Background and Objectives

The project was designed from the outset primarily as a conceptual exercise rather than relying heavily upon primary data gathering. It was deliberately set up as an exchange of intellectual traditions between an 'OECD' tradition of social policy and development studies, based on experience of analysing poverty and livelihoods in poorer countries. In this way, it had two main objectives:

- Support for DfID’s efforts to gain a stronger conceptual grasp of different global discourses about poverty and livelihoods
- Leading to improved institutional options for poverty elimination and welfare maintenance

At the same time, a single discrete piece of original fieldwork was planned and undertaken to 'test' out concepts, especially welfare regime, social exclusion and livelihoods dynamics, in Bangladesh. This has been done at country and village level.

The objectives of the research were not confined to servicing the precise agenda of DFID, but extended to the policy and applied research community more generally. In the context of globalisation, the separately bounded discourses of OECD social policy and the poverty-oriented dimension of development studies were no longer tenable. Given the rapidity of socio-economic change in various parts of the poorer world, especially through the commercialisation of agriculture, urbanisation and the growth
of formal employment, the question had to be asked whether the *sui generis* character of development studies has to give way to a generic notion of social policy in which the state corrects market inequalities. Thus ESCOR-DFID sponsored an examination of social policy in development contexts, partly to explore conceptual transfers from regions with pervasive labour markets and functioning states and partly as a fishing expedition in conceptual development under increasingly global conditions. Three institutions were funded: the Institute of Development Studies at Sussex University (to undertake primary empirical fieldwork); the School of Development Studies at the University of East Anglia (to analyse the relationship between work and well-being); and the Institute for International Policy Analysis at the University of Bath (to pursue conceptual development in selected areas, see below).

The Bath research adopted two key conceptual points of departure: *welfare regimes* as analysed for OECD countries and *globalisation*. Social policy colleagues at Bath had been particularly interested in the wider potential value of the ‘welfare regime’ analysis of Esping-Andersen. This conceives of state welfare within a broad framework and develops a cross-country classification of the OECD world. First, the state is situated alongside markets and households to analyse varying ‘welfare mixes’. Second, social outcomes are assessed in terms of ‘decommodification’ – the extent to which workers and their families are protected against risks stemming from their position in the labour market. Third, these patterns generate different interests, power constellations and patterns of stratification around welfare issues which tend to reproduce through time. On this basis, he identifies ‘three worlds of welfare capitalism’: the liberal (eg. the USA), the conservative (eg. Germany, Italy) and the social democratic (eg. Sweden).

This whole political economy analysis of welfare regimes rested on two social preconditions: a pervasive labour market and a legitimated state. To this, can be added mature, trusted and sophisticated financial markets through which both individuals and the state could make sustained livelihoods investments. Clearly these welfare regime arguments relied heavily upon the Polanyian principle that the Great Transformation to capitalism disembedded much economic behaviour from social morality, with the crucial exception of the labour market. Labour was at best an artificial commodity and thus remained deeply embedded within the moral psyche, though now requiring the state to represent that morality through upholding equity and fairness, though not equality. How would these arguments play out in less developed countries with partial labour markets, partial urbanisation and states with contested legitimacy?

Another assumption of the welfare regime framework is that states retain a degree of control over their economies and can implement social policies and fiscal redistribution. This assumption is now questioned by extensive globalisation: the opening up of domestic economies to trade, foreign capital investment and international financial flows, and the concomitant greater influence of international financial institutions on policy making. These concerns apply *a fortiori* to developing countries with their greater economic and political dependency within the global political economy. Is the welfare regime analysis undermined by economic and cultural globalisation? And what are the implications for a viable social policy in development contexts? At Bath, we chose to explore these central questions through the following, selected, themes.
Research Themes and Projects

**Welfare regimes**: conceptualised as above, and applied to a range of regional contexts representing middle income countries in East Asia (Gough) and Latin America (Barrientos), as well as an exemplar poorer country, Bangladesh (Davis). We also invited Bevan to explore the validity of these proposition in the context of countries in Africa. During this process, two conceptual developments occurred. First, an increasing focus upon security and insecurity at both individual and regime level (Wood). Second, an extension of the welfare mix in two directions: to add a community element to the original triangle, and to internationalise the resulting square. The result is the following ‘institutional responsibility matrix’ (IRM).

