

A Critical Review of Alternative Pathways to New Social Policy in Development Context

Ilcheong Yi^{*} · Hyuk-Sang Sohn^{**} · Taekyoon Kim^{***}

요약

At the turn of the century, social policy in both developed and developing countries confronts new challenges and risks caused by the multiple crises in finance, food, energy and climate change. Changes in the structures of risks are particularly significant. In addition, the global economic crisis starting in 2008 has provided a new context of the global political economy. Both developed and developing countries have responded to these new challenges and risks differently. What risks do these responses aim to address? How can these responses address these risks? Can these diverse responses offer lessons for lower income economies attempting to address social development challenges alongside economic growth in the globalised and increasingly uncertain 21st century context? This paper aims to provide a critical review of the new trends, phenomena or directions of social policy discourse and practice to respond to the new risks in the context of development. Explaining the nature and forms of new challenges and risks and pointing out the potentials and limitations of social policy discourse, it introduces the key points of the previous research we have to keep in mind in formulating alternative social policy approaches. General principles and core elements of social policy in addressing new challenges and risks in the 21st century, which are particularly visible in social policy reforms in emerging economies, are highlighted as a conclusion.

Key words: social policy, alternative pathways, development, partnership

* United Nations Research Institute for Social Development(ilcheongyi@gmail.com)

** Kyung Hee University(hsohn@khu.ac.kr)

*** Seoul National University(oxionian07@snu.ac.kr)

1. Introduction

Since the Second World War social policy has evolved, responding to different external and internal challenges and crises. In the North, main challenges and crises were inflation and growth in the 1950s, increasing inequality and bureaucracy in the 1960s, stagflation, unemployment, post-materialism and overloaded government in the 1970s and 80s, and globalization, unemployment, rigidities, inequalities, social exclusion and family instability in the 1990s (Esping-Andersen, 1997). In developing countries, in particular, post-colonial economies after the Second World War, social policy has been designed to address various issues of nation-building including distribution of the appropriated property, education, and health. Since the 1980s, the escalating poverty, anaemic growth rates, persistence in the structural weakness and reduced capacity of the government due to the structural adjustment became the major challenges and risks in many developing countries. Although there was a consistent fall in poverty in some developing countries such as China, poverty reduction was less successful in many developing countries, in particular in Sub-Saharan Africa. In industrialized countries, there were substantial increases in child poverty (Mosley & Dowler, 2003). Income inequality increased in both developed and developing countries.

At the turn of the century, social policy in both developed and developing countries confronts new challenges and risks caused by the multiple crises in finance, food, energy and climate change. Changes in the structure of risks are particularly significant. For instance, informal employment has been significantly increasing in both developed and developing countries, and employment policies and labour market regulations based on the Fordism have exposed the limitations of existing social policy programmes. An ageing society, which is fundamentally about the issue of fertility, puts more pressure on the system of welfare provision which cannot address “fertility resistance” (Esping-Andersen, 1999).

The global economic crisis starting in 2008 has provided a new context of the global political economy. The advanced economies which were the principal drivers of economic growth through the demand push have been mired in low growth with rising unemployment, faltering consumer spending and high debt levels along with widening trade and reserve deficits. Except for a few

fast-growing emerging economies including China and India, most developing countries have also been affected by the slowdown in traditional export markets and external financial flows such as FDI, aid and remittances. Both majorities of advanced countries and developing countries responded to the crisis with austerity measures.

Both developed and developing countries have responded to these new challenges and risks differently. While some advanced economies maintain the welfare state without fundamental reform, others retrenched welfare states. In some emerging economies, however, welfare programmes have expanded with various impacts. What risks do these expanded welfare programmes aim to address? How can these responses address these risks? Can these diverse responses offer lessons for lower income economies attempting to address social development challenges alongside economic growth in the globalised and increasingly uncertain 21st century context?

This paper aims to deepen our understanding of the limits of the existing mainstream social policy programmes and opportunities of the new social policy programmes by providing a critical review of the new trends, phenomena or directions of social policy discourse and practice to respond to the new risks in the context of development. Avoiding exhaustive review, it will point out the potentials and limitations of social policy discourse considering the new risks and challenges and introduce key points of previous research we have to keep in mind in formulating alternative social policy approaches. And then the section on the new challenges and risks will follow. We will focus on those challenges and risks which social policy based on Fordism and its assumptions has had a limitation in addressing. We will also suggest general principles and core elements of social policy in addressing new challenges and risks in the 21st century which we call new social policies. As a conclusion, we will highlight the importance of emerging economies' experience in designing and implementing social policies from a developmental point of view.

2. Social policy discourses and practices in development context

No successful economic development model was without social policy. In many cases, different forms of redistributive mechanisms were embedded in the political economy of successful

development models such as the Scandinavian social democratic welfare states and East Asian developmental states (Kangas & Palme, 2005; Kwon, 2005; UNRISD, 2010; Ringen et al. 2011).

However, the role of social policy as a system of welfare provision that underpinned this development model was neglected by mainstream development studies in large measure.

Several discursive and policy factors, however, revived the interests in the developmental role of social policy. Firstly, after the seminal work of Esping-Andersen(1990), *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, the geographical boundary of mainstream social policy studies was expanded to include the then emerging economies such as East Asian NIEs. Social policy studies also became enriched as various social policy domains, and issues other than income maintenance were highlighted. In particular research on late-late industrializers such as East Asian NIEs highlighted a productive aspect of social policy and paved the way for (re)establishing social policy and development nexus.

Secondly, the crisis in advanced welfare states in the West forced their policymakers to look at East Asian countries to find lessons. One of the most well-known episodes is the UK's Labour Party and Conservative Party. Although both parties had different concerns about the welfare state and interpretations of the East Asian countries, both of them regarded East Asian experiences, in particular, their social policies designed and implemented in harmony with economic growth, as instructional cases (Goodman et al., 1998; Jacobs, 2000). Social democrats were interested in how East Asian countries had not only acted, in general, to promote social cohesion and reduce inequality but had also taken decisive steps to provide key social services universally. In contrast, neoliberals focused on the experiences that high levels of popular welfare were achieved without high levels of government expenditure. As the international aid industry started to focus on poverty issues, often termed as post-Washington Consensus, the experiences of East Asian countries, in particular their social policies, began to be extensively researched from the developmental perspective as well as social policy perspective.

