P12 / Instruments of Social-welfare Provision

Topic : POLICY FORMULATION, ADMINISTRATION AND POLICYMAKERS

Chair : Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

This panel seeks to understand the panoply of instruments for providing social welfare in a comparative and historical perspective. Many years ago, Esping-Anderson (1990) asserted that modern welfare states “are now predominantly occupied with the production and distribution of social well-being” (p. 1). Though much research remains to understand the policy process, social policymaking is obviously the most common instrument of social-welfare provision. Yet, other instruments are being recognized, such as social entrepreneurship, public-private partnerships, and social movements. Prior research has also examined the intersection of public administration and nongovernmental organizations and the shared responsibilities of modern welfare states and “third parties” (Salamon, 1995; Savas, 2000), this panel seeks to analyze both intra-governmental (i.e., occurring within government) and extra-governmental (i.e., occurring outside government) instruments of social-welfare provision.

State capacity is a germane issue in that a government’s capacity to provide social welfare determine at least in part the policy instruments available to it. The social innovations behind social-welfare provision and the effective conduct of social policy presume a certain level of institutional development and state capacity that varies greatly from state to state. To provide welfare for its citizens through intra-governmental instruments such as public policymaking, a state needs policy capacity enabled through the development of its governance institutions. Indeed, the modern state with robust policy capacity has been the primary source of social innovation in developed societies for most of the twentieth century through today. Yet, when a society has feeble governance institutions and limited policy capacity, more extreme and unpredictable forms of social innovation such as social movements or even revolution can arise. One of the more striking developments of the late twentieth century has been the rise of social entrepreneurship. If a government’s policy capacity is limited but it has a functionally viable institutional foundation, even if inchoate, social entrepreneurship can serve as a source of extra-governmental social innovation (Shockley & Frank, 2011).

CALL FOR PAPERS

This panel seeks research into understanding the panoply of instruments for providing social welfare in a comparative and historical perspective. Many years ago, Esping-Anderson (1990) asserted that modern welfare states “are now predominantly occupied with the production and distribution of social well-being” (p. 1). Though much research remains to understand the policy process, social policymaking is obviously the most common instrument of social-welfare provision. Yet, other instruments are being recognized, such as social entrepreneurship, public-private partnerships, and social movements. Prior research has also examined the intersection of public administration and nongovernmental organizations and the shared responsibilities of modern welfare states and “third parties” (Salamon, 1995; Savas, 2000), this panel seeks to analyze both intra-governmental (i.e., occurring within government) and extra-governmental (i.e., occurring outside government) instruments of social-welfare provision.

P12 / Instruments of Social-welfare Provision

Chair : Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

Session 1Social-welfare provision: Theory

Thursday, June 27th 08:00 to 10:00 (MB 3.265)

Discussants

Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

Ageing in peripheral areas. Socially innovative practices to contrast the isolation of frail elderly people in Italy

Ilaria Madama (University of Milan)

Franca Maino (University of Milan)

Federico Razetti

Italy, together with Germany and Japan, is one of the countries with the oldest population in the world. In spite of that and of the alarming estimates about future demographic trends, Long Term Care (LTC) policy in Italy is still struggling to be acknowledged as a relevant issue in the public debate and political agenda. Policy inertia has instead been prevailing at the national level, leaving the question of how to take care of the growing number of vulnerable elderly people largely dependent on the means of (shrinking) individual families. While institutionalization rates are comparatively low and public home care services are overall weak, the major national measure to support elderly people in need of care consists in a flat-rate, unconditional cash-transfer. In this context, most families end up taking care of the elderly at home, either directly (through informal care) or indirectly (by hiring a caregiver or a helper, not rarely in the shadow economy). These arrangements, that de facto favor ageing in place solutions, make care practices heavily dependent on families' resources and abilities to manage the whole process, and often fail to address key-issues like services' integration and elderly socialization.

Within this context and in sharp contrast with the frozen scenario at the national level, since early 2000s many territories – especially in the North of the country – have been experimenting new socially innovative solutions in the field of LTC, addressing the challenge of building more inclusive local care environments for frail (dependent) elderly people and their families. Among these solutions, it is possible to include those explicitly aiming at trying to combine the advantages of ageing in place with the reduction of the connected risks of isolation, particularly relevant not only in large urban areas, but also in more peripheral territories, where population density is lower and transport services are less developed.