### The institutional responsibility matrix’ (IRM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Supra-national</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Domestic governance</td>
<td>International organisations, national donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Domestic markets</td>
<td>Global markets, MNCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Civil society, NGOs</td>
<td>International NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>International household strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further conceptual innovation was required to replace decommodification as a measure of welfare outcomes and to adapt the stratification dimension to countries with different distributions of power resources and more particularistic forms of interest representation.

**System Independent Concepts**: the globalisation of social policy (whether possible, probable or desirable) raises questions about the global acceptance of universal rights and standards. Doyal and Gough’s earlier *A Theory of Human Need* identified two universal basic needs (good health and personal autonomy) which could nevertheless be delivered through widely different satisfiers. Globalisation is changing the material basis and the discourses within which these debates take place, in particular through adapting international conventions on human rights to a global discourse on social rights. We recruited van den Anker from Sussex University to contrast the material and normative implications of globalisation.

**Adverse Incorporation**: much of the OECD social policy discourse refers to social exclusion as a central process through which poverty is created and reproduced. But Wood argues that poor countries are characterised rather by pervasive, but problematic, inclusion. The majority of the poor are held in dependent relationships of ‘rights’ and entitlement as clients of patrons: i.e. adverse incorporation, exploited through personalised dependency rather than impersonal capitalist exploitation. These arguments suggest an alternative ‘peasant analogue’ to the commodification analogue of the welfare regime analysis.

**Social Exclusion and Mass Poverty**: we clearly had to ask whether the concept of social exclusion is valid under conditions of mass poverty, such as Bangladesh. This has been explored conceptually through a comprehensive review of the social exclusion literature (Davis) and through an adaptation of livelihoods arguments as ‘snakes and ladders’ with promotional passports and protective buffers (Room). There has also
been empirical support through a case histories approach to livelihoods analysis in Davis’s ‘Calamity and Coping in a Bangladesh village’. While social exclusion remains an elusive concept with contested application, a clearer position has emerged in the research seeing social exclusion as a problem of membership and identity, threatening rights and entitlements, and a condition of being on the wrong side of closed social capital.

**Inter-Generational Transfer:** the reproduction of poverty and unequal opportunities rely heavily upon transfers between generations at societal level and within the family. Collard offers an innovative three-generational model as a way of analysing the dynamics of this process, for example by tracking transfers to and from the elderly and human capital investment in the young. We have agreed that further steps in this analysis require more adaptation to ‘peasant analogue’ conditions of poorer countries and more sensitivity in the model to gender outcomes arising from different hypothesised scenarios.

**Social Exclusion under conditions of globalisation:** given the significance of globalisation as material flows, international governance and normative claims, what new patterns of global social exclusion emerge? During the research Room has investigated the implications of Deacon’s claim that the opportunities for global exit by the rich and middle classes in developing countries is undermining the prospects for domestic social pacts supportive of Western-style social policies. In the face of this he studies the prospects and viability for a multi-tiered international welfare system.

**Methods**

Two principal methods were envisaged at the start of the programme: theoretical review and dialogue between social policy and development studies; and fieldwork in Bangladesh. In addition, in the absence of relevant supporting empirical work from elsewhere, we became interested in a cluster analysis of countries, representing different sets of conditions affecting the viability for application of the welfare regime model. This has led to a rough, incomplete typology as a basis for selecting exemplar regions to explore the limits of the welfare regime model. Thus we added a third method: regional comparisons of labour market and social protection data from secondary sources.

**Main Findings**

Two categories of output have emerged from the original headings, which will form the basis of the two volumes to be published (details below):

1. **Insecurity and Welfare Regimes in Developing Countries:** East Asia, Latin America, Africa and Bangladesh, together with models of multi-tiered welfare systems on a regional and international basis.

2. **Securing Development- Exclusion, Adverse Incorporation and Security Strategies:** social exclusion; generational bargains; vulnerability and coping; insecurity and search for security; clientelism and governance; institutional
responsibility; social rights, citizenship and correlative duties; de-commodification for development.

INSECURITY AND WELFARE REGIMES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Welfare regimes assume pervasive markets and relatively autonomous states. The ‘peasant analogue’ emphasises the opposite.

Welfare regimes comprise a relatively stable combination of institutional mix, livelihood outcomes and stratification effects, all within the context of a political ‘settlement’ between major social forces. The applicability of this framework depends on the extensiveness of capitalist social relations and the legitimacy and autonomy of states. It is a neo-Marxist political economy approach assuming the existence of markets, classes and states. At the other end of an ideal-typical continuum, the ‘peasant analogue’ emphasises a lack of institutional differentiation between markets, states, civil societies and households; the pervasiveness of clientelism within states; and the importance of ascriptive, status-based identities and the symbolic, bureaucratic and coercive dimensions of power.

