perspectives. This state-of-the-art report will also take into account both the wider research on deprivation and poverty and studies of capabilities, resources and interpretive patterns of life in poverty, or at risk of it. It will furthermore take into account research on social, cultural and economic practices at the low end of the income scale, such as low-wage and precarious labour, self-employment and small-scale entrepreneurship as well as on non- or low commodified or sub-market subsistence activities, formal or informal, modern, alternative or traditional. Crisis in the RESCuE concept is not seen as a kind of economic force to wield its influence causally on the households concerned, but to be associated with the investigated households' living conditions and developments in their own experiences and narratives.

Moreover, the reporting will be guided by several following additional aspects of high relevance to the RESCuE research questions. Those are spatial and community questions, the meso-level of welfare state institutions, Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the social economy in their interrelation to vulnerable and resilient households; the lessons to be learned for social policy, the longitudinal (or process-shaped) nature of resilience; the gender dimension and other intersecting dimensions of social inequality like migration and ethnicity.

The reporting will also support the subsequent fieldwork of WP 3, by fine-tuning hypotheses and research questions and placing them alongside scientific, socioeconomic, cultural and political developments. Thus, WP 2 has to look closely into the various approaches in poverty research, crossing the boundaries between academic disciplines and methodologies, to assemble an authoritative overview of the existing state of research and policy, whilst guiding the fieldwork by formulating clear general research questions that can be operationalized in sampling, interview guidelines, observation checklists and other research instruments. It will thus feed into both WP 3 and WPs 4-11, in the latter cases providing customized overviews of theory, methods and empirical evidence.

First, WP 2 will carry out an extensive review of scientific findings and literature as specified above, including secondary analysis of published data, such as poverty,

statistics and demographic records, drawing both on Europe-wide data sets and those specific to the case study regions. These will be analysed and interpreted, thus continuing and expanding the work that was started during the proposal preparation.

Second, the national teams will develop country-specific reports with a commonly agreed basic structure related to the questions and analytical dimensions specified above to ensure comparability. The general approach of the country reports is not just to report and analyse dominant intra-country developments, but to include also the inner differences (heterogeneity, heterodoxies), not to say contradictions of the respective situation and developments. This will make it possible not just to create the potential for international comparison but also to enrich the analytical results. For instance, a practice of socioeconomic resilience (such as foraging) might be an almost forgotten residual practice in a country like Germany, an emerging one in the UK and a dominant one in Finland or Poland, whilst another, (like cross-border emigration) might be (re)emerging in Spain and Portugal but declining, changing its character or stopping altogether in other countries. Such residual or emerging practices could go unnoticed if reporting focused on dominant developments only. Thus, the common dimensional structure of the national reports is a 'deductive' interface for comparison while the country-specific inner differences will provide interfaces for inductive comparison.

Third, the lead partner will develop the international comparative state-of-the-art report, on the basis of the national reports and with support from the national teams. This report will have a similar structure to the national reports, but with more emphasis on cross-country differences and similarities within the analytical dimensions.

5.3 Methodology and fieldwork

Sampling and obtaining field access: Each partner will select at least one urban and one rural case study, if they have not done so already, in which interviews, observations and the collection of photographs will take place. Country teams may decide to extend the different local settings up to four, due to ex ante and emergent criteria of diversifying and contrasting, while proportionally reducing the load of interviews per local setting, but ending up with the same total interview number. Expert interviews will be used in this phase to gain insight into local and regional socioeconomic structures, poverty situations and actor constellations as well as to identify potential spaces and cases for observation and prepare connections to the interviewees. In an open methodology like the one we choose, it is not helpful to use detailed and fixed ex ante sampling quotas. Therefore the RESCuE fieldwork will instead use initial or starting contrastive selection criteria for interviewing households at risk, such as household types (size, gender and generational composition), ethnic or migration-related differences, poverty duration and income types. Those criteria will have to be covered with at least one significant case each, but without proposing fixed proportions of coverage. A certain rather small number of cases throughout the whole sample should be maximum contrast cases which do not show signs of resili-

ence ('control group'). The initial contrasting criteria will be refined through the ongoing research, according to the respective local context and culture, and supplemented with additional criteria which usually emerge during the research process, since this is how 'openness' as core requirement of qualitative methods is operationalized in the sampling process (Glaser/Strauss 1967). This means that only a part of the cases will be drawn according to those *ex ante* starting criteria, while the other part will be added based on the emerging or modified criteria. Unlike in classical experiments or standardised surveys that aim to control interfering dimensions, which require huge sampling matrices, in qualitative studies with interpretive methods one case can cover more than one contrast dimension or influence, as either the interviewees will separate them in their narrations or the researchers can do so during analysis.

2. Developing fieldwork instruments: well thought out state-of-the-art qualitative fieldwork instruments are crucial for this WP, as they have to both ensure a good level of comparability through semantic similarity (not to say standardisation) and to facilitate openness in order to be able to discover previously unforeseeable diversity and heterogeneity in the research process. The WP team will jointly develop four fieldwork instruments: *First*, a written interview guide (due to methodological requirements this is not a questionnaire), listing the topics of interest for the expert interviews. As the roles of the targeted experts and the purposes of the interviews will vary widely (to cater for differences such as those between a local state representative, a priest from a poverty neighbourhood and a spokesperson of a discriminated ethnic minority) this expert interview guide will consist of dimensions which are of general interest to the project, which will then have to be adapted before each single expert interview on the basis of information available prior to the interview (public websites, newspapers, else). Usually, the duration of such interviews will range from a minimum of 30 minutes to several hours maximum. *Second*, a written interview guide listing the topics for interviewing households for the first time. This interview guide is the systematic interface between the interviews and the analytical interests of the subsequent work packages. It will therefore not only be based on the findings of the state-of-the-art report (WP 2) but will moreover address interviewees' socioeconomic and cultural resources, constraints and practices (WP 4 and 5), family and individual biography (WP 6), the local contexts, networks and community, spatial aspects, welfare state actions and NGO, charity and third-sector activities they are confronted with (WP 7,8,9,10), gender, migration and ethnicity aspects (WP 11), as well as their circumstances of living and their perception of society and crisis, regarding the development of resilience (or its absence). Each of those analytical dimensions will go into the interview guide and be broken down into subtopics to be addressed in free interview communication with narrative starting sequences. *Third*, based on the state-of-the-art in cultural anthropology, on visual methodologies and on the project's key dimensions of interest and its work packages, an inspirational guideline will be developed to motivate and support the interviewees in taking pictures. It will start with short common-sense explanations of the idea behind this

activity, and then offer themes and topics for the interviewees to interpret through self-taken photographs. Examples of such open topics are "my family", "my home", "days of feast", "my favourite things", "what and how we eat", "working or a working day", "hardship", "what we believe in", "joy", "my place", "leisure", "useful help", "obstacles and restrictions", "community" and more. The interviewees will be encouraged to vary, balance or decide between documentary and symbolic approaches in taking their photographs. *Fourth*, the pictures taken will serve as elicitive visual cues for the second interviews, where the interviewee explains his or her self-taken pictures to the interviewer narratively. Thus, the body of self-taken photographs will serve as an extremely case-specific 'guide' for the second wave of interviews. After a phase of drafting commonly and in English, the fieldwork instruments 1-3 will be localised (i. e. translated and adapted to local circumstances) by the respective teams.

3. Conducting interviews and participant observations, and collecting visual material: Each of the RESCuE partners will have to conduct a total of 48 expert and narrative qualitative interviews with people living in households at risk in the respective RESCuE partner country. Half of these will be conducted in urban and half in rural case settings (exemptions see above in paragraph 1). Due to budget limitations, this interview number will not fully meet the ideal requirements of theoretical sampling (Glaser/Strauss 1967) at country level, but will ensure a sufficient level of variation, which is the crucial point in qualitative studies. Moreover, the total body of interviews of RESCuE will comprise 432 interviews, which is at the upper possible limit of a single qualitative study and groundbreaking also in its internationally comparative character. The following actions are to be undertaken for each participating country:

- Implementation and analysis of a total of eight expert interviews with local experts involved in the protection of and/or assistance for people affected by crisis/poverty (NGO technical staff, managers of charities, neighbourhood associations, local and central government, scientists etc.), four in each of the two case settings. The chosen interview technique is described in some of the literature as semi-structured, but terms like 'loosely structured interviews with narrative sequences' (Trinczek 1995) or 'flexible guidance' (Kaufmann 1999) come much closer to the methodological essence of this technique (see also Promberger et al. 2002 and Sowa 2012).
- Implementation and analysis of a total of 40 narrative in-depth interviews with people from social groups affected by the current crisis and showing phenomena of resilience, half in rural and half in urban environments. Special attention will be paid to life-paths, resources and strategies and the perceived effects of the crisis on these. For these interviews, the interview guide described under 2 will be used. After questions arising directly from the initial narrative phase of the interview have been addressed, interviewers will be able to introduce topics and issues related to the research questions of WP 4 to 11, in case these topics have not been covered by the narrative. This orientation towards the research interests of subsequent work packages is to ensure that the material collected will provide a fruitful basis for later analyses. In the first attempt, about 12

households per local setting will be interviewed using interview guide 2. Eight of them will then be given a simple digital camera with removable SD card or a simple mobile phone with picture function (to remain in their possession afterwards as an incentive) to take pictures of their personal situation and living circumstances according to the inspirational guidelines described in 2. The interviews will be carried out in the homes of the interviewees, if possible, to ensure communication and a setting as natural as possible and to enable participant observation during the interview (Girtler 1992; Lofland/Lofland 1995). Although this requires great competency on the interviewer's part to avoid interview refusals, this has been successfully achieved in many qualitative poverty studies, also in cooperation with RESCuE partners (e. g. Hirseland/Ramos Lobato 2010; Bosch 2010). The interviews may take place singly or in groups, depending on the household's actual makeup.

