

ACTIVE SOCIAL POLICY

CONTENTS AND REFORM CHALLENGES

Drenka Vuković and Natalija Perišić
University of Belgrade – Faculty of Political Sciences

Summary

The activation concepts in social policy are frequently interpreted within the context of the social welfare reform, performed in the United States of America, during the 1990s as well as the programs of active policies on the labour market (the New Deals) introduced in Great Britain at the end of the last decade. Their assumptions, however, date back in the period of the first laws for the poor, when effectuating of their social rights was conditional upon accepting an employment.

At the beginning of the XXI century, numerous European social states, facing transformations in the world of work, family and ageing patterns, identified the need to change their social policies and adapt them pursuant to different economic, political and social circumstances. These changes mostly occur in terms of introduction (or highlighting) of active measures into employment policies, as well as limiting the rights to social help, at least to a certain degree, by performing some work, i.e. participating in various training or pre-qualification programs. They also include benefits for employment, directed towards people with disabilities and families with children. Along with that, the activation principle has been expanded, so as to include the ageing policies and various programs of early retirement and active ageing in general.

Overcoming the passive position of social help recipients, by giving them choices and initiatives in those situations in which it is a realistic option, enables establishing of more direct connection between work, as (economically) the most reliable way of preventing social risks (especially social exclusion) and rights in the social security system.

Depending on various social determinants and factors, the contents and measures of the active social policy programs, as well as their presence in different countries,

show certain national specifics. Pursuant to that, their reach and efficiency also differ.

Key words: active social policy, activation, activation strategy, employment.

Introduction

Characteristics and demands of social and economic development, along with the numerousness and seriousness of social problems it may be in(directly) linked with, have substantially altered the contents of social functions of modern states.

Compared to the period of its origin, the state with welfare responsibilities towards its citizens has fundamentally evolved. At the same time the very "foundations of 'mature' welfare states in 'developed' capitalist states are changing" (Dean, 2006:1), but in the rest of the world, as well.

Up to the 1970s, national welfare states had been developed in conditions of economic growth, relatively low unemployment rates and relatively high wages, as well as stable family nucleus. Typical social risks in this period had been coped with in the social security system, though pension, disability, health and unemployment insurance, as well as social protection and/or help.

Starting from the 1980s and in particular the 1990s, transformations in the labour market, family structure and population in general brought about the appearance of social needs of extremely diverse types. At the same time, it became obvious that these "new" social needs⁴⁴ could not be fully met within the traditionally designed social security systems, that is to say through social benefits as passive measures prevailing in the existing policies of institutional overcoming of social problems.⁴⁵

Simultaneously there came certain withdrawal of the state or leaving of more space to private initiatives in all areas of social systems. This was motivated by the changed standpoint about collective responsibility and value concept of the so-called "collective contract" between the state and the individual. On general level, this change is reflected on the increasing importance of paradigms of political

⁴⁴ These are social needs which were broadly speaking generated by transformation and "transition" into the so-called post-industrial society which brought about certain "new" social risks. They include: low qualification level or outdated qualifications; employment in non-profitable economic sectors; flexible employment forms (in terms of problems linked with the exercise of rights to social benefits in the event of part-time job); job with inappropriate or insecure income; impossibility of reconciling work and family obligations; single parenthood; care for relatives; inadequate coverage with social security system; wrong selection of private social security; new poverty and social exclusion.

⁴⁵ "For successive generations social policy was limited to providing social assistance and insurance against several well-defined social risks such as: short-term unemployment, incapability of working and insufficient resources in childhood and during pension. This approach was based on series of presumptions: that different levels in the life of individuals such as childhood, school, work and pension are clearly marked and separated; that the roles of genders in family are well defined, women being housewives and men employed; that there are strong links within the family nucleus; and that those who are working generally have constant full-time jobs.