Building on this background, the paper has three main goals: 1) to provide a "workable" definition of socially innovative policies and practices in the field of LTC; 2) to analyze a set of selected socially innovative policy solutions meant to enhance the inclusion of the "cared at home" frail elderly people and their families, and implemented over the last decade in two Northern Italian Regions, Lombardy and Piedmont; 2) to investigate and discuss the factors behind the adoption of such policies and practices at the local level.

From a methodological standpoint, the paper adopts a qualitative comparative approach, relying on sound empirical evidence. Documentary analysis and desk research have in fact been supplemented by in-depth field research, including a number of semi-structured interviews with key local policy actors.

Our preliminary findings suggests that to make sense of the novelties observed in the selected cases under review, we ought to focus on the interplay between raising functional pressure and the emergence of local multi-stakeholder networks involving local public institutions and other key players (NGOs, bank foundations, private companies), also thanks to the financial support made available through EU funding.

Keywords: Ageing in place, Long Term Care, social innovation, social inclusion, Italy

Institutionalization of the Social and Solidarity Economy in France: continuing or breaking the paradigm?

Didier Chabanet

This paper presents an analysis of the institutionalization process of the social and solidarity economy (SSE), of which the July 2014 legislation constituted the culmination. Adopting a neo-institutionalist approach, I analyze twenty interviews undertaken with SSE actors as well as available scientific literature in order to objectify the changes taking place. I identify four main issues:

-*The limits of an SSE*: the 2014 legislation introduced a major disruption by opening up the possibility for commercial companies to integrate the SSE sector, providing that they pursue social policy objectives. As such, these companies should aim to "provide support to people in vulnerable situations" or to contribute to "developing social links and maintaining and reinforcing regional cohesion or compete in the field of sustainable development". Some of the traditional actors of the SSE – mutuals, cooperatives, associations and foundations – lament this change, which they feel risks making the sector lose its core identity and values.

-*A shift from democracy to participation*: the legislation specifies that commercial companies which could integrate the SSE sector due to their social policy should adopt a "participatory governance". The methods for applying this principle are yet unspecified, but many warn that the requirements will be low and that companies will be able to meet such requirements almost virtually. This participatory governance, as defined by the legislation, seems to be more inspired by a multi-stakeholder partnership model, placing the accent on a plurality of members adhering to the framework, rather than on a strictly democratic dimension inseparable from the "one person - one voice" principle.

-*Funding of the SSE*: the legislation aims to promote the capacity of public authorities to intervene financially by giving a precise definition of the subsidy involved, so as to facilitate its use. This flagship legislative measure aims to limit the use of calls for tender and combat the trend to reduce subsidies and grants. However, without the necessary additional resources, the provision in the legislation on subsidies remains symbolic, with the incumbent leftwing government rather seeking to provide guarantees to those proponents of an SSE which is extensively regulated by public authorities.

-*The issue of territory*: the legislation creates a national framework, but this mainly aims to encourage the development of the SSE on a local level. The territorial anchoring of the SSE is indeed held to be one of its main attractions in the eyes of national political policy-makers, as the employment created therefrom cannot be delocalized. This can lead to inequalities in the level of services offered, however, which are the result of both decentralization and multiplication of public-private partnerships. In the home care and child care services sector, in which the lucrative private sector has heavily invested to compete with the voluntary sector, we can indeed observe a segmentation of the offer between wealthy and poor regions.

Regarding these transformations as a whole, the French 2014 legislation marked the beginning of a new era in the evolution of the SSE, now closer to market regulations and private investors than ever before.

Welfarism And Social Welfare Instrument Choice

Noel Semple (University of Windsor Faculty of Law)

This research considers the potential of welfarism to objectively assess instruments for providing social welfare. Welfarism holds that the best public policy option is always the one that is most likely to lead to individuals' lives going best (Veenhoven 2010). The "social welfare function" is a mathematical way to conduct welfarist analysis of policy options (Adler 2019). The premise is that the overall welfare of any individual's life can be represented by a single number, which can be compared to numbers representing the overall welfare of other lives (Sen 1979,Layard and O'Donnell 2015). These lifetime welfare numbers are cardinal and comparable, both between people and between alternative outcomes. They represent expected lifetime wellbeing, which allows welfarist policy analysis to accommodate uncertainty regarding the effects of policy choices (Harsanyi 1955).

While social welfare functions have traditionally been applied to regulatory policy questions (Adler 2017), this research considers their value for comparing instruments of social welfare provision. It defines "social welfare" as a prioritarian aggregation of the subjective lifetime well-being numbers of all individuals in the population of interest (Parfit 1995).The roles of state and non-state actors in generating social welfare are considered.