Thirdly, the notion of developmental welfare which attracted increasing attention in social policy circle provided development studies with a new conceptual and explanatory tool. It offered an opportunity to challenge the neoliberal claims that social expenditures harm the economy and that economic development requires retrenchment of publicly provided welfare services. It helped the community of development studies to establish an alternative paradigm to neo-liberalism which

focused on the role of social protection in development context (Midgley & Tang, 2002).

Although these discursive and policy factors have been formulated by different epistemic and political communities, they have one common concern: how to harmonize social policies with measures designed to promote economic development, in particular in developing countries where the need for social policies that were compatible with economic development was paramount.

The theoretical and policy efforts to bring back social policy to development projects can be categorized into two broad approaches: residual welfare state or status quo approach; and universal welfare state or transformative approach (Abel-Smith & Titmuss, 1986; Esping-Andersen, 1999). The former pays scant attention to historical and institutional contexts which enabled various types of welfare states to be successful in reducing poverty and inequality in the West. As a result, de-contextualised social policy programmes, mostly social assistance, were actively promoted in and transferred to developing countries for poverty reduction.

In this approach, three important contexts were neglected in transferring social policy programmes to developing countries. Firstly, the political economy context was missed, and the only individual programme was promoted in and transferred to developing countries. It was the worst form of selective amnesia about the fact that the drastic improvement of living standards in the Golden Age of capitalism in the West in the 1960s and 1970s was based on the structural change of political economy. In oblivion was the fact that the development since the Second World War was due to not only Keynesian demand-side macroeconomic management and welfare state, but also stable family structure based on male breadwinner model, regulated labour market with strong job security and relatively high and equal wage earners, and dynamic economy based on progress of productivity and mass production (Esping-Andersen, 1999). The fact that the welfare state or social policy can maximise the impact on the reduction of poverty and inequality only when it is designed and implemented to be a part of “system of coordination for productive and reproductive institutions” was not often taken into consideration when transferring social policy programmes to developing countries.

Secondly, politics and power aspects of social policy programme were not taken into consideration when designing social policy programmes for developing countries. One of the key functions of social policy in the European welfare states, in addition to humanizing conditions of

life and work, was to alter the structure of society by admitting the working class to full membership of the community and giving its members the full status of citizenship (Marshall, 1968). The changed power relations could create an enabling environment where social policy programmes could expand and sustain. Various types of institutions such as social dialogue mechanism including collective bargaining have played a key role in making capitalism and welfare compatible in capitalist western society. Highly coordinated social dialogue mechanism has contributed to reducing poverty and inequality through enhancing equality of opportunity, increasing wage share, compressing wage differentials, and stabilising macroeconomic conditions.

Thirdly, full employment, a key economic and social foundation which Post Second World War welfare state-building efforts were based upon, was omitted in the structure of the social policy programmes promoted in and transferred to developing countries. All the cases of welfare state building in the West such as the war-time economy in the US, the Keynesian and Beveridge model in the UK, the Rehn-Meidner model in Sweden, and Marshall Plan in Germany were embedded in the policy and institutional arrangements for full employment, albeit their pathways varied across the countries and periods (Beveridge, 1944; Erixon, 2008; Reinnert, 2007).¹⁾ All of them either strongly promoted for the central role of the government in generating employment (Scandinavian and the UK) or acknowledged the strong role of the state consolidated during the War (Continental European countries such as Germany and France, and the US). Welfare states after the Second World War, therefore, can be said to have been built upon this full employment imperative, be it liberal, conservative or social democratic welfare regimes. Social policy promoted in and transferred to developing countries did not have a strong linkage with full employment, and the emphasis on full employment was further weakened by the less government intervention into the market. Low inflation instead of full employment was considered a bedfellow of social policy programmes.

Most social policy programmes promoted in and transferred to developing countries in this approach were based on targeting approach. Targeting approach is associated with the

1) In his "Report on Full Employment in a Free Society" which is less known to his official report "The Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Social Insurance and Allied Services" (known commonly as the Beveridge Report), Beveridge contended that a full employment policy must mean that the central government accepts responsibility for the level of employment. To him, full employment was and should be linked to social policy programmes. He argued that "the way to full employment is to destroy "the giant evils of Want, Disease, Ignorance, and Squalor, which are a scandal and a danger" (p.150).

understanding of social policy as a tool to address the problems of those in need identified through a means test. It was argued that even if coverage were low, money would be saved or used efficiently if the near-to-poor were no longer subsidized by public fund. The public expenditure was cut back, and the role of the state in providing social services reduced in developing countries, in particular, both transition economies and developing countries (Townsend, 2004). The ultimate goal of social policy has been considered to provide a safety net for those fell off from the market and complement the market which is considered the institution for the growth and equal distribution.

The universal welfare state approach was a countermovement to this approach in a Polanyian sense. The universal approach emphasizes the fact that the social and the economic are inseparable from each other. It assumes that market economy is not the autonomous and self-regulating mechanism. The economy is embedded in the society where various economic, social and political relations are interacting with each other through its value and functional systems.

There are several variants of this approach. Some of them are alternatives to the residual approaches which have been widely employed in developing countries since the 1990s. Two notable cases can be identified. For instance, Institute of Development Studies (IDS)' transformative social protection group emphasizes the importance of social protection responding to social risks as well as economic risks in the context of developing countries. They argue that social protection needs to be understood comprehensively and holistically. They also emphasize political and power elements of social policy such as participation, empowerment, and rights-based approaches to development (Devereux & Sabats-Wheeler, 2006). They also highlight the need to address vulnerabilities arising from social inequality and exclusion by protecting and enhancing the rights of workers and minority ethnic groups.

Another example is a UN agency working on social policy research for a long time since its establishment, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). It argues that social policy, defined as a state intervention that directly affects the welfare of the individual, social institutions and social relations concerns protection, (re)distribution, production and reproduction functions of the society. Social policy affects the interactions between social, economic and political factors on the one hand. It also addresses the issues such as redistributive effects of economic

activities and policies, risk from the vagaries of the market and the changing circumstances of age, productive potential of members of society, and the burden of giving birth and care. Addressing these issues through various institutions and mechanisms, social policy can shape the political, social, and economic relations. The intensity and comprehensiveness of the linkages between functions are dependent upon a complex interplay of forces unique to each country (Mkandawire, 2004).

