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Abstract
Citizens may respond to economic crises and to policy responses to such crises in a variety of ways. This special issue focuses on collective responses as they express themselves in the public domain, in the form of social movements or other types of interventions. The special issue originates in a large-scale comparative research project funded by the European Commission and titles “Living with Hard Times: How Citizens React to Economic Crises and Their Social and Political Consequences” (LIVEWHAT). The eight articles all use a common dataset and adopt a common method, known as political claims analysis, which has proven fruitful in previous work on social movements and contentious politics, consisting in retrieving interventions in the public domain on a given issue, or range of issues, drawing from media sources, most often newspapers. The data stem from a systematic content analysis of newspapers in each of the countries under study.
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Citizens may respond to economic crises and to policy responses to such crises in a variety of ways. This special issue focuses on collective responses as they express themselves in the public domain, in the form of social movements or other types of interventions. The special issue originates in a large-scale comparative research project funded by the European Commission and titles “Living with Hard Times: How Citizens React to Economic Crises and Their Social and Political Consequences” (LIVEWHAT). The eight articles all use a common dataset and adopt a common method, known as political claims analysis, which has proven fruitful in previous work on social movements and contentious politics, consisting in retrieving interventions in the public domain on a given issue, or range of issues, drawing from media sources, most often newspapers. The data stem from a systematic content analysis of newspapers in each of the countries under study.

Los ciudadanos responden a las crisis económicas y a las respuestas políticas a tales crisis en una variedad de formas. Este número especial se enfoca en las respuestas colectivas tal como son expresadas en el dominio público en la forma de movimientos sociales u otros tipos de intervención. El número especial tiene su origen en un proyecto de investigación comparativo de gran escala financiado por la Comisión Europea y tiene por título “Viviendo en tiempos duros: Cómo reaccionan los ciudadanos a las crisis económicas y a sus consecuencias políticas y sociales” (LIVEWHAT por sus siglas en
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The articles in this special issue of Politics & Policy originate in a large-scale comparative research project funded by the European commission under the 7th Framework Programme (grant agreement no. 613237), titled “Living with Hard Times: How Citizens React to Economic Crises and Their Social and Political Consequences” (LIVEWHAT), coordinated by one the guest editors of this special issue. This project aims to provide evidence-based knowledge about citizens’ resilience in times of economic crises to inform more effective policy responses to the negative consequences of such crises. It examines in particular the ways in which European citizens have reacted to the crisis that, at different degrees of intensity in different countries, has afflicted Europe since 2008, but also how citizens deal with economic crises and their consequences more generally. More specifically, the project has three main objectives: to provide systematic evidence of the ways in which European citizens respond to economic crises and to policy responses to such crises, both individually and collectively; to advance knowledge on the connections between individual factors, contextual factors, and the ways in which European citizens respond to economic crises and to policy responses to such crises; and to suggest a number of good practices as to how to deal with economic crises, both at the social and political level, through which their negative consequences on European citizens can be avoided or limited. A more detailed description as well as various related documents and outputs are available on the project’s website at http://www.livewhat.unige.ch

Citizens may respond to economic crises and to policy responses to such crises in a variety of ways. First, citizens may respond individually (e.g., changing attitudes and behaviors) or collectively (e.g., engaging in collective action). Second, they may respond privately (e.g., changing lifestyle) or publicly (expressing discontent in the media). Third, they may respond politically (e.g., voting for a populist party) or nonpolitically (by broadening their social ties). This special issue focuses on collective responses as they express themselves in...
the public domain, in the form of social movements or other types of interventions. In addition, it focuses on a specific economic crisis, the one that started in 2008 and which has come to be known as the “Great Recession.”

