



DATIS

**Data for Inclusive Societies: Foes and Friends of Inclusiveness
in contemporary Greece
D2.1 Report on the literature review**

School of Political Sciences, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

July 2024



Abstract

One of the most important deliverables of DATIS project (Data for Inclusive Societies: Foes and Friends of Inclusiveness in contemporary Greece) is the survey among Greek citizens which aims to study empirically different views regarding the “foes” and “friends” of inclusive societies in contemporary Greece. For the development and implementation of the survey, a detailed theoretical and conceptual framework is needed. Analyzing a wide range of academic sources, this review aims to define inclusive societies and highlight marginalized social groups. As the DATIS project focuses on studying the prospects of inclusive societies through the lens of political sociology, it is crucial to identify the risks that threaten social cohesion at the political level. The primary factors that undermine social cohesion, which the DATIS project aims to examine, include populism, polarization among groups, and the interrelationship between these phenomena. The main aim of this report is to present this literature review that we used for the design of the questionnaire that will be the main tool of studying Greek society’s attitudes towards inclusive societies.

1. Introduction

The overarching goal of DATIS project **Data for Inclusive Societies: Foes and Friends of Inclusiveness in contemporary Greece** is to study the foes and friends of inclusive societies in contemporary Greece by implementing an innovative empirical research design. DATIS is a data - driven project with the aim to explore both theoretically and empirically the enemies and the supporters of inclusive societies by focusing both on parties and political elites, as well as on citizens. In a broader perspective, the goal of DATIS is to create an “index of inclusiveness”. At the core of the project are the causes and the consequences of adopting hostile attitudes towards other groups of the society both among political elites and citizens.

Moreover, DATIS will try to shed light on possible interactions between the micro (citizens) and the meso level (political parties) and the adoption of these attitudes. In order to explore further this research direction, we hypothesize that there are some driving factors that might facilitate or impede the rise of these attitudes. On one hand, DATIS focuses on the rise of populist attitudes both from the supply and the demand side of electoral competition and on the other hand, on the development of solidarity among Greek citizens. Therefore, our research direction is more oriented to the subfields of political sociology and political

methodology with the ultimate goal of providing concrete proposals regarding the measurement of “inclusiveness” taking into account the complexity of the term (see next section). This perspective offers a thorough understanding of how social structures, political ideologies and group identities interact and influence each other within Greek society. Examining this interplay from this point is decisive for fostering social cohesion and reducing the negative impacts of polarization in the community.

This report constitutes a review of the literature used to identify and extract pertinent items for designing the pilot questionnaire of DATIS research project. The questionnaire for Greek citizens was developed taking into account the conceptual framework that we present in this report. The main objective of the pilot questionnaire is to capture a range of different perspectives and experiences, providing a rich dataset for the study of the main enemies of social cohesion in contemporary Greek society.

The primary aim of this review is to search for formal definitions employed by the research community and experts related to the terms of social inclusion and discrimination in society. The purpose of DATIS and the survey, in particular, is to trace the degree of support and disapproval of individuals and elites in inclusive societies. Promoting inclusive societies has become an international necessity, driven by the acceptance that diversity and social inclusion are essential for the realization of fundamental human rights, economic prosperity, and the sustainable development of societies in general. This literature review synthesizes recent studies on the key dimensions and drivers of inclusive societies, offering insights to advance research and practices in this critical research field. Both the definitions of the individual elements and themes of inclusive societies, as well as the documentation on the challenges faced by individuals, might serve as important elements for understanding these specific themes better.

2. Defining Inclusive Societies

The integration of individuals into societies is a process based on the accession and the promotion of established values, relationships and institutions, which allow the participation of their members in social, economic, political and cultural life. In this way, the stability of societies, their safety and justice is ensured. The component that keeps societies united is no

other than social cohesion. Through this, members of society acquire a sense of belonging, participation and recognition, while social values derive their legitimacy. Social cohesion is not necessarily synonymous with social uniformity, on the contrary it is ensured through the acceptance and respect of diversity (United Nations, 2009).

Solidarity among the members of a society is also a fundamental part for its existence and its continuation in time as it enhances social cohesion. According to Habermas (2001), solidarity is the link that prevents the disintegration of societies. This unifying element of societies is no other than equal respect for all, not only for those who are like us, but especially for those who are different. The core of inclusive societies is the collective sense of "we" possessed by its members, which resists discrimination and reinforces inclusion by opening its borders to all and constantly extending them. The challenge of social inclusion, perceived through the removal of barriers to the participation of minorities in social processes, while increasing society's tolerance for difference (Foa, 2015).

At this point, it should be argued that at least for the European context which is at the focus of our analysis that there is a growing disparity between the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe on the one hand and Northern-Western countries on the other, with the former group exhibiting lower levels of inclusion (see e.g Carrino et al., 2024). For that it is important to take into consideration that social inclusion depends on the level of development of society and the broader socio-economic context (Silver, 2015). Our research aims to keep a comparative dimension while also considering the specific characteristics of Greek society. We recognize that the factors and dynamics influencing social inclusion can vary significantly from one society to another. Therefore, while striving to offer a comprehensive comparison, we also emphasize the unique characteristics and challenges faced by Greek society. By doing so, we aim to provide a deeper understanding of social inclusion that is both globally relevant and tailored to local conditions. This dual approach ensures that our findings are applicable to various contexts while offering targeted insights to address the specific needs of society.

Inclusive societies are communities based on the equality of all people, promoting the values of equality and social justice, ensuring equal opportunities for all their members.

These societies embrace diversity and go beyond tolerance of differences (Davis-Cotton, 2021). The aim is to create a "society for all", that gives opportunities to marginalized people to actively participate in social and economic life and to build an inclusive society (Lombe & Sherraden, 2008). The Expert Group Meeting on Promoting Social Integration (United Nations, 2008) defines as inclusive a society that overrides differences of race, gender, class, generation, and geography, and ensures inclusion, equality of opportunity as well as capability of all citizens to determine an agreed set of social institutions that govern social interaction.

