

QUESTION MODULE DESIGN TEAM (ESS ROUND 4) APPLICATION FORM	
Please return this form by email to:	Mary Keane ess@city.ac.uk (PDF files only)
CLOSING DATE FOR APPLICATIONS: 15:00 hours (CET) on 23rd February 2007	

1. Principal Applicant (person to whom all correspondence will be sent):

Forename: Stefan	Surname: Svallfors
Position: Professor	
Department: Department of Sociology	
Institution: Umeå University	
Full Address:	Stefan Svallfors Department of Sociology Umeå University 901 87 UMEÅ SWEDEN
Tel No: + 46907865560	Email: stefan.svallfors@soc.umu.se

2. Co-Applicants (up to 4):

(i) Forename: Wim	Surname: van Oorschot
Department: Department of Sociology	
Institution: Tilburg University	
Country: Netherlands	Email: w.v.oorschot@uvt.nl

(ii) Forename: Peter	Surname: Taylor-Gooby
Department: School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research	
Institution: University of Kent	
Country: Britain	Email: p.f.taylor-gooby@kent.ac.uk

(iii) Forename: Christian	Surname: Staerklé
Department: Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences	
Institution: University of Geneva	
Country: Switzerland	Email: christian.staerke@pse.unige.ch

(iv) Forename: Jørgen	Surname: Goul Andersen
Department: Department of Economics, Politics and Public Administration	
Institution: Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies, Aalborg University	
Country: Denmark	Email: goul@socsci.aau.dk

3. Proposed title of module (*max 80 characters*):

WELFARE ATTITUDES IN A CHANGING EUROPE

4. Abstract (*max 200 words*)

The module concerns the attitudes towards, and perceptions and evaluations of welfare policies in the broad sense. These data are expected to provide essential input to the interdisciplinary field of comparative studies of welfare state attitudes, to address important everyday-life concerns by citizens, and to offer critical insights of the public legitimacy of welfare state reform.

The following topics are covered:

Predispositions: trust, risk perception, beliefs, social values, personal experiences

Attitudes towards: welfare state scope & responsibilities; taxation & financing; alternative welfare state models; service delivery (privatization, choice etc); target groups / receivers; Europeanisation of welfare policies

Evaluations of: Task performance, Economic consequences, Moral/Social consequences

5. Curriculum vitae

(Please provide a brief cv for each applicant, including subject expertise, questionnaire design and analysis experience, relevant publications and record of joint working – maximum half page per applicant.)

Principal Applicant:

Stefan Svallfors was the national coordinator for Sweden for the first two rounds of the European Social Survey. He was also head of the Swedish part of the International Social Survey Program from its beginning in 1992 until 2003, and is still part of the Swedish ESS and ISSP teams. He participated as a member of the drafting group in the design of the 1996 ("Role of Government III"), 2002 ("Family and Gender III", co-chair) and 2006 ("Role of Government IV", co-chair) ISSP modules. He has a broad experience of managing projects and working in teams: since 1990 he has held 19 grants from Swedish research councils, most of which involved survey data collection and multi-member teams. He has conducted four major national surveys in Sweden on attitudes to the welfare state. His publications are focussed on attitudes towards welfare policies and redistribution, and the correlates of class in comparative perspective.

Selected publications

Svallfors, Stefan 'Worlds of Welfare and Attitudes to Redistribution: A Comparison of Eight Western Nations' *European Sociological Review*, Vol 13 (1997), pp 283-304.

Svallfors, Stefan 'The Class Politics of Swedish Welfare Policies' pp 203-28 in Geoffrey Evans (Ed) *The End of Class Politics? Class Voting in Comparative Context*. Oxford: Oxford university press, 1999.

Svallfors, Stefan & Peter Taylor-Gooby (Eds) *The End of the Welfare State? Responses to State Retrenchment*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Svallfors, Stefan 'Political Trust and Support for the Welfare State: Unpacking a Supposed relationship', pp 184-205 in Bo Rothstein & Sven Steinmo (Eds) *Restructuring the Welfare State: Political Institutions and Policy Change* New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Svallfors, Stefan "Welfare Regimes and Welfare Opinions: a Comparison of Eight Western Countries" *Social Indicators Research*, Vol 64, no 3 (2003), pp 495-520.

Svallfors, Stefan 'Class, Attitudes and the Welfare State: Sweden in Comparative Perspective' *Social Policy & Administration*. Vol 38, no 2 (2004), pp 119-38.

Svallfors, Stefan 'Class and Conformism: A comparison of four Western Countries' *European Societies*, Vol 7 (2) (2005), pp 255-86.

Stefan Svallfors (Ed.) *Analyzing Inequality. Life chances and Social Mobility in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Svallfors, Stefan *The Moral Economy of Class. Class and Attitudes in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.

Svallfors, Stefan (Ed.) *The Political Sociology of the Welfare State: Institutions, Social Cleavages and Orientations*. (Stanford University Press, forthcoming, 2007).

Staffan Kumlin & Stefan Svallfors "Stratification and articulation: why class differences in attitudes differ across countries" (forthcoming in Mau, Steffen & Benjamin Veghte (Eds) *Social Justice, Legitimacy and the Welfare State*, Ashgate, 2007).

Curriculum vitae (continued):

Co-applicant 1:

Wim van Oorschot is Professor of Sociology and Social Policy. His research regards (comparative) studies of poverty, unemployment, disability, and ageing, mostly from the perspective of welfare policy reform and related changes in welfare values and opinions. He has conducted three major Dutch surveys. One on take-up of benefits by elderly people and social assistance clients, and two on popular values, beliefs, feelings and preferences regarding the Dutch work and welfare system. He is initiator and co-coordinator of the "Comparative Module on Welfare Values and Opinions", which is applied in 4 European countries. He is head of the Department of Sociology of Tilburg University, which coordinates the European Values Survey. He is coordinator of the 'solidarity' module of the 1999/2000 EVS wave and has published on its results. Wim van Oorschot is founder and co-chair of the Network for European Social Policy Analysis ESPAnet, and Honorary Professor at the Centre of Comparative Welfare Studies of Aalborg University, Denmark. He is overall-coordinator of the European Data Centre for Work and Welfare, a new initiative under the EU FP6 Network of Excellence 'Reconciling Work and Welfare in Europe' (RECWOWE), he is member of the RECWOWE executive board, and he is associated expert on welfare legitimacy in the EU-FP6 Network of Excellence on 'Economic Change, Quality of Life and Social Cohesion' (EQUALSOC).