In addition to—at least potentially—changing individual attitudes and behaviors, discontent arising from economic hardship may also lead to collective forms of reactions, including protest behavior. More generally, the analysis of collective responses to economic crises intersects with the study of political interventions by organized actors in the public domain. The public domain contains a large plurality of actors—including powerful policy makers and political elites as well as corporate actors, pressure groups, and civil society organizations and movements—who thus have at disposal a common arena for making public their positions, mutual conflicts, shared agreements, and so forth. While the policy domain only includes institutions and main political elites that lead processes of decision making, the public domain is opened up to different types of publics that are the object of policy making (Cinalli 2004; Bassoli and Cinalli 2016). But obviously these two domains are strongly interlinked and twined together. In particular, institutional variations are expected to affect the relationship between economic crisis, policy responses, and citizens’ resilience. On one hand, neoinstitutionalist theories have clearly shown the institutional influence on movement forms as well the historical and institutional dependence of collective forms of political engagement (Lowndes 2010). In particular, the concept of political opportunity structures has been used to explain the levels, forms, and outcomes of collective action (Kriesi 2004; Meyer 2004). On the other hand, attention can also be focused on legal systems and rules through which collective engagement become possible. One may refer to the fact that the wide-spreading meaning of “rights” in the daily life of citizens has only occurred where the same meaning was reflected in legal and institutional practices (Tarrow 1996). The legal framework has also been crucial for shaping people’s conceptions of basic principles, for example, “equality” and “personhood” (Merry 1990).

In any large polity—such as the city, a larger region, and more so the national state—it is impossible for all these actors to interact publicly and directly, together, as in a face-to-face model. Consequently, they must rely to a considerable extent on the media to access and shape the public space, so as to express their position, debate the pros and cons of different policy choices, or call upon the support of the general public. As a consequence, there are growing bodies of research that focus on the crucial relationship between different types of actors, their interventions, and the common public domain that is available through the media. Drawing upon protest event analysis in studies of contentious politics (Hutter 2014), scholars have engaged with claims making (Koopmans and Statham 1999) in a way to systematically analyze roles and positions of all actors that enter national public spheres. Other scholars have dealt with the analysis of the media so as to go deeper in the assessment of cross-actor interactions and public deliberation in the whole polity as well as in
specific policy fields (Cinalli and Giugni 2013; Cinalli and O’Flynn 2014; Dob- 
zal, Helbling, and Hutter 2010). By acknowledging the plurality of modes of 
political intervention that different types of actors may use (Sanders 1997; 
Young 2000), a systematic analysis of the public domain has to refer to all 
potential forms of reactions and interventions in the public space, such as 
purely discursive forms (e.g., public statements, press releases, publications, 
and interviews), conventional forms of political action (e.g., litigation or 
petitioning), as well as protest forms such as demonstrations and political 
vio
cence.

By tackling the distinction between institutions and public discourse, this 
special issue deals with the different articulations at the intersection of the pol-
cy and the public domain so as to broaden the explanatory scope of our analy-
sis. We can thus engage with dynamics readjustments between the decisions 
that policy makers take on one hand, and the shape of the public domain on 
the other, focusing on processes of (mis)matching between the public and the 
policy domain. In so doing, we can also evaluate whether policy actors (in 
their quest for political advantages) have a discourse in the public domain 
that is consistent with their interventions in the policy domain. Additionally, 
we can evaluate which readjustments do take place across institutions and 
discourse.

The articles in this special issue are all based on the same dataset, generated 
in the LIVEWHAT project and following the method of political claims analy-
sis (Hutter 2014; Koopmans and Statham 1999). This method, which has pro-
ven fruitful in previous work on social movements and contentious politics 
(Cinalli and Giugni 2013; Giugni 2010; Koopmans et al. 2005), consists in 
retrieving interventions in the public domain on a given issue or range of issues 
drawing from media sources, most often—as here—newspapers. The interven-
tions are defined as “political claims,” which are instances of strategic action in 
the public sphere that are political in nature. They thus consist of the expres-
sion of a political position by some form of physical or verbal action that 
relates to collective social problems and solutions, regardless of the form this 
expression takes (verbal statement, violence, repression, decision, demonstra-
tion, court ruling, and so forth) and regardless of the nature of the actor (gov-
ernments, social movements, nongovernmental organizations, individuals, 
anonymous actors, and so forth). Each intervention of any actor is character-
ized by a typical structure, which can be broken down into six main elements 
inquiring into the main attributes of a claim. We have thus identified the claim-
ant (Who makes the claim?), the form (By which action is the claim inserted in 
the public sphere?), the addressee (At whom is the claim directed?), the content 
(What is to be undertaken?), the object (To whom is the claim directed?), and 
the frame (Why should this action be undertaken?).