The study and practice of social policy in development contexts thus needs to discriminate between different countries and regions according to these criteria.

The applicability of the welfare regime framework will depend on such factors as: the extent of industrialisation and urbanisation, relative income levels, the persistance of democracy and social mobilisation, and state legitimacy and capacity. Cluster analysis suggests three broad regional groups outside the OECD: above average government spending and welfare outcomes (Latin America and Central-Eastern Europe); below average expenditure and above-average outcomes (China and East Asia); and below-average expenditure and outcomes (South Asia and Africa). More discriminating analysis, and our regional studies, reveals a much more variegated patterning.

Latin America: from conservative-liberal to liberal-liberal regime.

Welfare regimes developed in the countries of South America in the first half of the twentieth century but have been transformed within the last decade. Prior to this they were segmented ‘conservative’ regimes with developed social insurance and employment protection for formal sector workers and their dependants, plus aspirations to universal access in health and education. Outside the formal sector, perhaps one half of the population had little security and relied on unregulated labour systems and household strategies. Following structural reforms in the 1990s, employment protection has declined and social insurance and social services have been partly replaced by privatised provision. This reflects the impact of changed global economic conditions, the shift to ‘export-led growth’ and the erosion of the older public-sector-based political coalitions.

East Asia: the limits of ‘productivist’ welfare regimes

In Northeast Asia, a quite distinct ‘productivist’ welfare regime exists. Social policy is subordinated to economic policy and the goal of state-directed economic growth. Social investment in education and basic health is relatively strong while social protection is remarkable weak. The role of markets and households is dominant within a context of high export and income growth. Southeast Asia has several
similarities though with less autonomous and steered states. The 1997 financial crisis, partly a result of the international exposure of these economies, has exposed the limits of this regime and is bringing about differential responses according to the extent of industrialisation and democratisation in different countries.

**In poorer countries, such as Bangladesh, the welfare regime concept engages less adequately with socio-economic conditions and livelihood mechanisms**

In Bangladesh, the welfare mix provides a fruitful way to map components of livelihood provision, provided it is extended to encompass local non-state forms of welfare provision (family, kinship, community, NGOs) and also more global or supranational actors (multilateral and bilateral donors, international remittances). This represents a use of the IRM framework. But the broader idea of regime has several shortcomings. In particular, non-economic power resources must be acknowledged, and ‘civil society’ (especially in the form of development NGOs) is only partially free of incorporation pressures and pervasive clientelism.

**In much of Africa only zones of insecurity are observable**

Much of Africa (outside North Africa, South Africa and parts of Southern Africa) can be characterised as a field of insecurity regimes. Neither Marx (capital and class) nor Weber (integrated national territory, legitimate monopoly of force, minimal revenue-raising capacity) apply. Openess to powerful international players and widespread political clientelism is the basis for both chronic conflict and insecurity. Under such conditions, livelihoods are precarious, unstable and uncertain with limited recourse to either state or civil society, requiring a heavier dependence on more personalised relationships or social resources for basic welfare. From this perspective welfare regimes can be seen as special cases of more general (in)security regimes.

**Resource transfers for welfare and development are increasingly affected by international conditions for most societies**

Although the domestic polity and economy remain the most significant arenas within which political settlements have to be made and livelihoods pursued, for most societies the international aspect of the welfare mix is of growing importance. This has four aspects. First, the impact of international governmental institutions and powerful Northern states on domestic policy-making in the developing world. Second, the intrusion of transnational corporations and financial institutions into traditional areas of national social provision, such as health, education, pensions and microfinance. Third, the role of international NGOs in emergency relief and longer-term social aid. Fourth, labour migration and remittances as part of transnational strategies undertaken by households. The openness of societies to these four aspects of globalisation will critically determine the context for domestic social policy making.

**A truly global social policy entails analysing interdependencies between the international and national levels**

A standard critique of national welfare argues that globalisation undermines national capacities via the global mobility of capital and skilled professions. However, the globalisation of social policy does not necessarily mean that the nation state and national welfare are redundant, but that their construction depends on appropriate
international foundations being laid. To analyse these interdependencies between the national and international levels, a regional perspective is fruitful. We are exploring the relevance of European Union experience in (relatively) consensual policy-making for different regions in the developing world. Such an approach can avoid the pessimism of many globalisation scenarios for social policy, as well as build on the regional differentiation explicit in our approach.