There are many challenges regarding the definition of social inclusion and our project takes into account the particularities of the socio political, cultural and economic context of Greece nowadays (for a broader discussion see (Cordier & Martin, 2020)

Officially, an inclusive society is a “society for all in which every individual, each with rights and responsibilities, has an active role to play” (United Nations, 1995). According to Lutfiyya and Bartlett (2020), inclusive societies should provide all individuals with full participation and access to society, regardless of age, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, race, ability, religion, migration status and socio-economic status. This full and inclusive participation in society as a whole has certain preconditions. According to Lutfiyya and Bartlett (2020), full participation extends to the whole range of social activities: (a) cultural, (b) economic, (c) social, (d) environmental, (e) legal, (f) physical, (g) political, (h) relational, and (i) spatial. Finally, inclusive societies should include policies that promote the above conditions, while excluding or nullifying measures and policies that may exist that are restrictive for marginalized individuals or social groups (Lutfiyya & Bartlett, 2020).

Marginalized social groups are communities or populations that often face social, economic, political and societal disadvantages due to systemic barriers, discrimination or exclusion. Often these groups have reduced access to resources, opportunities and limited rights compared to the dominant or major population (Lutfiyya & Bartlett, 2020). Overall, the study of inclusive societies is a multifaceted one and in this review, we try to shed light to its different components.

2.1 Who is marginated?

In general, groups that are not actively involved in social processes can be considered marginalized. While this varies from country to country and from one point in time to another, a common characteristic of these groups is that they are made up of vulnerable people. Also, in many countries, social cohesion is threatened by tensions or institutional prejudices against people who may have different national origins or different religious and cultural backgrounds (United Nations, 2009). Although groups experiencing social exclusion are often difficult to identify and classify, international organizations such as the United Nations (2009, 2020), the World Bank (2020), the World Health Organization (2011) and UNICEF (2020) have highlighted certain groups based on a series of studies, which are more directly related to the issue. These groups include women, the young or the elderly, people with disabilities, immigrants, ethnic and religious minorities and people belonging to sexual minorities. The 2023 Eurobarometer “Discrimination in the European Union” also focuses on the above groups (European Commission, 2023a). In our pilot survey we take into account this list.

2.1.1 Women

Gender roles and structural differences between men and women play a significant role in shaping attitudes that perpetuate the social exclusion of women, even in contemporary societies (Nigam, 2014). Despite efforts to advance gender equality, according to the United Nations Organization (UN Women, 2019), women are disproportionately affected by poverty, having fewer opportunities in education and professional fields (Kabeer, 2021), as well as limited access to credit, land, and social security. Women also face multiple and compounding forms of violence, with gender-based violence posing a significant threat to their lives (John et al., 2020), while approximately half of all women experience sexual harassment at some point during their working lives (Folke & Rickne, 2022). These challenges severely impact women's physical and mental health while also hindering their equal participation in social and political life, thereby exacerbating their marginalization (Mechkova & Carlitz, 2021).

2.2.2 Young & Older people

Young people nowadays have grown up having a significant advantage over previous generations and that is none other than access to knowledge and information. However, this generation today is in a more unfavorable position compared to previous ones in other areas and regarding social and economical exclusion (Fangen, 2010). More specifically, young people's participation in political life, is one of the biggest challenges European societies are facing (Kitanova, 2020), while high youth unemployment rates in European Union and especially in Greece, have a negative impact on their personal development and societal engagement, leading to social exclusion from the mainstream economic and social activities (Papadakis et al., 2017). In addition, the problem of unemployment exposes young people to risks, such as low future wages, repeated periods of unemployment and income poverty (Fergusson, 2004; Van de Walle et al., 2011). At the same time, in modern Western societies young people lack political participation, as they are often marginalized due to the negative prejudices that prevail about them as being immature or radical, whereas their participation is often shaped by the preferences of adults, unless they decide to abstain (Bastedo, 2015; United Nations, 2009). Finally, the marginalization of young girls is even more alarming, as they might be at higher risk of social isolation, due to their age and also their gender. For example, young mothers are often forced to drop out of school and face social discrimination (Rolfe, 2008).

Social exclusion has also an impact on other age groups. Older people are the largest growing population group in Central and Eastern European countries, yet this group is often marginalized. These people are identified as a vulnerable group, excluded due to their low income, health problems and limited mobility (Filipovic Hrast et al., 2013). Furthermore, another struggle this group is facing has to do with workplace discrimination. Older people that are still capable of working, lack the same working opportunities as the rest of the labor force, due to their age, despite being experienced in the field they apply (Chou & Choi, 2011; Scharf et al., 2001). The final field where older people experience social exclusion is digital technologies. While other groups often incorporate modern technologies into their daily lives, this is not the case for older individuals. As technology advances and becomes more integrated into everyday life, the marginalization of older people who struggle to use it poses

a significant risk (Seifert et al., 2021).

2.2.3 People with disabilities

The social integration of people with disabilities is one of the biggest challenges of modern societies. The inclusion of these people in social life, education and employment is often limited through physical and social barriers that are placed in their daily life, such as the lack of care for the creation of facilities accessible for wheelchairs or the difficulty of communication for people with hearing problems (Casas, 2007). Although measures have been taken and efforts have been made by international agencies, the social exclusion of individuals still exists in developed countries (Shaw, 2021). The social isolation of these individuals has created feelings of ignorance, indifference and fear towards them, cultivating negative stereotypes and prejudices, making it increasingly difficult for them to integrate socially (O'grady et al., 2004).