Firmly based on the inseparability of the economic and the social, both approaches emphasize the importance of economic, social and political relations, policy linkages, and the comprehensiveness of social policy interventions which transform the existing unequal and unjust social, economic and political relationship. Both of them succeeded in bringing back social policy without losing concerns about political economy, politics and employment. They emphasize the importance of the productive aspect of social policy or social investment such as investment in human capital and provision of economic opportunities, the importance of changing power hierarchies and inequitable social relations, and comprehensive framework of social protection or social policy.

Despite the significant contribution to understanding successful developmental experiences after the Second World War from a social policy perspective, and to establishing an alternative social policy strategy in developing countries, these approaches of transformative social policy have several limitations as conceptual and explanatory tools for a new social policy addressing new challenges and risks caused by changes in the social, economic and political foundations, particularly in developing countries. Firstly, although both approaches argue that “everything is related to everything else”, they fail to demonstrate that how they are related and which is more related to which. For instance, IDS approach argues that there are a weak relationship between protective measure (school feeding) and promotive function (economic opportunity), and a less obvious relationship between transformative measure and promotive functions (Devereux & Satates-Wheeler, 2006). It is, however, well known that school feeding programmes have a significant impact on reducing care burden and increase women’s participation rate in the labour market. UNRISD approach does not go beyond the general argument that “the weights on production, distribution, protection and reproduction (are) placed differently” either. The linkages

between economic and social policy are emphasized but have yet to be theorised. For instance, human capital is assumed to contribute to economic growth, but the explanations on what variables are intervening in this process are not sufficient. Secondly, in both approaches, social policy is not successfully moving beyond the national boundary, and the issues demanding global responses are not considered equally important. In particular climate change, despite its significant impact on the livelihoods of people, the production, redistribution, protection and reproduction, is only dealt with from the perspective of ameliorative measures addressing the consequences of climate change. Thirdly, framing new experiments in social policy programme with polemical debate, as in the case of various forms of cash transfer, runs the risk of ignoring the potential of the programme to make a synergy as a part of a system of coordination for development. For instance, a criticised programme such as Bolsa Familia had played a significant role in reducing poverty and inequality when it was expanded to cover a significant level of population and combined with minimum wage policy and universal health care. Last but not least, both approaches do not tend to take into account new challenges and risks in designing and implementing new social policy programmes.

3. New Challenges and Risks

“Newness” in social sciences is always controversial since it is a subjective notion. In fact, “new” social challenges and risks are the results of the changes perceived to deviate from the past. Challenges and risks are “new” when results of a specific change significantly modify the functions of other institution. “New” challenges and risks to social policy in the 21st century, therefore, are the ones caused by both quantitative and qualitative changes deviating from the past which significantly modify the functions of institutions and behavior of actors. Three changes which produced new challenges and formed a new risk structure can be identified: globalization, technological progress, and tertiarization or increased share of the service industry. They are the contexts different from those in which welfare states were built and social policies were designed and implemented after the Second World War. These changes are interlinked with each other and have different impacts on society, in particular, global finance, employment, productivity and wage, family, demography,

inequality, and environment which are key sources of new challenges and factors of risk structure. These changes have become particularly prominent since the global economic crisis of 2008.

1) Financialisation: The first new challenge is the financialization. The economies of the world have undergone profound transformations. One of the most profound changes is that the role of government has diminished while that of markets has increased across the national border. At the centre of this global-level marketisation is financialization, which refers to the increasing role of financial motives, financial markets, financial actors, and financial institutions in the operation of the domestic and international economies (Epstein, 2006). As economic transactions between countries have substantially risen, domestic and international financial transactions have drastically grown. One of the consequences of this process is the reduction of the investment in the non-financial corporations which are the major source of employment in most countries. Financial transactions, real interest rates, the profitability of financial firms, and the shares of national income accruing to the holders of financial assets increased while the investment in the non-financial sector which used to generate the majority of employment and revenues has fallen over the last three decades (Epstein, 2006; Eatwell, 1997). This observation is supported by the recent trends in OECD countries (Epstein & Jayadev, 2005). France and the US, in particular, being exemplified as typical cases of conservative and liberal welfare regimes in the 20th century, equally witnessed that the increase of financial transaction has been accompanied with the rise of real interest rate, the profits of financial institutions and the returns to holding financial assets, and the decrease of profit states of non-financial corporations (Crotty, 2005; Dumenil & Levy, 2005). In this financialization process, firms in the manufacturing and non-financial service sector have essentially become “a bundle of assets to be deployed or redeployed depending on the short run rates of returns that can be earned” (Fligstein & Markowitz, 1990). Financial markets directly reward companies for reducing payroll through various flexible labour market measures such as closures, restructuring, and outsourcing. Financialisation indicates a fundamental change in the role of financial institutions which used to be the driver of the efficient allocation of resources for desirable economic growth. In the process of financialization, although the financial investment of non-financial business has been rising, the accumulation of capital goods has been declining, and the insecurity in employment

has been increasing (Stockhammer, 2004). Impact of financialization on investment and employment raises challenges to the social policy because it reduces the fiscal base and increases the burden on income maintenance for the unemployed.

2) Divergence of productivity and wage : One of the most significant features of the last quarter century has been the dismantlement of the established relationship between wages and productivity. Productivity continues to grow, but wages no longer keep pace with profits and productivity. It results in the phenomenon that despite the consistent economic growth regarding the production of goods and services at the global level, with a slow down after 2008, the wage share has consistently reduced over the last 30 years or more in contrast to an increasing share of income going to capital income. The lack of decent jobs and the divergence of pay and productivity are one of the main causes of reduced wage share in total incomes. While productivity growth has risen substantially over the last few decades but the hourly compensation for worker has seen much more modest growth, especially in the last ten years or so.

3) Decreasing decent jobs: The lack of decent jobs is closely related to globalization, technology progress and tertiarization. In developed countries, technology advancement has reached a level where manufacturing industry no longer needs to employ low-skilled workers, and tertiary sector which is lagging behind the manufacturing sector regarding productivity has difficulty in absorbing labour force to the extent which compensates for the loss of manufacturing jobs. It results in a large number of the unemployed without adequate benefits and opportunities for re-education and skill training (in liberal welfare regime such as the US), a large number of the unemployed with benefits and opportunities for re-education and skill training (in conservative welfare regime such as Germany), and low unemployment but high share of low-paid service jobs (in social democratic welfare regime countries such as Sweden) (Esping-Andersen, 1999). This is a challenge in both supply and demand side of social policy. It consistently reduces tax base and gains decreasing returns or even negative returns, while the demand for social benefits and services is more likely to increase.