A distinction will be drawn between direct effects of a policy choice on social welfare (e.g. on the recipient of

a social service) and indirect effects (e.g. on individuals for whom the service-recipient provides care or labour). For a welfarist policy-maker, “sins of omission” (failure to put in place policies which are very likely to produce strong net welfare benefits) are just as serious as “sins of commission” (Singer 2016). The UK’s “Improving Access to Psychological Therapies” program is presented as an example of a social welfare instrument supported by strong welfarist arguments (Clark, Fleche et al. 2018).

Adler, M. (2019). Measuring Social Welfare: an Introduction. New York, Oxford University Press.
Adler, M. D. (2017). "A Better Calculus for Regulators: From Cost-Benefit Analysis to the Social Welfare Function (Working Paper EE 17-01 March 2017)."
Clark, A., S. Fleche, R. Layard, N. Powdthavee and G. Ward (2018). The Origins of Happiness: The Science of Well-Being over the Life Course. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
Harsanyi, J. C. (1955). "Cardinal Welfare, Individualistic Ethics, and Interpersonal Comparisons of Utility Author(s): ." Journal of Political Economy63: 309-321.
Layard, R. and G. O’Donnell (2015). "How To Make Policy When Happiness Is The Goal."
Parfit, D. (1995). "Equality or Priority? (The Lindley Lecture, University of Kansas)." from https://www.philosophy.rutgers.edu/joomlatools-files/docman-files/3ParfitEqualityorPriority2000.pdf.
Sen, A. (1979). "Personal Utilities and Public Judgements: Or What's Wrong With Welfare Economics." The Economic Journal89(355).
Singer, P. (2016). Ethics in the Real World: 82 Brief Essays on Things that Matter. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
Veenhoven, R. (2010). "Greater Happiness for a Greater Number." Journal of Happiness Studies11(5): 605-629.

The Dark Side of Social Entrepreneurship: Good and Bad Social-Welfare Provision

Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

Social entrepreneurship is fundamentally about social change. But there can be good social change and bad social change. What can ensure that good social change occurs? We begin this paper by exploring the likelihood that personal ethical positions are vital to producing good social change, such as those of the character Aeneas in Virgil’s Aeneid (Shockley & Frank, 2010) or the character Father Zosima in Dostoevsky’s Brothers Karamazov (Shockley & Frank, 2012). Yet, personal ethical positions of course are insufficient beyond immediate activity. In recent years, social entrepreneurship has become appropriately recognized worldwide for the social good that it has produced across the globe, such as those nurtured produced by Ashoka and the Grameen family of ventures of Muhammad Yunus that lead to the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 (Yunus & Weber, 2007). After a sketch our approach to the concept of social entrepreneurship based on the work of Joseph Schumpeter (1950) and Israel Kirzner (1997), we will first discuss social entrepreneurship as a force for social good on a larger, Schumpeterian scale. There is nothing inherent to the idea and practice of social entrepreneurship that ensures that it produces only social good. The polycentric, decentralized, bottom-up structures within which social entrepreneurship occurs mitigates to some extent the risks of abuse (Frank & Shockley, 2016). But they cannot systematically prevent and stop abuses. In short, social entrepreneurship could be a force for social bad as well social good. We will conclude with the possibility of this “dark” side of social entrepreneurship. We will review some poignant historical and current examples.

P12 / Instruments of Social-welfare Provision

Chair : Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

Session 2Social-welfare provision: Practice

Thursday, June 27th 10:30 to 12:30 (MB 3.265)

Discussants

Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

Gordon Shockley (Arizona State U.)

Redistribution through cash transfers : the impact of left-wing governments and corporatism on transfers to low-income families in OECD countries (1990-2018)

Dominic Durocher (University of Ottawa)

Child benefits were introduced in the postwar period to improve the economic well-being of families. In most countries, families receive the same amount of benefits regardless of their income. However, some countries like Canada, replaced their flat-rate child benefits with income-based benefits and introduced tax-credits targeted to low-income families and low-wage workers. These policies were specifically aimed at reducing child poverty and socioeconomic inequalities between families. Inspired by the power resource theory, we postulate that these reforms are influenced by the presence of leftist parties in government. Left-wing governments tend to create and increase benefits to low-income families, because their ideology favors redistribution and to consolidate the vote of low-income families. However, we postulate that this relation is influenced by the degree of coordination between social partners in collective bargaining. When coordination is strong, left-wing governments delegate the reduction of inequalities between workers and working families to unions and collective bargaining. Therefore, they maintain flat-rate child benefits that support families, regardless of their income. However, when the coordination is weak, unions are unable to reduce child poverty and inequalities between working families, because most low-income workers are not integrated in the collective bargaining process. Consequently, left-wing governments use income-based benefits and tax-credits to reduce inequalities and poverty. To demonstrate this argument, we use statistical analyzes based on OECD data to measure the effect of government ideology and corporatism on the level of benefits received by low-income families in OECD countries from 1990 to 2018.