2.2.4 Immigrants

The migration issue has been one of the most significant challenges facing the Western world in recent years (Abdelaaty & Steele, 2020). Immigrants often find themselves subjected to social discrimination, racism, xenophobia, and social exclusion. As individuals migrate, they leave behind their established living environments and must adapt to new and often difficult conditions (Marinucci & Riva, 2021). For example, the concentration of large migrant populations in specific areas frequently stigmatizes them, making it challenging to access the labor market, education, and social opportunities in general (Banerjee et al., 2018; Lamont, 2018).

2.2.5 Ethnic & religious minorities

The World Values Surveys have emphasized the importance of studying the social inclusion of individuals belonging to ethnic or religious minorities within societies (Fox et al., 2021). As Blanz et al (1995) state that socio - demographically the term "minority" refers to negatively stigmatized, excluded, oppressed, and outcast individuals or groups, or "anti-normative groups" (Martikainen & Hakoköngäs, 2023; Moscovici, 1994; Moscovici & Lage, 1976). These groups are generally distinguished by their size, strength, specific

characteristics, beliefs, or traits that set them apart from the majority population (Seyranian et al., 2008). Ethnic and religious minorities can persist for years, with prejudices against them being perpetuated over time. Historically, efforts to defend and preserve these unique characteristics have even led to the persecution of these populations (Aidenberger & Doehne, 2021).

2.2.6 People belonging to sexual minorities

A further social group that experiences a deficiency of acceptance comprises individuals with diverse sexual orientations, including homosexuals, bisexuals, and the broader LGBTQ+ community. The social exclusion and marginalization of these individuals significantly impact their well-being, particularly of the younger people who often live in fear of rejection and conceal their identities (Garcia et al., 2020). These individuals frequently experience social stigmatization and become targets of homophobic attitudes and discrimination from parts of the general population. These social practices reinforce the marginalization and discipline of the group (Cyrus, 2017).

However, today's societies are complex entities exposed to multiple crises, which often change their established order. The challenge of modernization and their need to readjust to global crises, such as the economic crisis or the pandemic crisis, have an impact on increasing inequalities within many Western countries (Milanovic, 2016), making them more complex through the fragmentation of their cohesion and solidarity among their members (Hoyweghen et al., 2020). The latter is also observed at the level of individuals, with the degradation of social identities and social alliances within societies, since any social change is initiated by the individuals in the society themselves.

European integration has opened new prospects regarding solidarity on a transnational level and thereby a potential of conflict around the de-bounding or restructuring of solidarity lines (Meuleman et al., 2020). The multiple crises European Union has faced in the recent years, like the the Euro crisis from 2009 onwards, the issue of migration that peaked in 2015, Brexit in 2016, polycrisis as it has been termed (Hoyweghen et al., 2020; Zeitlin et al., 2019), together with the ongoing process of digitization suggest the further destabilization of established solidarity lines, and hence the need for mass support towards inclusiveness. For

the European Union, solidarity is one of its main pillars, along with freedom, equality and justice. However, the multiple crises have revived contradictory feelings, such as xenophobia. At the same time, the rise of populist parties in countries such as France, Belgium, Hungary and Italy, as well as the growing expression of Euroscepticism and xenophobic statements, call into question 'European solidarity' (Hoyweghen et al., 2020).

3. Friends and Foes of Inclusive Societies

As stated earlier, one of the objectives of the DATIS Project is to identify enemies of inclusiveness, who, for the purposes of the project, are political forces that express and promote animosity towards specific groups and identities. Notwithstanding the immense variety of populist variants across the globe, certain populist actors and parties may operate as a crucial breeding ground of such animosity towards several groups. So, we hypothesize that one of the main threats to inclusive societies, which will undergo in-depth examination in this project, proposing ways to rigorously map its potentially harmful variants in order to deal with them effectively, is populism. However, before defining the relationship between **populism and polarization** between social groups, some characteristics of the concepts of populism and group-based polarization must be defined.

In the last decades there have been several references and definitions of the concept of populism. One of the theories that have dominated the texture and meaning of populism is the one that considers populism as an ideational approach". According to this theory, populism as an ideology divides society into two distinct competing groups: the people and the elite (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). The people are a homogeneous social group that has good will but is helpless, while the elites are a corrupt social group that has selfish interests and does not care about the popular will. At the same time, the theory is a pillar for the emergence of other ideologies within its domain. So different varieties of populism arise like, left-wing populism, right-wing populism etc.

On the other hand, in recent years, studies and research have emerged from a large number of researchers on **group-based polarization**. The definition of the concept in recent years has been developed in order to explain in depth the polarized social reality in the USA (Bauer et al., 2017). The research activity examining polarization between groups involves

two main pillars of study. Initially, one pillar focuses on the study of social values, multiculturalism, immigration, while the other pillar of study is mainly concerned with divisions between parties, both at the elite and at the mass levels (Muste, 2014). Different definitions describe in different ways what polarization between social groups means. First, Galtung (1996) describes polarization between groups as “Polarization means reducing [. . .] conflict formation to the most simplistic level, assigning all m parties to one or the other of two camps, wrapping all n conflict themes together in one super-theme. All positive, cooperative relations are within the camps and all negative relations between them [. . .]” A more mathematical definition was provided by Esteban, Mayoral and Ray (2012) and is characterized as “separation or distance across clustered groups in a distribution”.

In recent years, the rise of **populist parties** and **populist leaders** to power has led studies to a new path of searching for the relationship between populism and the emergence and strengthening of polarization in societies between different social groups. For example, looking at the case of the recent pandemic and the emergence of different social blocs supporting or not supporting anti-Covid-19 measures, Farias et al., (2022) argue that cases of populist leaders such as Bolsonaro in Brazil have reinforced polarization between different social blocs. Something similar we want to examine in DATIS' project, but this time in the light of inclusive societies. The recent government law in favour of same-sex marriage has opened up wide debates in public discourse, while the assertion of other measures in favour of more 'open' societies or opposition to them are issues of everyday debate. From a scientific perspective, however, we would like to examine in depth the support or not for behavioral societies and the possible embodiment of this support and positive or negative sentiments in specific social blocs, while looking for their relation to the emergence of populist discourse.