The data stem from a systematic content analysis of newspapers in each of 
the countries under study. A two-step procedure has been followed to gather 
the relevant content-analytic data, combining the advantages of automated
search and selection of online media sources with the qualitative detail allowed by human coding. In the first step, several national newspapers have been selected (available online through sources such as Lexis-Nexis). From these newspapers a representative sample of articles has been drawn through relevant keyword searches, which was then coded in the second step. We have created a comparative dataset by random sampling about 1,000 claims per country (for a total sample of 9,033 claims) selected from five newspapers in each country and covering the period from 2005 to 2014 (in Greece and Poland the number of newspapers have been reduced owing to lower online availability). The choice of newspapers has followed from the need to ensure as much as possible a representative and unbiased sample. Therefore, we have included both quality newspapers and more tabloid-oriented newspapers. Furthermore, we have considered newspapers from different political orientations. All articles containing any of the three words “crisis,” “recession,” or “austerity” have been selected and coded, to the extent that they referred to the current economic crisis. The articles have been sampled from all newspaper sections, excluding editorials, through key words search. Table 1 lists the newspapers used as a source for the coding.

The data generated allow for both nationally based and cross-national comparative analyses. More specifically, they provide evidence to study collective responses to the crisis and the position of policy makers in the public domain, to examine the positions of collective actors with regard to the crisis, how they frame the crisis, its origins (diagnostic), and potential solutions (prognostic). Which collective actors more often address issues relating to the economic crisis? What do policy responses to such a crisis “look like” in the public domain? What issues are most often addressed? What causes are attributed to the crisis and by whom? What solutions are proposed and by whom? How do organized citizens react publicly to periods of crisis? Are protest activities related in some way to such periods?

The articles in this special issue address these, as well as related, questions. More generally, they all engage with the debates and dynamics mentioned earlier. Some of them address more general questions and adopt a broader comparative framework, while others have a more specific focus, in terms of the issues addressed, the countries covered, or both. The first two articles, in a way, both question the relevance and impact of the economic crisis on political claims making and point to the relevance of national features in this process.

Lorenzo Zamponi and Lorenzo Bosi (Which Crisis? European Crisis and National Contexts in Public Discourse) ask whether there is such a thing as “the crisis” in the European public discourse and whether this emerges as a recognizable factor. Their analysis points to a number of differences between countries that were most severely hit by the crisis on one hand and countries that were less so on the other, but also to differences within the same group of most severely hit by the crisis. Based on that, they argue in favor of a more nuanced view of the crisis to account for its political consequences. The economic crisis has an impact on public
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>France</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libération</td>
<td>Bild</td>
<td>Kathimerini</td>
<td>La Repubblica</td>
<td>Dziennik</td>
<td>El País</td>
<td>Dagens</td>
<td>Neue Zürcher</td>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Figaro</td>
<td>Süddeutsche</td>
<td>Rizospastis</td>
<td>La Stampa</td>
<td>Gazeta Prawna</td>
<td>La Vanguardia</td>
<td>Nyheter</td>
<td>Zeitung</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Monde</td>
<td>Zeitung</td>
<td>Ta Nea</td>
<td>Corriere della</td>
<td>Gazeta</td>
<td>El Periodico</td>
<td>Svenska</td>
<td>Blick</td>
<td>Mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Parisien</td>
<td>Frankfurter</td>
<td>To Vima</td>
<td>Sera</td>
<td>Wyborcza</td>
<td>de Catalunya</td>
<td>Dagbladet</td>
<td>Tagesanzeiger</td>
<td>The Guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tribune</td>
<td>Allgemeine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Il Giornale</td>
<td>Rzeczpospolitain</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Göteborgs</td>
<td>Le Matin</td>
<td>The Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeitung</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Sole 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>El Mundo</td>
<td>Posten</td>
<td>Le Temps</td>
<td>The Times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                 | Welt            |              |                 |              |               | Norrbottens-Kuriren |               |               |

|                 | Frankfurter     |              |                 |              |               |               |               |               |
|                 | Rundschau       |              |                 |              |               |               |               |               |

Table 1. Newspapers Used as Source for the Coding of Claims Making
discourse, but not a homogenous one. One needs to take into account national specific features to understand the relationship between economic crisis and political change. In this perspective, they identify four different “crises” in public discourse—the global financial crisis, the public debt and austerity crisis, the industrial productive crisis, and the political legitimacy crisis—and examine the relationship between their relative visibility and the evolution of structural factors and political change in different national contexts.

