

Synergistic Interactions Between Social Policy and SSEs in Developing Countries: Interfaces in Discourse and Practice*

ILCHEONG YI | UNRISD
HYUK-SANG SOHN | KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY**
TAEKYOON KIM | SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

This study sets out to discover the potential linkages creating synergies between the expansion of social protections and the emergence of various forms of social and solidarity economy (SSE), both of which have been proactively identifiable within development discourses and practices for developing countries over the recent decades. These two expansion processes have also been producing interfaces where social policy and SSE are able to interact with each other. Focusing on the interfaces created by development strategies, participation and partnership, the study not only explains actors, institutions, and processes involved in the interactions between social policy and SSE, but also identifies opportunities and challenges created by specific tensions in each interface, and strategies to scale up both social policy and SSE in a synergistic way.

Keywords: *Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE), Social Policy, Social Protection, Development, Developing Countries, Transformation*

*This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2015S1A3A2046224). Authors would like to express their appreciation to the staffs of UN Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) for their suggestions during the planning and development of this work.

**Corresponding Author

Introduction

Facing multiple developmental challenges, an increasing number of governments in both developing and developed countries are paying attention to the importance of Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) that creates jobs, combats poverty and inequality and empowers workers. SSE, defined as economic activities and relations that prioritize social and often environmental considerations over private economic interests and profits, covers a diverse range of organizations and enterprises. They include but are not limited to: cooperatives, mutual associations, grant-dependent and service-delivery non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and communities and other forms of voluntary groups that produce goods and services, self-help groups, fair trade networks and other forms of solidarity purchasing, consumer groups involved in collective providing, associations of informal workers, and new forms of profit-making social enterprises and social entrepreneurs and NGOs that are having to shift from a dependence on donations and grants to sustaining themselves via income-generating activities. They involve forms of democratic management and governance which are often linked to active citizenship and democratic participation (Utting 2013).

Various contexts and factors have been combined to prompt SSE to expand, particularly in developing countries. Globalization, economic liberalization, and multiple crises in finance, food, and energy sectors often resulted in a heightened vulnerability, particularly among those living in developing countries. People, notably those affected heavily by these crises, began to organize themselves and engage in various forms of SSE organizations and enterprises to defend or improve their livelihoods. The expansion of SSE has also been accelerated by the increase of political and social forces organizing marginalized identities such as women and indigenous people. The search for alternatives to the norms and policies of market fundamentalism such as *Buen Vivir*, degrowth, and food sovereignty has provided normative underpinnings to SSE activists and practitioners (UNRISD 2016).

Laws, government's development policies, programmers and institutions, particularly social policy programs and institutions play a significant role in helping the SSE expand itself, exert its full potential for development and be resilient and stable over time (UNRISD 2016). For instance, to implement social policy programmes, governments in many

developing countries, particularly those under fiscal constraints, have often sought partnerships with the private sector in delivering social services rather than expand the public sector. Public social service delivery by private sector institutions based on government contracts has resulted in various unintended negative impacts such as fragmented welfare infrastructure, low quality service and adverse selection. SSE organizations and enterprises involved in delivering the contracted-out public services also run the risk of being coopted and instrumentalized by the government (UNRISD 2017).

Can SSE and social policy avoid these pitfalls? How can they create synergies in the sense that they are mutually reinforcing each other to deliver a high quality social service in an inclusive manner and realize the mandated purposes, normative values and organizational autonomy of SSE? To answer this question, we review the development discourses that offer an insight on interfaces between social policy and SSE and examine both discourses and policy practices with a focus on issues associated with participation and partnership which are considered key mechanisms of good, coherent and synergistic governance (Brinkerhoff 2007; Waheduzzaman 2010). Given the exploratory nature of this research, the main purpose here is to draw insights on the synergies between SSE and social policy rather than undertake rigorous empirical analysis.

The paper is structured as follows. The following section explains our approach to the interfaces between social policy and SSE within the broad context of state-society relations. Pointing to the limits of the past approaches to state, society or state-society relations in explaining the interfaces between social policy and SSE, we suggest a new approach to social policy and SSE which can explain the distinctive forms and nature of social policy programmes and SSE organizations and enterprises through its focus on relations between actors, institutions and processes. It provides a conceptual and explanatory framework for the examination of empirical cases of interfaces between social policy and SSE in the context of state-society relations. The following empirical cases offer an opportunity to identify the exogenous conditions and endogenous factors including institutions, policies, and actors to facilitate participation and partnerships in the interfaces of social policy and SSE. In conclusion, the study draws lessons on making synergies between SSE and social policies, scaling up SSE and creating enabling policy environments for SSE enhancement without weakening the institutional strength of the public sector. With these findings and lessons, the ultimate aim is to deepen the understanding of various pathways of SSE scaling-up in a sustainable way.

Interfaces between SSE and Social Policies

All the major paradigms about the state, despite their different focuses on plural interest groups, elites and classes, agree that the core function of the state is to regulate, coordinate or govern multiple relations between social groups (Alford 1975). The interfaces between the voluntary sector including SSE and social policy constitute the state-society relation these major paradigms aimed to address. State-society relations have been a long-standing issue for academic debates (Migdal 1988), in particular in academic disciplines researching the issues associated with the voluntary sector to which most SSE enterprises and organizations belong. Various theories, premises, and concepts of state-society relations, however, have often revealed their limitations regarding their explanatory and analytical capacities. One of the major sources of these limitations is the biases or narrow understandings of the state and society themselves. For instance, the so-called statist or state-centered approach, placing primary focus on the state, highlights the regulatory role. The voluntary sector is explained mainly through the lens of the government such as in relation to government subsidies. Some variants of the state-centered approach show how state functions and wills are translated into non-governmental organizations by focusing on various institutional mechanisms other than regulation. However, approaches which emphasize concepts such as embeddedness mainly focus on capital rather than on civil society (Evans 1995, 2014). In this line of research, the autonomy of the state is assessed as against capital, thereby sidelining voluntary agencies (Wolch 1990).

The tendency to treat the state as a homogenous entity is also problematic in understanding various state-society relations. Modern states are comprised of institutionally distinctive policy sectors with highly diverse organizational structures. And the relations these policy sectors form with the society are also distinctive. Even within the area of research which treats the subjects as homogeneous such as the welfare state or welfare regime, we can find vertical and programmatic diversity between national and local, and between income maintenance, housing, health, education and care (Fine 2017). Neglecting the sectoral distinctiveness of welfare programmes and policies constituting the welfare state significantly reduces the explanatory power of the theories or concepts which deal with the relations between the state and society. Scant attention to the distinctiveness of different aspects or parts of the state is also found in the case of national-level policy advice from donor agencies that

impose undue homogeneity across different localities. This is problematic given that interactions between institutions, policies, and actors at the local level create different locality from one region to another (Sellers 2010).