4) Increasing informal workers: In both developing and developed countries, the share of informal workers is increasing. Expanded global trade, which reached more than 60% of World GDP by 2007, compared with less than 30% in the mid-1980s, has had a limited effect in reducing

labour market vulnerability in many developing countries. Although expanded global trade contributed to global growth and job creation, in many instances, labour market conditions and the quality of employment growth in developing countries have not improved to the same degree. In many developing economies job creation has mainly taken place in the informal economy, where around 60% of workers find income opportunities. Less job security, lower income, the absence of access to a range of social benefits and fewer possibilities to participate in formal education and training programmes are predominant characteristics of informal employment and major sources of poverty and inequality. The share of labour force with informal employment is far bigger than the one with formal employment in developing countries. In developed countries, precarious workers, particularly among the youth have increased (Standing, 2011). Social policy based on the straightforward dichotomy of employment and unemployment has difficulty in dealing with this increased share of informal employment.

5) Increasing inequality : Increasing inequality is related to the challenges above. Inequality is not a new phenomenon, but certainly its magnitude is. The available empirical data on inequality between countries unequivocally demonstrate that the global expansion of markets and capitalism over the past two centuries has been accompanied by a significant rise in inequality. Most studies agree that by the late twentieth-century inequality between countries became comparatively higher than most observed inequality within countries. However, a new consensus emerges that in the 21st century inequality between countries have reduced but inequality within countries is rising (Korenjewicz & Moran, 2007; Milanovic, 2002; Lakner and Milanovic, 2013)

Inequality in developing countries has a new feature. Growth in developing countries on average has been relatively strong over the past three decades. It has exceeded that of the advanced economies and significantly contributed to reducing poverty. However, the impact of growth on poverty is highly mediated by the way wealth and income are distributed. For instance, even in those countries where growth has been the main driver of poverty reduction, further progress could have occurred under relatively favourable income distribution (Fosu, 2011). One of the important facts is that in developing as well as developed countries, there is a substantial level of wealth concentration. In developing countries, although the degree of wealth concentration is not so much high as developed countries, (the net wealth-to-income ratio is significantly smaller (roughly half),

on average than that in developed countries), the wealth inequality is closely related to income inequality. Given the large population live in rural area, and its majority lives in poverty, inequality of land ownership has a significant impact on poverty. Social policy is also significantly affected by the form of wealth concentration. In mineral-rich developing countries, the lion's share of concentrated wealth is financial wealth, and most are in "off-shore deposits" (Shaxson et al., 2012). And this form of wealth neither trickles down to the poor nor increases tax revenues. This situation questions a neoclassical economic assumption that substantial level of capital income or profits is reinvested. And it demands a more redistributive social policy based on a precise measure to mobilize resource.

6) Underutilization of human capital: Underutilisation of human capital is a new challenge to social policy. During the period of dynamic economic growth after the Second World War, the traditional mode of gaining place and privilege in society, i.e. inheritance, was more or less replaced by meritocracy through education and training for professional and technical jobs. Until the 1980s, at least in advanced countries, and some developing countries such as East Asian NIEs, the role of social policy in particular social services contributing to human capital accumulation was crucial in establishing a virtuous circle of growth and social development.

The virtuous circle in advanced countries slowly started to break down from the 1980s, when flexible work arrangement was introduced as a main policy tool to maintain or increase profitability. The labour force less attached to firms significantly undermined the accumulation of firm-specific skills. The system to accumulate firm-specific skills has been weakened when it is increasingly important in the context where more new technologies are applied to production (Bartel et al., 2003). The vicious circle of low level of accumulated firm-specific skills, low productivity, and high unemployment, in particular of the youth has been identified in many advanced countries (Green, 2016).

Current global economic crisis accentuated this trend, and the major victims are the youth, whose precarious forms of employment and unemployment have dramatically increased. The statistics published by the OECD, show youth unemployment reached a rate of 13.0% whereas the OECD average is 6.3% in 2016 (OECD 2018). The youth unemployment rate is expected to fall in the coming years but will be still far higher than the rate of 2007 before the crisis struck. Also, the

drivers of the decreasing unemployment rate of the youth are not due to improvements in the labour market but rather to large numbers of young people dropping out of the labour force altogether due to discouragement and rising NEET rate (“neither in employment, education or training”) among young people (ILO, 2012).

In developing countries, the problems of accumulation of human capital and transformation of human capital into productive jobs coexist. These coexisting problems of accumulation and transformation of human capital produce particularly damaging impact in Africa whose population, unlike other developing regions, is becoming more youthful. In Africa, the number of youth is multiplying, and around 19% of the global youth population lives in Africa in 2015. Although the youth unemployment rate in Sub-Saharan Africa has declined since 2012, the enrolment rates in secondary and tertiary education are the lowest among the continents (ILO, 2016).

7) Ageing society: Except for those in Africa, developing countries, as well as developed countries, are going grey. By 2050, the majority of elderly, out of about 2 billion elderly people, will live in developing countries. Countries in Asia are set to see some of the biggest rises – by 2050, one in four Asians will be older than 60 years of age. Even countries in South Asia, where fertility and mortality are still high, the number of people aged over 60 is set to triple from 53 million in 2009 to 150 million by 2050 (Shetty, 2012). It increases the financial burden on the social security systems, particularly those with well-developed programmes for the elderly.

8) Instability of breadwinner model: Many modern welfare states, in particular, those categorised as liberal and conservative welfare regimes, were firmly based on family economy of the male breadwinner model. One of the most fundamental challenges resulted from globalization, technological progress, and tertiarization is the instability of the family economy based on this male breadwinner model. Low wage, job insecurity, and increased female participation in the labour market pose a challenge to social policy designed to address challenges and risks of a political economy which features industrial production with strong demand for low-skilled workers, relatively homogeneous and undifferentiated, predominant male, labour force, so-called the standard production worker, stable families with high fertility, and a female population primarily devoted to housewifery (Esping-Andersen, 1999).