SECURING DEVELOPMENT: EXCLUSION, ADVERSE INCORPORATION AND SECURITY STRATEGIES

Social exclusion in development contexts

‘Social exclusion’, as used in European social policy debates, is of questionable use in development contexts. However a related notion, drawing on Weber, has proved fruitful. This sees it as a social process generating illfare in society which combines Marx’s emphasis on exploitation (the extraction of surplus value) with Weber’s emphasis on closure and the use of other (non-economic) power resources. This allows a broader and more applicable way of locating the process of social exclusion within attempts to understand the political economy of development contexts.

The role of capital, labour and class needs complementing with neo-Weberian concepts of social closure and exclusion based on ascriptive, status based identities

In development contexts the lines of social segmentation combine capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production. The latter underpin discrete sets of identities based on local natural resource management and territorial disputes over resources conceived as finite under low technological conditions, maintained through blood and affinal ties. The strength of these identities establish a contradiction between private goods social resources and public goods social capital: the strength of the former precluding the formation of the latter. To the extent that the latter is the basis for macro level social policy, then societies with intense sub-societal identities erect definite limits to the prospects for national social policy.

The political expression of these interests and identities in the form of patron-clientelism and adverse incorporation must be taken on board

These primordial, pre-capitalist identities underpin the pervasive clientelism through which resources and opportunities are actually distributed in such societies. The paucity and insecurity of commodified opportunities in open, urban labour markets requires poor people to seek security within pre-commodified relations. And with the state appearing only as a weak and unreliable patron, often more predatory than enabling, poor people are behaving rationally when committing their futures and fortunes to their social patrons. Membership is key. Furthermore, the process becomes self-reinforcing as alternative more progressive social structural options are precluded by virtue of the strength of the incorporation—a form of structuration. The practical overwhelms the strategic.
The significance and contradictions of informal rights and entitlements must be acknowledged

Where the state is de-legitimated, especially in the perception of the poor, recourse to informal rights and entitlements becomes imperative. However, the classic arguments against informalism still hold: the entitlements can be arbitrary, discretionary, conditional and unequal. Much of what would be identified by donors (and the American liberal political science discourse from which it emanates) as civil society is strongly implicated in the reproduction of poverty and inequality. A more sceptical, Gramscian, approach to understanding the role of civil society leads to a distinction between incorporated and critical civil society, with only the latter supporting the consolidation of democracy and the reduction of poverty through voice and advocacy.

In the context of institutional failure, the family retains high significance for welfare, development and security

Alongside informal community-based rights, the family retains a particular significance as an almost irreducible moral unit in the context of institutional failure in other domains. In poor countries, the family remains the moral site within which its members might expect their best possible allocation of needs satisfiers. However, the family in poor countries is shrinking as a moral unit under various forms of socio-economic transformation, especially from larger joint/extended kin units to smaller nuclear families. The combination of nucleation of families and expanding informal, and highly casual, labour markets can constitute a significant intensification of risk and vulnerability for household members.

The generational bargain is thus central to understanding the conditions for social policy, especially in countries where welfare regime principles are weakest

The generational bargain framework provides a useful way of looking at transfers from the working generation to the young (particularly education and training) and to the old (particularly pensions). The total transfer burden falling on a working generation depends not just on the old-age dependency ratio but on both the total dependency ratio (including children) and the size of transfers. Adjusting the concept in this way generally raises the transfer burden in developing countries and lowers it in developed countries. Use of child labour and under-investment in education may be rational for poor households, especially when liquidity constrained. The most important factors are direct and indirect education costs and the adult wage rate relative to the child wage rate.

Altering time-preference behaviour as a policy principle

To the extent that social policy is centrally about altering the time-preference behaviour of organisations, households and individuals, enabling poor people to adopt longer term perspectives and reducing their discount rate of the future has to be both a policy objective as well as a means to it. The poorer people of poorer countries have to rely far more on their inter-generational blood ties as the guarantee of certainty in long term obligations of care and realisation of investment. Thus individuals are heavily dependent not just on their partners or on their parents during childhood, but upon each other across their complete life-cycle. Of course these transfers are rarely
equitable, and 'bargains' are always sensitive to changes in the socio-economic environment.

**Social policy in development contexts is necessarily reflexive**

Social policy should seek a resolution to the unequal distribution of uncertainty, and the creation of a strong and predictable link between effort, investment and reward by poor people themselves. In addition to overall problems of opportunity absorption in the macro-economy, there has to be a multi-sourced attack upon exploitation, rent-seeking, privilege and other market distortions which reproduce poverty. Given the conditions faced by households, time preference behaviour can only be altered through the intervention of agencies external to the household. However, for some poorer countries and regions of sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia the central policy dilemma is the unreliability of the instruments on which such policy initiatives depend. Thus social policy has also to be about creating the instruments through which social policy can be pursued.

**EMPIRICAL FINDINGS**

Data from case studies carried out in Bangladesh in 2000 and 2001 examined common patterns of calamity and coping among groups of poor people in an attempt to understand both formal and informal forms of social protection and to inform the formulation of analytical concepts for evaluating such social policy interventions. In the process a useful life history analysis methodology was developed. This methodology had a number of advantages over usual survey techniques particularly in identifying relationships between life events and understanding cumulative effects within life trajectories. A number of important causes (and consequences) of calamity in peoples lives, such as ill health, crippling dowry costs, unemployment, accidents, court cases and legal costs and social conflict were identified as particularly important. These causes and consequences (often impossible to separate out) are clearly located in the wider political economy of ill fare and social protection. A wide range of coping strategies (both formal and informal) were also identified. These strategies were seen to have ambiguous outcomes for short and long term welfare as well as for reinforcing structural outcomes which may perpetuate prevailing patterns of subordination and dependency and (lack of) mobilisation. In order to evaluate the overall system of social protection produced and its outcomes (welfare, stratification and mobilisation) we need to recognise various sources of social power and the ways these are used to exploit and exclude poor people even while providing a minimal measure of social protection. Drawing from data in Bangladesh a broad political-economy approach to social protection is developed.

**Dissemination**

We have run two open extended workshops to present our findings: in Bangladesh in March 2000 and in Bath in March 2001.
The programme also built a website where the working papers can be accessed, as well as abstracts of published papers can be found.
(http://www.bath.ac.uk/Faculties/HumSocSci/IFIPA/GSP/)

**SPDC’s South Asia workshop in Dhaka, March 2000**: we were keen to convene at least one workshop abroad to test our thinking against the critical examination of academics from poor countries, as well as DFID social development advisors from a region. Given Bangladesh as our exemplar country, we convened this workshop near Dhaka at Koitta, with the assistance of IDPAA-Proshika, with invitees from India and Pakistan. We had circulated some of our draft papers well in advance to selected participants who were then able to present their own papers, referring to, testing and exploring our conceptual frameworks. Dr. Rogalý and his research team from West Bengal, in particular, engaged closely with our arguments. At a final, open session in Dhaka, we were also grateful for a constructive critique by Prof. Rehman Sobhan. In particular, he confirmed and applied the adverse incorporation arguments beyond face-to-face patron-client relations to state-society systems as a whole. He saw this as profoundly limiting any optimism about state performance of the corrective principle. This reference is particularly apposite, given opposing optimism by HQ DFID SDAs.

**SPDC Completion Workshop, University of Bath, March 2001**: A small final workshop was held at Bath, attended by representatives from DFID, UEA, Luton, Hertford, Johns Hopkins, Sussex. The first 4 sessions comprised papers presented by the SPDC at Bath team: conceptual overviews, regional welfare regimes, international social policy, and development and social policy. In the final, fifth, session de Haan and Shultz from DFID presented both a DFID perspective on global social policy as well as reactions to the Bath papers.

**Other conferences, seminars and presentations:**
In addition, team members have contributed to many conferences, workshops and research groups (see Annex 1)

**Publications and Working papers** (see Annexes 2 & 3)

**Forthcoming 2 Edited Volumes** (see Annex 4)
Annex 1: Conferences, Seminar and Presentations

Whole Team

Presentation of SPDC research project at DFID Social Development Annual Workshop, September 1999, relating particularly to the proposed SPDC regional workshop in Bangladesh in 2000.

Ian Gough

*Welfare regimes: some initial notes on adapting the framework to developing societies* - Paper presented at Final Conference of the European Forum, EUI, Florence, 21-22 June 1999

*Globalisation and the renewed structural power of capital* - Paper presented to workshop on Globalisation and Public Policy, University of Toronto, Canada, 10-21 May 1999

Participation in Manila Social Forum on Social Crisis in East Asia, jointly organised by the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank, Manila, November 1999;


*"From welfare to workfare: social integration or forced labour?"*. Paper presented at EU seminar, Portugal 1 February 2000


Participation in DfID workshop with Ravi Kanbur to discuss draft of World Development Report 2000/1: 'Attacking Poverty'. London 18 February

Participation in 'Seminar on Policies and Instruments to Fight Poverty in the European Union', organised by the Portuguese Presidency of the European Union; Almansil, Portugal, 1-2 February 2000;

Participation in 'Promoting socio-economic security', a workshop with invited international experts convened by the ILO InFocus Programme on Socio-Economic Security at the Rockefeller Foundation, Bellagio Italy, 6-9 March 2000


8–10 November 2000: Presentation on ‘Globalisation and welfare regimes: lessons from the East Asian Region’ to International Seminar on Global Social Policies and Social Rights, GASSP, New Delhi, India
11 November 2000: Attendance at Editorial Board of Global Social Policy, New Delhi, India


**Geof Wood**

‘Adverse Incorporation: Another Dark Side of Social Capital’ IDS Poverty Seminar February 1999

Participation in DfID/WDR Workshop in Oxford on governance issues, as preparation for the WDR 2000/1 February 1999

‘Problematic Inclusion as the mirror to social exclusion’ DFID/Social Policy Workshop (UEA, IDS and Bath) May 1999

*Prisoners and Escapees: Towards Political and Administrative Improvement* - paper for the Development Studies Association conference, September 1999

Discussions with the World Bank on issues of social protection, governance, and the anti-poverty programme, Washington November 1999


Participation in DfID workshop with Ravi Kanbur to discuss draft of World Development Report 2000/1: 'Attacking Poverty'. London 18 February 2000

Participation in the European Network of Bangladesh Studies Conference, 14-16th May 2000, Oslo.

‘Desperately Seeking Security’ Inaugural Lecture at University of Bath, 18 May 2000 (delivered again to Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Manchester, March 2001)


Presentation of 'Prisoners and Escapees' arguments to DFID sponsored course for senior civil servants from Bangladesh at Department of Public Policy and International Development, University of Birmingham 22nd May 2000

Conducting Social Development Training for senior officials in Rural Support Programmes in Pakistan, Autumn 2000

Christien van den Anker

Presented paper on UNDP proposals for Global Governance at the British International Studies Association Autumn 2000

Graham Room


Social Mobility, Social Exclusion and Social Welfare: Comparative Dynamics: an assessment of the feasibility of operationalising snakes and ladders by reference to UK/EU data sets, paper presented to Oslo workshop of EU research team on social exclusion, Spring 2000

Peter Davis

Welfare regimes and social exclusion: the case of Bangladesh - Discussion paper presented at DFID meeting, May 1999

Presentation and discussion of the conceptual approach to key researchers and social policy actors in Bangladesh, June/July 1999

Presentation of SPDC current work to groups in NGOs and Government Training Institutes in Bangladesh, July 1999

Presentation of “Rethinking the Welfare Regime Approach: The Case of Bangladesh” at the European Network of Bangladesh Studies Conference, 14-16th May 2000, Oslo

Participation in "Livelihood Diversification and the Rural Poor" workshop, New Delhi, Ministry of Rural Development/ODI 26th-30th June 2000
Discussion of research plans and findings with key personnel at Proshika, Bangladesh, September 2000

Presentation of research findings to staff and group members of Community Development Project, Kushtia, Bangladesh October 2000

Seminar presentation on welfare regimes at Alauddin Ahmed Teachers Training College, Kushtia, Bangladesh October 2000

David Collard

Inter-generational transfers - Paper presented at DFID meeting in May 1999.
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Insecurity and Welfare Regimes in Developing Countries

Edited by I. Gough and G. Wood

Ian Gough and Geof Wood  Introduction

Part 1  Analytical Framework

1. Ian Gough  Insecurity and Welfare Regimes in developing Countries
2. Ian Gough  Global Welfare Regimes: a regional analysis

Part II  Regional regimes

3. Armando Barrientos  Neo-liberal welfare regimes in Latin America
4. Ian Gough  East Asia: the limits of productivist regimes
5. Pip Bevan  The dynamics of African (in)security regimes

Part III  Welfare Mixes and Institutional Responsibility in Bangladesh

6. Peter Davis  Applying the welfare regime approach in Bangladesh
7. Geof Wood  Deep Structures and the Governance Problem in Bangladesh

Part IV  Towards a Global Social Policy

8. Graham Room  Multi-tiered international welfare systems
9. Ian Gough & Geof Wood  Conclusion: Regional Diversity or global conformity?
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Edited by G. Wood and I. Gough
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