These presumptions are no longer applicable to the majority of the OECD countries. Lifestyle varies more and people change or combine different activities at a different age. The model of man-worker is ever more overcome. There is a smaller number of children who spent their entire childhood with both biological parents. People separate and families are frequently re-formed. Employments are often stopped, due to unemployment, disability, resumption of education, child rearing and care for the elderly" (OECD, 2005:1)

economy, according to which the objectives of the welfare state are best achieved by providing efficiency of market and according to which social-political state interventions considerably jeopardize the budget. In that context, they are complementary, among other things, with the ethics of personal responsibility, that is to say reliance on one's own capacities and resources.

Partly under the influence of globalization and neo-liberalism in economy, confronted with objective incapacity or difficulties in sovereign management of economic growth factors, numerous states initiated reforms of social functions in the direction of affirmation of individualist principles. The related argumentation is contained in the need for "[...] a new emphasis on the personal responsibilities of individuals, their families and their communities for their own future well-being and upon their obligation to take active steps to secure this" (Rose, 1996:327-328, quoted according to Larsen, 2005:2).

The appreciation of importance and need for personal activity and responsibility, as well as a series of other social-political goals complementary with this postulate⁴⁶ (for instance reduction in the level of social transfers, encouragement of social inclusion and others) made the strategy of active social policy acceptable for social systems of different nation states. In that manner, although to a different extent and in a different form, the concept of active social policy became an integral part of the reform agenda of contemporary systems of social security⁴⁷. They "may be understood as a new political paradigm in three senses. Firstly, rights are conditioned and therefore dependant on individual behaviour; secondly, we speak about an approach based on individualism, first and foremost on encouragement of willingness of individuals to get employed; and finally it is aimed at economic participation and autonomy" (Jorgensen, Pascual, 2006:1). In an ideal case, the interwoven perspectives of the individual and the system is reflected in the fact that active social policy measures provide opportunities for diminishing situations of social risks.

Concept of Activation in Social Policy

Multidimensional character of the concept of active social policy is supported by the numerousness of factors of social-political, normative, but also of theoretical nature that impact its practical functions, objectives and measures.

Active social policy is linked with the notion of "active society" which also has multi-faceted definition. It primarily relates to self-reliant individual, what is at the same time "a dominant element in the reshaping of social policy" (Larsen, 2005:82). Although present on different levels, redefinition of rights and obligations and well as the change of roles of individuals, their families, different social groups and society on the whole, is taking place in the direction of clear profiling of new quality of relations. Contrary to the dependence on social benefits and assis-

⁴⁶ They are, however, at times mutually contradictory.

⁴⁷ Certainly the principle of activation does not constitute the only dimension of change in modern social policy.

tance of social services in general, the active society is based on the encouragement of activation (i.e. activities or actions) of different social actors, and in particular of individuals.

The very notion of "activation" is interpreted differently, in the following manner: [...] as a group of new discourses and events in social security systems and on the labour market [...] as an action program within political ideology [...] as a concept of new civil ethics [...] and as a new way of governance in society [...]" (Barbier, 2006: 14-15, 17, 27-28).

In essence, measures of activation in modern-day conditions, but also in historical ones, are largely linked to policies on the labour market and to unemployment policies generally⁴⁸, from the perspective of promotion of labour ethics. This is an imperative of acceptance of employment and ensuring existence with one's own (profitable) work⁴⁹ since "work is, in fact, a condition for autonomy of the individual" (Jorgensen, Pascual, 2006:1). In this connection, in economic conditions not conducive to job creation and in which the demand for (low qualified) labour force is insufficient, the emancipating character of activation may be converted into its opposite.