9) Political instability: One of the phenomena of structural change in this century deserving

particular attention is the increase of politically awakened population, in particular in developing countries. As Brezinsky aptly observes, “in the 21st century, the population of much of the developing world is politically stirring and many places see things with unrest. It is a population acutely conscious of social injustice to an unprecedented degree, and often resentful of its perceived lack of political dignity” (Brezinski, 2005). In many developing countries, power shifts through democratic procedures take place more often than the previous century. Although many developing countries remain in “pre-awakening” stage or struggle with “post-awakening”, it is certain that the aspiration for and pursuit of democracy, social justice and equality are increasing ever more and would continue in the future in various forms ranging from sporadic campaigns and demonstrations to the power change through either election or popular uprisings. This political awakening does not necessarily go with the consolidation of democracy, however. It still coexists with rampant corruptions and undemocratic institutions and behaviour of the powerful and the rich (Barak 2015). The rapidly rising expectation for welfare, a substantial degree of political awakening and lack of political institutions adequately representing people’s voices and facilitating participation can pose a serious challenge to politics of social policy.

10) Climate change: Climate change as a concept and fact began to be widely shared and acknowledged as a reality at the end of the 20th century. Increased level of natural disasters regarding magnitude and number has enhanced the awareness of policy stakeholders about it too. Climate change poses a fundamental challenge to social policy or welfare state since the environmental factor was less factored in the design of social policy, and natural disaster which is increasingly frequent and larger in terms of its economic and social impact, has been addressed not as a risk that social security system is supposed to address but the humanitarian or emergency service is. In the latter understanding, the prevailing approach in aid and recovery policies to address the damages of the disaster has been a short-term disaster relief programme rather than the one concerning long-term development and transformation of environmental conditions (Philip et al., 1993). Given negative impacts of environmental or climate changes disproportionately affect the vulnerable and poor people, social policy needs to transform the conditions of the poor and vulnerable people in the way to mitigate the negative impacts of climate or environmental changes.

4. Shifting Contexts and Possibility of Alternative Social Policy

New phenomena, trend or directions of social policies to overcome the limits of social policy based on Fordism and address new challenges and risks can be observed in the broader ideational and institutional context. First, there has been a marked shift in ideas and practices away from the market fundamentalism. The global economic crisis of 2007-2008 challenged the fundamental assumptions of the long-dominated neoliberal ideology. Public opinions against the banks, bankers and business leaders, financialization, and inequality have been widespread. Research on inequality has drastically increased. Some social and human science publications on inequalities and social justice produced worldwide increased from 18,626 between 2004 and 2008 to 30,506 between 2009 and 2013 (McCall and Percheski, 2010; UNESCO and ISSA, 2016).

Secondly, actors who had been at the fringe of policy making became more influential in domestic social policy design and implementation. In particular actors at the supranational level, in particular, regional actors began to play a significant role in shaping domestic social policies. The 2015 action of Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR) in Latin America around the joint procurement of high-cost medicines at significantly lower prices than those previously available in some or all of the member countries is a notable example (UNRISD, 2016).

Thirdly, some emerging economies have made inroads into poverty and inequality at national levels, particularly in Latin America. Although these positive trends are often associated with the favourable international economic environment, new and more redistributive social policy programmes have also been important elements of policy packages resulting in reduced poverty and inequality. India's social programme expansion based on rights-based approach and China's move towards universal health care are also particularly notable examples (Yi, Koechlein, and de Negri, 2017).

Fourthly, beyond such obvious 'social' policy programmes, many other policy instruments with a significant social functions, which may be called "social policy by other means", "subterranean social policy" or "functional equivalents to social policy", are being locally experimented or nationally implemented; these include for example minimum wage legislation, basic income, efforts to formalize labour, or policies related to land distribution and natural resource management (Chang, 2004; Estevez-Abe, 2008; Mishra, 2004; Caputo and Lewis, 2016; McFarland, 2017).

The change to which we need to pay attention is the increasing interests in long-term planning. Influenced by the environmental and energy concern initially (Ehrenfeld, 2009), policymakers are increasingly aware of the problems with short-term boom-bust thinking. They look for the way to systematically integrate long-term vision and plan in the policy design and implementation. In particular, as the sustainable development becomes more prominent in international development discourse since 2015 the demand for long-term vision and plan for three dimensions of development, that is, economic, social and environmental dimensions is rapidly growing.

However, recent (and on-going) multiple crises and the challenges of social policy demand social policy to be more innovative to promote economic development along with greater equity, inclusiveness and sustainability. Central to such policies must be a focus on employment and on capability-enhancing social policies, which in turn requires a role for the state in using a maximum of available resources for developmental purposes. That such approaches can work is shown in extensive evidence on the policy arrangements that created successful development experiences around the world, as well as those that led countries out of past crises and recessions (UNRISD, 2010; 2016). But crisis responses have also demonstrated the resilience of the main institutions and organizations of neoliberalism such as banks, bankers and financial institutions. They have emerged from the global economic crisis in large unscathed and still dominate political economy (Utting, Razavi, and Buchholz, 2012; Jolly et al., 2012). Alternative ideas – such as invoking heterodox economic policies, counter-cyclical fiscal stimulus, industrial policies or more extensive social policy programmes - have often struggled to gain traction or to be treated as a core part of a viable economic model. Deeper analysis is required to understand why this is the case, as well as the factors (politics, resources, etc.) that enable or constrain states in pursuing more heterodox combinations of policies.

The review of challenges and new risks and shifting contexts of new social policy helps us to formulate several general principles or guidelines to which we can refer when we consider a new social policy to address new challenges and risks.

Firstly, multifaceted and interconnected nature of challenges demands social policy to be expanded to identify and address bottlenecks and key problems which used to be located beyond the current social policy domains (Fine, 2009; UNRISD, 2016). Financialisation which directly

affects the employment and welfare benefits operates through various conduits such as changes in the structure and financial markets, changes in the behaviour of non-financial corporations, and changes in economic policy. Countering financialization, therefore, calls for a multifaceted agenda such as restoring policy control over financial markets, challenging the neo-liberal economic policy paradigm encouraged by financialization, maintaining employment, productivity and profit nexus, and reforming political process to diminish the influence of financial institutions and elites. It is also important to understand that financialization has affected social policy itself significantly in various ways. The financial market has been incorporated into the process of providing social security and services such as in the pension and housing sectors and contributed to generating various forms of derivatives for speculative trade and consequently produced instability. Sometimes it caused the loss of funds that finance social insurance due to the volatile international financial market. This financialization process also underpins and promotes privatisation, in particular, related to the provision of social security and social services (Fine, 2009). Without taking into account this agenda when designing social policy, the social policy would continuously fight losing the battle.