- After an initial twelve interviews in each of the two case settings (or an adjusted number if more settings are investigated), a selection of eight households will be interviewed for a second time. Those cases will be selected for complementary data collection with the help of visual methods, based on the significance of their household biography for the RESCuE questions. After the first interview, the household will be asked to take photographs of their everyday situations, inspired and focused by the inspirational guidelines described in paragraph 2. Photographs will be taken by the interviewee in the time between the first and the second interview, with a simple digital camera or simple camera-enabled mobile phone given to the interviewee as an incentive for participation. This allows the second interview to visually reflect on how they live, work and get by, how crisis is affecting their home and people with whom they live as well as on various resources and practices of resilience. Methodologically, in the second interview, the photos taken will, at case level, serve as a stimulus for generating narratives (Harper 2002) in the sense of photo elicitation. This will not only contribute to the fieldwork itself, but also to the intra-case comparison, inter-case visual comparison and inter-case visual and interview cross examination to be undertaken in the further work packages. Moreover, the photographs will serve directly as possible illustrations for use in scientific articles targeted at journals specialising in visual methods and studies and also as material for the virtual photographic exhibition and the downloadable slide show, two crucial dissemination activities of the project.
- In addition to, or in combination with, interviews, participant observation of relevant and significant situations in and around the households' everyday life and activities will be carried out, not only alongside the interviews but also during field stays and spatial explorations. This will be documented in field notes and observation records, and will serve to cross-check and complement the material produced.

4. Supporting and validating activities: All field teams will consist of more than one researcher, enabling the field researchers to have mutual support and allowing for regular validating discussions during the field phase. Local team leaders will stand by electronically or personally to give support in case of problems. Work package 3 will hold a workshop where the RESCuE field researchers will meet distinguished

methodologists and experts in combining visual, interview and observation-based field data in interpretive analysis. This aims to discuss interpretation techniques and exemplary lines of interpretation and to enhance the project's internal validation dialogue through the involvement of external experts. The workshop will take place before the subsequent work packages start, between month 10 and month 12.

5. Field data processing and compilation activities and delivery tasks to other WPs: All visual material produced will be recorded in digital format. The verbal material will be digitally recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis in the later work packages. Field and observation notes will be written or typed and archived digitally. As required by the subsequent WPs 4 to 11, samples of thematically significant interview sequences with non-English speakers will be selected and translated into English for use in reporting and publication writing as required/requested by the respective work package leader. Information obtained during the fieldwork has a double purpose beyond the mere project-based reporting. On the one hand, photographic and transcribed interview information will be used for the realisation of the virtual web-based photographic exhibition and documentaries, which highlight comparisons between different countries, the crises observed and the practices developed in response to the crisis. On the other hand, photographic and transcribed textual material will be used for analysis and the production of scientific papers on the current crisis in Europe, its diversity, and reactions, resistance and resilience in the face of it. Technically, the task of delivering interview excerpts will exceed WP 3 and move into WPs 4 to 11 after WP 3 is closed, which is practically facilitated by the fact that every partner will participate in every work package.

5.4 Typology of socioeconomic practices in resilient households

The initial work associated with WP 4 will be to draw on the results of the fieldwork carried out in WP 3 for the identification of the impacts of crisis, the forms and manifestations of resilience, their spatial classification (e. g. regions and rural/urban settings) and variation by household attributes (size, composition, poor/low income/middle income, unemployed/employed/self-employed, level of education/skills, ethnicity, migration status). These socioeconomic resilience patterns will be evaluated against the context of institutional social welfare (e. g. presence/absence and effectiveness of existing state support and welfare benefits) and against the local and wider socioeconomic conditions and frameworks. The main hypothesis of this WP is that a core component of resilience is based in the everyday socioeconomic practices of households, which WP 4 will therefore have to identify and reconstruct through analysis of the WP 3 fieldwork. The analytical perspective is threefold:

1) Every kind of household practice is of interest which is intended to contribute to that household's means of subsistence. These practices may include labour and other activities, whether these are formal or informal, market or non-market, monetary or non-monetary, carried out on their own or external premises, for their own, somebody else's or common profit or utility. These practices also include mutual help, gift exchange, sharing and other social practices, of which the economic inten-

tions may be only secondary to others, such as community building, gaining respect and the like. They also include practices and strategies of consumption, saving and other resource use. However those resilient economic practices, as they will be operationalized within RESCuE, will NOT include mobilising transfer incomes from the welfare state and its branches. For heuristic reasons, practices likely to be subject to sanctions and/or legal prosecution will also be excluded from the analysis.

2) These practices are interrelated to and interact with cultural practices (which are the topic of the entwined WP 5) e. g., actively participating in a religious community may create access to various kinds of mutual support, or, if a family has agricultural roots, even if these are not active, the respective knowledge may be reactivated through intergenerational transfer if needed in crisis.

3) These practices are shaped by the availability of resources of many kinds: natural or material resources, such as land, housing, tools, fortune or livestock; cultural resources, such as knowledge and skills; and social or institutional resources, such as political structures, social networks or economic systems. These conditions form the contexts, frameworks and environments of households' socioeconomic practices, to which the analysis will have to relate the identified practices.

The results of the national case studies will be examined in order to produce a Europe-wide analysis of the impact of the financial crisis and the coping strategies of vulnerable groups, households and individuals. A cross-country comparative typology of resilient socioeconomic practices will be constructed by analysing the regularities and peculiarities of existing as well as emerging coping strategies utilised by households in response to hardship in the case study countries and regions. The typology will reflect the interplay between strategies and patterns of action, and socioeconomic settings, frameworks, resources and conditions. Prior to the finalizing of the typology, a workshop will be held around the beginning of month 17, with the participation of key researchers from all consortium countries and the discussion and presentations of fieldwork and case study results during this event will feed into the Europe-wide analysis. The role of formal (welfare provision by states) and informal support systems will also be compared. The overall analysis will aim to produce a synthesis of the findings against the current state-of-the-art knowledge on socioeconomic resilience to highlight the contribution of the research to the existing literature and policy making. There is a broad interface with WP 5, which also investigates cultural settings of economic practices. Because socioeconomic and cultural settings and practices interact strongly with each other, work packages 4 and 5 will also interact, which is intended and operationalized through the parallel timeline as well as the simultaneous participation of all partners in both of them. Focused contributions will be submitted also to the WPs 12, 13 and 14.

5.5 Cultural practices in resilient households

1. Aims of investigation

There are two main aspects of culture and resilience which will be investigated in this WP:

First, there are the cultural practices of the investigated individuals and households, practiced for reasons of their own, which may have socioeconomic side outcomes. This includes religious or traditional cultural activities, knowledge acquisition and transfer. But it also includes participating passively in 'high', 'official' or informal, class-, folk-, group- or subculture-related outstanding cultural practices and rituals. These range from social activities, such as sports events, to public and private celebrations, as well as the active practice of fine arts, performing arts and literature. The social and/or economic (side) outcomes may lie in social recognition, community or group relatedness, feeling socially integrated, creating or maintaining relations, networks, or producing artefacts for sale. The sociocultural and psychological outcomes may lie in giving sense and meaning to one's life, providing a means for cultural production, creativity, self-expression and symbolic communication, but also in experiencing self-efficacy and gaining psychic stability. Special analytical attention will be paid to the impacts of crisis and the resilience effects of active and passive cultural activities, like participating in arts, literature and other activities of cultural self-expression and accultivation. This will not only contribute to the evaluation of the citizens' civil rights of cultural participation during crisis, but also help to understand the resilience-building role of 'accultivation' practices for individuals, households and families.