The article by Manlio Cinalli and Marco Giugni (Collective Responses to the Economic Crisis in the Public Domain: Myth or Reality?) questions the impact of the economic crisis in a clear-cut and provocative fashion. They challenge the common wisdom that the Great Recession has produced radical changes in terms of political behavior and more specifically in terms of a rise in protest actions. To do so, they assess the extent to which the crisis has spurred protest activities and given socioeconomic issues a higher saliency in public debates, but also the extent to which the crisis has provided a more prominent place for economic and labor actors as subject actors, as object-actors, and as addressees in claims making about the economic crisis. Their analysis shows that the crisis has not produced such radical changes in all these aspects, although it has had some impact. More broadly, the analysis unveils the normative underpinnings of the commonly held view that the economic crisis has fed a grievance-based conflict between capital and labor, which allegedly goes beyond the specific patterns and configurations of each country.

The remaining six articles all address more specific issues. The study by Marco Giugni and Maria T. Grasso (How Civil Society Actors Responded to the Economic Crisis: The Interaction of Material Deprivation and Perceptions of Political Opportunity Structures) focuses on the role of the civil society. They examine the relationship between material deprivation—an aspect most often stressed in works on the impact of the economic crisis—and different types of responses by civil society actors. Specifically, they look at the interaction of material deprivation and perceptions of the political environment or political opportunity structures. Their findings suggest that the effect of material deprivation on various aspects of responses to the crisis by civil society actors varies depending on the perceptions of political stability and of the effectiveness of government. This suggests that such perceptions feed into the interpretation of present conditions and act as signals leading material deprivation to become politicized as a grievance.

Maria Theiss, Anna Kurowska, and Janina Petelczyc (Whose Rights, Which Duties? Political Claims in the Sphere of Labor Policy in the Times of Crisis: The Social Citizenship Perspective) follow a “social citizenship perspective” and examine the discursive construction of social citizenship of labor market actors (employees, employers, and outsiders) during the crisis. Their study shows that the attribution of rights (or freedoms) to these three groups prevails and that claims supporting employees’ social rights are most often made. However, the framing of the claims varies according to the actor at
hand. In this regard, they outline three kinds of discourse about the rights and duties that actors should have with respect to the labor market: in contexts of severe crisis labor organizations and groups claim the rights of employees; in contexts of moderate crisis the state (re)calls the rights of the outsiders; and in contexts in which the crisis was present in the discourse rather than in real terms, a window of opportunity has emerged for markets and employers to claim their freedoms and rights.

The article by Sabina Monza and Eva Anduiza (The Visibility of the EU in the National Public Spheres in Times of Crisis and Austerity) looks at the articulation between the national and the European level in claims making during the economic crisis. To do so, they examine the visibility of the European Union (EU) in the debates that took place in the national public spheres of the nine countries included in the study. More specifically, they inquire whether the impact of the recent economic crisis and the implementation of austerity policies have advanced the presence of the EU, its member states, and European concerns in the national public spheres. Their analysis confirms previous work that has pointed to a limited presence of EU-level issues in political claims making in different fields. However, despite the very limited overall presence of the EU and European subjects in the national debates, they find meaningful cross-national differences. In particular, Germany stands out as having a leading position conveying visibility to European claims, followed by France, Greece, and Italy, whereas Poland, Spain, and Sweden display a lower visibility of the EU, and even more so Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

While the articles described so far all analyze the entire spectrum of countries included in the LIVEWHAT project—either generally or focusing on a more specific issue—the last three contributions look at specific countries. Christian Lahusen, Maria Kousis, Johannes Kiess, and Maria Paschou (Political Claims and Discourse Formations: A Comparative Account on Germany and Greece in the Eurozone Crisis) compare public debates on the economic crisis in two countries belonging to the Eurozone: a country that has been most severely affected by the crisis (Greece) and one that has largely been spared from it (Germany). They look at the patterns governing the discursive construction of the European financial and economic crisis in these two countries. In this regard, they suggest a number of possible scenarios: a widening of country-specific cleavages between competing discourse and policy communities; a realignment of these cleavage structures in the sense of a disruption and reorganization of existing discourse communities; and a mainstreaming or dealignment of discourse communities and a convergence of debates into a hegemonic discourse. Their analysis does not validate or refute either of such scenarios, but provides important insights concerning the patterns and implications of “crisis discourses.” First, the crisis did not erode the political cleavages and actor constellations within the domestic policy domains. Second, the crisis did not reinforce or enlarge the antagonism between contending policy communities when speaking about policy issues and ideas. More generally, while
their findings point to a number of differences between the Greek and German public debates, they also show that the dealignment of political cleavages in both countries stresses a seemingly underlying mainstreaming process that limits the diversity of crisis-related claims.