Second, related to the first, social policy should be proactive to address new challenges and risks which were not in the traditional categories of social risks (UNRISD, 2016). Climate change and its impact on livelihoods produce different types of contingency from those conventional risks associated with the market failures. Its global, irreversible and incalculable impacts demand an adjustment of social policy which had been designed by the contexts of the nation-state and money terms (Beck, 1999). The conventional social policy instruments to respond to market contingency and compensate for calculable individual costs need to be redesigned to respond to new types of contingency caused by climate change. It involves the re-conceptualisation of premises and assumptions upon which social policies dealing with both pre-existing and newly produced contingencies are based. Reconceptualisation of poverty or poverty line such as “development threshold” (Baer et al., 2007), redefinition of distribution and redistribution of social costs and benefits, expansion of social security and equity, etc. can be a few of the imminent tasks social policy has to tackle in order to deal with various impacts of climate change on the livelihood.²⁾ Close

2) A few social policy scholars make headway in researching social policy in response to climate change, in particular adaptation strategy. The IIDS has carried out a special research on poverty in a changing climate (September 2008) and emphasized a specific focus on social protection within the climate change policy discourse (Davies, Bruce, Jennifer,

examination on various attempts to move beyond the “nationalistic welfare state” to “welfare world” (Myrdal, 1960), i.e. going beyond conventional boundary of the nation state, through innovative global social policy tools is also necessary to respond to the climate change (Deacon, 2007).

Third, the new contexts of social policy such as high level of globalization, technology advancement, and tertiarization should be taken seriously in designing and implementing social policy. The new contexts also demand social policy to be sensitive to new logics operating in assessing the needs and impacts produced in different socio-economic and political contexts. One of the distinctive features in the 21st century, which recent global economic crisis demonstrates, is that both developed and developing countries are equally affected by these challenges, albeit with a varying degree. However, these challenges which are highly likely to accentuate social problems such as poverty and inequality do not always produce same economic and social consequences in a different country. National modes of managing these challenges are different since diverse institutions filter these challenges in different ways and consequently produce different outcomes. National diversity in dealing with new challenges and risks demands scholars and practitioners to further delve into the roles of institutions and policies, in particular linkages between institutions and policies in different policy domains and sectors in different countries.

Fourth, new social policy should identify and explain newly established complementarities and trade-offs which have been unseen or unidentified in the previous political, economic theories (Boyer, 2014). History of economic and social development tells us many failures to create synergies and complementarities of institutions and policies. The contrasting results between Marshall Plan with an institutional arrangement for reindustrialisation and Morgenthau Plan resulting in deindustrialization were one of the typical examples to demonstrate how different the outcomes of policies which can and cannot utilize the complementarity. Policies to make post-war Germany peaceful “pastoral state” under the framework of Morgenthau Plan the main method of which was to deindustrialise Germany turned out to be a disastrous failure. Deindustrialization caused agricultural productivity plummet (Balabkins, 1964; Reinnert, 2007). Expansion of Marshall Plan to Germany after three years of failed Morgenthau Plan was a confirmation of the importance of

Tom, & Thomas, 2008). It has explored the linkages between climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and social protection in the agricultural sector and suggested as research agenda the role of social protection in strengthening adaptation and the way to develop more climate-resilient social protection interventions.

complementary between institutions in both industrial and agricultural sector. Agricultural sector cannot be sustainable without a substantial level of development in the industrial sector. Social policy taking into account various linkages for development is vital in this sense. One of the examples in the recent period is the education, skill training and lifelong learning, labour market, and migration nexus. For instance, social policy designed to strengthen skill development system which connects education to technical training, technical training to labour market entry and labour market entry to workplace and lifelong learning, can be linked to migration policy to address the myriad of economic and social problems related to migration in developing countries (Adepoju, 2008; ILO, 2008). Social change, in particular, technological progress, creates a new linkage on which social policy can capitalize. Replacing fossil-fuel subsidy with cash transfer is one of the examples of which social policy responded to the newly highlighted links between climate change, energy poverty, and redistributive impact. Expansion of biofuel market creates a different form of linkages between environment, food security, and energy poverty which social policy needs to respond to in an innovative way (FAO, 2011).

Fifth, long-term plan of social policy which moves beyond needs-based assistance to rights-based social security is one of the core elements in new social policy (UNRISD, 2016). Even the welfare states in Nordic countries which fully committed universalism, comprehensive risk coverage, generous benefit levels and egalitarianism did take a long time to reach their mature forms which they could find only after the mid-1960s (Esping-Andersen, 1999). Decades of strong, even hegemonic, social democratic rule played a significant role in establishing and maintaining long-term vision and plan to transform their liberalistic social policies into universal, comprehensive and egalitarian welfare states (Baldwin, 1990; Esping-Andersen, 1992). The experience of developmental welfare states in East Asia also demonstrates the importance of universalism set as a goal to be achieved in the future, although it may not yet be a reality. National health insurance in the Republic of Korea, for instance, did not cover the entire population, when it was first launched in the 1970s, but the programme was designed as a scheme to move towards universal coverage. The rationale of universalism within the policy design shaped the nature of political discourse progressively and became a driving force for achieving fully universal programme (UN ESCAP, 2011; Yi, 2009).

5. Conclusion

We currently witness severe strains in the dominant 20th-century social policy approaches. Key social policy programmes are largely based upon the assumptions underpinning the Fordism and key institutions and organizations are mainly designed by and for national welfare states. Changes such as increased integration of the nation states into the global networks, technological progress, and tertiarization of industry has affected the nature and forms of risks social policy used to deal with and produced new forms of risks and challenges on people's wellbeing. Whether the 20th century social policy approach can adequately deal with new challenges and risks which emerges from the dismantled Fordism and often cross borders of nation states is a big question to make all the policy stakeholders scratch their heads.

The changes we are witnessing are interlinked with each other and have different impacts on society, I particular global finance, employment, productivity and wage, family, demography, inequality, and environment which are key sources of new challenges and factors of risk structure. Various new contexts, however, offer opportunity as equally strong as challenges. In response to the emerging risks and challenges, viable alternatives that have potentials to meet the challenges of 21st-century development appear to be emerging.