This may be supported by the fact that traditional activation measures are different in certain aspects from the new ones, but not entirely. First of all, active measure existed earlier. However, an important dimension of difference is manifested in the fact that it is "much more focused on the supply side than on the demand side. Secondly, because of the focus on the supply side, the single individual is at the center of policy initiatives" (Larsen, 2005:83). The point is, first of all, that measures of active policy in current circumstances are directed at those who were earlier employed but for certain (sometimes objective) reasons (such as economic recession) lost their jobs. The new value orientation in social policy, nevertheless, exerts "pressure" on an unemployed individual to get employed, and not on a society to open new jobs such was the case earlier combat discrimination during the so-called "golden" period of welfare state. "The idea of the active society based on workfare initiative builds on the asymmetric relationship of rights and obligations since focus is overwhelmingly on the single individuals to be active and self-reliant and much less on governmental obligations to and structural barriers against inclusions on the labour market on decent terms" (Larsen, 2005: 83).⁵⁰

Principles and measures of active social policy have expanded from the field of policies in regard to labour market and unemployment insurance to other areas of

⁴⁸ Active measures on the labour market are diverse. They include, among others:

- different activities carried out by employment agencies;
- training of the unemployed for work;
- measures targeted at young population (training and employment programs, internship)
- subsidized employment (benefits for employers in private sector; assistance to the unemployed for self-employment; state or non-profit sector job creation);
- measures targeted at persons with disabilities (training programs aimed at advancing employment capacities and creation of "protected" jobs) (OECD, according to Barbier, 2006)

⁴⁹ Economic independence creates the possibility of self-determination and individualization.

⁵⁰ This does not relate equally to all countries, that is to say in some it is less and in other more expressed.

the social security system. They are first introduced in the pension and active "working" old age "including mechanisms of financing of social security and complex and diversified interaction among tax policies, social security and other benefits and social services" (Barbier, 2004:5). Of no less importance in conditions of present development is the incorporation of the principle of activation into the education and training policies whose aims are complementary with the aims of social policy.

Conceptual Characteristics of Programs of Active Measures

The absence of generally accepted definition of the concept of active policies⁵¹ leads to differences in their interpretation. On practical level, it is manifested in observing a series of problems when trying to operationalise this concept and in some cases in differentiating between active and passive measures.⁵² Despite that, the inter-connection and dependence of rights exercised in the social security system through participation on the labour market, what constitutes in the widest possible sense the fundament of active social policy, have their history and reasoning in the evolution of social-political measures.

"Poor" legislation - A characteristic example from the past are the so-called poor laws whose adoption in a number of countries of Europe in the 19th century changed the philosophy of policies for the care of the poor applied hitherto. The Elizabeth Poor Act entered into force in 1834 in England established the difference between the measures aimed at incapable of working (old, sick, handicapped "unjustifiable" poverty) and at those capable of working ("justifiable" poverty). According to this law, the first category of the poor exercised rights to certain forms of protection. As distinct from them, the capable of working were accommodated in almshouses - lodgings of stigmatizing nature, and were forced to earn for their life on their own.

In the period preceding the adoption of the law, a Commission that elaborated a number of recommendations in relation to the reform of the law on the poor was established. One of the most important ones, the establishment of the principle affording fewer rights for the poor compared to the rights of workers, the so-called principle of "less eligibility" (Pinker, 1974:46) the aim of which was to provide assistance from the state, brings less benefits than the worst employment. The arguments for its introduction was to prevent the need to rely on the state provided social benefits.

⁵¹ This standpoint may be supported in particular for the EU countries, in which for the time being there is no common definition of activation.

⁵² "Careful examination of consumption details discloses the existence of numerous specific measures difficult to classify under the category of spending exclusively for active or exclusively for passive policy. For example, benefits for short-term jobs are included into passive expenditure because employees continue to work less hours, and it is not likely that they would look for another job. Benefits for winter construction allocated to the construction sector are considered active expenditure while benefits for bad weather conditions are defined as passive expenditure" (Barbier, 2006:18).

Active policies in Scandinavia - The modern "predecessor" of the concept of active social policy originated in Sweden and Denmark in the 1970s. In that period in parallel with emerging unemployment, the unions defined the so-called active policies on the labour market the aim of which was to create new jobs in the public sector, to encourage labour force mobility and lead the training policy.