Insensitivity to different social and geographical settings combined with Eurocentric concepts about civil society often excludes various hybrid forms of voluntary organizations which messy social construction processes in developing countries inevitably produce (Corry 2010). Although many studies indeed employ diverse terms and concepts to describe different agents of civil society in developing countries, since the meanings of these terms and concepts are in many cases similar to each other it is fair to say that they have not been successful in capturing the distinctiveness of different forms of civil society organizations (Roginsky and Shortall 2009). As such, mainstream theories and concepts which fail to capture the diversity and distinctive nature of the state and civil society may not be helpful in deepening our understanding of the relations between social policy and SSE.

To deepen our understanding of SSE and social policies, in particular the distinctiveness of SSEs and social policies in different contexts, we establish several new approaches. First of all, we try to identify SSE both in terms of activities and organizations. On the one hand, SSE can be viewed as a particular form of communication between different systems, be it government or non-government, which facilitates economic activities prioritizing non-profit values including but not limited to social and environmental values. On the other hand, SSE is also understood as a concept encompassing diverse organizations including both traditional social economy or third sector organizations and enterprise. The SSE concept, elaborated with activities and organizational entities, offers various analytical advantages, particularly in light of difficulties related to hybrid forms of SSE organizations and various interactions between SSE and public policies. Within this analytical approach, public policies, which have been normally treated as an exogenous variable or environment with unidirectional influence on SSE organizations, can be seen as an endogenous variable constituting a specific or distinctive SSE system, or what is often called the eco-system of SSE.

Secondly we also pay particular attention to different levels and sectors of SSE to identify their distinctive characteristics, particularly of SSE organizations and enterprises in developing countries. As a growing number of developing countries have adopted new policies, laws and programmes to promote SSE or some aspects of it, many studies actively examine the variation of the so-called 'SSE turn' at the national level (Corragio 2015). However, the fact that the existing literature mostly uses or borrows macro-

level theories and concepts results in ignoring the contrasting details and differentiations shown by diverse actors involved in micro-level interfaces. Previous research focusing on local governments as a key player pays less attention to the sectoral differences, since it borrows the concept of the state as a homogeneous or monolithic entity from state-centered discourses such as the developmental state (Bateman 2015).

To explain the facilitators or inhibitors of synergy-making between social policies and SSE, while simultaneously reflecting the specific conditions for SSE in developing countries, we focused on both discursive and practice levels, in particular participation and partnerships which are considered the key elements of good governance for development. Explanations on these interfaces can offer an insight to those concerned with making synergies between policy sectors and institutions.

Interfaces in Discourse: Development Strategies

Since the late 1970s, the state-society relations of developing countries, particularly those dependent upon foreign assistance, have been profoundly influenced by the macroeconomic policies or policy frameworks imposed by international donors. For much of the 1980s and 1990s, neoliberal stabilization and market fundamentalism were advanced as the dominant norms and principles underpinning development strategies. Under these neoliberal prescriptions, redistributive social policies were treated as a source of market distortions. Government spending on social policy with a goal for redistribution in health, education and pension was retrenched to conform to market principles and so as not to impose constraints on both the instruments and scale of macroeconomic policies.

This retrenchment was accompanied with a changed view on the state, particularly in developing countries: the state is a source of economic instability and inflation rather than a solution. The change of macroeconomic views and consequently development framework curtailed government's social expenditure and left a big gap in social service provision. Instead, the voluntary sector has been spotlighted as a good substitute to fill the gaps that governments otherwise should have taken actions for (Kendall 2003; Deakin 2001), and in some countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, up to one-third of health care services were provided by voluntary organizations in the 1990s (Hecht and Tanzi 1994). Not only prevailing views of the state as a source of the problem rather than a solution, but also growing pressure from

NGOs for popular participation helped to create an interface between social policy and SSE, which was not integrated into macro-level government policies and mostly remained at project levels (Mkandawire 2004). The strategy of NGO-centered social service delivery did not make a great contribution to enhancing the capacity of local NGOs involved in service delivery, as the resources for the third sectors' delivery of service were mainly channeled into INGOS which became an increasingly important actor in the development policies of the 1980s (Agg 2006).

The 1990s witnessed increasing uncertainty and doubt about the development strategies based predominantly on the pursuit of market-friendly policies and stability. Social concerns such as poverty in multiple dimensions became prominently placed on the global and national development agendas at the turn of the Millennium. The challenges to and tensions within the market principles and economic growth-centered development paradigm created a momentum for the turn of ideas and practices. They emphasised the social aspects of development, which have been often dubbed as "Post-Washington Consensus" (Stiglitz 2009), "quiet revolution" (Barrientos and Hulme 2009) or "social turn" (UNRISD 2016). Along with this ideational turn, new players such as emerging donors, charitable institutions, transnational corporations and social movements emerged and entered into a "contested terrain of emerging global governance" (Deacon 2007; Ghimire 2005; Josselin and Wallace 2001). It is noteworthy that developing countries themselves also started establishing regional mechanisms to address transnational social problems in the region, creating a space of alternatives to the traditional-donor-oriented social policy discourse and practice (Deacon 2007; O'Brien et al. 2000).

This social turn was strongly manifested in internationally agreed development initiatives and goals such as the UN's Millennium Development Goals, the ILO-UN's Social protection floors initiative, and the UN Resolution on Universal Health Coverage. They have played a significant role in shaping the discourse of social policy in developing countries at both national and global levels. In particular, these international frameworks and strategies for development including internationally agreed development goals played a significant role in bringing back the state as a problem solver and leading player in designing and implementing development policies again. Donors' policies, even in rhetoric, started to emphasise the need to work together with recipient governments to implement development projects, and new aid instruments such as budget support and sector-wide approaches (SWAps) were established to channel aid directly to recipient

governments (Agg 2006).

International donor agencies such as the World Bank actively transfer and diffuse the ideas and policies of social protection programmes including conditional cash transfers in developing countries where the state mainly implements them. Dominant trends in both low and middle-income countries from the 1990s to the global crisis of 2008 had culminated in the expansion of social protection coverage, yet with wide variation across countries (Yi et al. 2015). Some emerging economies such as Brazil and China became the symbols of the ‘quiet revolution’ or ‘social turn’ in social policy fields. The expansion of social assistance programmes – for instance pensions for the elderly, cash transfer programmes for children and public employment programmes involving direct employment creation by the government – has been a common phenomenon in developing countries, particularly middle-income countries. Also, social services – notably, education and health services – have continuously improved across developing countries, albeit to varying degrees (World Bank 2015).

In this process, the national governments and international donors actively searched for those who could work for service delivery with fewer costs but high performance. Widespread norms and principles of new public management with a focus on efficiency, continuing trends of privatisation, and fiscal constraints created an interface between social policy and non-governmental actors (Evers 1995; Kendall 2003; Kim 2008). In particular, civil society actors actively responded to this trend with their knowledge and experience in social service delivery accumulated over the last three decades (Ware 1989; Grindheim and Selle 1990; Salamon 1995).

Although SSE has a long history as a distinctive category of civil society groups, SSE emerged as a part of an alternative economic development agenda in development discourses and practices since the late 1990s.¹ A series of financial crises spanning different continents revealed the unsustainable nature of market-fundamentalism, and global movements searching for social justice worked together to confront various neoliberal development projects (de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez-Garavito 2007; Scholte 2011; Smith et al. 2016). Various alternative economic agendas ranging from neo-Keynesian, progressive macroeconomic policies to micro-initiatives

¹ Origins and evolutionary trajectories of SSE are inevitably diverse because the concept of SSE refers to various “forms of economic activity that prioritise social and often environmental objectives, and involve producers, workers, consumers and citizens acting collectively and in solidarity” (Utting 2015, p. 1). One of the oldest forms of surviving SSE is producer cooperatives which have existed since the beginning of the factory system in the West (Bonin et al. 1993).

undertaken by marginalised and vulnerable people have been discussed in numerous international fora. International dialogues have never failed to put forward SSE as a viable alternative initiative. Many SSE organizations and enterprises started to create a relationship with the government. The nature of relationship established by SSE organizations and enterprise are different from that of NGOs which worked as operational arms of INGOs in the previous period. SSE not as a substitute for but as a complement to state provision of social services played a significant role in making sectoral services comprehensive by creating positive externalities such as consolidation of democracy through active participation, generation of jobs, and improved living standards at the community levels.

From the perspective of discourse and development strategies, the establishment of the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE) in 2013 was particularly notable since it signalled the introduction of SSE into a public space of global development strategies and frameworks. The UNTFSSSE was established as a follow-up action to the Conference on “Potentials and Limits of Social and Solidarity Economy”, which was organized by the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), bringing together UN agencies and inter-governmental organizations with a direct interest in SSE as well as umbrella associations of international social and solidarity economy networks (UNRISD 2017). UNRISD, particularly its long tradition of a comprehensive approach to civil society, social movements and social policy played a significant role in forming the agenda of this global space for discussion, research and advocacy for SSE within the UN system. The broad definition of social policy promoted by UNRISD emphasises the multiple functions of social policy in economic and environmental dimensions (UNRISD 2016). This broad understanding of social policy, the often-called transformative social policy, has an elective affinity with the quintessential features of SSE; that is to say economic activities prioritising social and often environmental objectives over profits.

Over the last two years, the UNTFSSSE has been making efforts to utilize the potential of SSE as a means of implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Moreover, one of the SDGs which UNTFSSSE takes heed of is universal health coverage, which has long been seen as a key social policy targets (Yi and Kim 2015). To achieve universal health coverage, UNTFSSSE emphasizes the role of SSE organizations as an important partner in both health service delivery and health insurance. Indeed, various types of SSE organizations currently play a key role in providing accessible and

affordable health care services. It is remarkable to note that they are particularly prominent in areas such as care for the elderly and persons with disabilities, HIV/AIDS infected persons, maternal care, mental health care, post-trauma care, and rehabilitation and prevention (UNTFSSSE 2014).

Interfaces in Practices: Participation

Effective governance representing the voices and interests of all at local, national, regional and global levels is a necessary condition for sustainable and inclusive development. It is fair to state that one of the essential tools which effective governance requires would be people's active participation, defined as "the involvement of citizens in a wide range of policy-making activities, including the determination of levels of service, budget priorities, and the acceptability of physical construction projects in order to orient government programmes toward community needs, build public support, and encourage a sense of cohesiveness within neighborhoods" (UN DPADM 2017).

In fact, participation has been one of the most important concepts and practices in development discourses and practices since official development assistance (ODA) began after the Second World War. In particular, since the 1980s when international agencies began to put a great emphasis on the role of civil society as a key development agent, participation has been an element integral to any development project. Greater participation has been considered necessary not only because it contributes to increasing project efficiency and effectiveness but also being central to increasing the self-reliance of people and increasing the numbers of beneficiaries of development. Ultimately, reinforcing participation in the field of development cooperation results in signifying the accountability of development projects, in that people's participation can hold the government to be more accountable (Kim 2017).

Although many development agencies hailed the virtues of participation, there has been a consistent concern about its reductionism to mere consultations with stakeholders, often chosen quite selectively by technocrats or other actors in positions of governmental power (Cernea 1985). In response to such reductionism, various interpretations of participation commonly indicate that it should be considered a continuum rather than an either-or practice (Arnstein 1969). Participation as a continuum includes: beneficiaries or client groups' sharing the benefits of development

programmes; involvement of beneficiaries or client groups in decision-making, implementation and evaluation processes; influences of beneficiaries or client groups on the direction and execution of a development project; and control of beneficiaries or client groups over resources and regulation of institution or full managerial power (Uphoff 1979; Pearse and Stiefel 1980; Paul 1987). The control or regulation by the groups and movements of those hitherto excluded from such controls is a particularly important part of participation and should be considered genuine participation (UNRISD 2003).

To examine the degree of organizational participation of SSE in policy making and implementation processes, this study considers three mechanisms through which participating agents can have a different level of participation. The first is the incentive structure which materially rewards participation. In this case, organizations may make inputs or contributions into a project to enhance its chances of success or gaining economic benefits. The second mechanism is the formal participatory mechanisms of decision-making, implementation and evaluation, all of which are widespread in many development projects led by governments and international agencies. The third mechanism is devolution, in which some forms of authority are delegated to participating agents. Although these mechanisms are not mutually exclusive in reality, the main thrust of participation practised in development project process often assumes one or other of these mechanisms.

The Kudumbashree initiative in Kerala, India, “the community network of women and the Mission to support it” is a good example of how SSE ecosystems and the capacity of actors have been strengthened through participation.² Kudumbashree began as a municipal government’s small pilot programme to address poverty and women’s empowerment through the organization of neighbourhood groups, each of which has 20 women in the Alappuzha municipality, in the state of Kerala in 1992. As these groups proliferated, the Kerala local government registered them as an official organization (in Indian legal term, ‘society’ under the Kerala state law) in 1998, and launched it as a state-wide programme (Varier 2016). Currently, according to its website, there are 4,306,976 members organized by 277,175 Ayalkoottam (Neighbourhood Group).

For women to join the Kudumbashree programme, they have to organize into an Ayalkoottam. This group is a basic unit of Kudumbashree

² Kudumbashree means the prosperity of family in India: <http://www.kudumbashree.org/pages/178>.

providing a forum for members to plan and act with principles of democracy and solidarity and in many cases act as cooperatives or social enterprises (Kadiyala 2004; Rajan 2006; Mukherjee-Reed 2015). The Ayalkoottam sends elected representatives to the ward level Area Development Societies, and then Area Development Societies send their representatives to the village or community level Community Development Societies. Such a three tier system facilitating the participation of Kudumbashree members into development planning and implementation is contiguous with the local self-governance system (the Panchayat Raj system) composed of three tiers. They include Gram Panchayat (Village Council, a village level administrative body), Panchayat Samities (Block Council, an administrative body above villages such as Tehsil, Mandal, and Taluka which include villages that are called 'development blocks') and the District Administration. The government has an official office for administrating and supporting the Kudumbashree initiative in Panchayat, which is the government's focal point for street-level contact.

In a nutshell, the strongest feature embedded in this whole process of Kudumbashree comes from the essence of participation. First, Kudumbashree has been strongly influenced by the institutions and policies of the participatory planning processes which had been already firmly established in Kerala such as the 'People's Planning Campaign' and Community Development Society (Isaac and Heller 2003; Kudumbashree 2017; Lakshmanan 2006; Mukherjee-Reed 2015). Second, the nature of the interaction between Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) and Kudumbashree as an ecosystem of SSE has been also strongly influenced by this crucial value of participation firmly embedded in the institutions, actors, and processes of the government and Kudumbashree organizations. Consequently, MGNREGS *per se* has an institutional mechanism to promote participation in the sense that MGNREGS, established in 2005, is a rights-based employment guarantee programme in rural areas. The programme provides a legal guarantee of at least 100 days of paid employment at minimum wages in local infrastructure development projects to every rural household. MGNREGS has a strong element of local autonomy since local government can decide the nature and forms of works the beneficiaries of MGNREGS undertake (Mukherjee-Reed 2015). In addition to government bodies at various levels, the Act of MGNREGS stipulates that civil society organizations (CSOs), authorized by the Central Government or the State Government, are implementation agencies. The Fourth edition of the MGNREGA Operational Guidelines includes CSOs as

official stakeholders in enhancing awareness of the program and supporting and building the capacities of Gram Panchayat and State Governments in planning, implementation and social audits of MEGREGS (Ehmke and Fakier 2016). However, depending on the institutional environment that governments provide and the extent of government efforts to involve CSOs as official partners at various stages of MGNREGS, the degree of civil society's involvement varies (Ehmke and Fakier 2016).

In Kerala, the government addressed two challenges in the process of implementations of MGNREGS: male workers' low interests in the works of MGNREGS whose wages were only a half of the workers' average wage; and the traditional exclusion of women – the potential workers of MGNREGS programme – from the public space. To address these problems, the government appointed all the programme supervisors of MGNREGS from the members of Kudumbashree affiliated to Area Development Societies. Such an action for the appointment resulted in creating interesting dynamics to strengthen MGNREGS and the eco-system of the SSE. Most of all, Kudumbashree women appointed as supervisors actively participate in planning the work of MGNREGS and mobilize their Kudumbashree members to participate in the MGNREGS work. Regarding women's participation in MGNREGS, Kerala was ranked first according to surveys in 2011 and 2012. Second, the government trained these women programme supervisors in order to enhance their capacities to manage the projects. The elements of training to increase their capacities are associated with their various responsibilities. The maxim of responsibilities includes: "identifying work opportunities, mobilising groups for work, preparing estimates in consultation with the overseer or engineer, supervising work, providing amenities at the worksite, preparing and submitting muster rolls, and handling emergencies" (Mukherjee-Reed 2015, p. 307).

With these active participations in the programme as supervisors or workers, Kudumbashree women found the opportunity to utilize infrastructure development work in MGNREGS for various projects of the Kudumbashree programmes. In particular, they could relate those rural infrastructure programmes to farming such as Sangha Krishi (group farming) which is a part of the Kudumbashree programme. Under Sangha Krishi, the government provides 10 million acres of land to more than 44,000 collectives with more than 250,000 women farmers for agriculture. Kudumbashree women linked the MGNREGS works such as the reclamation of fallow land and the improvement of infrastructure to enhance the productivity and consequently developed the group farming under Sangha Krishi into a new

agricultural business (Mukherjee 2012; Mukherjee-Reed 2015; Varier 2016).

The strengthened capacity of Kudumbashree women, which is nurtured by well-designed institutional structure and policies, becomes a key factor to the successful establishment of the eco-system of SSE. It is clearly confirmed by the increasing number of Kudumbashree women in electoral politics. In 2011, 11,000 Kudumbashree women ran for the panchayat elections, and 5,404 won the election. The electoral rule of Kerala that reserves 50% of seats for women apparently played a significant role in this political empowerment of Kudumbashree women. All in all, political, social and economic institutions for the participation of poor women contributed to making the eco-system of the SSE successful, strengthening the social policy mandate of government to reduce poverty and enhance the capacity of SSE organizations and their members (Mukherjee-Reed 2015).

In Indonesia, a participatory community development initiative funded by the cash grant for the village – the National Community Empowerment Program Independent (Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat, hereafter PNPM Mandiri) – demonstrates a different type of institutional configuration with various outcomes regarding the capacity of the government and SSE actors. During the democratization process after the Asian Financial Crisis in the late 1990s and the early 2000s, strong policy power and substantial financial resources devolved to district governments which are below provincial governments. It was part of President Habibie's strategy to pacify growing discontent among people in remote regions and to avoid the risk of separation from Indonesia of those provinces endowed with abundant natural resources following the example of East Timor. The devolution undertaken between 1999 and 2001 transformed Indonesia from one of the world's most centralized nations to one of its most decentralized. Beginning in January 2001, the central government handed over 90 percent of internal revenues and 100 percent of the responsibility for delivering most social services – including healthcare and education – to about 300 district governments. The role of coordination and supervision held by the provincial governments was conducted only on paper, simply because they had little resource to undertake this role (Pisani 2014). The combination of various political and economic factors created a perfect breeding ground for ineffective, short-term social protection schemes that favoured the supporters of the local political elites. These factors included automatically transferred resources and the autonomy to spend, the weak capacity of district governments to govern, the strong legacy of clientelistic political relations, and regularly held local elections (Robison and Hadiz 2004). The

deterioration of social services was not uncommon. The central government's social protection schemes, such as national-level cash transfers, were implemented in this context where organized coordination mechanisms between levels of government were weak – PNPM Mandiri was one of them.

PNPM Mandiri provides a block cash grant to selected small-scale local physical and economic infrastructure projects such as building roads, sanitation, hiring extra midwives for villages, improving health centers and schools, providing school uniforms and education materials, etc. The selection of the projects is prepared by community organizations on the basis of quality and feasibility of proposals. PNPM Mandiri emphasizes local people's participation in the planning, implementation and maintenance of the projects, and the amount of financial allocation for subsequent years is competitively allocated in accordance with village performances against a certain set of indicators. PNPM Mandiri's emphasis on participation and empowerment elements particularly appeals to donors who try to incorporate the same items in development projects through their community-driven development (CDD) approach. The effectiveness, measured by the costs of the project, also attracted donors' attentions. The PNPM Support Facility, a government institution to support PNPM projects, discloses that building infrastructure through PNPM Mandiri mechanism costs 30–56 percent less than those executed by contractors. In some instances, the projects contribute to job creation by employing local people. Women's participation in the village and inter-village meetings is worth mentioning. All these results are attractive enough to donors, thereby not only leading donor aid to the PNPM Mandiri projects to drastically increase, but also contributing to expanding the coverage of the PNPM Mandiri (Wisnu 2013).

Donors' increased involvement has also had an adverse effect on the responsiveness of cash transfer programmes to the needs of the poor. In the initial phase, contributions from the central government accounted for a significant share of the budget for PNPM Mandiri. Over time, however, aid from foreign donors has become the primary source of financing for PNPM Mandiri. Technical assistance is also dominated by international agencies, which often establishes community development programmes in ways that do not reflect the priority needs of the poorest. Also, the government tends to select simple projects with visible outputs rather than focus on what people might need to earn income or to handle complex problems such as pollution, the results of which are not easily quantified within a short-time frame. Also, PNPM Mandiri tends to be awarded to those poor who can present project ideas and defend them in the selection process, which tends to exclude those

in chronic poverty who usually lack the capacity and time to make a well-crafted project plan.

In this process of selection based on the quality of the proposal, PNPM Mandiri becomes dominated by a few number of skills-making project proposals initiated by consultants from outside and constraining the participation of the poorest and most vulnerable in the village. It cements the power or stratification structures to generate inequality and exclusion in the villages, which was detrimental to the efforts to create social capital and make solidarity-based community self-help groups. The impact on the living standards and empowerment of the marginalized and vulnerable groups is not positive either. For instance, the living standards of women-headed households with low education attainment has not improved significantly enough to lift them out of poverty, and positive impact on employment opportunities is only temporary (Triwibowo 2017). A wide range of factors ranging from donors' over-intervention in the programme design and intervention in the method of selecting projects for granting has a negative impact on the eco-system of SSE which could have been a sound basis for SSE growth in Indonesia.

Interfaces in Practice: Partnership

Since the 1970s, scholars and practitioners have been arguing that “development is not possible without partnership approaches” (Brinkerhoff 2002, p. 1; Pearson 1969). Partnership in development discourses and practices has been a buzz word for a long time. The imperative of partnership was once again clearly manifested in the SDGs, which emphasize the interlinkages and integrated nature of the 17 goals and 169 targets. Both goals and targets are closely interlinked like a web-network in which goals are often associated with cross-cutting issues in policy making. They cannot be addressed in isolation, given the fact that they often transcend the boundaries of administratively defined or established policy sectors and do not correspond to the purview of individual ministries or departments (Meijers and Stead 2004). The fact that it is impossible to achieve these goals and targets with siloed approach implies that a partnership between multi-stakeholders is imperative. The partnership between multiple and diverse actors – including NGOs, community-based organizations, governments, inter-governmental organizations, donors, and the private sector – becomes the norm in order to enhance development outcomes through treating causes

of underdevelopment and addressing systemic forces that preserve the status quo (Brown and Ashman 1996).

Partnership contains processes to produce relational elements. In addition to enhancing outcomes, it creates synergistic rewards which are defined as the increase in performance of the combined elements over what those elements are already expected or required to accomplish independently (Boyer 2008; Brinkerhoff 2002; Sirower 2000). Development stakeholders, particularly international donors and national governments, envision partnerships which can produce enhanced and synergistic outcomes. Voluntary sector or third sector parties are also particularly encouraged and promoted to partner with the government in delivering social service by the international donor agencies and national governments. Resource constraints that the voluntary sector faces are also a push factor for its entrance into partnerships with the government in the areas of social service delivery such as housing, welfare and employment services.

The impacts of partnership on social service delivery are mixed. Some report that partnership between the third sector and the government has been cost effective while others point out significant deficiencies in either the structure or operations. Partners involved in development projects might elevate the possibility of perverse incentives and pass the buck to others when projects fail; therefore partnership needs organizational inputs for democratizing the relationship of development partners and driving them to work for common goals in the face of the enduring enticement of perverse incentives (Mulgan 2003; Gilson et al. 2005; Kim 2017). Many summaries of the research on public-private-partnerships (PPP) report that convincing evidence for or against the cost-effectiveness of PPP is rare, and available evidence, if there is any, is contradictory (Rees et al. 2011). Measuring outputs of partnerships with a focus on cost-effectiveness is methodologically problematic since the measurement is unable to take into account or control various intervening variables affecting the final outputs. One way to avoid this methodological problem is to identify and measure the set of resources partners mobilize through partnerships since the value-added of partnership does not include only the increase in performance of the combined elements but also the improvement of capacities of the partners.

Community-based mutual health insurance schemes, which have rapidly increased since the 2000s, offer an excellent opportunity to examine whether and how social policy and SSE could mobilize additional resources through partnerships. Partnerships for community-based mutual health insurance policy involving various levels of government and community

organizations have been established to enable members of the community to get easy access to health care and reduce social costs arising from the unequal distribution of services and misallocation of scarce resources (Prasad 2008; Yi et al. 2015). These small scale community-centered insurance schemes are characterised with voluntary membership, non-profit objectives, risk pooling and mutual aid/solidarity. Multiple and diverse institutions and organizations such as health facilities in both public and private sectors, member-based organizations, local communities or cooperatives firmly rooted in the community play a significant role in initiating these schemes and become main actors to own and run them. These institutions and organizations usually negotiate with public or private service providers over terms and conditions (Bastagli 2013).

One important feature of these schemes is effective interactions between representative organizations implementing them and beneficiaries who those organizations target. The interactions through various forms such as seminars, training and education courses, and participatory workshops enhance the negotiating capital of the partners such as local community organizations and cooperatives representing communities with both public and private partners, particularly private health care providers. It consequently contributes to making this insurance scheme closer to public rather than private goods. For instance, in Rwanda, from 1999, the government promoted community-based health insurance schemes whose long tradition dates back to the pre-independent years of faith-based NGO-run community mutual schemes (Soors et al. 2010). The government mobilized the voluntarism of people and non-governmental actors to organize community-based health insurance (CBHI) schemes. Participation in CBHI schemes is voluntary and based on a membership contract between the CBHI and members. With organizational structures including general assemblies, the board of directors, surveillance committees and executive bureaus to regulate contractual relations between members and service providers, CBHI schemes establish contractual relations with healthcare providers such as health centers and hospitals for the purchasing of health care services. Laws provide measures to minimize risks associated with health insurance such as adverse selection, moral hazard, cost escalation and insurance fraud (Diop and Butera 2005).

Technical and financial assistance from foreign donors and the international financial instruments for health such as the Global Fund are mostly channelled through to CBHI schemes. After its pilot phase of 2008, the government established a specific legal framework, making affiliation with health insurance in principle mandatory for nationals and residents

alike. CBHI members can access health care in any public and faith-based organization across the country. Population coverage increased from 7 percent in 2003 to 85 percent in 2008, and up to over 90 percent in 2010. Access to health care also increased from 31 percent in 2003 to almost 100 percent in 2012 (Soors et al. 2010; Nyandekwe et al. 2014). The increase of CBHI contributed to lifting the overall health insurance coverage of Rwanda up to 96.15 percent as of 2012 including other health insurance schemes.

Greater access for the poor to CBHI scheme benefits is in part a result of mobilizing network resources of partners for CBHI schemes. The partnership between CBHI schemes, grassroots associations and micro-finance schemes (Banques Populaires) plays a significant role in facilitating access for the poor to health care services through the CBHI and increasing memberships through the inclusion of grassroots associations into CBHI schemes as a group. Local micro-finance schemes provide loans to help the poor members of associations to pay for their yearly contributions to CBHI schemes. Governments in collaboration with NGOs finance the enrolment of the poorest and most vulnerable groups based on the information provided by the community organizations.³ Consequently, the Rwanda case shows both SSE and the government in the health care sector utilize various resources such as finance, networks and information to generate meaningful outcomes such as health coverage and strengthen their institutional capacities.

The recent phenomena of the increasing role of not-for-profit, non-governmental organizations in social service delivery in transition economies including China's signify different development trajectories of SSE in social service provision, specifically government-induced development of SSEs. In an attempt to create a better concerted social security system that covers the entire population regardless of their employment status, place of origin or current residence, the Chinese government established a new law that relaxes control over CSOs. With this law, the government has promoted the involvement of CSOs in delivering social services such as care for the elderly and a broad range of social services for migrant workers. As a result of the relaxed regulations, by the end of 2014, the total number of CSOs reached 547,000, 9.6 percent more than that of the previous year. More than 3,000 charitable foundations were set up to support the operation of CSOs, and

³ This observation does not deny there are problems in Rwandan CBHI schemes. First, undersupply or uneven distribution of health care providers, which is common in rural areas of developing countries, prevents people's willingness to participate in the schemes and negatively affect the scheme's sustainability. Second, there is substantial evidence supporting the schemes' exclusion of the poorest of the poor in Rwanda's *Mutuelles*.

6.37 million people were employed in them. One of the most interesting dynamics is that the current government agencies have started to enhance their administrative and managerial capacity by adopting knowledge and skills from CSOs. Although it is still arguable whether these CSOs can be defined as SSE given their limitations in the members' democratic control over the organizations, the development of CSOs in social service delivery in China may be the birth of another variant of SSE and its interaction with social policy (Li et al. 2015).

Conclusion

Although partnerships between the government and non-governmental actors (particularly private actors) in social service delivery is not a new phenomenon, the emergence of SSE which prioritize social goals over profits creates a new landscape of collaboration. The double expansion of social protection schemes and SSE creates an interesting policy interface across many developing countries with positive outcomes regarding jobs creation and overall improvement of living standards in some cases. Whether the interactions between the government and SSE in this interface strengthens each other's capacity – for example, the government's capacity to implement social policy and SSE's values and principles – remains, however, a crucial question for both social policy and SSE communities. The question is of particular importance since it is directly associated with the sustainability of social policies and SSE.

Selecting three kinds of interfaces in discourse and practice, with a focus on participation and partnership, we have examined how the interactions between social policy and SSE contribute to or hinder strengthening the capacities of the government and SSE organizations and actors. The support of international organizations for the social service project which bypassed the government in developing countries for much of the 1980s and 1990s deprived the government of the opportunities to enhance its governance capacities. It is questionable whether it nurtured the capacity of the third sector or SSE organizations, particularly the capacity to plan and act in the longer term and broader perspective.

The social turn and the emergence of SSE as a response to a series of multiple crises, however, created a new space of interactions between social policy and SSE. At this time, the state assumes itself as a development partner with non-government actors while SSE organizations and enterprises play a

role of autonomous partner prioritizing public interests over profits.

The configuration of political, economic and social institutions affects diverse nature of partnerships and varying degrees of participation which have ultimately impact on the capacity building of the government and civil society. In the case of Kudumbashree in India, well-matched three tier governance structure and synergistic relations with MGNREGS facilitated the participation of the poorest and marginalized – particularly, women – into policy making process and generated a significant improvement of standard of living for the poor class. It is clearly evident that the set of institutions contributing to rebalancing the existing power relations and creating synergies with other sectoral programmes is the key solution to establishing a successful eco-system of SSE.

In contrast, the case of the Indonesian PNPM Mandiri demonstrates how the design of social policy, selection of projects based on merit without empowerment or training of the poor and marginalized can constrain participation and make the whole process dominated and captured by a few policy or project elites. The eco-system of SSE which could otherwise have been a sound basis for SSE growth in Indonesia has been negatively affected by the institutions and processes that the PNPM Mandiri created.

Rwanda's CBHI schemes show how partnerships between and within government institutions and community based SSE organizations can contribute to health outcomes regarding health coverage. Both the government and SSE could mobilize and utilize additional resources which they could not have mobilized independently. It shows that the interface became mutually beneficial to both partners. Given the strong influence of the government in creating this health partnership, however, to what extent community-level insurance organizations can be resilient and sustainable still remains a question.

The Chinese case of social organizations' entry into social service delivery also shows mutual benefits from additional resources. Government agencies adopt new skills and knowledge from social organizations while social organizations get financial support from the government. The nature of social organizations and the long-term impacts on the capacity of both parties, however, need further research.

To sum up, interfaces between social policy and SSE have expanded but not without challenges. The challenges are diverse since the distinctive forms and nature of social policy and SSE organizations and enterprises shape the nature of the challenges differently. Although the challenges in making synergistic relations between social policy and SSE are diverse, there are some

common solutions crucial to maximizing the potential to scale up both social policy and SSE, such as addressing power asymmetry between and within the government and SSE organizations, and creating complementary institutions and policies. These findings and lessons particularly highlight the importance of issues such as internal governance of SSE, and relationships of SSE with a broad range of policies and institutions at various levels in making a better institutional environment for social development.

(Submitted: April 4, 2018; Revised: May 27, 2018; Accepted: June 21, 2018)

References

- Agg, Catherine. 2006. "Trends in Government Support for Non-Governmental Organizations: Is the "Golden Age" of the NGOs Behind Us?" *Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper No. 23*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Partnership." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4): 216-224.
- Barrientos, Armando, and David Hulme. 2009. "Social Protection for the Poor and the Poorest in Developing Countries: Reflections on a Quiet Revolution." *Oxford Development Studies* 37(4): 439-456.
- Bastagli, Francesca. 2013. "Feasibility of Social Protection Schemes in Developing Countries." *Directorate-General for External Policies*. Brussels: European Union.
- Bateman, Milford. 2015. "Rebuilding Solidarity-driven Economies after Neoliberalism: The Role of Cooperatives and Local Developmental State in Latin America." In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, edited by Peter Utting. London: Zed Books.
- Bonin, John P., Derek C. Jones and Louis Putterman. 1993. "Theoretical and Empirical Studies of Producer Cooperatives: Will Ever the Twain Meet." *Journal of Economic Literature* 31(3): 1290-1320.
- Boyer, Robert. 2008. "Growth Strategies and Poverty Reduction: The Institutional Complementarity Hypothesis." *Working Paper No. 2007-43*. Paris: Paris School of Economics.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2002. "Government-Nonprofit Partnership: A Defining Framework." *Public Administration and Development* 22: 19-30.
- _____. 2007. "Partnership as a means to good governance: Towards an evaluation framework." In *Partnerships, Governance and Sustainable Development: Reflections on Theory and Practice*, edited by Pieter Glasbergen, Frank Biermann and Arthur P. J. Mol. UK: Edward Elgar
- Brown, L. David and Darcy Ashman. 1996. "Participation, Social Capital, and

- Intersectoral Problem-solving: African and Asian Cases.” *World Development* 24(9): 1,467-1,479.
- Cernea, Michael. 1985. *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corragio, José Luis. 2015. “Institutionalising the Social and Solidarity Economy in Latin America.” In *Social and Solidarity Economy in Fringe*, edited by Peter Utting. London: Zed Books.
- Corry, Olaf. 2010. “Defining and Theorizing the Third Sector.” In *Third Sector Research*, edited by Rupert Taylor. New York: Springer.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura and César A. Rodríguez-Garavito. 2007. “Introduction: Expanding the Economic Canon and Searching for Alternatives to Neoliberal Globalization.” In *Another Production is Possible*, edited by Boaventura de Sousa Santos. London: Verso.
- Deacon, Bob. 2007. *Global Social Policy & Governance*. London: Sage.
- Deakin, Nicholas. 2001. *In Search of Civil Society*. London: Routledge.
- Diop, François Pathé and Jean Damascene Butera. 2005. “Community-Based Health Insurance in Rwanda.” *Findings* 256. Washington, D. C.: World Bank.
- Ehmke, Ellen and Khayaat Fakier. 2016. “Making Public Employment Schemes Work: Insights from Civil Society Engagement in India and South Africa.” *Research Note*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Evans, Peter. 1995. *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 2014. “The Korean Experience and the Twenty-first-Century Transition to a Capability-Enhancing Developmental State.” In *Learning from the South Korean Developmental Successes: Effective Developmental Cooperation and Synergistic Institutions and Policies*, edited by Ilcheong Yi and Thandika Mkandawire. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Evers, Adalbert. 1995. “Part of the Welfare Mix: The Third Sector as an Intermediate Area.” *Voluntas* 6(2): 159-182.
- Fine, Ben. 2017. “The Continuing Enigmas of Social Policy.” In *Towards Universal Health Care in Emerging Economies: Opportunities and Challenges*, edited by Ilcheong Yi. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ghimire, Kléber B. 2005. “The Contemporary Global Social Movements: Emergent Proposals, Connectivity and Development Implications.” *Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper No. 19*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Gibson, Clark C., Krister Andersson, Elinor Ostrom and Sujai Shivakumar. 2005. *The Samaritan’s Dilemma: The Political Economy of Development Aid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Girard, Jean-Pierre. 2014. *Better Health & Social Care: How are Co-ops & Mtuals Boosting Innovation & Access Worldwide?* Montreal: LPS Productions.
- Grindheim, Jan Erik and Per Selle. 1990. “The Role of Voluntary Social Welfare Organisations in Norway: A Democratic Alternative to a Bureaucratic Welfare

- State?" *Voluntas* 1(1): 62-76.
- Hecht, Robert M. and Vito L. Tanzi. 1994. *The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations in the Delivery of Health Services in Developing Countries*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Isaac, T.M. Thomas and Patrick Heller. 2003. "Democracy and Development: Decentralized Planning in Kerala." In *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowering Participatory Governance*, edited by Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright. London: Verso.
- Josselin, Daphné and William Wallace (eds.). 2001. *Non-state Actors in World Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Kadiyala, Suneetha. 2004. "Scaling Up Kudumbashree: Collective Action for Poverty Alleviation and Women's Empowerment." *Food Consumption and Nutrition Division (FCDN) Discussion Paper Brief*. Washington D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Kendall, Jeremy. 2003. *The Voluntary Sector: Comparative Perspectives in the UK*. London: Routledge.
- Kim, Taekyoon. 2017. "On Global Accountability: A Theoretical Revisit to Accountability for Development Partnerships." *Development and Society* 46(2): 317-339.
- _____. 2008. "The Social Construction of Welfare Control: A Sociological Review on State-Voluntary Sector Links in Korea." *International Sociology* 23(6): 819-844.
- Lakshmanan, P. 2006. "Participatory Planning Process in Kerala." In *Decentralized Governance and Poverty Reduction: Lessons from Kerala*, edited by P.P. Balan and M. Retna Raj. Thrissur: Kerala Institute of Local Administration.
- Li, Bingqin, Lijie Fang and Jing Wang. 2015. "Community-Based Social Service Delivery in China: Reshaped by Social Organisations?," Prepared for the UNRISD Methodology Workshop New Directions in Social Policy, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Meijers, Evert and Dominic Stead. 2004. "Policy Integration: What Does It Mean and How Can It Be Achieved? A Multi-disciplinary Review," Prepared for Berlin Conference on the Human Dimensions of Global Environmental Change: Greening of Policies – Interlinked and Policy Integration, Berlin, Germany.
- Migdal, Joel S. 1998. *Strong Societies and Weak States : State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Mkandawire, Thandika. 2004. "Social Policy in a Development Context: Introduction." *Social Policy in a Development Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Mukherjee, Ananya. 2012. "From Food Security to Food Justice." *The Hindu*.
- Mukherjee-Reed, Ananya. 2015. "Taking Solidarity Seriously: Analysing Kerala's Kudumbashree as a Women's SSE Experiment." In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, edited by Peter Utting. London: Zed Books.
- Mulgan, Richard. 2003. *Holding Power to Account: Accountability in Modern*

- Democracies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Nyandekwe, Médard, Manassé Nzayirambaho and Jean Baptiste Kakoma. 2014. "Universal Health Coverage in Rwanda: Dream or reality?" *Pan African Medical Journal* 17(2-8).
- O'Brien, Robert, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte, and Marc Williams. 2000. *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul, Samuel. 1987. "Community Participation in Development Projects: The World Bank Experience." *World Bank Discussion Paper No. 6*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Pearse, Andrew and Matthias Stiefel. 1980. *Inquiry into Participation: A Research Approach*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Pearson, Lester B. 1969. *Partners in Development: Report of the Commission on International Development*. New York: Praeger.
- Pisani, Elizabeth. 2014. "Indonesia in Pieces: The Downside of Decentralization." *Foreign Affairs* (July/August).
- Prasad, Naren. 2008. "Overview: Social Policies and Private Sector Participation in Water Supply." In *Social Policies and Private Sector Participation in Water Supply: Beyond Regulation*, edited by Naren Prasad. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rajan, J.B. 2006. "Kudumbashree: A Forum for Gender Mainstreaming." In *Decentralised Governance and Poverty Reduction: Lessons from Kerala*, edited by P.P. Balan and M. Retna Raj. Thrissur: Kerala Institute of Local Administration.
- Rees, James, David Mullins and Tony Bovaird. 2011. "Third Sector Partnerships for Service Delivery: An Evidence Review and Research Project." *Third Sector Research Centre Working Paper 60*. TSRC Informing civil society.
- Ringin, Stein, Huck-Ju Kwon, Ilcheong Yi, Taekyoon Kim, and Jooha Lee. 2011. *The Korean State and Social Policy: How South Korea Lifted Itself from Poverty and Dictatorship to Affluence and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Robison, Richard and Vedi R. Hadiz. 2004. *Reorganising Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Roginsky, Sandrine and Sally Shortall. 2009. "Civil Society as a Contested Field of Meanings." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 29(9/10): 473-487.
- Rossel, Cecilia. 2015. "State and SSE Partnerships in Social Policy and Welfare Regimes: The Case of Uruguay." In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, edited by Peter Utting. London: Zed Books.
- Salamon, Lester M. 1995. *Partners in Public Service: Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Scholte, Jan Aart. 2011. "Global Governance, Accountability and Civil Society." In *Building Global Democracy? Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance*, edited by Jan Aart Scholte. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sellers, Jefferey M. 2011. "State-Society Relations." In *Sage Handbook of Governance*, edited by Mark Bevir. London: Sage Publication.

- Sirower, Mark L. 2000. *The Synergy Trap: How Companies Lose the Acquisition Game*. New York: The Free Press.
- Smith, Jackie, Marina Karides, Marc Becker, Dorval Brunelle, Christopher Chase-Dunn, Donatella della Porta, Rosalba Icaza Garza, Jeffrey S. Juris, Lorenzo Mosca, Ellen Reese, Peter Smith, and Rolando Vázquez. 2016. *Global Democracy and the World Social Forum*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Soors, Werner, Narayanan Devadasan, Varatharajan Durairaj and Bart Criel. 2010. "Community Health Insurance and Universal Coverage: Multiple Paths, Many Rivers to Cross." *World Health Report (2010) Background Paper 48*. Geneva: WHO.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2009. "Is There a Post-Washington Consensus Consensus?" In *The Washington Consensus Reconsidered: Toward a New Global Governance*, edited by Narcis Serra and Joseph E. Stiglitz. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Triwibowo, Darmawan. 2017. *PNPM Mandiri: Promotes Participation without Empowerment?* Jakarta: Tifa Foundation.
- UN DPADM. 2017. *Online Glossary on Governance and Public Administration*. New York: Division of Public Administration and Development Management, UNDESA.
- UNTFSSSE. 2014. *Social and Solidarity Economy and the Challenge of Sustainable Development*. Geneva: UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy.
- UNRISD. 2003. *Research for Social Change*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- _____. 2016. "Policy Innovations for Transformative Change." *UNRISD Flagship Report*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- _____. 2017. *Potential and Limits of Social and Solidarity Economy*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Uphoff, Norman Thomas. 1979. *Feasibility and Application of Rural Development Participation: A State-of-the-Art Paper*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Utting, Peter. 2015. "Introduction: The Challenges of Scaling Up Social and Solidarity Economy." In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, edited by Peter Utting. London: Zed Books.
- Uzzaman, Wahed. 2010. "Value of People's Participation for Good Governance in Developing Countries." *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy* 4(4): 386-402.
- Varier, Megha. 2016. "The Kudumbashree story: How Kerala women's grassroots scheme grew into a multi-crore project What makes Kudumbashree relevant in 2016?" In *Women Power*, edited by The News Minute. India: The News Minute.
- Ware, Alan. 1989. *Between Profit and State: Intermediate Organizations in Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Wolch, Jennifer. 1990. *The Shadow State: Government and Voluntary Sector in Transition*. New York: Foundation Center.
- World Bank. 2015. *The State of Social Safety Nets 2015*. Washington D. C.: World

Bank.

Yi, Ilcheong and Taekyoon Kim. 2015. "Post 2015 Development Goals (SDGs) and Transformative Social Policy." *Oughtopia* 30(1): 307-335.

Yi, Ilcheong, Hyuk-Sang Sohn and Taekyoon Kim. 2015. "Linking State Intervention and Health Equity Differently: The Universalization of Health Care in South Korea and Taiwan." *Korea Observer* 46(3): 517-549.

ILCHEONG YI is Senior Research Coordinator at UNRISD. He joined UNRISD in October, 2008. Born in the Republic of Korea, he was trained as both political scientist (B.A. and M.A. from the Dept. of Political Science, Seoul National University, South Korea) and social policy analyst (D.Phil from Oxford University, the UK). He specializes in the issues of poverty, social policy, labour policy and historical analysis of the economic and social development process. Prior to this, he was Associate Professor of Kyushu University, Japan (2004-2008), Korean Foundation Visiting Professor, Dept. of East Asian Studies of Malaya University, Malaysia (2003-2004) and Visiting Research Fellow of the Stein Rokkan Centre, Bergen University, Norway (2002-2003). *Address:* Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland [*E-mail:* yi@unrisd.org]

DR. HYUK-SANG SOHN is the dean of Graduate School of Public Governance and Civic Engagement and director of Center for International Development Cooperation (CIDEC), Kyung Hee University. His research interests are political economy of development, international development cooperation, development NGOs, and development evaluation. He is currently leading a research team working on the subject of development partnership supported by the Social Science Korea (SSK) program of Korean Research Foundation. His articles have appeared in *World Development*, *Pacific Focus*, *Korea Observer*, *Korean Journal of International Studies*, and *Korean Political Science Review*. His book, *Civil Society and International Development Cooperation: Current Situation and Challenges of Korean Development NGOs* (in Korean), was published in 2015. His current research project focuses on analyzing the evaluation results of development partnership projects. *Address:* 605 Cheongwoongwan, 26 Kyungheedaero, Dongdaemungu, Seoul, Korea [*E-mail:* hsohn@khu.ac.kr]

TAEKYOON KIM holds a PhD in Social Policy from the University of Oxford and another PhD in International Relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. He has won the Fulbright Fellowship for his sabbatical research year (2017-2018) at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in USA. He teaches International Development, Global Governance and International Political Sociology at the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS), Seoul

National University. Dr Kim served as associate dean for international affairs at the GSIS (2016-2017) and policy adviser for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 2012. He published various academic articles and is the co-author of *The Korean State and Social Policy* (2011). *Address*: Graduate School of International Studies, 1 Gwanakro, Gwanakgu, Seoul, Korea [*E-mail*: oxonian07@snu.ac.kr]