Guidelines for Inmate Welfare in Thailand

Preechaya Nakfon (Srinakharinwirot University)

The objective of this article was to propose the guidelines for providing appropriate welfare for inmates. Relevant literature, in-depth interviews with experts, as well as inquiries about information and opinions from inmates and personnel involved in providing welfare for inmates in prisons and correctional institutions were analyzed to interpret the data. An inductive conclusion was developed based on tangible information or phenomena extracted from the collected data. The finding from the research was that existing goals and practices for providing inmate welfare are based on the basic concepts and definitions of the term “inmate welfare,” which have been used to define the scope of operations by operational officers who perform duties in prisons and correctional institutions. The “human rights principles”have been adhered to as the basic principles under the international standard framework. The basic concept of prison management is that a prison is a place of punishment, but not a place for punishment. The provision of welfare for Thai inmates should take into account three issues – (1) A clear definition and scope of the term ‘inmate welfare,’ (2) An understanding about social values, and (3) An awareness of minimum standard requirements. Thus, the principle for formulating the guidelines for inmate welfare provision should be the view that ‘imprisonment is a restriction of the freedom of inmates, but not the taking away of their fundamental rights or the diminishment of their human dignity.’ Thus, the welfare provided for inmates should comprise two parts – welfare based on basic citizen rights or human rights and welfare based on the right to development. The inmate welfare provision should involve the integration of operations from multiple parties, which include the

Department of Corrections, as the main implementing agency, and a public agency whose mission concerns providing basic services to the general public, business operators equipped with the capacity to support the provision of the welfare or basic services for inmates, and the general public who can take actions to support inmate welfare provision. If all of these parties possess positive attitudes and the good intention to integrate their operations seriously, this will allow for the improvement in inmate welfare provision-related work and ensure proper living conditions of inmates based on the basic rights which they are entitled to. This will be a contributing factor which will result in correctional operations in Thailand achieving the goals of inmate control and development.

Key words: Inmate Welfare, Inmate Welfare Provision, Inmates

Privatisation as an instrument of social welfare provision: the case prison privatisation in Victoria, Australia

Deirdre O'Neill (Monash University)

Valarie Sands (Monash University)

Graeme HODGE (Faculty of Law, Monash University)

Since the 1970s, many international jurisdictions have embraced private sector solutions to problems of social welfare provision. Prisons, once regarded as a core responsibility of the public sector, have not been quarantined from this process. In Australia, the state's monopoly of correctional services ended in 1990 with the opening of the first privately operated prison in the northern state of Queensland. Now, nearly three decades later, Australia has the highest proportion of prisoners in privately managed prisons in the world. Our paper analyses the experience of one Australian state, Victoria, which has made the most extensive use of a range of privatisation mechanisms to finance, build and manage that state's prison system. The Victorian experience of delivering alternative models of prison services has included the 'design, construct, finance and manage' (DCFM) model, which transmogrified into the 'build, own, operate and transfer' (BOOT) model, and more recently, 'public-private partnerships' (PPPs). As a consequence of implementing these new models, privatisation has become entrenched within Victoria's prison system.

The paper explains how successive Victorian governments of differing ideological persuasions utilised privatisation in the expectation of delivering more efficient and effective prison services in the context of a growing prison population. It identifies the key drivers of prisons privatisation, including changing views on the role of government, and more particularly, the public sector, in managing prisons, as well as the adoption of new forms of management within the public sector. The extent to which expectations of a cheaper, better and more accountable prison system have been realised via the adoption of privatisation are then assessed.

Taking an historical perspective and drawing upon publicly available documents, the paper traces the evolution of prison management in Victoria from a traditional bureaucratic model which assumed complete state responsibility to one in which the private sector took on major roles. The paper explores the impact of shared responsibility between the state and the private sector upon prison management and the provision of prison services. The experience of Victoria's prison privatisation project is lastly compared with those of other Australian states. In doing so, the paper seeks to evaluate the efficacy of various models of privatisation as instruments of social welfare provision in Australian prisons.