Selected publications

W. van Oorschot and L. Halman (2000) 'Blame or fate, individual or social? An international comparison of popular explanations of poverty' in: *European Societies*, vol. 2, nr.1, pp. 1-28

Oorschot, W. van (2000) 'Who should get what, and why' in: *Policy and Politics*, vol.28, nr. 1, pp. 33-49

Oorschot, W. van (2002) 'Popular support for social security: a sociological perspective' in: J. Clasen (ed.) *What future for social security? Debates and reforms in national and cross-national perspective*, Bristol: The Policy Press, p. 33-52

Oorschot, W. van (2002) 'Individual motives for contributing to welfare benefits in the Netherlands', in: *Policy and Politics*, vol. 30, nr. 1, pp. 31-46

Oorschot, W. van, (2005) 'The social capital of European welfare states: the crowding out hypothesis revisited', in: *The Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 15, nr.1, pp. 05-26

Oorschot, W. van, (2005) 'Welfare state effects on social capital and informal solidarity in the European Union: evidence from the 1999/2000 European Values Study', in: *Policy and Politics*, vol. 33, nr.1, pp. 35-56

Oorschot, W. van, (2006) 'Making the difference in social Europe: deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states', in: *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 16, nr. 1, 23-42

Oorschot, W. van and W. Junk (2007) 'Multi-level Determinants of the Public's Informal Solidarity Towards Immigrants in European Welfare States', in: S. Mau and B. Veghte (2007), *Social Justice, Legitimacy and the Welfare State*, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Curriculum vitae (continued):

Co-applicant 2:

Peter Taylor-Gooby is Professor of Social Policy at the University of Kent and Director of the Economic and Social Research Council's Social Contexts and Responses to Risk priority network (£2.8m). He is a Founding Academician at the Association of Learned Societies in Social Sciences, President of the Sociology and Social Policy Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts. His main interests are in social and public policy, especially in a comparative context, in how people understand and manage risk and uncertainty and in public attitude surveys. He has published over 150 papers in refereed journals and 18 academic books and has acted as an adviser to the Department of Health and Social Security the European Commission Research and Employment Directorate Generals, the Faculty and Institute of Actuaries, various research agencies and multi-national companies and to Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation. He chairs the Research Assessment Exercise Social Work and Social Policy panel.

Recent publications include:

Risk in Social Science, (edited, and Jens Zinn), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006

Ideas and the Welfare State, Palgrave, 2005

New Risks, New Welfare, Oxford University Press, 2004

Making a European Welfare State?, Blackwell, 2004

'Market Means, Welfare Ends: the UK Welfare State Experiment', Journal of Social Policy vol. 33, no 4, 2004.

'New Social Risks in Post-Industrial Society', International Social Security Review vol. 57, no 3, 45-64, 2004.

'Open Markets and Welfare Values' European Societies, vol 6, no 1, 9-48, 2004.

'Neglecting Europe' (with Anne Daguerre), Journal of European Social Policy, vol 14, no 1, 25-39, 2004.

'Adaptation to Labour Market Change in France and the UK' (with Anne Daguerre), Social Policy and Administration (special issue), vol 37, no 6, 625-39, 2003.

Risk, Trust and Welfare, Macmillan, 2000.

Curriculum vitae (continued)

Co-applicant 3 (*if applicable*):

Christian Staerklé is a social and political psychologist working at the University of Geneva, Switzerland. He has directed a representative survey on public attitudes towards the welfare state in Switzerland, funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. He has then spent two years at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he has conducted extensive research with international databases on ethnic identity, nationalism and prejudice. He has a broad experience in data analysis and questionnaire construction. His research focuses on the links between everyday justice reasoning and political theories and draws upon a cognitive approach to public opinion. His publications cover topics derived from a political approach to social psychology, concerning for example the role of prejudice in public opinion, minority-majority differences in political attitudes and the social construction of legitimacy judgements. He is currently studying attitudes towards disciplinary state action and their relationship to welfare attitudes.

Selected publications

Staerklé, C., Delay, C., Gianettoni, L., & Roux, P. (2007, in press). Qui a droit à quoi? Représentations et légitimation de l'ordre social. [Who is entitled to what? Representations and legitimation of the social order]. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.

Staerklé, C., Delay, C., Gianettoni, L., & Roux, P. (2007, in press). Régulations disciplinaire et redistributive : Le double effet du sentiment de vulnérabilité matérielle. [Disciplinary and redistributive regulation : The double effect of the feeling of material vulnerability]. Bulletin de psychologie.

Green, E., Staerklé, C., & Sears, D.O. (2006). Symbolic racism and Whites' attitudes towards punitive and preventive crime policies. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30, 435-454.

Staerklé, C., Sidanius, J., Green, E., & Molina, L. (2005). Ethnic minority-majority asymmetry and attitudes towards immigrants across 11 Nations. *Psicologia Politica*, 30, 7-26.

Staerklé, C., & Clémence, A. (2004). Why people are committed to human rights and still tolerate their violation. A contextual analysis of the principle-application gap. *Social Justice Research*, 17, 389-406.

Staerklé, C., Roux, P., Delay, C., Gianettoni, L. & Perrin, C. (2003). Consensus and conflict in lay conceptions of citizenship: Why people reject or support maternity policies in Switzerland. *Psychologica Belgica* (Special issue Social identity and citizenship), 43, 9-32.