Nevertheless, the example of active policy measures in Denmark commenced in the late 1989's served as a good practice, as "the slogan of 'activation' since then has become fashionable in political discourse" (Barbier, 2004:4). In the first half of 1990's reforms on the labour market were initiated, and the new social vision, which encouraged active workfare policies, was promoted. The first measures were directed at welfare beneficiaries at the age of 18 and 19 years.

The reforms in the Anglo-Saxon world carried out at this same time and primarily motivated by the reduction of budgetary funds for social transfers were also in favour of accepting active initiatives in social policy.

Reform of social benefits in the USA - With the *Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act* (PRWORA)⁵³ of 1996 the USA has essentially "created the trend of transformation of social benefits policy into labour and employment policy" (Avramovic, 2004:127). The general characteristic of this Act lies in the strong demand for employment of social assistance beneficiaries. Thus one of its innovations was time limitation on the right to financial benefits after which the beneficiary had the obligation to be employed. At the same time the measures for inclusion of under age parents into job training programs were foreseen, and in particular the encouragement of employment of as large number of single parents as possible.

Although the effects of this law cannot be assessed outside the wider social-economic context, in view of the fact that the economic growth ensured, among other things, opening of a large number of new jobs for persons with low qualifications, "popularization of *welfare to workfare strategies* in the US and the wide world usage of English language helped to extend the influence of the workfare concept" (Eransus, 2003:1).

New Deal in Great Britain – At the same time in Great Britain in 1997 *New Deal* foresees the so-called obligatory schemes focusing on young people and long-term unemployment, as well as the so-called voluntary schemes for single parents, persons with disabilities, unemployed over 50 years old and partners of the unemployed. These schemes covered various opportunities such as personal counselling service, support in searching for employment, programs for acquiring working experience and additional qualifications. As in the USA the right to upon unemployment benefits was conditional the participation in some of the planned programs. There are ambivalent opinions about the success of *New Deal* in the United Kingdom. One of the illustrating views is: "A specific success of *New Deal*, from the

⁵³ Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

standpoint of employment and unemployment rates, may be in the worst case questioned and in the best is considered moderate” (Dean, 2006:13).

However, its postulates served as a basis for the implementation of further reforms during 2001 and 2002 which were also motivated by workfare strategy. Eventually, further legislative reforms were proposed with the Green Book, entitled *A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work* of 2006. “Reforms have been constituted around the language of responsibility [...]. The welfare to work approach is characteristically hybrid. It encompasses, on the one hand, a strong emphasis on the empowerment of beneficiaries; on their preparedness and ownership of action plans, use of capabilities [...] On the other hand, the emphasis is on coercion, participation and punishment or reconciliation sanctions” (Dean, 2006:14).

OECD’s Active Social Policy Agenda: The efforts of the OECD aimed at introducing active social policies date back in 1964 and are linked with the recommendation on the promotion of active social policies on the labour market. “At that time, the OECD assessed the combination of policies implemented in Sweden positively. It is only after the neo-liberal turn [...] in a context of separation of macro-economic and social policies, that the notion of ‘active labour market policies’ took its present OECD content, i.e. the focusing on structural and supply-side labour market reforms” (Barbier, 2003:5). At the same time, OECD started to advocate the Danish model of social security system reforms, in the context of activation policies and first of all active measures on the labour market.

Today the most important elements of the OECD’s social policy agenda consist of the following:

- Investment in families and children [...]
- Active social policies to tackle poverty [...] and
- Mobilization of all parts of society in delivering social protection (OECD, 2005:2)

Empowerment of family and children is a primary objective of OECD. The importance of different measures to protect families with children lies, among other things, in negative consequences of generational reproduction of poverty and the present risk of social exclusion. At the same time active social policy measures, viewed from the perspective of decreasing poverty, are most directly linked to integration in the labour market. “Active social policy means getting people off benefits and into work instead of keeping people in a state of dependency. Active social policies that work are, for example: good social and employment supports, making work pay, requiring people on benefits to look for work or training, and making the different public agencies work better” (OECD, 2005:2). Finally, to implement these elements, it is indispensable to redefine and divide responsibilities between the state and other actors. The point in question is division of responsibilities among the state, individuals, their families, different groups in a community and

the community etc. in the context of encouraging responsibility of all for social security (and/or wellbeing).