4. Presentation of the items of the questionnaire

The research design for the DATIS research project includes questionnaires tailored to the requirements and objectives of the project in order to answer the critical research questions through its findings. The paragraphs above provide a useful overview of the terms and concepts around the issue of inclusive societies, with a central reference to marginalized people, their categories, and the problems or support and solidarity they face within society.

At this point, however, the preceding literature review will be presented in more detail in order for us as a research team to arrive at the useful items of the questionnaires, which constitute the central pillar of our subsequent conclusions. Based on the social groups described above as marginalized, personal questions have been included in the pilot questionnaire to examine the extent to which a person may belong to a social group or have experienced a traumatic experience. Theories have been developed about individuals who have been harassed or some other type of negative experience who experience different challenges in their daily lives (Raver & Nishii, 2010). Examining the possible causes and association with other factors from the questionnaire can provide useful insights. So, based on this context, we have included in our pilot questionnaire questions about the personal experiences of the respondents. At first, the Q12 “Now I would like to ask you some questions about other harm you have experienced. In the past year, could you tell me if you have been harassed, abused or made to feel uncomfortable for any of the reasons on this card?” and Q13 “In the past year, have you have been treated less favourably by people who are in positions of authority, because of any of the personal characteristics on this card?. Both these items are followed with these subquestions: 1 “Religion”, 2 “Nationality”, 3 “Disability”, 4 “Sexual orientation”, 5 “age”, 6 “gender”, 7 “Social class”. Finally, we have selected the question Q18 “In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or experienced harassment on one or more of the following reasons? Please tell me all that apply.” The possible reasons-items that we are offer to the respondents are: age, political opinions, socio-economic status, because you are a man or a woman, generally because of external appearance, because you're transgender, because you're bi-sexual, for your skin color, about your religious beliefs or your faith, about your ethnic origin, for your sexual orientation, for some disability

4.1 Social Justice

More specifically, the question on the characteristics that characterize a just or unjust society was initially chosen to be used. In his book, *The Theory of Justice*, John Rawls characteristically describes what makes a society just or unjust, while also standing analytically on relationships between social groups and their effect on the well-being and justice of a society (Rawls, 1971). In addition, Rawls argues that a just society is one in

which the distribution of resources and opportunities is equitable, emphasizing the 'difference principle', which allows inequalities only if they benefit the least advantaged members of society. In contrast, an unjust society is characterized by significant inequalities in wealth, education and access to health care, where these inequalities perpetuate the disadvantaged position of marginalized groups.

Taking the above into account, we include the question Q1 "There are many different views on what constitutes a just or unjust society. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?" having as subquestions the following: Q1a "A society is fair when income and wealth are equally distributed among all people", Q1b "A society is fair when hardworking people earn more than others", Q1c "A society is fair when it takes care of those who are poor and in need regardless of what they give back to society", Q1d "A society is fair when people from families with high social status enjoy privileges in their lives" . The respondents have to answer this with a scale from 1 "strongly agree" to 5 "strongly disagree" and the intermediate values. At the same time, these items have been used in research network surveys, such as the European Social Survey (2023) on Timing of life, Justice and fairness.

4.2 Discrimination in the workplace

Meanwhile, a long-standing issue regarding discrimination of social groups is that of discrimination between men and women in the workplace. It has been the subject of study by many researchers how men benefit more than women in finding a job, how they are treated by the employer in situations such as the birth of a child, but also within the working environment itself with particular behaviors. Gender discrimination in the workplace has been a crucial issue, extensively studied across various disciplines. According to Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004), who conducted a field experiment, resumes with male names receive more callbacks than those with female names, highlighting implicit biases in recruitment processes. Furthermore, according to Gatrell (2013), even today it is accepted that in the case of having a child, it is women who will take care of and raise the child, while men are the ones who will bring money into the house. In addition, research by Kaas and Manger (2012) on the German labor market showed that the number of rejected applications

and CVs from immigrants or ethnic minorities was much higher than those from natives. Finally, an issue that has been in the Greek and international news for several years now is the issue of same-sex couples having children. Research, such as that of Farr et al. (2010) has shown that children growing up in a same-sex couple's family have no differences in behavior or education from children growing up in a heterosexual couple's family.

Building on the above framework, the question Q2 "Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?" with the following subquestions: Q2a "When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women" Q2b "When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to people of this country over immigrants", Q2c "If a woman earns more money than her husband, it's almost certain to cause problems", Q2d "Homosexual couples are as good parents as other couples", Q2e "It is a duty towards society to have children", Q2f "Work is a duty towards society". The respondents have to answer in this with a scale from 1 "strongly agree" to 5 "strongly disagree" and the intermediate values.

At the same time, these items have been used in research network surveys, such as 2017-2021 World Value Survey Wave 7 (Haerpfer, C. et al., 2022) (Q33, Q34, Q36, Q37, Q40). Similarly, we retrieved the following question Q3 "Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?" with the following subquestions: Q3a "When a mother works for pay, the children suffer", Q3b "On the whole, men make better political leaders than women do", Q3c "A university education is more important for a boy than for a girl", Q3d "On the whole, men make better business executives than women do", Q3e "Being a housewife is just as fulfilling as working for pay".

Finally, in recent years more and more employers have been incorporating into their employment policies measures that promote and respect diversity within the workplace (Blommaert & Coenders, 2024). In their study, Blommaert and Coenders (2024) highlight public opinion on whether or not to support diversity in the workplace. They come to useful conclusions about the support for policy implementation by different social groups, such as white men, women, immigrants. Based on this framework, we created the question Q11 "To what extent do you support or oppose each of the following workplace measures to promote diversity:" and the following subquestions: Q11a "Diversity training for employees and

employers”, Q11b “Monitoring workforce composition to assess representation of groups at risk of discrimination”, Q11c “Monitoring recruitment processes to ensure that candidates from groups at risk of discrimination have the same opportunities as other candidates with equal skills and qualifications”. The respondents are invited to answer to them: 1 “I completely oppose”, 2 “I oppose on”, 3 “I support on”, 4 “I completely support”. Finally, we select the question Q14 “In your opinion, how much influence does each of the following factors have on the decision to recruit or not to recruit a person for a job in Greece?” with the following subquestions-items: Q14a “The person’s knowledge and skills”, Q14b “The person’s on-the-job experience”, Q14c “Whether the person knows someone in the organisation”, Q14d “Whether the person has an immigrant background”, Q14e “The person’s gender”. Also, we gave to them the following answer choices: 1 “No influence”, 2 “Some influence”, 3 “Quite an influence” 4 “Absolute influence”. These items was selected, also, at the ESS round 9 - 2018. Timing of life, Justice and fairness.

4.3 Gender rights and equality

In addition, an issue that has been of concern to the scientific community, particularly in recent years, is that of sexual orientation discrimination. People with different sexual orientations, people belonging to the LGBTQ+ community, are often a marginalized social group, while at the same time, they are subject to negative attitudes and behaviors from the rest of society (Cyrus, 2017)). However, in recent years, significant support for the rights and freedoms of people in the LGBTQ+ community have developed in several social groups, often demanding changes and modifications to policies regarding their treatment (Naylor, 2020).

Based on this literature, we retrieved the two following questions about the rights and the freedoms of these people. Firstly, the question Q4 “Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?” and the following subquestions: Q4a “Gay men and lesbians should be free to live their own life as they wish”, Q4b “If a close family member was a gay man or a lesbian, I would feel ashamed”, Q4c “Gay male and lesbian couples should have the same rights to adopt children as straight couple”. The respondents have to answer this with a scale from 1 “strongly agree” to 5 “strongly disagree” and the and the intermediate values. Also,

these items have been used in research network surveys, such as the European Social Survey (European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC), 2023) on Timing of life, Justice and fairness. Correspondingly, we include the following question Q5 “Do you agree or disagree with the following statements?” with the following subquestions: Q5a “Lesbian, gay and bisexual people should have the same rights as heterosexual people(marriage, adoption, parental rights)”, Q5b “There is nothing wrong in a sexual relationship between two persons of the same sex” Q5c “Same sex marriages should be allowed throughout Europe”, Q5d “Transgender people should have the same rights as anyone else (marriage, adoption, parental rights)”. The respondents have to answer in this with a scale from 1 “strongly agree” to 5 “strongly disagree” and the intermediate values. These items, additionally, were included in other surveys about gender discrimination, such as Special Eurobarometer 535, April-May 2023, about "Discrimination in the European Union".

Finally, at the same point, at the level of policies regarding people from the LGBTQ+ community, we included the two following questions. The first is the Q7 “Do you think that transgender persons should be able to change their civil documents to match their gender identity?” and the Q8 “Do you believe that official documents, like passports and birth certificates, should have a third option, such as X or O (other) beside male (M) and female (F) for those persons who do not identify as female and male?”. Respondents' answers are yes or no. Also, these items were included in other surveys about gender discrimination, such as Special Eurobarometer 535, April-May 2023, about "Discrimination in the European Union" (European Commission, 2023b)).

Self-reporting about gender choice is also very important because it can reveal useful patterns about the association of those with a strong social identity with other factors and survey questions. For example, regarding sex similarities, older individuals, both men and women, heterosexuals, those with lower levels of education, and people living outside of capital cities were all more likely to identify with traditional binary gender categories (Whyte et al., 2018). From this framework, we select the question Q9 “Some people describe themselves by their gender. How about you? How strong would you say your attachment is to your gender identity you chose?”. Also, this item was included in the European Social Survey

Round 11.

In addition, research, such as that of Kabber and Natali (2013), has revealed a positive contribution of gender equality to dimensions such as economic growth. At the same time, according to Welzel et al. (2002) gender equality is an important democratization prerequisite for modern representative democracies. Based on this, we selected the question Q10 “Please indicate how much you agree or disagree that gender equality in Greece:” with the following items-statements as subquestions: Q10a “It increases economic growth”, Q10b “It improves the quality of democracy”, Q10c “It improves environmental sustainability”, Q10d “It facilitates balancing work and family”, Q10e “It overburdens businesses with regulating employee behavior” and the respondents have to answer in this with a scale from 1 “strongly agree” to 5 “strongly disagree” and the and the intermediate values. These items, also, were included on Flash Eurobarometer 2017 as questions.

4.4 Education measures

The issue of marginalized social groups is a critical issue in both the socio-political and scientific debate on the need to introduce into school curricula, useful references and lessons on the information and education of students. Developing curricula that include the histories, cultures, and contributions of marginalized groups ensures that all students see themselves represented in their education (Banks, 2009). Furthermore, Addressing implicit biases and resistance from educators, parents, and communities is a significant challenge. Engaging stakeholders through dialogue and education about the benefits of inclusion can help overcome resistance (Nieto, 2001).

From this perspective, we include the question Q6 “To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? School lessons and material should include information about ...?” and the following subquestions: Q6a “The experience of disability”, Q6b “Racism”, Q6c “The history of antisemitism in European countries and the Holocaust”, Q6d “Religions or beliefs”, Q6e “Roma culture and history”, Q6f “Sexual orientations (for example being lesbian, gay, or bisexual)”, Q6g “The existence of multiple gender identities (for example being transgender)”. The respondents have to answer in this with a scale from 1 “strongly agree” to 5 “strongly disagree” and the and the intermediate values. Also, these

items included in surveys like Special Eurobarometer 535, April-May 2023, about "Discrimination in the European Union"

4.5 Digital technologies and inclusiveness of people with disabilities

In recent years, with the development of digital technologies, another critical aspect of everyday life has emerged, that of the connection between digital technologies and the needs of people with disabilities. From this perspective, Manzoor and Virmalund (2018), conduct an important study to examine which branches of technology and information can help people with disabilities in their daily lives.

From this framework, to examine the support of the public to digital technologies as a crucial tool for the well-being of people with disabilities, we have created the Question 20 "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?" with the following subquestions-items: Q20a "Digital technologies can drastically help people", Q20b "Digital technologies can help people with special needs in their daily life activities", Q20c "Digital technologies cannot adequately help disabled people, as they need different government policies, such as transport infrastructure and public buildings", Q20d "Digital technologies can negatively affect people with special needs, creating a passive everyday life for them".

4.6 Social inequalities and conflicts

As described above, various social groups are often marginalized and discriminated against by a section of society. Racial and ethnic inequalities are deeply rooted in historical contexts of colonization, slavery, and segregation. These inequalities manifest in various forms, including disparities in education, employment, housing, and criminal justice. Critical race theory (CRT) provides a framework for understanding how systemic racism perpetuates these inequalities and leads to intergroup conflicts (Bonilla-Silva, 2021). Also, social mobility, or the ability to move up or down the social hierarchy, is often limited by structural barriers. Research shows that social mobility is heavily influenced by factors such as education, family background, and social networks, which can entrench existing inequalities (Putnam, 2016). Often, however, people from certain social groups do not have this opportunity in order to remain marginalized.

The examination of the aforementioned factors and the possible existence of specific attitudes and perceptions in Greek society remains an important research question. For this reason, we have chosen specific items, which examine the existence of conflicts between social groups and especially the possible existence of negative feelings towards social minorities. From this perspective, we have selected the the following questions: 1) The Q15 “Please tick one box for each of these to show how important you think it is for getting ahead in life...” with the following subquestions: Q15a “...how important is coming from a wealthy family?”, Q15b “... how important is having well educated parents?”, Q15c “... how important is having a good education yourself?”. Q15d “... how important is hard work?”, Q15e “... how important is knowing the right people?”, Q15f “... how important is having political connections?”, Q15g “...how important is giving bribes?”, Q15h “... how important is a person’s race?”, Q15i “... how important is a person’s religion?”, Q15j “... how important is being born a man or a woman?.

In addition, we have selected the Q16 “In all countries, there are differences or even conflicts between different social groups. In your opinion, in Greece how much conflict is there between...” with these following subquestions: Q16a “ ... poor people and rich people?”, Q16b “... the working class and the middle class?”, Q16c “...management and workers?”, Q16d “...young people and older people?”, Q16e “...people born in Greece and people from other countries who have come to live in Greece?”.

Finally, in this context, we have included questions Q17 “For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare or very rare in Greece? By discrimination we mean when somebody is treated unfavourably compared with others based on arbitrary criteria. Discrimination on the basis of... and Q19 “Regardless of whether you have children or not, please tell me, using a scale from 1 to 10, how comfortable you would feel if one of your children was in a love relationship with a person from one of the following groups? 1’ means that you would feel "not at all comfortable" and ‘10’ means that you would feel "totally comfortable". At the first, we asked respondents to give their opinion on possible discrimination experienced by social groups because of sexual orientation, being a Roma, religion, ethnic identity, skin color, disability, socio-economic status, age, transgender,

gender. At the second, we asked them to give their feelings about social groups like the above at a 10-grade scale, whether they are comfortable with them, with 1 meaning they are not comfortable at all and 10 meaning they are completely comfortable with them.

5. Next steps

The main aim of this report was to present the literature and the conceptual framework that we have used for the design and implementation of the pilot questionnaire and the main questionnaires that will be used for studying Greek society's attitudes towards inclusive societies. The analysis of the pilot survey data will be included in the document: D4.1 "Dataset and report of the pilot survey findings" that will be delivered next month. The main conclusions will be included in the document D4.2 "Dataset and report of the ELNES voter survey findings" that will be delivered near the end of the project.

6. Bibliography

- Abdelaaty, L., & Steele, L. (2020). Explaining Attitudes Toward Refugees and Immigrants in Europe. *Political Studies*, 70, 003232172095021.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321720950217>
- Aidenberger, A., & Doehne, M. (2021). Unveiling everyday discrimination. Two field experiments on discrimination against religious minorities in day-to-day interactions. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 72(2), 328–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12811>
- Banerjee, R., Kelly, P., Tungohan, E., Cleto, P., de Leon, C., Garcia, M., Luciano, M., Palmaria, C., & Sorio, C. (2018). From "Migrant" to "Citizen": Labor Market Integration of Former Live-In Caregivers in Canada. *ILR Review*, 71(4), 908–936.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0019793918758301>
- Banks, J. A. (2009). Diversity and Citizenship Education in Multicultural Nations*. *Multicultural Education Review*, 1(1), 1–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.111102861>
- Bastedo, H. (2015). Not 'one of us': Understanding how non-engaged youth feel about politics and political leadership. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18(5), 649–665.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2014.992309>
- Bauer, P. C., Barberá, P., Ackermann, K., & Venetz, A. (2017). Is the Left-Right Scale a

- Valid Measure of Ideology? *Political Behavior*, 39(3), 553–583.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-016-9368-2>
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2004). Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination. *American Economic Review*, 94(4), 991–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828042002561>
- Blanz, M., Mummendey, A., & Otten, S. (1995). Positive–negative asymmetry in social discrimination: The impact of stimulus valence and size and status differentials on intergroup evaluations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(4), 409–419.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1995.tb01074.x>
- Blommaert, L., & Coenders, M. (2024). The effects of and support for anonymous job application procedures: Evidence from a large-scale, multi-faceted study in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 50(10), 2468–2490.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2023.2282385>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2021). *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Carrino, L., Farnia, L., & Giove, S. (2024). Measuring Social Inclusion in Europe: A non-additive approach with the expert-preferences of public policy planners. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*, 187(1), 231–259.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jrssa/qnad106>
- Casas, I. (2007). Social Exclusion and the Disabled: An Accessibility Approach*. *The Professional Geographer*, 59(4), 463–477. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00635.x>
- Chou, R. J.-A., & Choi, N. G. (2011). Prevalence and correlates of perceived workplace discrimination among older workers in the United States of America. *Ageing & Society*, 31(6), 1051–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X10001297>
- Cordier, R., & Martin, R. (2020). The Challenges of Defining and Measuring Social Inclusion. Στο P. Liamputtong (Επιμ.), *Handbook of Social Inclusion: Research and Practices in Health and Social Sciences* (σσ. 1–22). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48277-0_18-1
- Cyrus, K. (2017). Multiple minorities as multiply marginalized: Applying the minority stress theory to LGBTQ people of color. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 21(3),

- 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2017.1320739>
- Davis-Cotton, D. (2021). Marginalized Communities, Curriculum, Children (MC3). Στο *Emerging Strategies for Public Education Reform* (σσ. 126–160). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-5695-5.ch005>
- Esteban, J., Mayoral, L., & Ray, D. (2012). Ethnicity and Conflict: An Empirical Study. *American Economic Review*, *102*(4), 1310–1342. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.4.1310>
- European Commission. (2023a). *Discrimination in the European Union* [Report]. <https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2972>
- European Commission. (2023b). *Special Eurobarometer SP535: Discrimination in the European Union*. http://data.europa.eu/88u/dataset/s2972_99_2_sp535_eng
- European Social Survey European Research Infrastructure (ESS ERIC). (2023). *ESS round 9 —2018. Timing of life, Justice and fairness*. <https://doi.org/10.21338/NSD-ESS9-2018>.
- Fangen, K. (2010). Social exclusion and inclusion of young immigrants: Presentation of an analytical framework. *YOUNG*, *18*(2), 133–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/110330881001800202>
- Farias, D. B. L., Casarões, G., & Magalhães, D. (2022). Radical Right Populism and the Politics of Cruelty: The Case of COVID-19 in Brazil Under President Bolsonaro. *Global Studies Quarterly*, *2*(2), ksab048. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isagsq/ksab048>
- Farr, R. H., Forssell, S. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2010). Parenting and Child Development in Adoptive Families: Does Parental Sexual Orientation Matter? *Applied Developmental Science*, *14*(3), 164–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2010.500958>
- Fergusson, R. (2004). Discourses of Exclusion: Reconceptualising Participation Amongst Young People. *Journal of Social Policy*, *33*(2), 289–320. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279403007451>
- Filipovic Hrast, M., Kopac Mrak, A., & Rakar, T. (2013). Social exclusion of elderly in Central and Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Social Economics*, *40*(11), 971–989. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-05-2012-0082>
- Foa, R. S. (2015). *Creating an Inclusive Society: Evidence from Social Indicators and Trends*. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.90316>

- Folke, O., & Rickne, J. (2022). Sexual Harassment and Gender Inequality in the Labor Market*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 137(4), 2163–2212.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjac018>
- Fox, J., Finke, R., & Mataic, D. R. (2021). The Causes of Societal Discrimination against Religious Minorities in Christian-Majority Countries. *Religions*, 12(8), 611.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12080611>
- Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. SAGE Publications.
- Garcia, J., Vargas, N., Clark, J. L., Álvarez, M. M., Nelons, D. A., & Parker, R. G. (2020). Social isolation and connectedness as determinants of well-being: Global evidence mapping focused on LGBTQ youth. *Global Public Health*.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17441692.2019.1682028>
- Gatrell, C. J. (2013). Maternal body work: How women managers and professionals negotiate pregnancy and new motherhood at work. *Human Relations*, 66(5), 621–644.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726712467380>
- Habermas, J., & Rehg, W. (2001). Constitutional Democracy: A Paradoxical Union of Contradictory Principles? *Political Theory*, 29(6), 766–781.
- Haerpfer, C., Inglehart, R., Moreno, A., Welzel, C., Kizilova, K., Diez-Medrano J., M. Lagos, P. Norris, E. Ponarin, & B. Puranen. (2022). *World Values Survey: Round Seven – Country-Pooled Datafile Version 6.0*. <https://doi.org/doi:10.14281/18241.24>
- Hoyweghen, I. V., Pulignano, V., & Meyers, G. (2020). *Shifting Solidarities: Trends and Developments in European Societies*. Springer Nature.
- John, N., Casey, S. E., Carino, G., & McGovern, T. (2020). Lessons Never Learned: Crisis and gender-based violence. *Developing World Bioethics*, 20(2), 65–68.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/dewb.12261>
- Kaas, L., & Manger, C. (2012). Ethnic Discrimination in Germany’s Labour Market: A Field Experiment. *German Economic Review*, 13(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0475.2011.00538.x>
- Kabeer, N. (2021). Gender Equality, Inclusive Growth, and Labour Markets. Στο *Women’s Economic Empowerment*. Routledge.
- Kabeer, N., & Natali, L. (2013). Gender Equality and Economic Growth: Is there a Win-

- Win? *IDS Working Papers*, 2013(417), 1–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2013.00417.x>
- Kitanova, M. (2020). Youth political participation in the EU: Evidence from a cross-national analysis. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 23(7), 819–836.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2019.1636951>
- Lamont, M. (2018). Addressing Recognition Gaps: Destigmatization and the Reduction of Inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 83(3), 419–444.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122418773775>
- Lombe, M., & Sherraden, M. (2008). Inclusion in the Policy Process: An Agenda for Participation of the Marginalized. *Journal of Policy Practice*, 7(2–3), 199–213.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15588740801938043>
- Lutfiyya, Z. M., & Bartlett, N. A. (2020). Inclusive Societies. Στο *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1022>
- Manzoor, M., & Vimarlund, V. (2018). Digital technologies for social inclusion of individuals with disabilities. *Health and Technology*, 8(5), 377–390.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12553-018-0239-1>
- Marinucci, M., & Riva, P. (2021). How intergroup social connections shape immigrants' responses to social exclusion. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 24(3), 411–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219894620>
- Martikainen, J., & Hakoköngäs, E. (2023). Drawing as a method of researching social representations. *Qualitative Research*, 23(4), 981–999.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/14687941211065165>
- Mechkova, V., & Carlitz, R. (2021). Gendered accountability: When and why do women's policy priorities get implemented? *European Political Science Review*, 13(1), 3–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773920000272>
- Meuleman, B., Abts, K., Schmidt, P., Pettigrew, T. F., & Davidov, E. (2020). Economic conditions, group relative deprivation and ethnic threat perceptions: A cross-national perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(3), 593–611.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1550157>
- Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global Inequality: A New Approach for the Age of Globalization*.

- Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjghwk4>
- Moscovici, S. (1994). Social representations and pragmatic communication. *Social Science Information*, 33(2), 163–177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901894033002002>
- Moscovici, S., & Lage, E. (1976). Studies in social influence III: Majority versus minority influence in a group. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 6(2), 149–174. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420060202>
- Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Muste, C. P. (2014). Reframing Polarization: Social Groups and “Culture Wars”. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 47(2), 432–442. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096514000353>
- Naylor, L. A. (2020). *Social Equity and LGBTQ Rights: Dismantling Discrimination and Expanding Civil Rights*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351213509>
- Nieto, S. (2001). *Language, Culture, and Teaching: Critical Perspectives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410605818>
- Nigam, S. (2014). *From the Margins: Revisiting the Concept of ‘Marginalized Women’* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 2490983). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2490983>
- O’grady, A., Pleasence, P., Balmer, N. J., Buck, A., & Genn, H. (2004). Disability, social exclusion and the consequential experience of justiciable problems. *Disability & Society*, 19(3), 259–272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0968759042000204158>
- Ostiguy, P. (Επιμ.). (2017). Populism: A socio-cultural approach. Στο *The Oxford Handbook of Populism* (σ. 0). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198803560.013.34>
- Papadakis, N., Drakaki, M., Papargyris, A., Dafermos, V., Basta, M., Theodorikakos, P., Pandis, P., & Kyridis, A. (2017). “Painted from life ...” A Disengaged Youth? Young people and NEETs in a devastated country. *LLAKES Research Paper*, 59, 1–45.
- Putnam, R. D. (2016). *Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis*. Simon and Schuster.
- Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 236–254. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018377>
- Rawls, J. (1971). A Theory of Justice. Στο *Ethics: Essential Readings in Moral Theory*.

Routledge.

- Rolfe, A. (2008). 'You've got to grow up when you've got a kid': Marginalized young women's accounts of motherhood. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18*(4), 299–314. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.925>
- Scharf, T., Phillipson, C., Kingston, P., & Smith, A. (2001). Social Exclusion and Older People: Exploring the connections. *Education and Ageing, 16*.
- Seifert, A., Cotten, S. R., & Xie, B. (2021). A Double Burden of Exclusion? Digital and Social Exclusion of Older Adults in Times of COVID-19. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B, 76*(3), e99–e103. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa098>
- Seyranian, V., Atuel, H., & Crano, W. D. (2008). Dimensions of Majority and Minority Groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 11*(1), 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430207084843>
- Shaw, A. (2021). Inclusion of disabled Higher Education students: Why are we not there yet? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 28*(6), 820–838. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1968514>
- Silver, H. (2015). *The Contexts of Social Inclusion* (SSRN Scholarly Paper 2641272). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2641272>
- UN Women (Επιμ.). (2019). *Families in a changing world*. UN Women. <https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/Library/Publications/2019/Progress-of-the-worlds-women-2019-2020-en.pdf>
- UNICEF. (2020). *State of the World's Children 2019: Children, food and nutrition*. <https://www.unicef.org/documents/state-of-worlds-children-2019-regional-briefs>
- United Nations. (1995). *World Summit for Social Development* (σ. 65). <https://www.un.org/en/conferences/social-development/copenhagen1995>
- United Nations. (2008). *Promoting Social Integration*.
- United Nations. (2009). *Creating an Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to Promote Social Integration*. <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/egms/docs/2009/Ghana/inclusive-society.pdf>
- United Nations. (2020). *The Sustainable Development Goals Report*. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2020/>
- Van de Walle, T., Coussée, F., & Bouverne-De Bie, M. (2011). Social exclusion and youth

- work – from the surface to the depths of an educational practice. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 14(2), 219–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2010.506534>
- Welzel, C., Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2002). *Gender Equality and Democracy*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156913302100418628>
- Weyland, K. (2017). Populism: A political-strategic approach. Στο *The Oxford handbook of populism*. Oxford University Press.
- Whyte, S., Brooks, R. C., & Torgler, B. (2018). Man, Woman, “Other”: Factors Associated with Nonbinary Gender Identification. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 47(8), 2397–2406. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1307-3>
- World Bank. (2020). *Poverty Overview* [Text/HTML]. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/overview>
- World Health Organization, W. B. (2011). *World report on disability* (World Health Organization). <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241564182>
- Zeitlin, J., Nicoli, F., & Laffan, B. (2019). Introduction: The European Union beyond the polycrisis? Integration and politicization in an age of shifting cleavages. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 26(7), 963–976. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1619803>