Second, economic and other everyday practices are also embedded in cultural settings and conditional frameworks, be it language and knowledge, norms, values, and they manifest themselves in social roles, interpretive patterns, behaviour, communication and practices in their various patterns and ways, being stratified, gendered, but also diversified according to regions, subcultures, ethnicities and group identities, individuals, and organised actors. Therefore this WP will focus especially on cultural frameworks such as religious practices, traditional and customary practices, tacit and explicit, traditional, alternative and modern knowledge, which embed and enable the socioeconomic practices identified in WP 4. Of certain interest here is also the social and economic relations' and practices' cultural embeddedness into norms, values and feelings, such as kinship, family, acquaintance, solidarity.

The aim will be to identify and analyse the aspects of culture and their influence on resilience, either directly, through a socioeconomic side outcome, or by embedding and enabling socioeconomic practices which contribute to buffering hardship.

2. Structure of investigation

Those cultural aspects and their relation to resilience will be investigated in the selected households, based on the fieldwork collected in WP 3. The analytical work will be carried out using three approaches: *First*, a dimensional cross-case comparison, for example addressing knowledge, symbolic practices, norms and values, but also dimensions which might appear during the fieldwork. *Second*, a case study approach which picks 'significant cases' in which a cultural moment of resilience formation turns out to be particularly strong – or the opposite. *Third*, an investigation of cultural aspects underlying the typology of socioeconomic resilience developed in WP 4 – and an assessment of whether this typology could or should be enhanced or amended if cultural aspects are taken into account. This analysis will mainly draw on the interviews and the self-taken photographs through combined methodologies of hermeneutical text analysis and visual analysis. Such techniques require an extensive and ongoing validation dialogue within the local teams and between the teams involved. Because analysis is necessary for modifying empirical instruments and further case selections, analytical work will start after the first interviews and will reach maximum intensity after all four steps of the fieldwork have been successfully undertaken.

3. Interrelations with other WPs and partners' responsibilities

The topics of the later WP 5 will already provide inputs into the development of interview guidelines in WP 3, but will also be strongly involved in the development of an 'elicitive text' or inspirational guideline for the photographic fieldwork in WP 3, addressing not only its documentary purposes but also its creative, self-expressive and symbolic communication aspects, which will be of main interest for WP 5. This work package interfaces strongly with WP 4, which analyses the socioeconomic practices, and will submit condensed contributions to WPs 12 to 14.

5.6 Longitudinal and biographical development of household resilience

Poverty issues in particular, as we understand, are far more than just current socioeconomic or cultural states of persons and households. They are processes in time, biographically including events and reflections under certain, possibly changing circumstances. Getting into, staying in and moving out of poverty comprises characteristic and contexted sections of individuals' life courses, families' histories and may even span between antecedent and subsequent generations. Therefore this work package will develop insights into the longitudinal and biographical structures and processes of resilience development in families and households, by focusing on trajectories of adaptation, coping and resistance over time, and by examining how household resilience to the crisis varies according to family life stage and generational relations. It will examine similarities and differences in everyday patterns of resilience across family life transitions and stages, in different socioeconomic and institutional contexts, across the case study countries and regions. There is a well-

developed body of scientific research on variations in exposure to the risk of poverty at different family and life-course stages. Furthermore, it is clear that the crisis has had a varying impact on individuals depending on life-course stage. For example, unemployment and austerity policies have disproportionately affected young adults, with correspondingly different consequences for households, depending on family life stage, regional family culture and type of welfare state. However, comparatively little is known about how citizens mobilize social and cultural resources to manage family transitions and to develop resilience to the varying challenges they face during the life courses and family history, and at different life stages of families at one time. Qualitative research is essential for understanding the dynamics of household resilience across the family life course because it opens a window on individual family practices, helping to explain why some households may be more resilient at different family life stages, why key life transitions may present more challenges to some households than others, why some develop more resilience than others over time. Examination of resilience from a longitudinal, biographical perspective therefore not only provides vital information about how states can better support households to cope with the crisis in the present, but will also enable them to plan for the challenges and different capacities for resilience that European households will face in the future as families move through the life course. The work package will adopt the following approach to developing a longitudinal and biographical approach to household resilience:

- Collation of country reports on the demography, regional family culture and existing scholarship on poverty, resilience and the life course.
- Examination of the in-depth qualitative data generated in WP 3 to identify households in different regional and socioeconomic contexts according to family life stage.
- Thematic and comparative analysis of the WP 3 interviews in order to establish variations and similarities in strategies and sources for resilience to the crisis at different family life stages, identifying similarities and differences across European states, and in urban and regional contexts. Particular attention will be given to how families mobilise varying kinds of social support from extended family members, neighbours, ethnic or community groups, and the state at different stages of the life course. In coordination with WP 4 and WP 5, the analysis will identify whether or not households have more or less capacity for resilience in different life course, socioeconomic and cultural contexts.
- Thematic and comparative analysis of the data on life trajectories in the in-depth interviews in order to establish how past strategies of adaptation, coping and resistance during earlier life transitions have impacted on current patterns of resilience to the crisis. Production of composite narratives of family life trajectories to illustrate and explain typical patterns of resilience in the different contexts.

5.7 The spatial dimension of households' resilience

This work package is analysing the spatial, especially urban/rural dimension of vulnerable households' resilience. Given that social inequality, poverty, vulnerability and their conditions agglomerate, manifest themselves and are modified through a spatial dimension, it has to be hypothesized that this counts for vulnerable households' resilience as well. Following this, work package 7 refers back to a long tradition of considering poverty in terms of being trapped in a poor spatial setting, like the inner city or deprived or disconnected rural areas, increasing the concerned households' exposure to social and economic risks. But on the contrary, it has to be recognized that a spatial setting can help mobilizing or accessing resources – like positive social relations, prosperous economic settings and conditions or natural resources, or improving the conditions for this by enabling for solidarity or community formation. The spatial dimension of analysis, as understood here, targets on spatially located and agglomerated manifestations of socioeconomic and cultural resources, frameworks and actors' strategies, interpretations and behavioural patterns, in combination with genuinely spatial characteristics like geographical properties, distance, density and spatial differentiation.

Analysing the spatial dimension of resilience work package 7 focuses on rural and urban settings and their relevance for vulnerable households' resilience, following hypotheses that rural and urban settings are supposed to be differently affected by the crisis, providing different natural or economic resources, and potentially different access or restrictions to make use of institutional or other social resources. Moreover, urban and rural spaces may show considerable inner heterogeneities for themselves.

The main question of WP 7 is whether there are differences in practices, strategies, habits and resources of household resilience in times of crisis within and between rural and urban settings. Especially it has to be explored how spatial characteristics and differences interplay with the patterns of resilience. The maximum strategies of contrast of the case studies in the fieldwork WP are hence highly relevant here, as the case study locations include metropolitan (capital) areas, shrinking cities, de-industrialised provincial towns and remote agricultural areas, and subarctic hunter/gatherer/herding zones. Beyond literature work and secondary analysis on geographical information, many of it prepared during WP 2 but complemented in WP 7, the empirical sources of WP 7 will be those interview sequences from WP 3 (experts, households interviews wave one and wave two, photographs) which address the spatial dimension. WP 7 will partly work alongside the socioeconomic patterns and cultural frames and practices of resilience as identified in WP 4 and 5. Except the expert interviews and the relevant chapters of the state-of-the-art report, all sources are at micro level, which enables the reporting to include and display micro material, such as typical patterns of space use, space or household profiles.

There will be three major steps in analysis:

First, as a preparatory step for the national and international comparative reports, the national teams will work out case studies on their investigated areas (at least one urban and one rural per country). This analysis will describe the relations between the households' resilience patterns (as identified in WP 4 and 5) of the respective urban/rural sample with

- characteristics of a genuinely spatial nature, like geographical properties, spatial distance, spatial density and spatial differentiation, but also with the samples' different geographically clustered characteristics like natural resources, political and social frameworks of earning a living, economic structures, socioeconomic and cultural history and developments, demographic patterns and changes through time, knowledge distribution, property distribution, functional or hierarchical relations to wider areas, class, strata and larger group relations.
- The inner heterogeneity of the investigated spatial settings with respect to resilience will also be a topic of analysis here.

Second, work package 7 will do a comparative analysis at national level, based on the case studies of step 1, introducing the urban/rural dimension as a contrastive matter. The aim of this comparison is to find out if and which typical patterns of resilience are directly or indirectly enabled or restricted by specific spatial conditions or settings, especially those following an urban or rural pattern. Hence, this step will show if there are clear urban or rural patterns of resilience, and thus display how and to which extent the chances to develop resilience are differing for households living in urban or rural contexts in the respective country. Third, the results of the national reports on the spatial characteristics and influences on households' resilience will be compared and drawn together in an international comparative analysis. This analysis will not only compare the national level results, but also will go back to the level of the single case studies of step 1, comparing them through dimensional cross-country 'clustering'. This follows the concept that in step 2, abstractions and condensations are very likely and make sense, which might not make sense for step 3. E. g., if a rural practice like forest gathering is residual in Germany or the UK, it might not be regarded as a relevant resilience strategy for those countries, but if it is a frequent rural practice in Finland and Poland, the fact that it is also identifiable in Germany and UK supports to consider it as a relevant practice from an internationally comparative point of view, not limited to Baltic areas.