Active social inclusion at the EU level – Activation and related concepts, that is to say aims, have started to play an important role on the political (and social) agenda of the EU after the Essen Summit of 1994. Previously the White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Employment of 1993 defined the recommendations to advance active social policies on the European labour markets.

Promoting the objectives of reducing the number of poor and socially excluded persons, the EU activation concept relates to both active measures on the labour market and employment policies and to the so-called social activation. In this context, the Commission advocates active involvement of all members of a society, whose component is the following:

- Encouragement of broadening of activities of employment services
- Providing social assistance and minimum material support to all and
- Access to health care, education, social and other services in the society, training programs, child care, etc., flexible working hours, counselling and support (European Social Network, 2006:3).

Activation “Models”

Accesses to active social policies are rather diversified in reality.⁵⁴ One of the reasons comes from the fact that activation measures have been introduced on account of different (political and practical) motivation into different national social security systems. There are numerous factors that determine the level of presence of active measures, as well as the emphasis on a certain segment. Among of the most important ones are:

- nature and characteristics of the economic system and the labour market;
- theoretical, institutional, normative and value postulates of social policy and social security systems; and
- demographic features of the state.⁵⁵

Although theory has not reached an agreement on the position of divergence (vis-à-vis convergence) of active social policies, their positioning may basically be viewed in the context of classification of regimes.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ One of the views is even that:” empirical evidence shows that under this common tendency [activation policy] such different strategies can be discovered that it questions the convenience of using a common term. (Eransus, 2003:1). However, there are opposing views as well.

⁵⁵ Each of these factors is multidimensional.

⁵⁶ The theory of regimes is one of the contemporary approaches to researching similarities and differences among national social security systems. Its wide acceptance was largely facilitated with the study entitled *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* by Gøste Esping-Andersen who classified the ‘worlds of welfare’ into three social

REFRAMING SOCIAL POLICY:

In this connection, Jacob Torfing distinguished between defensive and offensive activation strategies.

	Workfare Activation	Welfare Activation
Political Aim	Reduction of state spending. End of assistance dependency. Access to employment depends on individual.	Promotion of job creation. Better access to labour market for excluded sectors of population. Increased social participation.
Poverty concept	Individual responsibility Underclass approach (as a growing and structural phenomena)	Social responsibility. Exclusion approach (multidimensional and reduced phenomenon)
Labour market	There must be initiatives for employment while social benefits rights are “discouraged”. Encouragement of social beneficiary to quickly return to work: Negative taxes Employment agencies and re-qualification counselling.	Advancement of capacities of excluded sectors of population. Impossibility of integration of all. Aimed at advancement of human capital: Public sector job creation and training resources Counselling mechanisms
Target of the Activation strategy	Only targeted at the most excluded (families with dependent children)	Oriented at overall active population or main priority groups (young, long-term unemployed)
Contents of Strategy	“Work first” Short term strategies based on “carrots and sticks” program	“Improving employability” Training Job experiences Public job creation

Source: Eransus, 2003

The defensive activation strategies are motivated by the need to limit budgetary resources that is to say to reduce state spending; consequently social rights are “narrowed”. Therefore their main characteristic is targeting of rights at material (money) social benefits for those who are absolutely poor and are not in a position to provide basic means to support themselves (on the basis of the officially set poverty line – the so-called pauperism). The purpose of active measures is integration

regimes: liberal, corporate and social-democratic. This theory became the basis for research for many analysts later, but was also disputed. It was added other social models such as South European and Eastern European.

of persons on benefits into the labour market. Leadel & Trickey named this strategy *Work First* since priority is to get a job (irrespective of its duration and/or the fact that the generated income does not provide “exit” from the poverty zone etc.) In line with this,” putting an end to dependence on benefits and combating fraud (identifying people receiving benefits who are capable of working) become a priority for activation (Eransus, 2003:4) and is in accordance with the workfare model.