The last two articles focus on the British case. Luke Temple, Maria T. Grasso, Barbara Buraczynska, Sotirios Karampampas, and Patrick English (Neoliberal Narrative in Times of Economic Crisis: A Political Claims Analysis of the U.K. Press, 2007-14) engage with the debate of the place of neoliberal thinking and policies in times of economic crisis. They show that press coverage of the financial crisis, recession, and austerity in the United Kingdom drew heavily on a neoliberal discourse. Political, market, and civil society actors discussed the impact of hard times on people using a reductionist neoliberal narrative, framing people as economic actors and consistently underplaying any social or political traits. Thus they find a strong overlap in language utilized by market actors and political actors, and by actors from the opposing two main parties, particularly from 2010 onward. While civil society actors were more likely to break away from this neoliberal mold, the stories which they told were from many reference points, with no evidence of a coherent counter-narrative. More generally, by examining communicative rather than coordinative discourse, the authors expand the focus of previous studies that have examined the embeddedness of ideology in society, and highlight potential links to studies of citizen participation and mobilization.

Finally, the article by Patrick English, Maria T. Grasso, Barbara Buraczynska, Sotirios Karampampas, and Luke Temple (Convergence on Crisis? Comparing Labour and Conservative Party Framing of the Economic Crisis in Britain, 2008-14) looks in further detail at the ways in which the two main British political parties framed the economic crisis. More specifically, they examine the impact of the financial crisis—seen as a “critical juncture” for British politics—on the consensus that has been forming in the United Kingdom since the 1980s regarding the ideological primacy of the market and Thatcherite politics. The authors examine whether this Downsian model of political convergence showed any change in direction between 2008 and 2014. This is of particular interest in the U.K. context since the Labour Party left office in 2010 after being in power for 13 years. Findings show that, despite the critical juncture offered by the crisis, the consensus was maintained and the Labor and the Conservatives adopted very similar framings and narratives of the economic crisis in their public discourses. The authors conclude that such narratives and frames are very much part of a continued Thatcherite, neoliberal understanding and practices in British politics. Taken together, these two articles show how the neoliberal discourse is deeply embedded in British politics and society and that, even important external “shocks” such as the financial crisis, have not overturned this state of affairs.

In conclusion, this special issue offers an articulated argument concerning the political relevance of the Great Recession, well beyond a mere economic
reading of the crisis. While the economic aspects and indicators have largely
been discussed by academics and pundits, more work remains for the social sci-
ences to dig into the varied meanings, effects, and implications of the Great
Recession for European politics. This special issue sheds light on just a few, yet
crucial trends for the politics of crisis. Among the main results, we find that the
crisis opens up opportunities for different discourses in different countries,
even when these latter are similar in the economics of crisis. Contrary to com-
mon opinion, the crisis does not translate necessarily into political action, even
when focusing specifically on the reaction of civil society. We also stress the
possibility to distinguish between an objective crisis on one hand and a subjec-
tive crisis on the other, both of which imply different roles for main political
actors as well as variable dealignments in terms of traditional cleavages. In
addition, the Great Recession can be appreciated in its quality as a strong test
to evaluate the articulation between Europe and the national state, as well as
the resilience of the neoliberal entente between left-wing and right-wing politics
across the public and the policy domain.

Ultimately, this special issue analyzes what is politically at stake with the
crisis. The limits of a purely economic approach may well hide different
attempts to elaborate and disseminate different discourses following the differ-
et normative stand of different actors. So this special issue comes to comple-
ment a broader effort of the scholarly community that must consist in
dedicating publications, conferences, and working group discussions to knowl-
dge that gives us a better view of the multiple political crises that comes
together with the Great Recession. Confused by fear-mongering and economic
technicalities, it is time for Europeans to appreciate the multiple facets, in their
structure and in their construction, of the Great Recession. This latter is a
powerful enterprise of politics that lies entirely within the political realm.
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