5.8 Communities, participation and politics

Households, families and individuals are embedded into the wider social relations of communities. Community can be defined as beyond-family social relations relatively long in duration, driven possibly by shared interests, but certainly by common norms, values and feelings – like solidarity, trust, acquaintance. There is a broad range of communities that play a role in the life of European citizens: local communities that represent and embody local political life, such as municipalities and local

political organisations, local branches or locally autonomous religious organisations, trade unions, guilds, ethnic or migrant-based communities, charities, (sub-)cultural communities like music associations, women's organisations, neighbourhood associations, motorbike clubs, street gangs, sports clubs, celebration committees, plot gardener associations and numerous others, including the rural village as a community in itself. But beyond these more or less traditionally or early-modern rooted communities, there are new, some say postmodernist communities as part of new social movements and social protest, and there are social networks, some of them even transnational, some of them virtual through new media, some of them formal, some of them informal, generally with less duration and copresence and a more fluid character. In any case, community relations, group life and self-organisation must be seen as key elements of life, economic, social and cultural activities and therefore political, social and cultural participation. Enabling participation for households at risk of or in poverty is a key challenge for European welfare states, many of which have codified basic support as well as cultural and social participation as a civil right.

WP 8 of RESCuE aims to find out how communities of various kind actually contribute to the development of households' resilience, and which communities do so. Positive community influences can happen through direct socioeconomic support – as through providing accessible resources and collective goods, through the psychosocially stabilizing and encouraging effects of community involvement and participation itself, and through political participation such as in local governments, political parties and interest groups, directly influencing the living conditions at the level of the local community. Given this, additional attention will have to be given to the effects of the recent and ongoing crises, especially on how the crisis affects communities and community involvement of households at risk, how the participatory patterns of at-risk individuals and households in communities and at the local level are affected by the crisis and maintained through resilience developments, and whether crises support or hinder the self-organisation and community formation, community involvement and/or local political participation of households at risk, as well as the developments of their preconditions at the level of norms, values and collective feelings. A further topic to be investigated is whether and how communities may develop collective resilience by themselves, which will be analysed for its interaction with households' resilience. This may include various kinds of communities as well as the aspect of community formation and community transformation, if significant.

Analysis will be based on the fieldwork done in WP 3, which includes the household interviews, participant observations in the local settings, and expert interviews with community representatives. The visual documents taken by the interviewees will also be analysed, as well as the elicited interviews, since community activities will be part of the elicitive text/inspirational guide. Analysis will be carried out via triangulations between the different data and methods, such as ethnographic reconstructions and interpretative methodologies, to enable insight into the ways that community issues also touch unspoken, emotional and habitual issues which usually do not

appear at the surface of interview texts. Ethnographic reconstructions based on the interviewees' narratives will be used to identify not only relevant communities but also actual interrelations (being supported, excluded, participation, involvement) of the investigated household with wider communities of different kinds. Hermeneutic (interpretive) methods such as sequential analysis are used to analyse the subjective meaning of community related practices for the interviewees, including implicit components of the interviewees' perspective. Particularly those self-taken photographs which address community-related topics provide additional possibilities for interpretive analysis, as they can be interpreted as documents themselves through the methodology of visual analysis, and this can be crosschecked and triangulated with the interviewee's commenting and explaining of his or her self-taken photographs in the second interview (photo elicitation interview). Another interface for triangulation will be those photographs and related interview sequences addressing cultural activities and frames, as they correlate with 'structures of feelings' along community, group and other social relations, revealing unspoken, emotional and habitual aspects of the household members' community relations, involvement and participation.

The national reporting will consist in a combination of dimensional analysis following the thematic structure outlined above (2nd paragraph), and significant case studies at the level of resilient households, depicting how community involvement actually can work positively towards socioeconomic resilience.

An international comparative report will draw together and compare the national results, leading into an international comparison of communities and community involvement and their role and contribution to resilience developments at household level. Those results will be placed into wider contexts, as the interfaces with WPs 7, 9 and 10 allow, especially concerning the spatial conditions of a positive role of communities, and the mutually intervening character of communities, community involvement and participation, self-organization and the local welfare state activities.

5.9 Resilient households and welfare state institutions

Welfare state practices can in principle be supportive, neutral or ignoring, or restrictive in their impacts on risk-exposed households' practices, such as resilience. Possibly even more so after the transformation of welfare states' activities into the 'activation' paradigm, and given the varieties of welfare state patterns in Europe and its neighbours. In the light of this, it is an open question if and how members of resilient households interact with the transformed welfare state institutions and their supportive, neutral or restrictive practices. Resilient households may try gaining support in developing or maintaining resilience and fail or win, but also may choose not to claim benefits, if refusal, negative treatments or side effects are anticipated. Thus, they may also decide on alternative survival strategies, be they successful or not. Furthermore there are also strategies and practices for resisting the requirements and specifications of the welfare institutions to continue resilient practices which do not correspond to officially legitimate behaviour (e. g. informal labour) or have con-

flicting time structures. NGOs and their actions might also turn out to play a role for this WP, as in some places they provide basic social services where the welfare state has retreated or never been, and in other countries they supplement the state system or care for those who have dropped out of view of the welfare state. Some NGOs or charities, accessible through 'lower doorsteps', like those holding food banks, second hand shops, or cafeterias for unemployed people, might even be able to stay in contact with non-claimants of state benefits, some of whom may practice resilient strategies. Those and other organisations will deliberately be involved into the expert interviewing and serve as contrast groups to local branches of the welfare state for the analysis of WP 9.

The analysis of practices of resilient households in their interaction with welfare state institutions and supplementing NGOs will be compared alongside different types (and typologies) of welfare states. The basis for this analysis will be the fieldwork of WP 3, especially those household interview sequences where the interaction with welfare state institutions (or its absence, or avoidance) is addressed, as well as relevant expert interviews. Methodologically, the main work will use content analysis with validating hermeneutical cross checks on interview sequences which do not easily reveal their full meaning, as well as cross-checks with the expert interviews from local welfare state and NGO representatives. Nine national reports and one international report, as well as specialized dissemination pieces and policy recommendations will be important outcomes of WP 9. The national reports will comprise case studies (investigating such issues as 'good' and 'bad' practices, bottom-up and top-down structures with relation to resilience formation) and dimensional analysis (related to labour market reintegration, benefit payment, social inclusion, sanction, training, psychosocial stability, conflict and others). One important aspect of the international comparative report of WP 9 will be to explicitly relate local welfare state practices in the perception of the interviewed households to current or modified welfare state typologies and the respective countries' position within these typologies. This approach will not only illuminate the debates about how relevant the 1990s typologies still are today, but could shed light on how restrictive or empowering welfare states' local actions are in shaping resilience. This analysis will also provide insights into future pathways for institutional learning by welfare state institutions and provide the basis for an article to be submitted to an internationally renowned social policy journal.

5.10 Social economy & household resilience

Concepts of social innovation are often seen as a core element of the self-learning of European social policy. Although those concepts are closely related to actors like social entrepreneurs and the social economy, actors of that kind have been in the field long before any concept of social innovation was born. Thus, social economy and social entrepreneurs must not necessarily be seen as new and innovative, but simply as a way of contributing to the organization of local communities' activities in social policy. They organize care work or community work, conduct labour market

and social policy measures, educational activities, projects for cultural integration of migrants, others for preventing juvenile deviance, keep people active through job creation schemes, just to mention a few of their typical activities. Social economy and social entrepreneurship means organized but non-government, but possibly NGO and charity based activities on means of limited, no or low profit, usually making use of public resources like subsidized labour, educational vouchers, reduced taxes, public premises or caseload related direct funding, employing professionals and specialists in care and social work as well as underprivileged persons from the field. The social economy not only co-organizes the field of social policy, but is a well organized interest group in itself. Any analysis on poor or vulnerable households, on resilient practices and on its institutional frameworks at community level would be fairly incomplete without looking at the social economy, which is to be done in this WP 10.

It can be anticipated that the outcomes of social economy activities may range across a broad spectrum between support and threat. A lot has been written about 'creaming effects' and 'poverty traps' that semi-market jobs or a secondary or tertiary labour market may impose on people in poverty. But much of this literature neglects the fact that some people affected by poverty are temporarily or permanently unable to hold non-sheltered jobs in the primary labour market. Neither does it address the contribution of such activities and involvement to psychosocial stability and community cohesion. The main hypothesis of this WP is that social economy actions and projects are more successful and will bring more profit and benefit for the whole community if they are based on bottom-up local community initiatives, with the support of the public and/or the NGO sector. Thus, RESCuE will look at the outcomes of social economy and social entrepreneurship activities for resilient households and communities.

WP 10 will try to answer the following questions:

- What is the function of the social economy and social entrepreneurship in the development of resilience in the investigated households and communities?
- What kind of relationships can be identified between different actors (NGO's, public and private organisations) involved in or interacting with the social economy in the investigated communities, and how do those relations influence the development of resilience?
- Are there distinctive positive or negative contributions of the social economy actors which influence the resilience of households and communities in times of crisis?
- How does the crisis affect and change the relations between social economy, welfare state institutions, charities and NGOs, and resilient households at risk?

WP 10 will mainly be based on the 72 expert interviews collected in WP 3, and focus primarily on those taken from social economy experts. However they will also draw on interviews with other experts where these touch on the topics addressed in

WP 10, as well as on interviews with households at risk with an active connection to the social economy. Technically, the analysis will be made on English or Polish language full interviews (maximum 24 of 72) and on English language excerpts and short profiles (maximum 48 of 72) delivered by the partners to the leader of this WP. Differences between maximum and actual case numbers here are based on estimates of the relevance of the interviews for the WP 10 topic.

Each partner will prepare a national report. The national reports will describe 'good practice' and 'bad practice' positive and negative examples of social economy actors and projects in their respective social, economical and political circumstances, analysing their influence on households and communities, to identify conditions and patterns of action which are helpful and supportive, or restrictive and inhibiting for the development of vulnerable households' resilience. These national reports will be used as a basis for developing the international report, in which a comparison of the political, economical and social background of the social economy in all investigated countries will be undertaken, and direct and indirect reasons and specific circumstances of success or failure of social economy actors' involvement into resilience developments.

WP 10 will not only produce its own reports but also make an important contribution to RESCuE's policy recommendations, as well as interacting with WP 8 and 9, because it is communities, their households at risk, their self-organisation and their administrative structures, but also local welfare state branches, NGOs and charities that constitute the core environment and level of action of the social economy and social entrepreneurs.

5.11 Gender, ethnic and migration aspects of household resilience

The aim of this work package is to analyse the relevance of gender, ethnicity and migration to household resilience. According to social theory, gender, ethnicity and the status of being a migrant, as dimensions of social inequality, result from social processes of ascription and differential treatment on the basis of such ascriptions. As such, they combine objective socioeconomic characteristics, subjects' treatment by institutions and other members of society, cultural characteristics and their history and actual situation (potentially including discrimination or being underprivileged). Individuals subjected to such processes of ascription are assigned to and treated as members of groups who are visibly (or audibly) different from what is seen as the norm, with the resulting differences and inequalities being reified and naturalised.

At the same time, 'gender' and 'migration' interact with other dimensions of social inequality, such as skin colour, sexual orientation, religious identity, class etc., in a way that modifies individual experience, subject formation, social practices, institutional arrangements and patterns of subordination. The perspective of this WP, which is informed by the notion of intersectionality, will pay heed to such dynamics in its analyses. It recognises that inequalities, in particular at the extreme end of poverty and vulnerability, can only be properly understood if the intersecting dynam-

ics of gender, ethnicity and migration are taken into account. This applies to individuals acting within the labour market or in relation to state institutions as well as within their families and communities, but also to those families and communities themselves.

A socioeconomic crisis may challenge and even change or transform gender roles and relations, as labour market participation, the amount and distribution of power and resources available within households, and the self-perceptions of household/family members may change, adapt to or resist under changing conditions. Institutional treatments may also change in response to crisis conditions. Historically, economic recessions have placed a disproportionate burden on women, particularly in socioeconomic contexts where women are more likely than men to be in vulnerable jobs, to be under-employed or without a job, and to have limited access to social infrastructures of welfare provision. One research goal in this WP is to understand the specific ways in which gender plays a role in determining differential exposure to social suffering, poverty, and exclusion from access to welfare state provision, but also in developing resilient practices that allow poor households to buffer hardships imposed by crisis. However the role of gender will be addressed in the context of its interactions with other variables.

Migration patterns at the level of entire countries, but also within areas or communities, may change during a crisis, and it is clear that the migration behaviour of families is also subject to change. Socioeconomic pressure may encourage cross-border migration, urbanisation or moves to the countryside, or lead to new or heightened inflows of immigrants from the countryside, cities or abroad. It is thus obvious that resilience developments may be affected by migration, both positively and negatively. For instance, if a household member migrates to work elsewhere, this may stabilise the household economically, but may also mean a loss in intensity of the family's local networks and have destabilising psychosocial effects on the family. Moreover, being an immigrant or having to emigrate might give rise to experiences of discrimination or partial social exclusion in a family's or individual's social environment, both in the sending and receiving country. RESCuE aims to investigate if and how migration issues are tackled in resilient households, but also at the level of communities experiencing migration flows. Even when not linked to migration, membership of an ethnic minority may also be linked with particular patterns of labour market vulnerability, social exclusion or institutional discrimination. However, ethnicity too may provide sources of resilience like mutual help, on a background of intra-ethnic bonding like strong family support or ethnic community solidarities.

Work package 11 will be based on the fieldwork done in WP 3. The narrative interviews conducted during the fieldwork stage in particular will be a valuable source of evidence, affording participants an opportunity to develop identity-related narratives on their everyday practices, experiences and self-concepts relating to gender and migrant roles. WP 11 will also draw on the typologies and analytical work of WPs 4

and 5, and others, where relevant. Its aim is to develop two synoptic reports, one on gender and resilience, and one on migration, ethnicity and resilience.

The gender and resilience report will mainly be a cross-sectional dimensionally structured report, reanalysing the fieldwork and analyses completed in other work packages with regard to gender issues. Its tentative dimensional structure is as follows: challenges for gender roles and relations, intra-household gender divisions of labour, gender-related coping and adaptation strategies to vulnerability and socio-economic crises, the gendered structure of resources, the relationship between gender, community and welfare state institutions, and others. Gender differences will not only be seen as a potential source of discrimination and disadvantage, but also as a form of diversity that has the potential of enhancing the scope of possible activities of families and households in adapting, coping and making a living. It will include local as well as national and international aspects in a comparative way, and offer convincing proofs based on the empirical material.

WP 11's migration and ethnicity report will assemble illustrative and significant household-level case studies from all participating countries, where migration and/or ethnicity is relevant in different ways, for different reasons and with different outcomes. It will differentiate between households that have taken up migration as a strategy only recently, those which have been part of migratory processes for a longer time and those which have full national citizenship but are from disadvantaged ethnic groups. These will be analysed in the broader context of migration patterns at national and international levels and their relations to resilience.

6 Project outlook

The project will consist of four phases. First, in the **preparatory, conceptual exploratory phase**, the state-of-the-art will be assessed and analysed, following the concepts and ideas sketched out in this report, and will be further developed and refined to create a framework and background for the fieldwork.

The fieldwork as a second phase: First, this activity contains a minimum of two local case studies per country, involving an urban/rural contrast and a focus on country-specific vulnerable groups in combination with general socio-demographic comparison aspects like age, gender, ethnicity, education and others in each of the countries. Then expert interviewing will take place, and based on the collected information, the households' sample will be selected according to the mentioned criteria, applying different and contrasting access methods, and of course drawing on information on resilience, but including also a few cases without resilience as maximum contrast cases. Each case study will comprise a sample of a minimum of 12 households, which will be subject to individual interviewing and group discussions, with a selection of 8 of them participating in the visual fieldwork.

Third, in the **analytical phase** the project will unfold into eight work packages, each based on the fieldwork done in the phase before. The results of this fieldwork will in most cases provide inputs for country-specific analysis on common topics: socio-economic practices, cultural practices, longitudinal aspects, spatial aspects, community, politics and participation, interactions with welfare state institutions, the role of the social economy, and gender aspects. The analytic work packages will draw on these results for cross-country comparison, in the form of typological, dimensional, comparative country-specific analyses of interviews, observation records and visual documents. Analysis will (and for methodological reasons has to) be done in the respective country language, but will then be translated if necessary (which will be the case at least for non-English interview quotes and field notes, paraphrases and case profiles), reported and submitted in English to the respective work package leader who compiles and edits the WP reports.

Fourth, the **dissemination phase** as last phase will develop a synthesis of reports and policy recommendations as well as a virtual exhibition and disseminate through proper media. The first step of the project will be a project kick-off meeting in April in Nuremberg where the IAB invites the partners from the University of Silesia (Poland), the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain), the University of Hertfordshire (United Kingdom), the Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences (Greece), the Middle East Technical University (Turkey), the University of Lapland (Finland), the National University of Ireland Maynooth (Ireland) and the University Institute of Lisbon (Portugal).

References

Achatz, J.; Trappmann, M. (2011): Arbeitsmarktvermittelte Abgänge aus der Grundversicherung * der Einfluss von personen- und haushaltsgebundenen Barrieren. (IAB-Discussion Paper, 02/2011), Nürnberg, 41 S.

Adger, W. N. (2000): Social and ecological resilience. Are they related? *Progress in Human Geography* 24(3): 347–364.

AgeUK (2013): *Later Life in the United Kingdom*. London.

Aidukaite, J. (2004): *The Emergence of the Post-Socialist Welfare State: the Case of the Baltic States: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania*. Huddinge: Södertörn (University of Jonköping doctoral thesis).

Alexiou, T. (1999): "Salaried labour and social exclusion". *Theseis*, Issue 69, Oct.-Dec.

Almeida, J. F.; Capucha, L.; da Costa, A. F.; Machado, F. L.; Reis, E. e Nicolau, I. (1992): *Exclusão Social: Factores e Tipos de Pobreza em Portugal*. Oeiras.

Alonso, L. E.; Fernández, C. J. (2011): Del consumismo a la culpabilidad en torno a los efectos disciplinarios de la crisis económica (From consumerism to guilt: about the disciplinary effects of the economic crisis). *Política y Sociedad*, 48(2): 353–379.

Andreß, H.-J.; Lohmann, H. (eds.) (2008): *The Working Poor in Europe: Employment, Poverty and Globalisation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Anthias, F. (2005): Social stratification and social inequality. Models of intersectionality and identity. In Devine et al. (eds.) *Rethinking Class. Culture, Identities and Lifestyles*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Arts, W.; Gelissen, J. (2002): Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A State of-the-Art report. *Journal of European Social Policy* 12(2): 137–158.

Batty, E.; Cole, I. (2010): *Resilience and the recession in six deprived communities. Preparing the worse to come?; Joseph Rowntree Foundation Programme Paper*. York.

Berninger, I. (2009): Welche familienpolitischen Maßnahmen fördern die Arbeitsmarktpartizipation von Müttern? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 61(3): 355–385.

Blien, U.; Becher, M.; Beyer, T.; Dausend, B.; Eigenhüller, L.; Günthener, R.; Holten, R.; Promberger, M.; Schmid, W.; Schömmel, I.; Schösser, F.; Wöhler, C. (2011): Bericht der Arbeitsgruppe 1 "Regionale Arbeitsmärkte - Wirtschaftsstrukturpolitik". In: Kommission "Anforderungen aus dem zweiten Bayerischen Sozialbericht". München, S. I,1–I,84.

Boltanski, L.; Chiapello, E. (2003): *Der neue Geist des Kapitalismus*; Konstanz.

Bonanno, G. (2004): Loss, trauma and human resilience. Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist*. 59: 20–28.

Boratav, K. (2011): *Bir Krizin Kısa Hikayesi*, Ankara.

Bosch, A. (2010): *Konsum und Exklusion. Eine Kultursoziologie der Dinge*. Bielefeld.

Bude, H. (2008): *Die Ausgeschlossenen. Das Ende vom Traum einer gerechten Gesellschaft*. Bonn.

- Bude, H.; Medicus, Th.; Willisch, A. (Hrsg.) (2011): *Über Leben im Umbruch. Ansichten einer fragmentierten Gesellschaft*. Hamburg.
- Butler, J. et al. (2007): Psychological resilience in the face of terrorism. In: Bongar et al. (eds.). *Psychology of terrorism*. Oxford. pp. 400–417.
- Canvin, K.; Marttila, A.; Burstrom, B.; Whitehead, M. (2009): Tales of the unexpected? Hidden resilience in poor households in Britain. *Social Science & Medicine*, Volume 69, Issue 2, Pages 238–245.
- Capucha, L. (2009): Poverty and Social Exclusion. In: Maria das Dores Guerreiro, Anália Torres e Luís Capucha (eds.), *Welfare and Everyday Life – Portugal in the European Context*, Vol. III, Oeiras, Celta Editores e CIES/ISCTE-IUL. pp. 169–187.
- Capucha, L. (2005): *Desafios da Pobreza*, Oeiras.
- Cáritas Española (2012): *De la coyuntura a la estructura. Los efectos permanentes de la crisis (From the conjuncture to the structure. Permanent effects of the crisis. VII Informe del Observatorio de la realidad Social. Equipo de Estudios Caritas (septiembre 2012).*
- Castel, R. (1997): *La metamorfosis de la cuestión social. Una crónica del salariado*. Barcelona.
- Castel, R.; Dörre, K. (eds.) (2009): *Prekarität, Abstieg, Ausgrenzung. Die soziale Frage am Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts*. Frankfurt am Main/New York.
- CEBOS (2009): *Odczuwane i przewidywane konsekwencje kryzysu*.
- Central Statistical Office Warsaw (2012): *Household Budget Surveys in 2011*. Warsaw.
- Central Statistics Office (2012): *Survey on Income and Living Conditions 2010*. Dublin.
- Coaffee, J.; Wood, D.; Rogers, P. (2009): *The Everyday Resilience of the City. How Cities respond to terrorism and disaster*. Basingstocke.
- Corcoran, M. P.; Gray, J.; Peillon, M. (2010): *Suburban Affiliations: Social Relations in the Greater Dublin Area*. Syracuse, NY, and Dublin.
- Cribb, J.; Joyce, R.; Phillips, D. (2012): *Living Standards, poverty and inequality in the UK*. Institute of Fiscal Studies Commentary C124.
- Daly, M.; Leonard, M. (2002): *Against All Odds: Family Life on a Low Income in Ireland*. Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.
- Drudy, P. J. and Collins, M. L. (2011): Ireland: from Boom to Austerity. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 5(3): 1–16.
- Ebbinghaus, B. (2012): *Comparing Welfare State Regimes: Are Typologies an Ideal or Realistic Strategy?* Draft Paper presented at European Social Policy Analysis Network, ESPAnet Conference, Edinburgh, UK, September 6-8, 2012.
- Eitinger, L. (1964): *Concentration camp survivors in Norway and Israel*. Oslo.
- Erlinghagen, M.; Knuth, M. (2010): Unemployment as an institutional construct? Structural differences in non-employment between selected European countries and the United States. *Journal of Social Policy* 39(1): 71–94.
- Eroğlu, Ş. (2011): *Beyond the Resources of Poverty: Gecekondu Living in the Turkish Capital*. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Esping-Andersen, G. (1996): *Welfare States in Transition*. London: Sage.
- Esping-Anderson, G. (1990): *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Eurostat (2012): *At risk of poverty or social exclusion in the EU27*. Eurostat news release. 3rd December 2012.
- Fenge, L-A. et al. (2012): *The impact of the economic recession on well-being and quality of life of older people*. *Health and Social Care in the Community* 20(6): 617–624.
- Ferrera, M. (1996): *The 'Southern Model' of welfare in Social Europe*. *Journal of European Social Policy* 6(1): 17–37.
- Frankl, V. (1959): *Man's search for meaning*. New York.
- Frers, L.; Meier, L. (eds.) (2007): *Encountering Urban Places – Visual and Material Performances in the City*. Ashgate, Aldershot (UK)/Burlington (USA).
- Fundación 1º de Mayo (2012): *Trabajadores pobres y empobrecimiento en España (Working poor and impoverishment in Spain)*, Colección Estudios nº 56. (October 2012).
- Girtler, R. (1992): *Methoden der qualitativen Sozialforschung: Anleitung zur Feldarbeit*, Wien etc.: Böhlau.
- Giuntoli, G.; South, J.; Kinsella, K.; Karban, K. (2011): *Mental health, resilience and the recession in Bradford*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Glaser, B.; Strauss, A. (1967): *The Discovery of Grounded Theory. Strategies for Qualitative Research*. London.
- Golinowska, S. (ed.) (1997): *Polska bieda II. Kryteria. Ocena. Przeciwdziałanie*. Warsaw.
- Golinowska, S. (ed.) (1996): *Polska bieda. Kryteria. Ocena. Przeciwdziałanie*. Warsaw.
- Greek Statistical Authority (GSA) (2012): *Survey of Income 2010 (income 2009)*. Athens.
- Greenberg, M. T. (2006): *Promoting Resilience in Children and Youth. Preventive Interventions and Their Interface with Neuroscience*. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. Volume 1094, pages 139–150.
- Gripaios, P.; Bishop, P. (2005): *Spatial inequalities in UK GDP per head: the role of private and public services*. *The Service Industries Journal* 25(8): 945–958.
- Groh-Samberg, O. (2008): *Soziale Ausgrenzung und Klassenstruktur*. Wiesbaden.
- Grotowska-Leder, J. (2002): *Fenomen wielkomięskiej biedy*. UŁ, Łódź 2002.
- Haase, T.; Pratschke, J. (2012): *The 2011 Pobal HB Deprivation Index for Small Areas (SA): Introduction and Reference Tables*.
- Häußermann, H.; Kronauer, M.; Siebel, W. (eds.) (2004): *An den Rändern der Städte*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Harper, D. (2002): *Talking about pictures. A Case for photo-elicitation*. *Visual Studies* 17: 13–26.

- Harrison, E. (2012): Bouncing Back? Recession, Resilience and Everyday Lives. *Critical Social Policy*. Online First.
- Harrow, J. (2009): Leadership and resilience: local communities and services in a time of fragmentation: are there reasons to be cheerful? Paper given at the Public Policy Seminar. 30 October.
- Harvey, D. (1990): *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Hirseland, A.; Promberger, M.; Wenzel, U. (2007): Armutsdynamik und Arbeitsmarkt: Qualitative Beobachtungen und Befragungen im Feld von Arbeitsmarkt und sozialer Sicherung. In: M. Promberger (ed.). *Neue Daten für die Sozialstaatsforschung. Zur Konzeption der IAB-Panelerhebung "Arbeitsmarkt und Soziale Sicherung"* (IAB-Forschungsbericht, 12/2007). Nürnberg. pp. 102–130.
- Hirseland, A.; Ramos Lobato, P. (2010): Armutsdynamik und Arbeitsmarkt: Entstehung, Verfestigung und Überwindung von Hilfebedürftigkeit bei Erwerbsfähigen. (IAB-Forschungsbericht, 3/2010). Nürnberg.
- Holling, C. S. (1973): Resilience and Stability in Ecological Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 4: 1–23.
- Hossain, N.; Byrne, B.; Campbell, A.; Harrison, E.; McKinley, B.; Shah, P. (2011): *The impact of the global economic downturn on communities and poverty in the UK*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Hyppönen, M.; Hyvönen, J.; Morri, P.; Puoskari, J.; Hallikainen, V. (2010): Keräilyn metsästyksen ja kalastuksen merkitys Ylä-Lapin kuntien kotitaluksille. *Maantieteen aikakauskirja* 1/2010. 65–73.
- INE 2012: *Encuesta de Condiciones de Vida Año 2011*.
- Institute for Social Innovation (2004): *Social exclusion in Greece-Exploring the field for effective policies with a spatial basis; final study*, Athens, (in Greek).
- Jahoda, M.; Lazarsfeld, P.; Zeisel, H. (1932/1975): *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Jones, C. et al. (2006): Studying social policy and resilience to adversity in different welfare states: Britain and Sweden. *International Journal of Health Services* 36: 425–442.
- Kainulainen, P. (2011): Selvitys petojen aiheuttamien vahinkojen vaikutuksista poronhoidolle ja toimenpiteet pedoista aiheutuvien ongelmien ratkaisemiseksi. Lapin liito.
http://www.lapinliitto.fi/c/document_library/get_file?folderId=223971&name=DLFE-6999.pdf (abgerufen am 2. Mai 2014).
- Kassimati, K. (ed.) (1998): *Social Exclusion: The Greek Experience*; Gutenberg, Athens (in Greek).
- Kaufmann, J.-C. (1999): *Das verstehende Interview*, Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.
- Kitchin, R.; Gleeson, J.; Keaveney, K.; O'Callaghan, C. (2010): *A Haunted Landscape: Housing and Ghost Estates in Ireland*. NIRSA Working Paper Series, 59 (July).
- Kozarzewski, P. (2005): Strategie przetrwania i rozwoju gospodarstw domowych. W: *Wygrani i przegrani polskiej transformacji*. M. Jarosz (red.) Oficyna Naukowa. Warszawa. 211–249.

- Kronauer, M. (2002): Exklusion. Die Gefährdung des Sozialen im hoch entwickelten Kapitalismus. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Laparra, M. (2011): El impacto de la crisis en la cohesión social o el surf de los hogares españoles en el modelo de integración de la “sociedad líquida; Documentación Social 158: 97–130.
- Laparra; Eransus (2010): El primer impacto de la crisis en la cohesión social (The first impact of the crisis on social cohesion) Fundación FOESSA y Cáritas. Colección de Estudios 32.
- Leibfried, S. (1992) Towards a European welfare state? On integrating poverty regimes into the European Community. In Ferge, Z.; Kolberg, J. (eds.). Social Policy in a Changing Europe. Vienna.
- Leibfried, S.; Leisering, L.; Buhr, P.; Ludwig, M.; Mädje, E.; Olk, T.; Voges, W.; Zwick, M. (1995): Zeit der Armut. Lebensläufe im Sozialstaat. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Lessenich, S. (2008): Die Neuerfindung des Sozialen – Der Sozialstaat im flexiblen Kapitalismus. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Lister, R. (2004): Poverty. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lofland, J.; Lofland, L. H. (1995): Analysing Social Settings. A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. 3rd ed. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Lupton, R.; Power, A. (2002): Social exclusion and neighbourhoods. Hills, J. et al. (eds.). Understanding Social Exclusion. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Luthar, S.; Zelazo, L. B. (2003): Research on resilience. An integrative review. In: Luthar, S. Resilience and Vulnerability. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 510–549.
- Luthar, S. et al. (2000): The construct of resilience. A critical evaluation and guidelines for further work. Child Development 71: 543–562.
- Manyena, S. B. (2006): The concept of resilience revisited. Disasters 30(4): 433–450.
- McMurray, I. et al. (2008): Constructing resilience. Social Workers understandings and practice. Health and Social Care in the Community 16(3): 299–309.
- Minigione, E. (ed.) (1996): Urban Poverty and the Underclass. London: Blackwell.
- Mohaupt, S. (2008): Review Article: Resilience and Social Exklusion. Social Policy and Society 8(1): 63–71.
- Mollona, M. (2009): Made in Sheffield - An Ethnography of industrial work and politics. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Müller, B. (ed.) (2011): Urban Regional Resilience. How do cities and regions deal with change? German Annual of Spatial Research and Policy 2010. Berlin: Springer.
- Muffels, R.; Tsakoglou, P.; Mayes, D. (eds.) (2002): Social Exclusion in European Welfare States. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Murphy, M. (2012): The politics of Irish labour activation: 1980 to 2010. Administration, 60 (2). pp. 27–49.
- Mutz, G.; Ludwig-Mayerhofer, W.; Koenen, E.; Eder, K.; Bonß, W. (1995): Diskontinuierliche Erwerbsverläufe. Opladen.

- Nettles, S. M.; Mucherah, W.; Jones, D. S. (2000): Understanding Resilience – The role of social resources. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 5(1): 47–60.
- Newman, I. (2011): Work as a route out of poverty: a critical evaluation of the UK welfare to work policy. *Policy Studies* 32(2): 91–108.
- Nolan, B.; Smeeding, T.H. (2005): Ireland's Income Distribution in Comparative Perspective. *Review of Income and Wealth* 51(4): 537–560.
- Norris, F. et al. (2008): Community Resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *Am J Community Psychology* 41: 127–150.
- Pakkanen, A.; Valkonen, J. (2011): Poronhoitajien hyvinvointi ja tulevaisuuskuvat eteläisimmässä paliskunnissa. *Esiselvitys*. Lapin yliopisto.
- Papadopoulou, D. (2012): *Sociology of exclusion in a globalizing world*. Athens: Topos. (in Greek).
- Papadopoulou, D. (eds.) (2002): *From social vulnerability to social exclusion*. INE GSEE-ADEDY. Athens (in Greek).
- Paugam, S. (2007): *Las formas elementales de la pobreza*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Pedreño, A.; Riquelme, P. J. (2006): La condición inmigrante de los nuevos trabajadores rurales (The immigrant status of new rural workers). *Revista española de estudios agrosociales y pesqueros* 211: 189–238.
- Petraki, G. (1998): The Social Exclusion: Old and new definitions of social problem. *Proceedings of the 6th Scientific Conference of the Foundation Saki Karagiorga Social Inequalities and Social Exclusion, 27-30 November 1996*, pp. 19–24, Saki Karagiorga Foundation, Athens (in Greek).
- Pilkaskas, N. V.; Currie, J.; Garfinkel, I. (2012): The Great Recession, Public Transfers and Material Hardship. *Social Service Review* 88(3): 401.
- Promberger, M. (2012a): *Topographie der Leiharbeit. Flexibilität und Prekarität einer atypischen Beschäftigungsform*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.
- Promberger, M. (2010a): How much structure is in the changes? *Work Organisation, Labour and Globalisation* 4(1): 206–211.
- Promberger, M. (2010b): Hartz IV im sechsten Jahr. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 48: 10–17.
- Promberger, M.; Böhm, S.; Heyder, T.; Pamer, S.; Straß, K. (2002): *Hochflexible Arbeitszeiten in der Industrie. Chancen, Risiken und Grenzen für Beschäftigte*. Forschung aus der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, 35. Berlin: Edition sigma.
- Raco, M.; Street, E. (2012): Resilience Planning, economic change and the politics of post-recession development in London and Hong Kong. *Urban Studies* 49(5): 1065–1087.
- Rhodes, M. (1997): Southern European welfare states: Identity, problems and prospects for reform. In M. Rhodes (ed.). *Southern European welfare states: Between crisis and reform*. London. pp. 1–22.
- Rogaly, B.; Taylor, B. (2009): *Moving Histories of Class and Communities. Identity, Place and Belonging in Contemporary England*; Basingstoke. Palgrave.
- Rutter, M. (1999): Resilience concepts and findings. Implications for family therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy* 21: 119–144.