The workfare activation strategy is characteristic of the liberal social regime. It puts an emphasis on individualism and individual freedoms which cannot be restricted by state actions. Fundamental regulatory mechanism of positioning an individual in a social hierarchy is the market. Consequently, population is generally stimulated to take part in the labour market since it is considered that the market ensures social justice and equality. Social-political measures are primarily aimed at encouraging employment, this being promotion of individual initiatives for employment, providing information on available jobs, but also short-term investment into programs of re-qualification, additional qualification and training in general. Outside the social-political context, individuals are stimulated to work, among other things with tax policy. A characteristic development trend which has influenced negative social policy is that very often “For individuals, having a conventional job in the market tends to be the normal way of accessing protection (both private and social) from risks, and work tends to systematically replace assistance” (Barbier, 2004:7). Namely, employment as the basis for exercising the right to social insurance is expanded for persons capable of working on social benefits system. At the same time, principles of active social policy have expanded, on similar defensive basis, to persons with disabilities but also to pensioners.

Offensive activation strategies are targeted at fighting unemployment and social exclusion. Contrary to defensive strategies, social expenditures are increasing since they are motivated by improvement of life situation of persons on benefits with the aim of spurring their integration into the labour market. Complementary with this, the active social policy represents also a segment of public investment into new jobs creation. “This is represented by the strategy developed by traditionally social-democratic countries called the welfare model in which, as we have seen, the state plays a decisive role in the activation strategy as an employment-generating agent” (Eransus, 2003:5). Offensive strategies are a factor for the development of society because they are not only the expenditure but a long-term investment.

The welfare activation strategy is characteristic of countries with social-democratic regime. The social-political and general social aim of this regime is promotion of equality for all at the “highest level” (Soede at al. 2004:23), resulting in incitement of universal participation in society. Social benefits in this regime, viewed comparatively, are the highest and consequently social assistance beneficiaries are provided a relatively decent standard of living. At the same time, states of social-democratic regime are featured by a long tradition of technical training programs, as well as targeting of the larger segment of funds within social transfers to active workfare measures. The reason is integration of full employment into social and

economic policy. The market does not have unconditional role, that is to say market mechanisms have been modified with certain state measures. ” Activation applies to all citizens in a relatively egalitarian manner and the ‘negotiations’ between the demands of individuals and those of society appears to be much more balanced” (Barbier, 2004:7). A truly active society gains importance in this model since it takes into account diverse capacities and capabilities of individuals and does not relieve the society/state of the obligation to generate preconditions for social security. Of no less importance for social security of individuals is that it does not only offer employment but an appropriate quality of employment. Laedmal & Trickey therefore named this strategy *enhancing human resources strategy*.

Comparative researches speak in favour of the existence of the third, ideal type of activation which has not been consistently studied. In view of the fact that countries of the third, continental social regime differ among themselves most (compared to the difference among the countries of other models) activation strategies in them are consequently the least homogenous.

First and foremost, since they are generally founded on the exercise of social rights on the basis of employment, that is to say payment of employment fees, benefits in the countries of the continental regime are closely linked to participation on the labour market. However, differences among them are based on the strength of this requirement. “This tendency was to a lesser degree present in the strong Bismarck’s welfare regimes such as Germany, but in France – leader of republican tradition – the function of recent programs of social integration was filling the gaps often left by the social security systems based on social insurance payments” (Dean, 2004:191).