Several general principles on which new social policy approach can be based have been drawn from the careful review of new challenges, risks and shifting contexts of new social policy. Firstly, social policy needs to be expanded to identify and address bottlenecks and key problems which used to be located beyond the current social policy domains. Second, social policy should be proactive to address new challenges and risks which were not in the traditional categories of social risks. Third, the new contexts of social policy such as high level of globalization, technology advancement, and tertiarization should be taken seriously in designing and implementing social policy. Fourth, new social policy should identify and explain newly established complementarities and trade-offs which have been unseen or unidentified in the previous political, economic theories. Fifth, long-term plan of social policy which moves beyond needs-based assistance to rights-based social security is one of the core elements in new social policy.

Compared with the advanced countries with well-developed social policy systems of the 20th

century and austerity policies under the low growth economic regime, the social policy choices of the (large) emerging economies offer more empirical and concrete cases where we can draw the lessons on how alternative approaches of these countries incorporate these principles into their policies and programmes. Research on the nature and political economy of social policies and welfare systems in emerging economies (including but not limited to the BRICS) as well as other developing countries, will also allow an examination of the conditions for success and the limits of differing social policy strategies and interventions. More importantly, they may demonstrate (in a variety of ways) combinations of economic and social policies as well as the political arrangements conducive to development in the contemporary globalised world. The current context – in its degree of global integration and liberalisation – is very different from the conditions which enabled the creation of welfare states, or even the success of the East Asian developmental states, of the 20th century. In this sense, what ‘recent developers’ offer regarding development strategies and options for achieving welfare improvements with economic development in the contemporary context may be more relevant to social policy stakeholders concerning new and alternative social policy approaches in the 21st century.

■ Bibliography □

- Abel-Smith, B., Titmuss, K. & Titmuss, R. (1986). *Social policy*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Adepoju, A. (2008). *Migration and social policy in sub-saharan africa*. Geneva: URNSID, IOM and Institute for Future Studies.
- Baer, P., Athanasiou, T. & Kartha, S. (2007). The right to development in a climate constrained world. Publication series on ecology. 1. Berlin: Heinrich Boel Foundation.
- Balabkins, N. (1964). *Germany under direct controls: Economic aspects of industrial disarmament, 1945-1948*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Baldwin, P. (1990). *The politics of social solidarity: Class bases of the european welfare states*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barak, G. (2015). Introduction: on the invisibility and neutralization of the crimes of the powerful and their victims. In G. Barak(eds). *International handbook of the crimes of the powerful*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bartel, A., Ichniowski, C. & Shaw, K. (2003). *The effects of recent technological change on skill demand: An analysis using direct intra-industry measures*. NBER Working Papers.
- Beck, U. (1999). *World risk society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beveridge, W.H. (1944). *Report on full employment in a free society*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Boyer, R. (2014). *Welfare States and Institutional Complementarity: From North to South*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Brezinski, Z. (2005). The dilemma of the last sovereign. *The American Interest*. 1(1). 37-46.
- Caputo, R.K., & M. Lewis. (2016). Introduction. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*. 43(3). 3-8.
- Chang, H. (2004). The role of social policy in economic development: Some theoretical reflections and lessons from Asia. In T. Mkandawire(eds). *Social policy in development context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crotty, J. (2005). The neoliberal paradox: The impact of destructive product market competition and 'modern' financial markets on nonfinancial corporation performance in the neoliberal era. In G.A. Epstein(eds). *Financialization and the world economy*. Edward Elgar.
- Deacon, B. (2007). *Global Social Policy*. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Devereux, S. & Satates-Wheeler, R. (2006). Transformative social protection. In IDS(eds). *IDS In Focus*. Brighton, Sussex: IDS.
- Dumenil, G. & Levy, D. (2005). Costs and benefits of neoliberalism: A class analysis. In G.A. Epstein(eds). *Financialization and the world economy*. Edward Elgar.

- Eatwell, J. (1997). International Capital Liberalization: The Impact on World Development. *Estudios de Economica*, 24(2), 219-261.
- Ehrenfeld, D. (2009). *Becoming good ancestors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Epstein, G.A. (2006). Introduction: Financialization and the world economy. In G.A. Epstein(eds). *Financialization and the world economy*. Edward Elgar.
- Epstein, G.A. & Jayadev, A. (2005). The rise of rentier incomes in OECD countries: Financialization, central bank policy and labor solidarity. In G.A. Epstein(eds). *Financialization and the world economy*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Erixon, L. (2008). *The Rehn-Meidner model in Sweden: Its rise, challenges and survival*. Scandinavian Working Papers in Economics.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- _____. (1992). The making of a social democratic welfare state. In K. Misgeld, K. Molin & K. Aamark(eds.) *Creating social democracy*. University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- _____. (1997). Welfare states at the end of the century. In OECD(eds). *Family, market and community*. Paris: OECD.
- _____. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estevez-Abe, M. (2008). *Welfare and capitalism in postwar japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FAO (2011). *The state of food insecurity in the world 2011*. Rome: FAO.
- Fine, B. (2009). Financialisation and social policy. The UNRISD Conference on the "Social and political dimensions of the global crisis: Implications for developing countries. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Fligstein, N. & Markowitz, L. (1990). Financial reorganization of American corporations in the 1980s. In W.J. Wilson(eds.) *Sociology and the public agenda*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Fosu, A. K. (2011). *Growth, inequality, and poverty reduction in developing countries*. Helsinki: UNU-WIDER.
- Goodman, R., White, G. & Kwon, H. (1998). *In search of an East Asian welfare state*. London: Routledge.
- Green, F. (2016). *Skills demand, training and skills mismatch: A review of key concepts, theory and evidence*. London: Foresight, Government Office for Science
- ILO(2008). *Skills for improved productivity, employment growth and development*. Geneva: ILO.
- _____(2012). *Global employment trends for youth 2012*. Geneva: ILO.

- _____(2016). *World employment and social outlook 2016*. Geneva: ILO.
- Jacobs, D. (2000). Low public expenditure on social welfare: Do East Asian countries have a secret? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 9, 2-16.
- Jolly, R., Cornia, G.A., Elson, D., Fortin, C., Griffith-Jones, S., Heleiner, G., Hoeven, R., Kaplinsky, R., Morgan, R., Ortiz, I., Pearson, R. & Stewart, F. (2012). *Be outraged: There are alternatives*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Kangas, O. & Palme, J. (2005). Social policy and economic development in the Nordic Countries: An introduction. In O. Kangas & J. Palme(eds). *Social policy and economic development in the Nordic Countries*. Basingstok and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koreniewicz, R.P. & Moran, T.P. (2007). World inequality in the Twenty-first Century: Patterns and tendencies. In G. Ritzer(ed). *The blackwell companion to globalization*. Madlen, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kwon, H. (2005). Transforming the developmental welfare state in East Asia. *Development and Change*, 36(3), 477-497.
- Lakner, C. & Milanovic, B. (2013). *Global Income Distribution: From the Fall of the Berlin Wall to the Great Recession*. Policy Research Working Papers. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Marshall, T.H. (1968). *Social policy in the twentieth century*. London: Hutchinson & Co. LTD.
- McCall, L. & Percheski, C. (2010). Income inequality: New trends and research directions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 329-347.
- McFarland, K. (2017). Overview of current basic income related experiments. *Basic Income News*, 25 March.
- Midgley, J. & Tang, K. (2002). Introduction: social policy, economic growth and developmental welfare. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 10(4), 244-252.
- Milanovic, B. (2002). True world income distribution, 1988 and 1993: First calculation based on household surveys alone. *The Economic Journal* 112, 51-92.
- Mishra, R. (2004). Social protection by other means: Can it survive globalization. In P. Kennett(ed). *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*. Cheltenham, UK and Northhampton, MA, Edward Elgar.
- Mkandawire, T. (2004). Social policy in a development context: Introduction. In T. Mkandawire(ed), *Social policy in a development context*. New York, Basingstoke and NY: UNRISD and Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mosley, P. & Dowler, E. (2003). Introduction. In P. Mosely & E. Dowler(eds). *Poverty and social exclusion in North and South: Essays on social policy and global poverty reduction*. New York: Routledge.

- Myrdal, G. (1960). *Beyond welfare state*. Bristol: Yale University Press.
- OECD(2018). *OECD Data*. Paris: OECD.
- Philip, B.R., Kartez, J. & Wenger, D. (1993). Recovery after disaster: Achieving sustainable development, mitigation and equity. *Disaster*. 17(2).
- Reinert, E.S. (2007). *How rich countries got rich...and why poor countries stay poor*. London: Constable.
- Ringen, S., Kwon, H., Yi, I., Kim, T. & Lee, J. (2011). *The Korean State and Social Policy: South Korea Lifted Itself from Poverty and Dictatorship to Affluence and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shaxson, N., Christensen, J. & Mathiason, N. (2012). *Inequality: You don't know the half of it*. London: Tax Justice Network.
- Shetty, P. (2012). Grey matter: Ageing in developing countries. *The Lancet*. 379 (9823). 1285-1287.
- Standing, G. (2011). *The precariat: The new dangerous class*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Stockhammer, E. (2004). Financialization and the slowdown of accumulation. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*. 28. 719-741.
- Townsend, P. (2004). From Universalism to Safety Nets: The Rise and Fall of Keynesian Influence on Social Development. In T. MKandawire(ed). *Social policy in a development context*. New York: Basingstoke and NY.
- UN ESCAP (2011). *The promise of protection: Social protection and development in asia and the pacific*. Bangkok: UN ESCAP.
- UNESCO & ISSA. (2016). *World social science report*. Paris: ISSC, IDS and UNESCO.
- UNRISD. (2010). *Combating poverty and inequality: Structural change, social policy and politics*. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- _____. (2016). *Policy innovations for transformative change*. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Utting, P., Razavi, S. & Buchholz, R.V. (2012). Overview: Social and political dimensions of the global crisis: Possible futures." In P. Utting, S. Razavi & R.V. Buchholz(eds). *The Global crisis and transformative social change*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan and UNRISD.
- Yi, I. (2009). *Social integration, poverty eradication, productive and full employment and decent works*. New York: United Nations.
- Yi, I., Koechlein, E. & A. de Negri. (2017). Introduction. In I. Yi(ed). *Moving towards universal health care in emerging economies*. UNRISD and Palgrave Macmillan.

국문요약

개발 맥락에서 신사회정책에 대한 대안적 접근의 비판적 고찰*

이일청**·손혁상***·김태균****

세기말 개발도상국과 선진국의 사회정책은 금융, 식량, 에너지, 기후분야 등의 복합적인 위기로 인해 새로운 도전에 직면하면서, 대응해야 할 위기 구조의 변화가 명확해졌다. 2008년부터 시작된 전세계적 금융, 경제 위기로 인해 세계정치경제 구조의 새로운 조건이 만들어지기도 했다. 이에 많은 발전도상국과 선진국들은 새로운 위기와 도전에 응하기 위해 사회정책의 개혁을 다양한 방식으로 추구하기 시작했다. 이들 개혁들은 어떤 특정한 위기와 도전에 대응하였는가? 이러한 다양한 개혁방안들은 사회정책 개혁을 추구하는 국가들, 특히 세계화와 불확실성 시대인 21세기에 경제성장과 사회개발을 동시에 추구해야 하는 개발도상국에 어떤 교훈을 주는가? 본 논문은 새로운 도전과 위기에 대응하기 위한 사회정책 개혁 담론과 정책에서 발견되는 새로운 동향을 비판적으로 평가하는 것을 그 목적으로 한다. 이를 위해 본 논문은 첫째, 사회정책이 대응해야 할 새로운 위기와 도전의 본질과 다양한 형태를 분석한다. 둘째, 개혁담론과 정책의 한계점을 논의한 후, 신흥부국의 사회정책 개혁이 주는 긍정적인 측면과 그 정책적 시사점을 밝힌다. 이를 토대로 새로운 위기와 도전에 대응할 수 있는 사회정책의 근간이 되는 원칙과 핵심요소를 제시한다.

주제어: 사회정책, 개혁 담론, 개발, 파트너십

◆ 2018. 4. 13. 접수 / 2018. 6. 13. 1차수정 / 2018. 6. 18. 게재확정

* The authors would like to appreciate the staffs of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) for their lively discussions, which formed the basis of this work. We also thanks for the reviewers' valuable comments that improved the manuscript. This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2015S1A3A2046224).

** UN 사회개발연구소, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Senior Research Coordinator

*** 경희대학교 공공대학원, 교수(교신저자)

**** 서울대학교 국제대학원, 교수