- Şengül, T.; Attila Aytekin, E. (2011): Zonguldak coalfield and the past and future of Turkish coalmining communities. In: Kirk, J.; Contrepolis, S.; Jefferys, S. (eds.). *Changing Work and Community Identities in European Regions: Perspectives on Past and Present*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 154–183.
- Sennett, R. (1994/1997): *Flesh and Stone. The Body and the City in Western Society*. New York: Norton.
- Serrano, A. et al. (2012): *Miradas sobre la pobreza: representaciones sociales del sector de "nuevos pobres" de la Comunidad de Madrid en un contexto de crisis económica. (Perspectives on poverty: social representations of the "new poor" sector in the Community of Madrid in a context of economic crisis)*.
- Simmel, G. (1995): *Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben*. In: Simmel, G. *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen. 1901-1908*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. pp. 116–131.
- Simmel, G. (1906): *Zur Soziologie der Armut*. *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 1: 1–3.
- Simmie, J.; Martin, R. (2010): *The economic resilience of regions: towards an evolutionary approach*. *Cambridge J Regions Econ Soc* 3 (1): 27–43.
- Solga, H. et al. (2013): *Vergleiche innerhalb von Gruppen und institutionelle Gelingensbedingungen. Vielversprechende Perspektiven für die Ungleichheitsforschung*. WZB Discussion Paper SP I 2013–50.
- Sowa, F. (2012): *Grönländische Identifikationsprozesse und die Musealisierung von Indigenität: Zur Narration der kollektiven Identität von grönländischen Inuit*. *Sozialer Sinn* 13(2): 257–280.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2011): *Europe finally admits its debt problem to save the euro*. *Financial Times*. 22 July 2011.
- Szukielójć-Bieñkuńska, A. (2009): *Ubóstwo w Polsce na tle krajów Unii Europejskiej – podstawowe fakty i dane*. EAPN Polska – profesjonalny dialog na rzecz Europy Socjalnej.
- Tarkowska, E. (2007): *Ubóstwo i wykluczenie społeczne młodzieży*. IPiSS. Warsaw.
- Tarkowska, E. (2000): *Zrozumieć biednego. O dawnej i obecnej biedzie w Polsce*. Typografia. Warsaw.
- Tekgüç, H. (2010): *The implications of Consumption from Self-produce for Vulnerability to Poverty in Turkey*. Working Papers. Mardin Artuklu Univeristy, Department of Economics, <http://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:mrd:martwp:2011-02> (abgerufen am 2. Mai 2014).
- Trinczek, R. (1995): *Experteninterviews mit Managern: Methodische und methodologische Hintergründe*. In: Brinkmann, C.; Deeke, A.; Völkel, B. (Hg.): *Experteninterviews in der Arbeitsmarktforschung. Diskussionsbeiträge zu methodischen Fragen und praktischen Erfahrungen (= BeitrAB 191)*. Nürnberg, S.59–67
- Vaarala, M.; Pohjola, A.; Romakkaniemi, M. (2012): *Poronhoitajien kriisiapujärjestelmä koskeva selvitys*. Lapin yliopistopaino. Rovaniemi.
- Venkatesh, S. (2008): *Gang Leader for a Day. A rogue sociologist takes to the streets*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Voyvoda, E. (2009): *Küresel Kriz ve İstihdam Yaratmayan Büyüme Üzerine*. *Odtülüler Bülteni* 184: 10–11.
- Wacquant, L. (2003): *Leben für den Ring*. Konstanz: UVK.

- Waltermann, R. (2010): Abschied vom Normalarbeitsverhältnis? Neue Juristische Wochenschrift 22.
- Warzywoda-Kruszyńska, W. (1999): *Życie Na marginesie wielkiego miasta*. IS UŁ. Łódź.
- Watson, D.; Maitre, B.; Whelan, C. T. (2012): *Work and Poverty in Ireland*. Dublin: Department of Social Protection and Economic and Social Research Institute.
- Watson, S. (2006): *City Publics. The (Dis)Enchantments of Urban Encounters*. London: Routledge.
- Werner, E. (1977): *The Children of Kauai. A Longitudinal Study from the Prenatal Period to Age of Ten*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Willisch, A. (2012): *Wittenberge ist überall. Überleben in schrumpfenden Regionen*. Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag.
- Wingerter, C. (2012): *Atypische Beschäftigung: Arbeitsmarkt im Wandel*. Wirtschaftsdienst – Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik. 92(3).
- Wódz, K.; Łęcki, K. (2003): *Ubóstwo w regionie pogranicza kulturowego [w:] Biedni o sobie i swoim życiu, /red./ E. Tarkowska, W. Warzywoda Kruszyńska, K. Wódz. Śląsk Katowice-Warszawa. pp.19–124.*
- Wódz, K.; Łęcki, K. (2001): *New and Old Poverty in Upper Silesia*. In Buchowski, M.; Conte, E.; Nagengast, C. (eds.). *Poland beyond Communism. "Transition" in Critical Perspective*. University Press Fribourg.
- Wódz, K.; Łęcki, K. (1999): *New and Old Poverty in Upper Silesia (Poverty in the Province of Cultural Borderland)*. *Polish Sociological Review* 1(125).
- Xiao, Y.; Zandt, S. V. (2012): *Building Community Resiliency. Spatial Links between household and business post-disaster return*. *Urban Studies* 49(11): 2523–2542.

Recently published

No.	Author(s)	Title	Date
10/2013	Fuchs, J. Söhnlein, D.	Projektion der Erwerbsbevölkerung bis zum Jahr 2060	10/2013
11/2013	Dauth, W. Dorner, M. Blien, U.	Neukonzeption der Typisierung im SGB-II-Bereich: Vorgehensweise und Ergebnisse	10/2013
12/2013	Schubert, M. Parthier, K. Kupka, P. Krüger, U. Holke, J. Fuchs, Ph.	Menschen mit psychischen Störungen im SGB II	10/2013
13/2013	Schwengler, B. Bennewitz, E.	Arbeitsmarkt- und Einkommensindikatoren für die Neuabgrenzung des GRW-Regionalfördergebietes ab 2014 Gutachten im Rahmen der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe „Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur“ (GRW) Studie im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Technologie	11/2013
14/2013	Bechmann, S. Dahms, V. Tschersich, N. Frei, M. Leber, U. Schwengler, B.	Beschäftigungsmuster von Frauen und Männern: Auswertungen des IAB-Betriebspanels 2012	12/2013
15/2013	Springer, A.	Selbstständige Leistungsbezieher in der Arbeitslosenversicherung: Empirische Befunde zum Versicherungspflichtverhältnis auf Antrag	12/2013
1/2014	Egenolf, D. Fertig, M. Hunger, K. Puxi, M. Rosemann, M. Weimann, M.	Implementationsstudie zur Berliner Joboffensive: Endbericht zum 31. Juli 2013 vorgelegt von ISG Institut für Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik GmbH, Köln	2/2014
2/2014	Hirschenauer, F. Springer, A.	Vergleichstypen 2014: Aktualisierung der SGB-III-Typisierung	2/2014
3/2014	Dummert, S. Kubis, A. Leber, U. Müller, A.	Betrieblicher Arbeitskräftebedarf 2006 – 2012	3/2014
4/2014	Fertig, M.	Quantitative Wirkungsanalysen zur Berliner Joboffensive: Endbericht zum 28. Juli 2013 vorgelegt von ISG Institut für Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik GmbH, Köln	4/2014

As per: 2014-05-12

For a full list, consult the IAB website

<http://www.iab.de/de/publikationen/forschungsbericht.aspx>

Imprint

IAB-Forschungsbericht 5/2014

Editorial address

Institute for Employment Research
of the Federal Employment Agency
Regensburger Str. 104
D-90478 Nuremberg

Editorial staff

Regina Stoll, Jutta Palm-Nowak

Technical completion

Gertrud Steele

All rights reserved

Reproduction and distribution in any form, also in parts,
requires the permission of IAB Nuremberg

Website

<http://www.iab.de>

Download of this Forschungsbericht

<http://doku.iab.de/forschungsbericht/2014/fb0514.pdf>

ISSN 2195-2655

For further inquiries contact the authors:

Markus Promberger
Phone +49.911.179 3139
E-mail markus.promberger@iab.de

Lars Meier
Phone +49.911.179 6827
E-mail lars.meier@iab.de