One of characteristic examples of activation strategies aimed at social integration are active policies in France introduced in tandem with labour market reforms. Changes of regulations in the area of unemployment insurance commenced in 1992 in France were primarily directed at time limited unemployment benefits and encouragement of the unemployed to accept a job. At the same time, the introduction of minimum social integration benefit (RMI) was supported by both liberal and social-democratic social options; the former have seen in it instrument inspiring employment initiatives; the latter the way to promote rights of excluded and marginalized individuals and groups.

The most important segment of the reform was introduction of negative income tax in 2001⁵⁷, along with the right to personal evaluation and support (PAP) to persons looking for a job. Although it was suggested that this program be conditioned

⁵⁷ Namely it became obvious that certain persons employed at low paid jobs are not eligible for RMI and that essentially they are not motivated to get employed. “In effect, a person that in 2000 earned 442 Euro i.e. 0.5 SMIC loses the right to RMI (350 Euro after reduction of housing benefits). Since RMI provides for benefits in kind, especially for children, the advantage of employment is really rather insignificant if any” (Mandin, C. Palier B., 2003:47). Therefore it was proposed that the state subsidized certain benefits (PPE) to persons making low income, in order that they would not be deprived compared to RMI beneficiaries.

upon acceptance of employment, following the state intervention in 2000, it was determined that unemployment benefits could not be suspended when a beneficiary was given a job below his/her qualifications or when he/she refused to take part in PAP. At the same time, the program of personal evaluation and support is carried out by the Public Employment Agency.

Some of the characteristics of activation policy in France, as well as in other countries of corporate regime, favour offensive and others defensive strategies, respectively. For instance, introduction of social integration benefits is similar to the existing rights in Denmark and Sweden, “although implemented in France less successfully (Barbier, 2003:11). In contrast, reforms moved in the direction of making the state the last and not the first resort for employment. However, as distinct from activation of individuals in the liberal regime, it primarily relates to activation of demand for labour force. Some measures had contradictory effects. Providing social security for social assistance beneficiaries (and to the poor in general) was “jeopardized, if not the opposite, with the concurrent need to protect the rights enjoyed by those employed at the moment, but the primary goal is to create opportunities for employment, to present but not necessarily to guarantee the right to work” (Dean, 2004:191).

Therefore there is no agreement on whether the corporate regime is featured by particular, autonomous active approach or it is a combination of the existing ones.

Conclusion

The Anglo-Saxon countries in which comparatively speaking social transfers are lower are characterized with lower allocations for active social policies. Their defensive activation strategies are partial in nature since they are dominantly targeted at social assistance beneficiaries. The underlying reason comes from the need for further reduction of spending for social benefits and of general budgetary expenditures for social security, that is to say transfers of responsibility for social risks on individual level.

Social-democratic countries, in parallel with the developed passive social policy (comparatively the highest level of social benefits), are featured by the highest spending on active measures, as well as by universal activation policy. In addition to the population capable of working (irrespective of whether they are employed or not), their activation policy principles are targeted at young people, long-term unemployed and old people. When it comes to persons on benefits (or broadly speaking socially excluded), in addition to participation in specifically designed programs for social inclusion, they also take part in programs targeted at the general population.

As regard the spending on active social measures, corporate countries are positioned between Anglo-Saxon and social-democratic ones. In these countries, persons who used to be employed (and afterwards lost their jobs) have essentially dif-

ferent rights from those who were not employed. Activation measures in them do not follow a single, coherent pattern.

A very important correlation of (risks from) poverty (the highest rates in the Anglo-Saxon world, followed by continental and then social-democratic) and social measures indicates to the necessity of ensuring a certain minimum material income (security network) for persons that are poor and/or exposed to poverty risk. In addition to the aspect of income, the poverty concept includes, among other things, dimensions of work, education, housing, as well as accessibility of certain rights and social services. Therefore, passive measures must be accompanied by certain additional measures, that is to say active social policies. The importance of new paradigm of activation is in special correlation with reduction of social exclusion linked with pushing of individuals to a social margin and their social isolation. This results from the fact that different active measures promote opportunities and capacities for employment and full participation in the life of society. Although the most often cause for social exclusion is extreme poverty, the excluded do not have to be only those who are materially vulnerable, but may also be foreigners, migrants, racial, religious and ethnic minorities.