Staerklé, C., Roux, P., Delay, C., & Gianettoni, L. (2003). Droits et appartenances dans une société fragilisée: analyse de la légitimité populaire de l'Etat social suisse [Rights and memberships in a fragile society : analysis of the popular legitimacy of the Swiss welfare state]. Final research report for the Swiss National Science Foundation, PNR

Curriculum vitae (continued)

Co-applicant 4 (if applicable):

Jørgen Goul Andersen is professor of Political Sociology, director of Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies, Aalborg University. His main research interests are welfare research and political behaviour. He is coordinator of Danish Election Studies Programme (since 1998) and of the Danish ISSP Programme (since 1997). He was member of the board of the Danish Democracy and Power Study (1998-2003); co-initiator, working group coordinator and management committee member of COST A13: Changing Labour Markets, Welfare Policies and Citizenship; and Management Committee Member of the ESF Network Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID). He has directed numerous large-scale survey based research projects on citizenship and political participation (1979, 1998, 2000), welfare values (2000), political attitudes, elections and referenda (since 1978), unemployment and marginalisation (1998-03, 2005-09), as well as projects on political decision-making processes, inequality, welfare issues, etc. Currently he is the director of the research programme "New Challenges, Politics and Changing Welfare Policy. Danish Welfare Architecture in a Comparative Perspective (2005-2008). He is author/editor of some 35 academic books and some 150 scientific articles.

Selected books in English:

Andersen, JG, Guillemand, A-M, Jensen, PH & Pfau-Effinger, B, eds. (2005). *The Changing face of Welfare*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Naeyele, G., Barkholdt, C., deVroom, B., Andersen, JG. & Krämer, K. (2003). *A new organisation of time over working life*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Andersen, JG., Clasen, J., van Oorschot, W. & Halvorsen, K., eds. (2002) *Europe's New State of Welfare*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Andersen, JG & Jensen, Per H., eds., (2002) *Changing Labour Markets, Welfare Policies and Citizenship*. Policy Press.

Andersen, JG & Hoff, J (2001) *Democracy and Citizenship in Scandinavia*. Palgrave.

Borre, O & Andersen, JG (1997). *Voting and Political Attitudes in Denmark*. Aarhus University Press. in Danish

Nielsen, JA & Andersen, JG (2006). *Hjemmehjælp mellem myte og virkelighed*. University of Southern Denmark Press

Andersen, JG (2004). *Et ganske levende demokrati*. Aarhus University Press.

Larsen, CA & Andersen, JG (2004). *Magten på Borgen*. Aarhus University Press.

Andersen, JG & Borre, O, eds. (2003). *Politisk forandring*. Aarhus: Systime.

Andersen, JG (2003). *Over-Danmark og under-Danmark?* Aarhus University Press.

Togeby, L, Andersen, JG, Christiansen, PM, Jørgensen, TB & Vallgård, S (2003). *Magt og demokrati i Danmark*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Andersen, JG., ed., Larsen, CA & Jensen JB (2003) *Marginalisering og velfærdspolitik. Arbejdsløshed, jobchancer og trivsel*. Copenhagen: Frydenlund.

6. Theory behind proposed module (*max 5000 words*):

(A description of the theory that is driving the proposal, demonstrating the team's expertise in the chosen topic (citing relevant literature, past studies, and publications in the field). Explain the relevance of the topic to a key academic or policy concern within the European arena). A list of the variables to be measured should be specified. Full details on the requirements for this section are contained in 'Procedures for appointment and guidelines for applications of ESS question module design teams'.

THIS BOX WILL EXPAND AS YOU ADD TEXT.

WELFARE ATTITUDES IN A CHANGING EUROPE

I. Introduction: Why We Need This Module

The module we propose to the European Social Survey 2008 concerns the attitudes towards, and perceptions and evaluations of welfare policies in the broad sense. These data are expected to provide essential input to the interdisciplinary field of comparative studies of welfare state attitudes, to address important everyday-life concerns by citizens, and to offer critical insights of the public legitimacy of welfare state reform, thereby ensuring high policy relevance of the module. They will be of value to the European research community for several reasons:

A. The new module will make possible rigorous cross-national comparisons of the impact of cultural and institutional variation on attitudes towards welfare provision and its financing. Furthermore, we will be able to analyse the impact of cultural and social diversity within countries, in terms of class, gender, ethnicity, life-styles and life-courses, on attitudes towards welfare policies across Europe. It will thus provide a unique opportunity to survey the interactive effects of social status and national/cultural membership on welfare opinions.

B. Social and economic changes are leading to new forms of diversity, new patterns of vulnerability and new resources, both at the individual and at the institutional level. The module we propose will enable us to chart perceptions of these changes in detail and to identify opportunities for the provision of welfare in ways that are appropriate to the current context.

C. European welfare states are under increasing pressure from a number of directions. Population ageing and shifts in family patterns increase needs, while the pressures of globalisation on national competitiveness restrict the capacity to finance expansive welfare policies. Furthermore, welfare states have been accused of damaging social ties and undermining traditional forms of solidarity. New data gathered in a structured way in order to facilitate cross-national comparison will enable the question of the political legitimacy of current welfare reform (retrenchment or recalibration) in different national settings to be thoroughly examined.

A. Institutional and Cultural Variation Across Europe

A substantial number of studies have contributed to our understanding of how institutional and cultural factors impinge on the formation of attitudes in different contexts (for a selection of recent book-length examples, see Roller 1992; Cook and Barrett 1992; Martinussen and Jenssen 1994; Scarborough and Borre 1995; Svallfors 1996; Gilens 1999; Svallfors and Taylor-Gooby 1999; Andress et al. 2001; Arriba et al 2006; Larsen 2006; Staerklé 2007a; Svallfors 2007). From the 1990s onwards, a growing number of studies have also been conducted from a comparative perspective, trying to explain variations across countries in attitudes towards welfare policies and redistribution (see, for example, Bonoli 2000; van Oorschot and Halman 2000; Andress and Heien 2001; Mau 2003; Brooks & Manza 2006; Jæger 2006; Larsen 2006; Svallfors 1997; 2003; 2007).

Data limitations have forced researchers to conduct these comparisons at a fairly general level, thus possibly concealing important variations between various welfare regimes. What is crucially lacking is data that (a) are more firmly based in welfare state theory; (b) more clearly specify the relevant dependent variables that may reveal variations between different institutional and cultural environments; and yet (c) are comparable across countries.

Existing comparative data sets, such as the European/World Values Studies and the International Social Survey Program, cover a broad range of countries with widely different cultural and historical

traditions, and huge differences in institutional conditions. The issues that have been possible to address in such surveys are therefore restricted to fairly broad and general ones that might not fully capture the variations in attitudes among populations of the advanced industrial societies.

Existing national data sets often cover a much more specific range of issues, dealing with issues such as risk perception, trust in the welfare state, beliefs about sustainability, views about target groups and claimants, attitudes to service delivery, views about alternative welfare arrangements etc. Because these data were generally not produced with a comparative framework in mind, they are typically framed in nationally idiosyncratic ways, and, of course, cannot be compared across countries due to differences in item framing and question wording.

The scientific relevance of producing a new comparative dataset on this topic is therefore evident, in that we will be able to analyse the impact of institutional and cultural variation on attitudes, perceptions and aspirations towards the welfare state within the European populations.

B. New Forms of Diversity

Welfare policies deal with concrete life-course risks faced by citizens such as illness, unemployment, economic hardship and old age. Therefore, welfare state issues have strong relevance with respect to citizens' everyday concerns. Various social and institutional actors provide protection against negative consequences of such risks, for example by offering economic support in periods of hardship or by ensuring access to care and service. Welfare policies can be seen as one of the ways in which a society organises to meet our common vulnerability and need for protection. It is therefore of great importance to investigate citizens' attitudes towards these arrangements, and their recent restructuring and recalibration.

In several respects developments over the last decades have increased diversity in relation to welfare policies and the degree and type of social protection they provide. Examples at the individual level include increased ethnic diversity among target populations as well as among the populations at large, and increased diversity along the life-cycle, taking different shapes across welfare regimes, and creating new forms of risk (and perceptions of risk by members of different groups). At the institutional level increased diversity is found in the form of provider pluralism and new forms of public management, and in new forms of policies and state intervention, in particular in relation to work-family reconciliation and activation. It is therefore urgent and timely to consider the valuation among European populations of these changes and their importance for understanding public support for redistribution and other forms of state intervention. Possible future replications of the module will allow further possibilities for analyses of the dynamics of public opinion and of the causal relation between institutional change and changes in attitudes, values and perceptions, as well as the relation between structural changes in the economy and the labour market, and changes in attitudes.

C. The political legitimacy of welfare state reform

The rapid changes faced by European welfare states impinge on attitudes towards welfare policies. Rising concerns about welfare state sustainability (due to demographic changes and international economic competition), persistent unemployment in many European countries, increased population diversity (in terms of ethnic composition, family forms and employment relations), encompassing policy changes (pension reforms in several European countries being a case in point), and the slowly growing "Europeanization" of welfare policies are all factors that are likely to affect citizens' views about welfare state arrangements, and also their trust in and attitudes to political actors and institutions.

Since the inhabitants of national welfare states are in the last instance both financiers of and beneficiaries from welfare policies, their views about the fairness and legitimacy of these arrangements and their distributional effects are of fundamental political importance. Recent political reshuffles and discontent in the Western part of Europe can in most instances be traced, in one way or the other, to welfare state issues. National surveys have shown that welfare retrenchment is a highly unpopular course of action. But they have also shown that retrenchment and cost-containing restructuring may under certain conditions be widely accepted. What are the conditions of such acceptance - and is it compatible with maintaining support for distributive equality, or does it entail declining solidarity and less concern for just distribution? Again, later replication of the module will allow us to assess the dynamic impact of the rich variety of current welfare reforms.

The experiences of several of the most recent EU members, along other countries in Eastern Europe, are also instructive in pointing to the problems of establishing a functioning welfare state amidst resource scarcity and population decline. Social cohesion is defined as a fundamental policy goal within the European Union; yet many countries have to struggle hard, in the face of demographic

changes and economic scarcity, to provide adequate and sustainable welfare policies that will contribute to this goal. The data we aim at producing through the European Social Survey will help to elucidate citizens' experience with and attitudes towards welfare policies, and in this way contribute to a more enlightened debate about policy options and choices.

Relevance to the ESS

The European Social Survey is the ideal vehicle for the proposed module for several reasons. The most important is probably that the ESS encompasses enough institutional and cultural diversity to make systematic international comparisons possible. For example, all the "worlds of welfare" that Esping-Andersen (1990) and others (Castles and Mitchell 1992; Korpi and Palme 1998; Leibfried 1992; Lewis 1992) have identified are included in the range of countries. Comparisons in several different dimensions are possible (East vs. West; North vs. South; between "worlds of welfare", between countries with high and low diversity, etc), which will make the data set attractive even beyond the group of scholars specifically occupied with attitudes to welfare policies, such as "area specialists", electoral researchers, cultural psychologists and economists, social geographers, and comparative political scientists and sociologists.

These considerations make it clear that welfare state issues are by no means restricted to the most encompassing welfare states of north-western Europe, even if much of the existing research – mainly due to data access – deals with these particular countries. The issues are just as relevant, perhaps even more so, for Mediterranean welfare states struggling with declining birth rates and population ageing, and for Eastern European countries struggling to establish new forms of social protection. Furthermore, there is an obvious theoretical need to widen the focus of comparison beyond the standard set of countries included in comparative analyses of welfare state attitudes, and our module would create new data making this possible.

Yet, the ESS countries are not so fundamentally different so as to make meaningful comparisons impossible. By global standards, they have fairly similar cultures and fairly similar levels of economic development. The over-diversity that has marred other comparative surveys, sometimes to the point of precluding interesting comparisons, is not present within the ESS.

The issues we raise in our proposal have not been addressed to any significant degree in the first three rounds of the ESS, nor in other comparative surveys, so the data will clearly be a new addition. Yet, as will be clear in the following sections, we will at several points make use of existing standard ESS items in our own analytical framework. In addition to gains in analytical leverage, this will make the proposed module a well integrated part of the whole survey.

II. Conceptual Framework for the Study

Our conceptual framework is summarised in a heuristic model (figure 1). Reading this figure clockwise from the lower left-hand box gives a picture of how we hypothesise the causal mechanisms, and shows how we conceptualise the different components.

The importance of applying a comparative perspective becomes clear if we take our starting point in the risks and resources that different individuals are exposed to and endowed with, and the institutional framework in which these individuals are embedded. On the one hand, risks and resources vary between different groups with different socio-demographic characteristics, both within and between countries. We assume that citizens develop a sense of being exposed to different forms of risk (e.g., unemployment, poor health, solitude, lack of resources) on the basis of their position in the social hierarchy and of their everyday experiences. This risk perception is expected to be a major factor shaping predispositions and attitudes towards welfare policies.

On the other hand, the most important institutional variations are (still) found between nation states, and the European area provides ample opportunities for comparisons in this regard, because of the large variation that is found among its' national welfare policy regimes. Institutions are crucial for the formation of attitudes in several respects: First, institutions modify the structure of risks, resources, possibilities and incentives. Second, institutions affect perceptions and norms in a more direct way, since they affect (a) the visibility of social phenomena; (b) the outcomes citizens consider politically possible to achieve in a given setting; and (c) the policies and regulations citizens consider fair, just and legitimate.

The institutions that we expect to be especially crucial in regards to the formation of welfare opinions are those related to the programmatic structure of the welfare state, and those related to the connection of work, families and welfare policies. Here, our project will benefit from the establishment of the European Data Centre for Work and Welfare (EDAC), under directorship of co-applicant van

Oorschot, that will provide convenient access to data regarding work and welfare in the European countries. EDAC is now being established and will be fully operational when data from ESS2008 become available, providing access to institutional and other macro-data for analyses.

In our framework, risks/resources and the institutional conditions give rise to a set of predispositions, which are hypothesised to act as mediators from risks/resources and institutional factors to attitudes to, and evaluations of, welfare policies. We discern five such predispositions: (1) trust, (2) risk perception, (3) beliefs about the functioning and sustainability of welfare policies, (4) social values, and (5) personal experiences.

Figure 1: A conceptual framework for analysing attitudes to welfare policies (see separate sheet)

The first element is trust, which can be organised into three subcomponents : (a) the level of trust in various kinds of institutions, in particular institutions delivering welfare policies, but also political institutions more generally, (b) trust in political actors, such as politicians and parties, and (c) interpersonal trust in one's fellow citizens, expressed in questions such as "are they reliable or not ?", "would they take advantage of you if they got the chance ?". All three types of trust have been shown to vary both between different institutional settings and between more or less endowed individuals (Uslaner 2002; Rothstein 2005). Thus, we expect trust in institutions, political actors and fellow citizens to be a major factor affecting attitudes towards the welfare state and evaluations of its performance.

The second element is risk perception. The welfare state can be conceptualised as a system for risk reduction and redistribution. From a simple "rational choice"-perspective, one would expect individuals who perceive their risks for sustenance problems at the market to be particularly severe, to be most in favour of encompassing and collective welfare policies. But the effects of perceived risk and vulnerability are likely to be much more complex. It has been shown that vulnerability leads to suspicious and distrusting attitudes, to more pessimistic outlooks on society and on the future, and to heightened levels of perceived threat. Vulnerability could thus on the one hand increase support for collective welfare policies (as a response to increased levels of collective risk), but may on the other hand also give rise to exclusionary attitudes restricting welfare provision to certain categories of citizens (Staerklé et al., 2007b).

Third, beliefs about the role of state institutions in citizens' lives, including the functioning of welfare policies and the sustainability of the welfare state, is expected to shape attitudes and evaluations of welfare policies. Not least, there are expectations about the enabling features of welfare states to enhance the capabilities of diverse groups. Such beliefs are likely to vary between groups and between institutional contexts. The cognitive basis for attitudes in this field is a clearly under-researched area, but it has a strong potential of becoming a major topic of investigation in future research on political attitudes. Previous research, which is mainly American, shows for example that perceived size of the groups of claimants has an effect on attitudes to welfare spending (Hills 2002; Kuklinski and Quirk 1997) and similar points are observed in relation to attitudes to ethnic minorities (Banting et al. 2007). It is not clear, however, how far the impact of beliefs about how welfare policies relate to individual circumstances can be attributed to rational and self-interested judgements or to group identities. Another central issue concerns the question to what extent such judgements may be changed by new knowledge, or indeed how far American results can be extrapolated to other contexts.

In relation to beliefs about sustainability, it should be noted that even people who are normatively disposed to favour redistribution and collective risk reduction, may not support extensive welfare policies if they believe that the welfare state is simply not (or no longer) affordable. On the other hand, individuals do not necessarily have to see immediate personal benefit to give implicit support to redistributive structures (Sefton, 2005).

Fourth, the social values of individuals are likely to have a strong impact on their attitudes to and evaluations of welfare policies. Ideological beliefs about justice principles, equity, desert and merit (van Oorschot, 2006), but also about desirable human traits in terms of individuality and conformity, are likely to have a substantial impact on the ways in which welfare policies are judged. Social values form the bases for normative judgements about welfare policies and their impact.

Lastly, the personal experiences of encounters with the welfare state in its concrete manifestations are also likely to have an impact. Research has shown that personal experiences as welfare client and receiver have a substantial impact not only on judgements about particular welfare policies and institutions, but on political attitudes more broadly (Soss 1999; Kumlin 2004). Since existing research of this issue consists of single-country studies, we know little about how such effects may vary across national contexts. It is likely that effects are affected by the institutional framework, which makes a

comparative perspective highly pertinent.

Moving our attention to the upper right-hand box of figure 1, we find a set of aspects of attitudes to welfare policies that we propose to survey. The first one is attitudes to welfare state scope and responsibilities. Such attitudes refer to the measures citizens think that the state and public authorities should enact in order to redistribute resources and safe-guard against risks. The central question citizens need to answer in this respect concerns the line to be drawn between public and private responsibilities.

Closely connected to that issue is the question of collective financing. What do European populations think about current levels of taxation? How should welfare policies be financed? To what extent are citizens prepared to pay higher taxes themselves in order to increase or maintain spending on welfare policies? What do they think about the distribution of taxes? Do they think that taxes are collected in an efficient and just way? What does the public think about alternative means of financing, such as user fees and social security contributions? Responses to such questions reveal the self- or other-interested motivations behind welfare attitudes and point towards the justice principles citizens enact when taking up a stance toward welfare policies.

In European welfare states, a number of different models of welfare policies are present: universal vs. means-tested, income-related vs. flat-rate etc. What is the perceived legitimacy of alternative welfare state models? Which ones do people prefer when given a choice? Which ones do they find most fair and just? Do their preferences match their current welfare regime?

A fourth aspect deals with service delivery in the welfare state. Do citizens think that public providers deliver services and benefits in an efficient, just and forthcoming way? What do they think of alternative providers, about privatization and increased consumer choice?

A fifth aspect deals with attitudes towards the target groups and receivers of welfare policies. What are the attitudes among the public at large towards those receiving various kinds of benefits and services? A considerable amount of research has studied this issue (see Gilens, 1999). A major finding is that attitudes towards beneficiaries are a key driving force behind welfare opinions. To the extent that welfare recipients are perceived as undeserving and untrustworthy, their claims and rights are likely to be considered illegitimate and abusive. Often entire ethnic or cultural minority groups are the target of discrimination and stigmatisation (as in the racism directed at African-Americans in the US, or at the Romani population in many East European countries) which makes it all the more unlikely that policies benefiting these groups will enjoy large public legitimacy.

The last aspect we seek to tackle is attitudes towards the slowly growing Europeanization of welfare policies. Although no legislation has been adopted that involves actual social transfers to the citizens of the EU, the question whether this development is approved and supported by the citizens of the member states becomes increasingly relevant. Hence, it needs to be asked how citizens perceive a shift of competencies towards the European level, i.e. European regulation and/or coordination? How do they perceive the increasing effect of EU regulation, and how are such changes evaluated? Furthermore, we need to ask about the national boundaries of redistributive communities: To what extent are citizens prepared to redistribute resources to citizens of other (European) countries?

The last box of figure 1 shows three aspects of citizens' evaluations of the welfare state. We hypothesise that these evaluations have a reciprocal relationship with attitudes towards different aspects of welfare policies.

The first such evaluation is of the task performance of the welfare state: to what extent are welfare policies able to solve the problems they are supposed to solve? Does the schooling system provide a good education, does the public health care system provide an adequate health care, does the social insurance system safeguard against problems of sustenance, etc? Such evaluations of task performance can be made both at a personal and at a societal level. In personal evaluations, individuals judge whether or not the welfare state provides well for them personally, for example concerning one's own pension. In societal evaluations, individuals indicate to what extent they think the welfare state provides adequately for citizens in general: Do most pensioners get a reasonable pension or not?

The second aspect of evaluations concerns the economic consequences of welfare policies. Do such policies stifle or promote economic growth? Do they decrease or increase inequality in society? A related question concerns the impact on people's work ethic: Do given welfare policies make people more or less productive and hard-working? Such issues are the subject of heated political debate; yet we know little about how such judgements vary across countries and across groups among ordinary citizens.

The last type of evaluations concerns the perceived moral and social consequences of welfare policies, for example concerning issues such as divorce, child upbringing, and family and gender relations. This set of questions refers to perceptions of social cohesion and social order in relation with the welfare state. To what extent do people consider that fundamental values underlying social organisation are weakened or bolstered through various welfare policies? Such perceptions are particularly important with respect to reactions to deviance and marginality, and thus to an important category of welfare recipients. In a first step, it is important to study the extent to which citizens perceive any such moral influences. In a second step, it is necessary to know how such influences, if acknowledged, are evaluated. For example, if welfare policies are seen as making it easier to divorce, or generally to pursue non-traditional family forms, is this a desirable or undesirable outcome?

As all models, ours is necessarily a simplification and its purposes at the present stage are purely heuristic. In real social processes, feedback effects are likely to abound, as are interaction effects. The exact relationship between the different elements and aspects of the model has to be the object of detailed empirical analysis once data are in place. It should also be pointed out that our framework is a flexible working tool. We will modify the model as appropriate in the light of empirical testing. The data to be gathered permits rigorous testing and development of the model, which we believe will provide an important influence on the development of research in this field.

III. The team and their network

In addition to the five people listed at the application form, the application team includes Steffen Mau (University of Bremen), and John Hills and Tom Sefton (London School of Economics). The team is comprised of scholars from several social science disciplines (sociology, political science, social policy, social psychology, economics), and incorporates a rich experience of survey research, both at a national and at a comparative level. The applicants have all published widely in the field (see CV summaries).

The team has a fairly extensive history of cooperation. The core of it was formed as an outcome of a conference at Tilburg University in 2004. The aim of this conference was to take stock of existing national and comparative datasets regarding attitudes to welfare policies, and discuss possibilities for future cooperation. An important outcome of the meeting was the decision to set up a smaller team that would apply for a future module in the European Social Survey. Both before and after the meeting, participants in the team have collaborated successfully on numerous occasions (see the attached CVs). In addition to various joint projects and publications, an important outcome has been the development of a "Comparative Module on Welfare Values and Opinions", which has recently been fielded in national surveys in Denmark, Norway and the Netherlands, with a future replication scheduled in Finland. The core of the module will also be replicated in Britain and Germany. Apart from indicating our ability for successful collaboration, these surveys will serve as a possible source for items to be included in the ESS module. We feel confident that we will continue to work well as a team, and will fully oblige to the ESS procedures, rules and deadlines.

Our team will have access to support from a reference group of experts that will provide information and feedback in the questionnaire design process. This advisory group includes Helena Blomberg-Kroll (University of Helsinki), Barbara Hobson (Stockholm University), Orsolya Lelkes (European Centre for Social Welfare, Vienna), Luis Moreno (Spanish National Research Council), and Martin Potůček (Charles University, Prague). A particular advantage of this group is that it also includes scholars from Eastern and Southern Europe, regions that are not represented in our team.

A further strength of our team is that it has direct personal links to the Network for European Social Policy Analysis (ESPAnet, www.espanet.org), which has more than 1000 members among academics and European policy-makers. ESPAnet runs a newsletter and organises seminars on topics related to social policies in Europe, including an annual conference, annual "young researchers' workshops", and an annual summer school. This wider network will provide access to arenas for dissemination, publicity and critical scrutiny of results. In all likelihood, this will increase usage of the module far beyond the group of scholars who are currently working in the field. It will also increase even further the international visibility and reputation of the European Social Survey as a whole.

References

- Alesina, A. and Glaeser, E. L. (2004) *Fighting poverty in the US and Europe : a world of difference*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Andress, H. J. and Heien, T. (2001) Four worlds of welfare state attitudes? A comparison of Germany, Norway, and the United States; *European Sociological Review*, 17, 337-356.
- Andress, H.-J., Heien, T. and Hofäcker, D. (2001) *Wozu brauchen wir noch den Sozialstaat?: Der deutsche Sozialstaat im Urteil seiner Bürger*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Arriba, A.; Calzada, I. and del Pino, E. (2006), *Las actitudes de los españoles hacia el Estado del Bienestar (1985-2005)*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (Colección Opiniones y Actitudes, no. 55).
- Banting, K., Johnston, R., Kymlicka, W. and Soroka, S. (2007). "Do Multiculturalism Policies Erode the Welfare State? An Empirical Analysis," in Banting, K. & Kymlicka, W. (Eds), *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonoli, G. (2000) Public Attitudes to social protection and political economy traditions in Western Europe; *European Societies*, 2, 431-52.
- Brooks, C. and Manza, J. (2006) 'Social Policy Responsiveness in Developed Democracies' *American Sociological Review*, Vol 71, s 474-94.
- Castles, F. G. and Mitchell, D. (1992) Identifying welfare state regimes: the links between politics, instruments and outcomes; *Governance*, 5, 1-26.
- Cook, F. L. and Barrett, E. J. (1992) *Support for the American welfare state : the views of Congress and the public*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Gilens, M. (1999) *Why Americans Hate Welfare. Race, Media and the Politics of Antipoverty Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hills, J. (2002) Following or leading public opinion? Social security policy and public attitudes since 1997; *Fiscal Studies*, 23, 539-58.
- Jæger, M. M. (2006) Welfare Regimes and Attitudes Towards Redistribution: The Regime Hypothesis Revisited; *European Sociological Review*, 22, 157-170.
- Korpi, W. and Palme, J. (1998) The paradox of redistribution and strategies of equality: Welfare state institutions, inequality, and poverty in the western countries; *American Sociological Review*, 63, 661-687.
- Kuklinski, J. and Quirk, P. (1997) Political facts and public opinion, Paper presented at the "The future of fact" conference, Philadelphia.
- Kumlin, S. (2004) *The personal and the political : how personal welfare state experiences affect political trust and ideology*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Larsen, C. A. (2006) *The institutional logic of welfare attitudes : how welfare regimes influence public support*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Leibfried, S. (1992) Towards a European Welfare State? On integrating poverty regimes into the European Community; In *Social Policy in a Changing Europe* (Eds, Ferge, Z. and Kolberg, J. E.) Westview, Boulder, pp. 245-79.
- Lewis, J. (1992) Gender and the Development of Gender Regimes; *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2, 159-73.
- Martinussen, W. and Jenssen, A. T. (1994) *Velferdsstaten i våre hjerter*, Ad notam Gyldendal, Oslo.
- Mau, S. (2003) *The Moral Economy of Welfare States. Britain and Germany compared*, Routledge, London.
- Roller, E. (1992) *Einstellungen der Bürger zum Wohlfahrtsstaat der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Westdeutscher Vlg, Opladen.
- Rothstein, B. (2005) *Social traps and the problem of trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scarborough, E. and Borre, O. (Eds.) (1995) *The scope of government*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Sefton, T. (2005) "Public attitudes to redistribution", in A. Park et al. (eds.) *British Social Attitudes: The 22nd report*, Sage, London.
- Soss, J. (1999) Lessons of welfare: Policy design, political learning, and political action; *American Political Science Review*, 93, 363-80.
- Staerklé, C., Delay, C., Gianettoni, L., & Roux, P. (2007a, in press). Qui a droit à quoi? Représentations et légitimation de l'ordre social. [Who is entitled to what ? Representations and legitimation of the social order]. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Staerklé, C., Delay, C., Gianettoni, L., & Roux, P. (2007b, in press). Régulations disciplinaire et redistributive: Le double effet du sentiment de vulnérabilité matérielle. [Disciplinary and redistributive regulation : The double effect of the feeling of material vulnerability]. *Bulletin de psychologie*.
- Svallfors, S. (1996) *Välfärdsstatens moraliska ekonomi : välfärdsopinionen i 90-talets Sverige*, Boréa, Umeå.

- Svallfors, S. (1997) Worlds of welfare and attitudes to redistribution: A comparison of eight western nations; *European Sociological Review*, 13, 283-304.
- Svallfors, S. (2003) Welfare Regimes and Welfare Opinions: a Comparison of Eight Western Countries; *Social Indicators Research*, 64, 495-520.
- Svallfors, S. (Ed.) (2007) *The Political Sociology of the Welfare State: Institutions, Social Cleavages and Orientations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Svallfors, S. and Taylor-Gooby, P. (Eds) (1999) *The end of the welfare state? : responses to state retrenchment*, Routledge, London.
- Uslaner, E. M. (2002) *The moral foundations of trust*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- van Oorschot, W. and Halman, L. (2000) Blame or Fate, Individual or Social? An International Comparison of Popular Explanations of Poverty; *European Societies*, 2, 1-28.
- van Oorschot, W., (2006) 'Making the difference in social Europe: deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states' , in: *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 16, pp 23-42.

7. Proposed module design (max 2000 words):

Outline, in advance of a first draft of actual questions, how the team proposes to operationalise their measurement objectives. This section should succinctly state the theoretical questions to be answered and then propose the method for doing this. Please describe the proposed coverage of each set of measures and indicate the final information requirement. All of the variables to be measured stated in Section 6 should be covered here. In addition please identify any existing indicators that might successfully be deployed cross-nationally). Full details on the requirements for this section are contained in 'Procedures for appointment and guidelines for applications of ESS question module design teams'.

THIS BOX WILL EXPAND AS YOU ADD TEXT.

In this section we present all the key concepts from our model, indicate which types of measures we suggest to use, and point out where existing comparative and national items can be used or adapted, and where existing ESS core items will be useful. Numbers for ESS items refer to the 2006 questionnaire.

Abbreviations: CMWV=Comparative Module on Welfare Values and Opinions (as discussed in section 6); ISJP=International Social Justice Project; ISSP=International Social Survey Program; BSA=British Social Attitudes; DES=Danish Election Surveys; DWS = Dutch Welfare Surveys (1995, 2006); FWS=Finnish Welfare Surveys; SOM=Society, Opinion, Media Surveys (Sweden); SpWS (Spanish Welfare Surveys); SWL=Swiss Welfare Legitimacy Surveys; SWS=Swedish Welfare Surveys (four national surveys 1986-2002).

1. Socio-demographic characteristics (no new items needed): We intend to use existing ESS items in order to indicate people's age (F3), gender (F2), occupation (F12-F17, F22-F25), education level (F6-F7), household characteristics (F4, F60-F70), etc.

2. Risks & Resources: (no new items needed) We intend to use existing ESS items in order to indicate, for example: Economic resources and problems (F32-34), Present and previous unemployment (F8, F27-F29), Low education (F6), Health (C15, C16), Social networks (C2-C4).

3. Institutional framework: (not part of the questionnaire) Our module will benefit from the collection of data at EDAC (as discussed in section 6). In addition, there are many other comparative data bases that analysts may use to model the institutional framework, or to use as input in constructing more qualitative typologies.

4. Predispositions:

a, trust. (1-2 items) Existing ESS items cover interpersonal trust (A8-A10), trust in politicians and parties (B7, B8), and trust in political and judicial institutions (B4-B6, B9-B10). We propose to add specific items on trust in institutions that deliver welfare policies (for example, social insurance administrations or hospitals), or tax authorities, modelled after the battery B4-B10.

b, risk perception: 3-4 items asking people about how they perceive various risks, such as unemployment, poverty and sickness: Questions in this format have been used in SWS (1997 and 2002), in a comparative Nordic survey which was fielded as an extension of ISSP1999, in the DWS and in the SWL.

c, beliefs: 3-4 items asking people about their perception of the size and composition of claimant groups, and about how they perceive the sustainability of the welfare state, in terms of whether it can be afforded or not. Items on this topic have been used in the DES.

d, social values: (3-4 items) Existing ESS items, both from the core questionnaire, and from the "Human Values scale", can be used to tap several of these, such as:

- left/right-orientation (B23)
- conformity/tolerance (B31, GS-G, GS-T)
- xenophobia/attitudes towards immigrants (B35-B40)
- egalitarianism (B30, GS-C)

We propose to add a set of items that measures different conceptions of society. Examples may be picked from the SWL.

e, personal experiences: (5-6 items) Existing ESS items can be used to indicate whether the respondent is retired, unemployed, sick/disabled etc (F8), and what the main source of income in the household is (wages/salaries, pensions, unemployment benefits etc – F31). We propose to add a set of items that indicate a) respondents' present use b) their families use, and c) respondents past use of a selection of welfare policies, and their experience in doing so. Examples may be adapted from SOM, DWS and CMWV.

5. Attitudes to:

a, welfare state scope & responsibilities: 5-6 items that ask either about the responsibilities of government for various tasks, or about the division in responsibilities between individuals and families on the one hand and government and public authorities on the other, in deciding on social protection. Examples of the former are found in ISSP (1990, 1996, 2006) and in CMWV, examples of the latter are found in ISJP, CMWV and SpWS.

b, taxation & financing: (5-6 items) We propose a few items that cover attitudes towards the distribution of taxes (flat-rate vs. proportional vs. progressive taxes). Examples to adapt are found in BSA and ISSP. We also propose a couple of items that ask about the efficiency and fairness of tax collection. Examples are found in DES and SpWS.

We also propose to ask about individual and private forms of financing welfare services and social insurances. Examples that ask about user fees and private insurance provisions may be found in SWS, and examples that ask about vouchers for private services are found in BSA.

An alternative is to ask about motivations to pay for social security systems (apart from following legal obligations). Examples can be found in DWS and CMWV.

c, alternative welfare state models: 4-5 items tapping views about means-tested vs. universal benefits, and about flat-rate vs. income-related benefits. Such items have been used in BSA, FWS and CMWV. In combination with answers to (b) above, this will allow us to compare implicit attitudes to the redistributive effects of welfare spending and its financing.

d, service delivery: 4-5 items asking respondents who they think is best suited to deliver services (public authorities, private companies, families and networks etc), and how they perceive the effects of privatization of services in terms of access and freedom of choice. Examples of the first can be found in SWS.

e, target groups / receivers: 4-5 items to tap respondents' views about people who receive public benefits and services, in particular possible misuse and fraud, and deservingness criteria. Examples can be found in BSA, in SWS, in SpWS, in CMWV, and in the ISJP.

f, Europeanization of Welfare Policies: (3-4 items) The core ESS questionnaire already ask about the general attitude toward European unification (B34), and about trust in the European parliament (B9). We need a set of items that tap respondents views about (a) the role of European institutions in welfare policies; (b) redistribution to citizens in other (European) countries. We could use a set of Likert-type statements to tap these two aspects. Another possibility could be to ask about specific policy areas, to probe to what extent respondents feel that the EU should get involved: not at all, by coordinating national policies, or by developing its own policy instruments.

6. Evaluations of:

a, Task performance: (in general): (2-3 items) existing core module items ask about the "state of education" (B28) and "state of health services" (B29). We propose to add items modelled after these two that ask about the level of pensions (or living conditions for the elderly), the level of unemployment benefits (or living conditions for the unemployed), or possibly some other services/benefits.

personal level: 2-3 items tapping respondents beliefs about whether they themselves will receive (or are receiving) adequate pensions, adequate health care in case of need, adequate unemployment or sickness benefits in case of need. Examples can be found in SWS.

b, Economic consequences: 4-5 items related to perceptions about whether welfare policies are contributing to or undermining economic growth, stifle initiative or contribute positively to 'human capital' formation, redistribute effectively to the needy or not. Examples can be found in CMWV, DWS, and SpWS.

c, Moral/Social consequences: 4-5 items related to perceptions about whether welfare policies are having positive or negative effects on the moral and social fabric of society. Examples can be found in CMWV, DWS and in ISJP.

*

The preliminary sum of items runs to 52-67 items, which should be feasible to adapt to a 50 item module, although hard decisions will have to be made in the final version. Since some of the concepts we propose may prove difficult to operationalise, we feel it is better to have a somewhat longer list of topics and items to begin with, from which cuts can be made in the final instances.