References

Avramović, N. (2004), *Reforme socijalne pomoći u SAD i njihovi efekti*. U: A. Čekerevac (ur.), *Socijalni rad i socijalna politika – Zbornik radova VI* (str. 125-144). Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka.

Barbier, J. C. (2006), *Analyse comparative de l'activation de la protection sociale en France, Grande Bretagne, Allemagne et Danemark, dans le cadre des lignes directrices de la stratégie européenne pour l'emploi*. Rapport de recherche pour la DARES, Ministère du travail. Paris: Centre d'Etudes de l'Emploi.

Barbier, J. C. (2004), *Activating Social Protection and the Employment Insurance*. Berlin Meeting, WZB, May 24-25, 2004.

www.pes.org/downloads/Activating%20social_protection_and_employment_insurance_JC_Barbier.pdf, mart 2007. godine.

Barbier, J. C. (2003), *The European Employment Strategy, a Channel for Activating Social Protection?* In: L. Magnusson, P. Pochet and J. Zeitlin (eds.), *Opening the Method of Coordination; the case of the EES*.

<http://eucenter.wisc.edu/OMC/Summer03Conf/barbier.pdf>, maj 2007. godine.

Dean, H. (2004), *The Implications of Third Way Social Policy for Inequality, Social Cohesion, and Citizenship*. In: J. Lewis and R. Surender (eds.) *Welfare State Change – Towards a Third Way?* (p. 182-206). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dean, H. (2006), *Activation Policies and the Changing Ethical Foundations of Welfare*. A draft for a plenary paper to be presented at a conference „Activation Policies in the EU“, organized by ASPEN/EUIT, Brussels, 20-21 October 2006.

Eransus, B. P. (2003), *Activation Policies and Basic Income Schemes. From welfare to Workfare? or Work for Welfare? The Experience of Southern European Countries*. Universidad Publica de Navarra: Department of Social Work.

www.socsci.aau.dk/ccws/conference-2004/papers/Begona-Perez.pdf, mart 2007. godine.

European Social Network (2006), *Social and Employment Activation*. A briefing paper by the European Social Network.

<http://www.socialeurope.com/inclusion/alldownloads/activation/ESN.S&E%20Activation2%5BENG%5Dsm.pdf>, mart 2007. godine.

Jorgensen, H. Pascual, A. S. (2006), *Supranational Regulation and the Politics of Identity: the Case of Activation Policies*. A conference „Activation Policies in the EU“, organized by ASPEN/EUIT, Brussels, 20-21 October 2006.

<http://aspenn.fss.uu.nl/conference/conferencePapers.php>, mart 2007. godine.

Larsen, J. E. (2005), *The Active Society and Activation Policy*.

www2.ihis.aau.dk/gep/publicationer/nr4.pdf, maj 2007. godine.

Mandin, C. Palier, B. (2003), *Policy Maps – France*.

<http://www.kent.ac.uk/wrasmoc/workingpapers/secondyearreports/policymaps/francepolicymaps.pdf>, septembar 2006. godine.

OECD (2005), *The Active Social Policy Agenda*.

www.oecd.org/socialmin2005, mart 2007. godine.

REFRAMING SOCIAL POLICY:

Pinker, R. (1974), *Socijalna teorija i socijalna politika*. Zagreb: Savez društava socijalnih radnika Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske.

Soede, A. J. Vrooman, J. C. Ferraresi, P. M. Segre, G. (2004), *Unequal Welfare States*. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Vuković, D. (2005), *Socijalna sigurnost i socijalna prava*. Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka.