



ESRC Research Group on
Wellbeing in Developing Countries

WeD Working Paper 30

STRUCTURES, REGIMES AND WELLBEING

Julie Newton

Copyright © Julie Newton

April 2007



WeD - Wellbeing in Developing Countries

ESRC Research Group

WeD is a multidisciplinary research group funded by the ESRC, dedicated to the study of poverty, inequality and the quality of life in poor countries. The research group is based at the University of Bath and draws on the knowledge and expertise from three different departments (Economics and International Development, Social and Policy Sciences and Psychology) as well as an extensive network of overseas contacts and specific partnerships with institutes in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand. The purpose of the research programme is to develop conceptual and methodological tools for investigating and understanding the social and cultural construction of well-being in specific countries.

Correspondence

The Secretary

Wellbeing in Developing Countries ESRC Research Group (WeD)

3 East 2.10

University of Bath

Bath BA2 7AY, UK

E-mail wed@bath.ac.uk

www.welldev.org.uk

Tel +44 (0) 1225 384514

Fax +44 (0) 1225 384848

A large print size version of this paper is available on request.

Working Paper Submission

For enquiries concerning the submission of working papers please contact Ian Gough by email: i.r.gough@bath.ac.uk or by writing to the above address.

Acknowledgements

The support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is gratefully acknowledged. The work was part of the programme of the ESRC Research Group on Wellbeing in Developing Countries.

SUMMARY

This paper proposes a way for the Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) ESRC research group to take on board the influence of wider societal structures on wellbeing. Often, the analysis of structures has been dominated by top down macro-level studies and intervention engaging little with the complexities and diversity of local realities on the ground. Similarly, bottom up micro studies have been criticised for being parochial in their failure to sufficiently situate the pursuit of livelihoods in the wider processes, structures and institutions that constrain and enable agency. The paper offers some propositions on how to bridge this gap using a welfare regimes framework.

It begins from a modification of Esping-Andersen's 'welfare state regime' framework undertaken by Gough, Wood, Bevan and others (2004), which sets out a broader welfare regime framework sensitised to developing countries. This paper extends that approach to embrace the WeD wellbeing perspective. First, this extends the analysis from a focus on welfare outcomes to wellbeing outcomes and processes. Second, it makes the case for exploring how resources are negotiated through relationships across the institutional landscape of the state, market, community and household. Third, it argues for greater emphasis on the role of culture in explaining wellbeing outcomes. Lastly, it proposes analysing separately the processes of stratification and mobilisation which reproduce or undermine these welfare regimes. Rather, these are separate processes affecting wellbeing which shed additional insights into the foundational notion of autonomy which lies at the heart of much thinking about wellbeing. Taken together this new framework, it is anticipated, can shed light on the way macro-level structures are mediated by local level agents and mediators.

Keywords: structures, wellbeing, welfare regime approach, social and cultural resources

Key Readings: Gough, I. & Wood, G. (2004) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press

Gough, I. & McGregor, A. (2007) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From Theory to Research*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for comments from Ian Gough, Laura Camfield, Catherine Dom and Allister McGregor.

CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Julie Newton

Wellbeing in Developing Countries ESRC Research Group (WeD)

University of Bath

Bath BA2 7AY

E-mail: J.Newton@bath.ac.uk

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper explains the approach taken by the Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD)¹ ESRC research group to explore the ways in which wider societal structures manifest themselves in the social and cultural construction of wellbeing. Often, the analysis of structures has been dominated by top down macro-level studies and intervention (focused on the market and state) with little engagement with the complexities and diversity of local realities on the ground. Similarly, bottom up micro studies (largely influenced by sustainable livelihoods approaches) have been criticised for being parochial in their failure to sufficiently situate the pursuit of livelihoods in the wider processes, structures and institutions that constrain and enable agency (Gough et al, 2007).

This paper offers some propositions on how to bridge this gap by using a wellbeing perspective to explore how we are to understand the role of structures in the study of wellbeing. The welfare regime approach pioneered by Esping-Andersen (1990) and later adapted to the developing world context by Gough, Wood, Bevan and others (2004) provides a heuristic device that relates a specific set of welfare outcomes to an understanding of systems and structural processes. While it is well suited for exploring policy and the political economy, it tends to presume a degree of commonality of social structures and culture². This paper proposes a set of revisions to the welfare regime analysis to reorientate it towards an investigation of the role of social and cultural structures in the pursuit of wellbeing.

The paper begins with an outline of how structures fit into the WeD framework and are important for understanding wellbeing outcomes and processes. It then reviews Gough and Wood's (2004) adaptation of welfare state regime approach to the developing country context, highlighting strengths and weaknesses. The main body of the paper focuses on how the regime approach can be further adapted to a wellbeing perspective. First, this involves extending analysis from a focus on welfare outcomes to wellbeing outcomes and processes (see Gough and McGregor, 2007).

¹ Established by the ESRC in 2002, WeD is an international interdisciplinary research group, based at the University of Bath, working in collaboration with local institutions in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand to investigate the relationship between development and human wellbeing. WeD's fundamental goal is to develop a research framework for understanding the social and cultural construction of wellbeing in developing countries.

² Although it is important to note that Bevan (2004) and Davis (2004) begin to challenge assumptions of social and cultural commonality using examples from sub-Saharan Africa and Bangladesh.

Second, it makes the case for exploring how resources are negotiated through relationships across the institutional landscape of the state, market, community and household. Third, it argues for greater emphasis on the role of culture in the structuring of society. Lastly, it discusses the need to separate the analysis of processes of stratification and mobilisation which tend to be subsumed together in the Esping-Andersen approach under the banner of the reproduction consequences of a regime. Rather, these are separate processes affecting wellbeing which shed additional insights into the foundational notion of autonomy which lies at the heart of much thinking about wellbeing.

2. CONNECTING SOCIETAL STRUCTURES TO WELLBEING

Wellbeing is regarded as an overarching concept arising from a combination of what people have, what they can do and what they think and feel about what they have and can do (McGregor, 2007ab). The WeD framework presents wellbeing as both outcome and process which are fundamentally interlinked, allowing us to challenge and move beyond mainstream discourses of development.

Wellbeing provides a means to understand a person's life from a more holistic perspective than is commonly adopted in much development thinking. It goes beyond a simplistic account of the objective or material dimensions of people's lives, arguing that this is one of three dimensions of wellbeing. Wellbeing is conceived as arising from a person's material (or objective), cognitive/subjective and relational conditions. In more detail, wellbeing is constituted by:

- the resources a person is able to command
- the needs and goals they are able to meet
- the subjective evaluation of the outcomes they achieve and process they experience.

This latter dimension includes the meaning that people attribute to the goals they achieve and processes they engage in and identifies what is referred to by many as 'quality of life' as a key dimension of 'meaning', which influences the strategies and aspirations of the person (McGregor, 2007).

WeD argues that it is important to understand the processes through which subjective states and objective/material endowments have arisen, and

which in turn generate themselves (White and Pettit, 2007: 242, 2004). This recognises that wellbeing is both process and outcome. For example, the way people think and feel will influence the aspirations and strategies people pursue to fulfil these (McGregor, 2007b). The latter captures the relational dimension of wellbeing which refers to how people's subjective perceptions and objective/material endowments are constituted through social interaction (i.e. relationships) and cultural meanings (McGregor and Kebede, 2003).

However, in order to explain the construction of livelihoods, objective states of welfare endowments and subjective quality of life that comprise 'wellbeing' among the studied communities, households and individuals, it is necessary to locate them within larger societal structures. Here, 'structures' are understood to comprise the social and cultural contexts, norms and values, political economy and policy regime that manifest themselves at different levels ranging from the local to the international arena. WeD adopts a dynamic approach that places the person at the centre of analysis whilst simultaneously recognising how people are constrained and enabled by structures. This recognises the "social nature" of the human being where people cannot be understood without locating them within their collectivities, communities and societies. These in turn are influenced by the wider social structures and ideologies in which humans interact (McGregor, 2006: 7, 2007). In doing so, the WeD conceptual framework moves beyond the criticisms directed at livelihood approaches for being too focused on the micro and at the large scale models of structures that ignore the complexities of the local; and begins to build a bridge between the two.

The aim of the 'structures' research in the WeD programme is to understand how individuals and their livelihoods are embedded within wider processes of securing wellbeing and how these in turn are located within larger structures operating at the community, regional, national and supranational/global levels. It explores how regional, national and global structural dimensions of the persistence of poverty are manifested and experienced at local levels by real people in their day to day lives (McGregor, 2004). In doing so, we recognise that structures are continuously reproduced and contested through the actions of individuals and communities (McGregor, 2004).

Structures can often be seen as having a significant influence over people's agency to secure wellbeing. They also play a role in mediating the transformation of capabilities into functionings (Sen, 1985). White and Pettit

(2004) demonstrate how this transformation has further implications for the degree to which people can 'participate' in society; thus connecting to wider debates on poverty (Townsend, 1979), human need (Doyal and Gough, 1991) and human development (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2000).

Central to an analysis of structures in the pursuit of wellbeing is the need to strike a balance between the 'universal' and 'local'. Universal models of development such as those behind the Washington Consensus have been criticised for being individualistic, objective and paternalist (see Gore 2004, Gough, 2004b). They tend to work with a model of the individual that is overdetermined and risk 'missing the target'³ because of their desire to simplify the complexity of local realities. In contrast, locally focused models such as the sustainable livelihoods, action-oriented and participatory approaches focusing on the micro level with the person and household at centre of analysis have been criticised for failing to sufficiently locate the 'local' in the wider political economy at meso and macro levels (Carney, 2002, 1998). These 'local' approaches neglect the role of institutions in everyday relations, networks of reciprocity and negotiations of cultural norms and have been criticised for skirting around issues of power (Bauman, 2000, Shankland, 2000, Newton, 2004, Hopley, 2001; Morrison et al, 2000).

Both approaches have their strengths and weaknesses as noted by McGregor (2004: 339): "While universal models offer a means of bringing order to the bewildering complexity and diversity of local models, it is an academic challenge not to lose sight of important dimensions of complexity and diversity. It is also a political challenge to bring more local understanding as a legitimate contribution to the global contestation". This resonates with Doyal and Gough's (1991) earlier work on Theory of Human Needs which sought to bridge the gap between the pursuit of normative 'universal human needs' and 'need satisfiers' that are contextually and culturally diverse.

For a more comprehensive approach, what is required is a model or framework that is sufficiently open and dynamic to be used in a variety of contexts but remains able to expose the specificity of each (White and Ellison, 2004, 2007). Reorientating a welfare regime approach towards a wellbeing perspective suggests one way of achieving this. It allows us to explore how universal discourses of human welfare and quality of life

³ See Satterthwaite, D. (2003) *The Millennium Development Goals and Local Processes: Hitting the target or missing the point*, IIED

interact with local priorities to impact wellbeing. More specifically, it explores the politics of how needs are defined and are met or denied for different kinds of people in different cultural contexts. In doing so, it is able to reveal what is distinctive to particular settings and what is universal to all.

3. THE WELFARE REGIME APPROACH AND SOCIETAL STRUCTURES

Esping-Andersen's (1990) welfare state regime has been hugely influential in the social policy literature. The framework that it offers was adapted by a group based at the University of Bath to develop a heuristic device for improving the debate over social policy in the developing world⁴. Gough and Wood (2004) present this adaptation as a middle range conceptualisation of institutions and regimes that is sensitive to the reality of social formations. This approach begins to challenge universal narratives of homogenisation (inherent within globalisation discourses) whilst emphasising diversity and path dependency. However, this paper will argue that there is still room to further sensitise it to the local through adoption of a wellbeing perspective. Before doing this, however, it is necessary to explore how Gough and Wood (2004) welfare regime ideas for use in relation to the different and diverse circumstances of the developing world.

3.1. Origins

The 'welfare state regime' paradigm was initially developed to understand the post-war transformation of capitalist societies of the West into welfare states⁵. It was heavily influenced by the seminal work of Esping-Andersen on *Three worlds of welfare capitalism* (1990) who emphasised that the concept was only applicable to capitalist societies that had transformed into welfare states heavily engaged in social policies. Esping-Andersen uses the concept to explore how interactions within the institutional matrix of market, state and family generate welfare outcomes and how these influence the

⁴ The framework was developed in the *Social Policy Development Contexts (SPDC)* programme on 'welfare regimes'. The project culminated into the production of a book titled "Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America" published by Cambridge University Press in 2004 edited by Gough and Wood with contributions from Bevan, Davis, Barrientos and Room.

⁵ "Welfare state" describes the situation whereby the formal state provides for all the security needs of individuals through pensions, social protection, social services and labour market regulation. Although activities are embedded within other markets (e.g. financial) and household/family systems, the state is the primary actor.

provision of different forms of welfare⁶. The resulting welfare outcomes could then be measured by the extent of labour de-commodification (state protection from market forces) (Gough, 2004a, b). Esping-Andersen concludes that under these circumstances, social policy both reflects and reproduces 'stratification outcomes' affecting power relations, class divisions and other forms of inequality. The welfare state regime paradigm consequently becomes a useful framework for exploring how social policies can influence and perpetuate political divisions and alliances in a path dependent way (Wood and Gough, 2006). Esping-Andersen draws on these features to identify three types of welfare state regimes in the OECD: liberal, conservative and social democratic⁷.

Because the original model was developed for the advanced capitalist countries of the West, it falls short when applied to the developing world for many reasons. One is that it fails to acknowledge the influential role that informal relationships play in providing greater support in comparison to states and markets in many developing countries where poverty and insecurity are distinguishing issues. Because formal institutional provision of welfare/security is either weak or completely absent, people adopt a wider range of risk avoidance strategies that involve a greater reliance on personal and family resources to secure wellbeing. This is not devoid of risk and can serve to perpetuate inequalities through hierarchical and clientelist relationships (Wood and Gough, 2006). This phenomenon is referred to as 'adverse incorporation' by Wood (2004). It is in this context that Gough, Wood, Bevan and Davis adapt Esping-Andersen's framework to incorporate a wider range of institutions into social policy discourses that are more relevant to the different path dependent patterns of development and underdevelopment of poorer countries.

Gough (2004a) argues that the framework can enhance our understanding of the reproduction of poverty and social policy in developing countries on several grounds. First, it gives greater emphasis to the broader welfare mix. In other words, it acknowledges a wider range of interactions between different actors that span beyond the market and the state. Second, it goes beyond the role of institutions and also explores welfare outcomes. Third, it is a 'political economy' approach that recognises the role of power and its influence over how welfare institutions are embedded within structures of social reproduction and stratification. Fourth, it facilitates identification of

⁶ In other words, how the welfare state is embedded in the welfare mix (Wood and Gough, 2006)

⁷ For a more detailed discussion of the characteristics of these types, see Gough (2004a)

groups of countries that share similar patterns of path dependency. These four reasons make it an appropriate framework for beginning to explore the role of structures in the construction and reproduction of wellbeing. This framework consequently allows important progress on addressing the weaknesses of the sustainable livelihoods approach by illuminating what others have called the 'grey box' of 'institutions and organisations' (Scoones, 1998), 'transforming structures and processes' (Carney, 1998), 'policies, processes and structures' (Neefjes, 1999) or 'policies, institutions and processes' (DFID, 2006).

Gough and Wood et al's (2004) adaptation of Esping-Andersen's typology is premised on five core interrelated principles outlined below.

1. Poor countries often have relatively weak states (i.e. with low levels of legitimacy) and poorly functioning labour and financial markets
2. The above factors limit the ability of the state to compensate for the inequitable outcomes of markets
3. Non-state actors play an important role in compensating or mitigating the above and should be recognised in comparative social policy
4. Given the weak legitimisation of states and inequitable labour and financial markets, social relationships are relied on to provide informal rights and entitlements. These can be allocated through formally organised non-state actors or rest within more personalised relationships (e.g. kin) that can be clientelist or reciprocal.
5. There is an assumption of path dependency whereby the outcomes of the political economy and intervention from state and non-state actors result in social reproduction which is either simple (static) or extended (dynamic). The latter point is a new distinction elaborated in Wood and Gough (2006). Simple reproduction results in the continuation of the status quo (i.e. reproduction of inequalities and power differences). Extended reproduction changes the direction of the regime through new mobilisations, identities and solidarities.

3.2. A reworking of Esping-Andersen's 'welfare state regime' towards 'insecurity and welfare regimes'

Premised on the above points, Gough (2004a: 26) proceeds to redefine 'welfare regimes' as the "entire set of institutional arrangements, policies and practices affecting welfare outcomes and stratification effects in diverse social and cultural contexts". However, apart from the work of Davis (2004)

and Bevan (2004, 2006), such analysis has not substantially considered the role of these diverse social and cultural structures. Nevertheless, the definition used is broader than Esping-Andersen's original conceptualisation of 'welfare state' regime as it emphasises that the state is only one of many different actors, and may not always be the most influential in securing welfare outcomes. Indeed, Gough (2004a) stresses that welfare state regime is simply one 'family' amongst others of welfare regimes, with a distinct set of social arrangements and welfare outcomes particular to the OECD welfare state.

Gough (2004ab) argues that the concept of 'welfare regime' provides a more useful entry point into debates on global social policy because it opposes 'one size fits all' discourse prevalent in policy that targets poverty eradication/alleviation. Rather, it advocates a "universalism about ends with a relativism about means" (Gough, 2004b: 305). Gough (2004a) proceeds to distinguish a hierarchy of three regimes types or 'families': welfare state regimes, informal security regimes and insecurity regimes. Welfare state regimes are seen as the ideal. These are briefly summarised in Figure 1 overleaf. Gough's (2004) description of a welfare state regime draws heavily on Esping-Andersen's original definition applicable to the Western capitalist societies. He defines it as the institutional conditions/arrangements "where people can reasonably expect to meet (to a varying extent) their security needs via participation in labour markets, financial markets and via the finance and provisioning role of a 'welfare state'" (Gough and Wood, 2004:33). This regime is characterised by a capitalist economy with a legitimate and autonomous state, formal labour market, and strong democratic institutions.

Gough (2004a) proposes two further families of regimes when applying the framework to the developing country context. An *informal security regime* contains institutional arrangements "where people rely heavily upon community and family relationships to meet their security needs" (Gough and Wood, 2004: 33). The regime is characterised by hierarchical and asymmetrical relationships that reinforce patron-client relationships. The entrenchment of these relationships within communities makes them very difficult for civil society (e.g. NGOs) to challenge. Through these relationships, people are forced to enter into situations of long term vulnerability and dependence in order to gain some degree of informal but short term and precarious security. In Wood's (2004: 51) language, "the provision of security informally comes at the price of adverse incorporation,

or clientelism”. Instead of compensating or moderating for insecurity, the state is involved in its reproduction.

An *insecurity regime*, as elaborated in detail by Bevan (2004), has institutional arrangements “which generate gross insecurity and block the emergence of stable informal mechanisms to mitigate, let alone rectify, these” (Gough, 2004a: 34). An insecurity regime is characterised by a situation of extreme political instability and conflict where governments have extreme levels of inability to enforce security because of weak legitimacy. The instability generated from the interaction of powerful external actors (e.g. foreign donors, Transnational Corporations) and weak internal actors underpin this regime type. The prevailing instability impedes the development of patron-clientelist relationships and subsequent distribution of informal rights, thus perpetuating a ‘vicious circle’ of vulnerability, insecurity and suffering. Bevan (2004) argues that many of the nation-states of Sub-Saharan Africa (and other regions with similar conditions) can be characterised as ‘insecurity regimes’ because of the way in which the state itself is implicated in the generation of illfare (i.e. particularly through the use of violence and militarisation). State legitimacy is precariously founded on personal political domination by small domestic elites and an international political system dominated by powerful external actors. The ‘predatory’ nature of these interactions further inhibits the formation of the stable provision of welfare from family, kin and/or community. Rather than ameliorating the status quo, communities and households become equally involved in generating insecurity and illfare.

Figure 1: the comparative welfare regimes framework

	Welfare State Regime	Informal Security Regime	Insecurity Regime
Dominant mode of production	Capitalism: technological progress plus exploitation	Peasant economies within peripheral capitalism: uneven development	Predatory capitalism
Dominant social relationship	Exploitation and market inequalities	Variegated: exploitation, exclusion and domination	Variegated forms of oppression, including destruction
Dominant source of livelihood	Access to formal labour market (i.e. job with regular, contracted payment)	A portfolio of livelihoods	A portfolio of livelihoods with extensive conflict
Dominant form of political mobilisation	Class coalitions, issue-based political parties and political settlements	Diffuse and particularistic based on ascribed identities: patron-clientelism	Diffuse and fluid, including flight
State form	Relatively autonomous state	'State' weakly differentiated from other power systems	Shadow, collapsed and criminal states with porous, disputed borders
Institutional landscape	Welfare mix of market, state and family	Broader institutional responsibility matrix with powerful external influences and extensive negative permeability	Precarious: extreme negative permeability and fluidity
Welfare outcomes	Varying degrees of decommodification plus health and human investment	Insecurity modified by informal rights and adverse incorporation	Insecurity: intermittently extreme
Path dependent development	Liberal, conservative and social democratic regimes	Less autonomous path dependency, with some cases of regime breakdown	Political disequilibrium and chaos
Nature of social policy	Countervailing power based on institutional differentiation	Less distinct policy due to permeability, contamination and foreign actors	Absent

Source: Gough (2004a)

In summary, these different ‘families’ of regimes describe different ways in which people secure their livelihoods. At its core is the interplay between rights and correlative duties⁸ which are the product of the particular context of political economy and history. This in turn affects the legitimacy of the state and the role of non-state actors in social policy. Gough and Wood acknowledge that the reality is not so clear cut: some regions and countries can be classified into more than one of these regime types at a particular point in time.

3.3. Mapping welfare regimes

Initial attempts to map these welfare regimes to the four WeD countries (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Thailand and Peru) have been made by Gough (2004a) through a cluster analysis of welfare mix and welfare outcomes⁹ from countries outside the OECD together (see Appendix 1). These are enriched with detailed studies of three world regions (Latin America, East Asia, Africa and one country in South Asia: Bangladesh¹⁰) that are summarised in Wood and Gough (2006).

South Asia: informal security regimes

Many South Asian countries display characteristics of informal security regimes. Davis (2001; 2004) gives a comprehensive account of how Bangladesh shares these traits. This includes a poor record of welfare outcomes and high levels of insecurity together with a welfare mix dependent on family, kinship, community, local government and civil society. The welfare mix is mediated by actors at the international level through the foreign aid community, bilateral donors and families sending remittances from abroad. Although aid dependency brings policies targeting welfare provision that match a welfare state regime, the prevalence of patron clientelist relationships perpetuates the misappropriation of aid by the elite; thus making such a regime difficult to put into practice¹¹. The result is

⁸ Whilst ‘rights’ can be defined as the “legitimate claims ... against some person, group or organisation”, a ‘correlative duty’ can be described as the obligation to ensure that the rights-holder secures their right (Moser & Norton, 2001: 10)

⁹ The cluster analysis used two indicators of welfare mix (public spending on health and education as a share of GDP and the sum of international inflows of aid and remittances as a share of GNP) and one indicator of welfare outcomes (Human Development Index).

¹⁰ Explored in detail by Davis (2004), Barrientos (2004) and Bevan (2004).

¹¹ According to the 2005 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index, Bangladesh has ranked as one of the most corrupt countries in the world for the fourth consecutive year from 2001. The index defines corruption as the abuse of public office for

that “deep social and political structures continue to define the relationship between rights and correlative duties as highly personalised, segmented, preferential, discretionary and clientelist, as patrons mediate between the needs of poor people and the imperfect institutions in the state and market domains” (Wood and Gough, 2006: 1704). Davis (2004) argues that there is a need for greater accountability from the donors and social sectors programme in welfare provision.

Latin America: Liberal informal security regimes

Latin America’s welfare regimes is also characterised by informal welfare provision, but differs by including some elements of state welfare that are present in developed countries. Barrientos (2004) explains how the regime is the function of a complex history of decolonisation and political independence coupled with the shift from export economies to import substitution. The outcome was a growing polarisation between a capitalist class and urban proletariat versus a land owning class and peasantry accompanied by problems of social exclusion and marginalisation. Barrientos (2004) describes post-war Latin America as characterised by *combined conservative-informal welfare regimes*, which retained some similarities to southern Europe states. This included elements of social insurance and employment protection schemes for formal sector workers and some state aspirations for universal access to health and education. In contrast, the informal sector workers were excluded from such benefits and largely dependent on their own resources, unregulated labour markets and some elements of residual public assistance programs.

Barrientos argues that by the 1990s, the welfare regime had transformed into a *liberal-informal* regime due to a shift from import substitution to export-oriented growth models in face of the debt crisis, structural adjustment and the liberalisation of trade. The impact on welfare provision was stark. Labour market deregulation weakened employment protection, individual saving and market provision replaced social insurance, and the privatisation of health and education was encouraged.

East Asia: productivist welfare regimes

Gough (2004c) argues that many of the middle income countries of East Asia such as South Korea and Taiwan are characterised by *productivist welfare regimes* where economic policy and growth take precedence over social policy. They tend to have strong unified states and capitalist market

private gain and measures the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among a country's public officials and politicians

economies which have driven extensive development and growth resulting in a significant improvement in welfare outcomes. Productivist welfare regimes differ from welfare state regimes in the West because social policy is subsumed by the primary goal of economic growth. The limited social policy that does exist focuses on education and basic health as opposed to social protection. Furthermore, nation building and regime legitimisation are key drivers of policy. Lastly, family and household strategies, savings and marketised provision play a larger role in the welfare mix than the state since the latter focuses on regulation rather than provision. However, the aftermath of the collapse of the Thai Baht in the East Asian financial crisis of 1997 demonstrated the fragility of this type of regime by exposing the lack of investment in social sectors and social protection measures. The impact of the financial crisis has given stimulus to greater local participation in political decision-making and exposed the political costs of neglecting social policy (Funston, 2001).

Sub-Saharan Africa: insecurity regimes

Bevan (2004) uses the term '*in/security*' regime to describe regimes in peripheral, dangerous and powerless zones of the world applicable to many Sub-Saharan African countries and other parts of the world. Expanding on the description in section 3.2, such regimes often have contested 'nation-state' identities due to a complex history of colonial rule, and post-colonial settlement crosscut by local ethnic and traditional loyalties and identities. Bevan (2004) expands upon a prominent and well documented literature on States in Sub-Saharan Africa (Bayart, 1993; Bayart et al, 1999; Mamdani, 1996; Clapham, 1996) and also emphasises that the notion of insecurity regime can extend beyond national boundaries because of intervention from powerful external interests and how they interact with domestic elites and incoherent states that perpetuate insecurity and suffering. Under these circumstances, nation-state governments have little ability to enhance security and govern effectively. The result is that the poor have to constantly make tradeoffs between short term and long term welfare solutions.

4. APPLYING A WELLBEING PERSPECTIVE TO WELFARE REGIMES

Although the welfare regime framework provides a useful starting point for exploring the impact of societal structures on wellbeing, further elaborations are required to sensitise it to a wellbeing perspective that also takes account of such social and cultural structures. Initial attempts have been made by Wood and Newton (2005) who present four major adaptations:

1. We focus not on ‘welfare outcomes’ but more broadly on ‘wellbeing outcomes and processes’, including greater attention to the factors that enable person’s agency.
2. Greater consideration is given to how the institutional landscape of welfare provision can enhance or constrain the ability to negotiate resource profiles, particularly in terms of their impact on wellbeing outcomes.
3. A re-interpretation of institutional conditions as ‘conditioning factors’ enables greater emphasis on the role of culture in wellbeing.
4. ‘Stratification’ and ‘mobilisation’ outcomes are treated as separate processes in order to recognise their different consequences for the reproduction of the regime.

The following section expands upon these proposed revisions.

4.1. From welfare outcomes to wellbeing outcomes and processes

A reorientation towards ‘wellbeing outcomes and processes’ requires us to give consideration to a broader set of ‘outcomes’ and ‘processes’ than the welfare regime currently addresses. In particular it encourages us to pay greater attention to the *subjective* and *relational* dimensions of both outcomes and the processes that generate these. Wood and Gough’s (2006) model focuses largely on the objective dimensions of wellbeing by defining welfare outcomes as a range of objectively verifiable circumstances that a regime is likely to produce. This includes the level of poverty, insecurity and the extent of needs satisfactions (the degree to which a population’s basic needs and intermediate needs are met). Although Wood and Gough acknowledge ‘subjective wellbeing’ as a welfare outcome, they fail to elaborate its influence on ‘welfare’ and do not sufficiently explore its role in relation to more objective dimensions of wellbeing. Their model also assumes a positive unmediated connection between the improvement of welfare outcomes and the underlying issues of security of agency (Wood and Newton, 2005). As noted earlier, the WeD conceptual framework presents wellbeing as arising from the ‘resources retained, acquired, or lost’, ‘needs met or denied’, and people’s experiences and evaluations of these processes (i.e. the quality of life achieved). This highlights the interplay of material, cognitive and relational dimensions of wellbeing.

The first benefit of moving from welfare to wellbeing outcomes is that the inclusion of subjective wellbeing through ‘quality of life achieved’

acknowledges that people's feelings and emotions influence what they define as needs. This includes the 'need' of people to experience and achieve a sense of wellbeing, which is akin to eudaimonic psychological needs such as competence, relatedness and autonomy (e.g. Deci and Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Sapp, 2007). This has important implications for understanding people's aspirations and choice of strategies to mobilise resources to meet their needs¹². Similarly, it includes the 'meaning' that people give to the goals that they achieve and the processes in which they engage (McGregor, 2007). WeD recognises that this meaning-giving is strongly influenced by a person's social and cultural context¹³. Drawing on a range of multi-disciplinary research that brings the importance of subjective evaluations centre-stage¹⁴, WeD subsequently defines Quality of Life (QoL) as the outcome of the gap between people's goals and perceived resources, in the context of their environment, culture, values and experiences¹⁵.

A second benefit of moving from welfare to wellbeing outcomes is that wellbeing outcomes¹⁶ are best understood in relation to wellbeing processes; thus highlighting the dynamic and **relational** properties of this approach. The latter describes how the objective or material circumstances of the person and their subjective evaluation is located within society, constituted through relationships and the frames of meaning in which we live (Gough et al, 2007).

The importance of the relational dimension becomes more apparent when we look at the interplay between objective and subjective wellbeing outcomes. In the WeD framework, resources can be material, natural,

¹² In doing so, WeD expands upon the work of Doyal and Gough (1991) on the Theory of Human Needs (THN) by including eudaimonic psychological needs. While THN embrace a wider range of standard welfare outcomes than those captured within the welfare regime framework and touches upon the importance of relationships with its focus on autonomy as a basic need, WeD places greater importance on the role of relationships.

¹³ Such an approach moves beyond the weaknesses of the sustainable livelihoods approach which fails to acknowledge the role of individual aspirations and motivations behind livelihood strategies to secure certain livelihood outcomes and how these might be influenced by cultural values and norms (Newton, 2004).

¹⁴ Subjective QoL by health psychologists (notably the WHOQoL), psychology of affect balance and life satisfaction (Diener, 1984) and the economics of happiness.

¹⁵ For more information see <http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/methods-toobox/qol-toolbox.htm>

¹⁶ McGregor (2007: 25) notes that "outcomes are abstracts and it is important for the analysis of wellbeing that they are always understood to be non-discrete, ongoing moments that are a part of an interplay of complex societal and cognitive processes".

human, social or cultural. They become a resource to an individual when they allow the person to achieve his/her goal or meet a specific need. Feelings of satisfaction and optimism and self confidence (emotional positivity) can also become a resource that may dictate goals and influence the specific point when an individual decides or feels that they have achieved a certain goal. Thus, people's subjective evaluations of their conditions interact with objective wellbeing outcomes to influence what people seek to achieve and how they achieve it. What it is important to note here is that resources only have meaning in the context of relationships which are significantly influenced by cultural meanings (White and Ellison, 2007; McGregor and Kebede, 2003). This is also reiterated by White and Pettit (2007: 242) who recognise the need to "explore the processes through which both 'subjective' states of mind and 'objective' endowments have arisen and to which they in turn give rise". Wellbeing subsequently becomes both an end-state and basis for action.

4.2. Negotiating resource profiles across the 'wellbeing mix'

Gough and Wood (2004) use the term **welfare mix** to describe the combination of institutions and organisations in which people seek to secure their livelihoods and welfare objectives. The different domains of the 'arena/landscape' include the state, market, community (informal and organised) and the household operating at both domestic and supra-national levels. These are envisaged as having a direct impact on welfare outcomes. The inclusion of 'community'¹⁷ allows greater sensitivity to how actors within the institutional domains *beyond* the state can promote welfare and be more efficient at distributing rights. Similarly, the inclusion of a global dimension allows for greater recognition of how poorer countries often have a high dependence on international actors/transfers in all four domains. This elaboration makes considerable progress towards addressing the shortcomings of the limited 'grey box'¹⁸ of institutions and organisations encapsulated within the sustainable livelihoods approach and begins to touch upon how institutions are implicated in the pursuit of welfare and now wellbeing.

¹⁷ Including 'community' recognises the complex hierarchical and reciprocal relationships embedded within kinship, clans, villages etc. It also includes more purposive and organised networks (e.g. civil society groups and NGOs) (Gough and Wood, 2004).

¹⁸ The 'grey box' of factors that influence the ability of groups and individuals to mobilise resources has been labelled many things including: 'institutions and organisations' (Scoones, 1998), 'Transforming structures and Processes' (, 1998), 'Policies, Processes and structures' (Neefjes, 1999), or 'Policies, Institutions and Processes' (DFID, 2006).

In order to sensitise this institutional landscape involved in the provision of welfare to a wellbeing perspective, Wood and Newton (2005) make the case for incorporating a resource profiles approach. This has several interrelated advantages. First, by visualising the 'wellbeing mix' as the arena in which resources are instantiated and negotiated, we are provided with insights into *how* value and meanings are attributed to resources¹⁹. In WeD language, it is the landscape in which systems of meanings are created and negotiated that shapes what different people *do* (or cannot do) with what they *have* (Gough et al, 2006). Second, it facilitates an analysis of relationships by illustrating which relationships are important. It also demonstrates the different incentives and abilities of actors to manoeuvre within the landscape (by mobilising resources) to secure wellbeing outcomes; thus highlighting who is powerful or not. This enables an understanding of the diverse strategies used to pursue wellbeing and the processes that produce poverty. Although Wood and Gough (2006) recognise 'permeability' as a crucial feature of the welfare mix (i.e. how different institutions are interdependent), they fail to elaborate how these relationships/interdependencies would manifest themselves.

Third, it places greater emphasis on how *social* and *cultural* resources²⁰ are mediated across the institutional landscape. These interactions are often underplayed in mainstream economic and political structural approaches to poverty and by livelihood approaches that place greater emphasis on material resources. This ignores how people's actions are influenced by what they value. Indeed, in contexts where individuals and households have limited ability to mobilise human and material resources, it is argued that they may be more dependent on social and cultural resources (McGregor, 2004). This links directly to Wood and Gough's observation that non-state actors play a greater role in the provision of wellbeing in developing countries and unsettled societies. In addition to control over economic and political resources, their influence is underpinned by a greater command of social and cultural resources. In the process of securing these resources, people become involved in reproducing norms, values and structures within society that either constrain or enable agency.

¹⁹ White and Ellison (2007) emphasise that resources take on meaning through relationships and that the motivations of a resource user reflect the meanings, values and norms in wider structures.

²⁰ Social resources include relationships in which people invest in to secure entitlements. In contrast, cultural resources refer to the symbols of status or markers of identity which are deployed in negotiations over the value of endowments (Gough et al, 2006). In mainstream livelihood approaches, the two tend to be subsumed together.

For example, in Ethiopia, *iddirs* (burial associations) provide a key support mechanism at times of stress through the provision of savings and food (Pankhurst and Mariam, 2000). WeD research also revealed that during times of household food scarcity, male members of household will migrate to find work and/or beg (Bevan, 2006). Marriage is another key strategy for families to access resources (e.g. land for agricultural production, other material resources). Ethnicity and religion was also found to determine what strategies are used. For example, Orthodox Christians give alms to the poor regularly whilst richer Muslims provide charity during key religious festivals. Clan relationships were important in providing access to material resources for survival in the Oromo sites whilst monthly religious feasting groups (*mehaber*) were more important for the richer Amharic households (Bevan, 2006).

Similarly, in Peru there are various forms of local collective action expressed as reciprocal labour exchange arrangements in the rural WeD sites that provide an important means of pooling labour and sharing food (e.g. *faena*²¹). However, people's over-reliance on the social and cultural dimensions of their resource profiles can work negatively to exclude them from forming alliances with power holders; thus entrenching their insecurity (i.e. adverse incorporation). Bangladesh provides a prime example of how reliance on customary cultural and social institutions (e.g. *bangsho* and *samaj*²² crosscut by caste and religion) provide an important form of social safety net to alleviate the shortcomings of state provision (c.f. McGregor 1994, Davis and McGregor 2000, Davis, 2004; Wood, 2003; Blair, 2005). Yet, these same structures are underpinned by a pervasive system of vertically aligned patron-clientelism that reinforces adverse incorporation (McGregor 1989). Devine et al (2006) also provide an illustration of what relationships matter in the negotiation of resources across the wellbeing mix in Bangladesh. There are clear gender differences: women rely more on relationships within the home whereas men rely on relationships in market and community. This is clearly a reflection of the gendered division of labour which is also reflected in the other WeD sites²³. Wood and Newton (2005) argue that increasing both the quality of resources and the capacities of

²¹ A *faena* can be defined as pooling of voluntary labour for an agreed period in order to achieve a common purpose (e.g. cleaning irrigation channels).

²² *Bangsho* refers to lineage structures and *samaj* refers to community structures.

²³ It is beyond the remit of this paper to provide detailed empirical examples. See Devine et al (2006) for an account of how a local institution was implicated in moving people from a heteronomous condition under old patrons to a more autonomous position. It provides an illustration of how the right kind of dependency relationship can provide a route for the poor to assert greater agency and autonomy.

people to maintain the value of resources is crucial for increasing people's agency²⁴.

4.3. Wellbeing conditioning factors: the role of culture

The welfare mix is portrayed by Gough and Wood (2004) as being influenced by the **institutional conditions** of the country. Essentially these include the factors that enable and constrain what different people can or cannot do such as the organisation and functioning of the state and the structure of markets. Wood and Newton (2005) argue for a broader account of societal conditions than originally conceived by Esping-Andersen. They argue for the inclusion of issues of social integration and cohesion²⁵ (the degree to which people feel part of society) as well as the influence of cultures and systems of values and the regime's location in the global political economy and global policy discourses.

Although there is some reference to 'cultures and values' as having an influence over the welfare mix, their role is insufficiently elaborated. This criticism can also be directed towards the adapted regime framework by Gough and Wood (2004). While there is a recognition that regimes vary in different social and cultural milieu, there is little discussion of *how* or *why* this is the case. Addressing wellbeing affords us greater recognition of the overarching impact of 'culture' as a 'wellbeing conditioning factor' influencing/or embedded within dynamics across the 'wellbeing mix' and overall pursuit of wellbeing outcomes. A wellbeing perspective facilitates a greater understanding of *what* people perceive as resources and goals, and *how* this shapes aspirations and strategies to secure resources and meet their needs and goals as well as their ability to negotiate the wellbeing mix. WeD research in Ethiopia reveals some of the ways that religion is an important cultural conditioning factor. Muslim women in Ethiopia are restricted in mobility and who they may marry. A person's religion also determines what local institutions they may join which are vital social protection safety nets during vulnerable times. There were some instances in WeD research sites where conversion to Protestant religion resulted in being ostracised from the local *iddir* (Bevan et al, 2006).

²⁴ For example, one way to increase people's agency is by creating the capacity for alliance building between the poor and non-state actors (Wood and Newton, 2005).

²⁵ It is beyond the remit of this paper to discuss the distinction between social integration, social inclusion, social exclusion and social cohesion. For a comprehensive account see Phillips (2006).

Past attempts to explore the role of culture at a socio-structural level have been made by Wallerstein (1992) and Therborn (2004). Wallerstein uses the concept of 'geoculture' to describe the cultural framework within which the world systems operate. However, he is criticised by Therborn (2004) for subsuming political and cultural dimensions under economic primacy, and by Axford (2004) for failing to consider the relationality of culture. Therborn identifies the 'world system of culture' as one of five major human world systems that are not mutually exclusive²⁶. He defines a world cultural system as the "worldwide configuration of patterns and processes of identity, values, cognition, and symbolic forms" which provides meanings of the world and one's position within the world (2004: 49). This system comprises four core elements: an architecture of identities, geocultural pattern of values and norms, structure of cognition, and interconnected configurations of symbolic forms. The first dimension includes how people perceive the world, the members of it and their position within it. The second refers back to Wallerstein's original description of geoculture as the 'underside' of geopolitics. Therborn (2004: 50) presents 'family systems' as an example of a "historically produced geographic cultural anchorage of norms and institutions". The third acknowledges that the meaning of knowledge differs and the way that knowledge manifests itself or is formulated varies in different contexts. Under this element, he alludes to the tension between 'universal' and 'local' knowledge. The fourth and final dimension refers to the 'high culture' of arts and etiquette and popular mass culture of entertainment, sports, styles and so on. Therborn also recognises that the cultural world system is maintained by two constitutive processes: historical moulding (diffusion and imposition of cultures) and current flows and entanglements (flows of information and interactions).

WeD researchers have argued that culture²⁷ has a fundamental impact on the structuring of society as a whole. That is not to say that it operates in isolation of the wider political economy as some sort of 'super-structure' (White, 2006), rather, that culture as a dynamic force works in conjunction with other influences to shape the pursuit of wellbeing; thus reinforcing Sahlins' (1976) assertion that the material and cultural are inseparable.

²⁶ The other four world systems are: socio-economic system, world system of power, humanity as a global population system and planetary ecology.

²⁷ WeD recognises that 'culture' is a contested term which has been explored in depth amongst anthropologists. It is beyond the remit of this paper to explore the different theorisations of culture in depth. For a more comprehensive account for the use of culture in the development context see Rao and Walton (2004). What is presented here is a summary of WeD's position on culture. For more detail see McGregor (2007)

McGregor defines culture²⁸ as the “dynamic systems of norms, values and rules that are developed by particular communities, founded in their relationships to particular natural and social environments...to be identified at all different levels of social collectivity, both within the nation state and beyond it” (McGregor, 2006: 12). This is further elaborated by White (2006: 12) who draws on Appadurai²⁹ (2004) to argue that culture is embedded in the everyday actions of individuals and “structures material and relational desires through a cascade of associations that makes them meaningful and designates some as pressing”.

McGregor (2007: 19) proceeds to make the connection between wellbeing and culture by describing culture as the systems of meaning through which people perceive “what it is they need or want, and also provide the measures against which we decide, whether we have enough of what we want, or whether we are satisfied with what we are able to do and be”. Culture is a fluid and dynamic social product that is in a constant state of flux, repeatedly contested and reproduced through social relationships. It influences the degree of social cohesion, trust and reciprocity and the level at which a society is integrated. Not only does this affect relationships between individuals at household and community level, it also influences interactions with the state and the market. Indeed, the degree to which a dominant culture persists is dependent on systems of authority that maintain those systems of meanings and values. The latter does not necessarily refer to the state because culture can influence the degree to which a society consents to be governed. In weak nation-states, state legitimacy is often compromised by highly diverse societies where non-state actors may exert more authority than the state (i.e. as is the case in insecurity regimes). Therefore systems of governance overlap with culture to dictate *who* is given voice to exercise rights. Culture also affects how policy is internalised by people and communities and plays an important part in the overall effectiveness of policy to secure certain wellbeing outcomes. Similarly, culture can also enable or inhibit interactions with the market and influence a country’s position within the global system and its ability to cope with the forces of the globalisation. An understanding of people’s culture consequently becomes an important ingredient for enhancing development effectiveness (Rao and Walton, 2004). More importantly, it plays a key role in the reproduction of society, as discussed in the following section.

²⁸ It is beyond the remit of this paper to discuss the many contested definitions of culture. For a more detailed discussion see Rao and Walton (2004) and De Sardan (2005)

²⁹ Appadurai (2004) argues that aspirations are derived from cultural norms.

4.4. Reproduction consequences and their implications for wellbeing

Wood and Gough (2006) envisage ‘**stratification**’ and ‘**mobilisation**’ as the ‘reproduction consequences’ of a welfare regime. Stratification refers to the way in which power is distributed within society and includes the resulting societal inequalities. These in turn influence (but do not dictate) the mobilisations of different groups and coalitions which can reproduce the institutional conditions within society leading to path dependency. Alternatively, they can create discontinuities by destabilising the institutional conditions and change the welfare mix, thus affecting welfare distribution within the country. Discontinuities are usually precipitated by wider events within the political economy or environment that may create a crisis that alters reproduction consequences (e.g. war, environmental shocks and hazards such as drought, flooding etc.).

An adaptation to a wellbeing perspective retains the emphasis on path dependency and the different routes a society can take towards producing wellbeing or illbeing for its people. However, it clearly distinguishes stratification and mobilisation as two inter-related processes emerging from interactions within the wellbeing mix (Wood and Newton, 2005). These processes become significant in changing trajectories for regime reproduction. Focusing on wellbeing facilitates an elaboration of the different ways a society can be stratified to produce both ‘inequality’ and ‘illbeing’³⁰. It does this by recognising additional forces that exclude, exploit, dominate and destroy (Bevan et al, 2006). Under such conditions, cultures and values remain intact and continue to perpetuate ideologies that disadvantage those who have little ability to mobilise resources to renegotiate the wellbeing mix to secure particular wellbeing outcomes.

Yet, these circumstances may reach a point where dissatisfaction with wellbeing outcomes may trigger mobilisations leading to a more dynamic trajectory of social and political change causing extended/expanded reproduction. This takes place through incremental steps where some individuals or groups start to explore the limits to their agency and challenge their existing constraints. Alternatively, their agency may be deliberately stimulated by large scale mobilisations led by non-state actors such as NGOs (as in Bangladesh over recent decades). These ‘mobilisations’, which emerge to challenge the historic political settlement, have the potential to kick-start a process that stimulates institutional reform and increases

³⁰ Although it is important to note that in some very poor societies, one can have complete equality, yet have tremendous illbeing. I am grateful to Des Gasper for pointing this out.

expectations and confidence. Thus, mobilisation can increase agency and change the reproduction circumstances.

A wellbeing perspective on ‘reproduction consequences’ sheds additional insights into the broader underlying issue of autonomy that underpins the pursuit of wellbeing within what we can now call a ‘wellbeing regime’. I wish to focus on autonomy as a broader reproduction consequence because it connects the processes of agency and capability (that underpin wellbeing as both outcome and process) by revealing people’s capacities as agents, thus providing an entry point into the analysis of power. Doyal and Gough (1991:53) define autonomy as “the ability to make informed choices about what should be done and how to go about doing it”. They proceed to identify *critical autonomy* as a further ‘higher order level of autonomy that “entails the capacity to compare cultural rules, to reflect upon the rules of one’s own culture, to work with others to change them and, *in extremis*, to move to another culture” (1991: 187). The latter definition has direct implications to mobilisations to challenge the status quo. Autonomy is an important concept for understanding wellbeing as both outcome and process (i.e. as a relational concept) because it implicitly refers to the boundaries of the relationship between the self and others (McGregor, 2006). It connects to agency because the decision to act (or not) is influenced by people’s values and preferences which in turn are shaped by their socio-cultural-political milieu. Similar, autonomy is linked to capability because the *ability* to act on a *decision* (i.e. assert autonomy) is determined by capability. It is for this reason that an analysis of autonomy, agency and capability through the lens of wellbeing provides important clues about the manifestations of structures at the local level; particularly how structures shape what people have, their goals and aspirations and the choices people make in achieving goals. The challenge is to understand what constitutes autonomy locally and how this influences pursuit of wellbeing³¹.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has illustrated the importance of structures for an understanding of wellbeing. In particular, it has noted how the study of structures is an intrinsic component for understanding agency and processes. The main purpose of the structures research is to locate the research sites within regional, national and global structures of power, exchange and information.

³¹ Devine et al (2006) begin to address this in their paper on Autonomy and Dependence in Bangladesh.

Because WeD's focus is on the 'person', the structures research also seeks to draw attention to how actors within the research sites mediate between the households and outside organizations, including government, business and civil society.

The paper has then proceeded to make the case for how a welfare regimes framework can be adapted to explore the role of structures in the social and cultural construction of wellbeing. It has specifically drawn on Gough and Wood's (2004) modification of Esping-Andersen's 'welfare state regime' framework towards the developing world and adapted it towards a wellbeing perspective using the work of Wood and Newton (2005) as a starting point. This involves a reorientation from welfare outcomes to wellbeing outcomes and processes to move beyond a focus on only objective to include the subjective and relational dimensions of wellbeing. Second, it argues for exploring how resources are negotiated³² amongst different institutions across what can be called a wellbeing mix. This provides insights into what relationships are important and how meanings are attributed to resources. Third, the paper makes the case for emphasising the role of culture as a conditioning factor that influences the structuring of society as a whole. Lastly, it argues for recognition of the impacts of 'stratification' and 'mobilisation' on wellbeing; particularly with reference to how it affects the underlying issue of autonomy.

³² This includes how resources are generated, controlled and distributed.

Appendix 1

Gough's (2004a: 43) cluster analysis revealed four broad clusters of welfare regimes summarised below:

1	<i>Actual or potential welfare state regimes</i> with high state commitments and relatively high welfare outcomes Includes Central Europe and some countries from Easter Europe, southern cone of Latin America; Kenya, Algeria and Tunisia in Africa and Thailand
2	<i>More effective informal security regimes</i> with relatively good outcomes achieved with below-average state spending and low international flows. Includes Southeast Asia, Sri Lanka, remaining countries of Latin America (that we have data for) and parts of Middle East.
3	<i>Less effective informal security regimes</i> with poor levels of welfare coupled with low public commitments and moderate international inflows. Include South Asia (excluding Sri Lanka) and certain countries of sub-Saharan Africa
4	<i>Externally dependent insecurity regimes</i> heavily dependent on aid and/or remittances with very poor welfare outcomes. Includes most of sub-Saharan Africa (that we have data for)

Source: Gough (2004a: 43)

References

- Appadurai, A. (2004) "The capacity to aspire: culture and the terms of recognition", in Rao, V. & Walton, M. (eds) *Culture and Public Action*, (Stanford University Press: Stanford)
- Axford, B. (2004) "Multi-dimensionality, mutual constitution and the nature of systemness: the importance of the cultural turn in the study of global systems", *Proto Sociology: an international Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 20, 125-142
- Barrientos, A. (2004) "Latin America: towards a liberal-informal welfare regime", in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 121-168
- Baumann, P. (2000) "Sustainable livelihoods and political capital: Arguments and evidence from decentralisation and natural resource management in India", *ODI Working Paper*, 136, (ODI: London)
- Bayart, J. F. (1993) *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly* (Longman: London)
- Bayart, J.F. , Ellis, S. & Hibou, B. (1999) *The Criminalisation of the State in Africa* (James Currey: Oxford)
- Bevan, P. (2004a) "Conceptualising in/security regimes", in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 88-120
- Bevan, P. (2004b) "The dynamics of Africa's in/security regime", in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 202-254
- Bevan, P. (2006) "Power and Social Policy in Development Contexts: Ethiopia's In/Security Regime" , *Paper delivered at 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (August 30th-September 3rd)*
- Bevan, P., Pankhurst, A. & Holland, J. (2006) "Power and poverty in Ethiopia: four case studies", *Paper prepared for the World Bank Poverty Reduction Group*
- Camfield, L. & McGregor, J. & Yamamoto, J. (2005) "Quality of life and its relationship to wellbeing", draft WeD paper, <http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/methods-toobox/qol-toolbox.htm>
- Camfield, L. & McGregor, A. (2004) "Resilience and wellbeing in developing countries" in Ungar, M. (eds) *Methodological challenges in resilience research* (Sage Publications)

- Carney, D. (1998) *Sustainable rural livelihoods: what contribution can we make?* (DFID: London)
- Carney, C. (2002) *Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches: Progress and Possibilities for Change*, (DFID: London)
- Clapham, C. (1996) *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge)
- Davis, P. (2004) "Rethinking the welfare regime approach in the context of Bangladesh", in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 255-286
- Davis P, & McGregor J.A. (2000). Civil Society, International Donors and Poverty in Bangladesh. *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*. 38 (1). pp. 47-64.
- Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. 2000. 'The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior', *Psychological Inquiry* 11: 227-268
- De Sardan, O. (2005) *Anthropology and Development: understanding contemporary social change* (Zed Books: London)
- Devine, J. Camfield, L. & Gough, I. (2006) "Autonomy or dependence-or both? Perspectives from Bangladesh", *WeD Working paper 13*,
- Diener, E. (1984) "Subjective wellbeing", *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575
- DFID (2006) *Sustainable Livelihoods guidance sheets* (www.livelihoods.org)
- Doyal, L and Gough, I. (1991) *A Theory of Human Need*, (Macmillan: London)
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, (Cambridge and Oxford: polity press)
- Funston, J. (2001) *Government and Politics in Southeast Asia*, zed books
- Gore, C. (2004) "MDGs and PRSPs: Are Poor Countries Enmeshed in a Global-Local Double Bind", *Global Social Policy*, 4, 277-283
- Gough, I., McGregor, A. & Camfield, L. (2006) "Introduction: conceiving wellbeing in development contexts", (forthcoming)
- Gough, I. (2004a) "Welfare regimes in development contexts: a global and regional analysis", in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 15-48
- Gough, I. (2004b) "Human wellbeing and social structures: relating the universal and the local", *Global Social Policy*, 4:3, 289-311

- Gough, I. (2004c) "East Asia: the limits of productivist regimes", in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 169-201
- Gough, I, McGregor, A. & Camfield, L. (2006) "Wellbeing in Developing Countries: conceptual foundations of the WeD Programme", WeD Working Paper 19
- Gough, I. & McGregor, A. (2007) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From Theory to Research*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) (2004) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge
- Hobley, M. (2001) Unpacking the PIP box
<http://www.livelihoods.org/pip/pip/PIP-Syn.rtf>
- Lewis, D. & McGregor, A. (1992) "Vulnerability and impoverishment in Northern Albania", CDS Occasional Paper and Report to Oxfam
- Mandani, M. (1996) *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Fountain Publishers, Princeton University Press, James Currey, David Philip Publishers: Kampala, Princeton, London, Cape Town)
- McGregor, J.A. (1989) 'Boro Gafur and Choto Gafur: Development Interventions and Indigenous Institutions' *Journal of Social Studies* 43(January): 39-51 .
- McGregor, J.A. (1994) 'Village Credit and the Reproduction of Poverty in Rural Bangladesh', in J. Acheson (ed.) *Anthropology and Institutional Economics* (pp. 261-282). Lanham, MD: University Press of America .
- McGregor, J.A. (2004) "Researching Wellbeing: Communicating the needs of policy makers and the needs of people", *Global Social Policy*, 4:3, 337-358
- McGregor, J.A. (2006) "Researching wellbeing: from concepts to methodology", WeD working paper 20
- McGregor, J.A. (2007a) "Researching wellbeing: from concepts to methodology", *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From theory to research* (Cambridge University Press:
- McGregor, J.A. (2007b) Wellbeing and (some of) its challenges to the business of international development, *Mokoro seminar, 8th January, 2007*,
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/news/mokoro/Mokoro%20template%20allister.pdf#1-format.pdf>

- McGregor, J.A. & Kebede, B. (2003) "Resource profiles and the social and cultural construction of well-being, Paper to the inaugural workshop of the ESRC WeD research group (Jan 13th-17th, 2003)
- Morrison, J., Dorwood, A. & Kydd, J. (2000) *Sustainable livelihoods and new institutional economics* (<http://www.livelihoods.org/info/docs/nieweb2.doc>)
- Moser, C., Norton, A., Conway, T., Ferguson, C., Vizard, P. (2001) *To claim our rights: livelihood security, human rights and sustainable development*, (ODI: London)
- Neefjes, K. (1999) "Oxfam GB and sustainable livelihoods: lessons form learning", *Paper presented at IDS Sustainable Livelihoods Programme Workshop, Brighton, June*
- Newton, J. (2004) *Gender responsive approaches to natural resource management in Namibia*, University of Sheffield. (unpublished PhD thesis),
- Nussbaum, M. c. (2000) *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge)
- Pankhurst, A. & Mariam, D.H. (2000) "The Iddir in Ethiopia: Historical Development, Social Function, and Potential Role in HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control", *Northeast African Studies*, 7.2, 35-57
- Phillips, D. (2006) *Quality of Life: Concept, Policy and Practice* (Routledge: London)
- Rao, V. & Walton, M. (eds) (2004) *Culture and Public Action* (Stanford University Press: Stanford)
- Ryan, R. M. and Sapp, A. R. (2007) 'Basic psychological needs: a self determination theory perspective on the promotion of wellness across development and cultures' in Gough, I. and McGregor, J.A. (Eds) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: New Approaches and Research Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sahlins, M. (1976) *Culture and practical reason* (University of Chicago Press: Chicago/London)
- Saltmarshe, D. (2002) "the Resource Profile Approach: A Kosovo Case Study", *Public Administration and Development*, 22: 179-190
- Satterthwaite, D. (2003) *The Millennium Development Goals and Local Processes: Hitting the target or missing the point*, IIED
- Scoones, I. (1998) "Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis", *IDS Working paper 72*, (IDS: Brighton)
- Sen, A. (1985) *Commodities and Capabilities* (North-Holland: Amsterdam)
- Sen, A. (1999) *Development as Freedom* (Oxford University Press: Oxford).
- Shankland, A. (2000) "Analysing policy for sustainable livelihoods", *IDS Research Report, 49*, (IDS: Brighton)

- Therborn, G. (2004) "Culture as a world system", *Proto Sociology: an international Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 20, 46-70
- Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom* (Penguin: Harmondsworth)
- Wallerstein, I. (1992) *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the changing world-system*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge)
- White, S. (2006) "The cultural construction of wellbeing: seeking healing in Bangladesh", WeD Working paper 15
- White, S. & Ellison, M. (2007) "Wellbeing, livelihoods and resources in social practice", in Gough and McGregor (2007) (eds) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From theory to research* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge)
- White, S. & Pettit, J. (2004) "Participatory approaches and the measurement of human well-being", *WeD Working Paper 8*
- White, S. & Pettit, J. (2007) "Participatory approaches and the measurement of human wellbeing", in McGillivray, M. (eds) *Human Well-Being: Concept and Measurement*", Palgrave MacMillan: Basingstoke, 240-268
- Wood, G. (2004) "Informal security regimes: the strength of relationships" in Gough, I. & Wood, G. (eds) *Insecurity and welfare regimes in Asia, Africa and Latin America: Social Policy in Development Contexts*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 49-87
- Wood, G. (2007) "Using security to indicate wellbeing" in Gough and McGregor (2007) (eds) *Wellbeing in Developing Countries: From theory to research* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge)
- Wood, G. & Gough, I. (2006) "A comparative welfare regime approach to global social policy", *World Development*, 34:10, 1696-1712
- Wood, G. and Newton, J. (2005) "From welfare to wellbeing regimes: engaging new agendas", *Paper presented at the World Bank Social Development Division conference on 'New Frontiers of Social Policy: Development in a globalizing world', Arusha Tanzania, Dec 12-15, 2005*

List of WeD Working Papers

WeD 01 'Lists and Thresholds: Comparing the Doyal-Gough Theory of Human Need with Nussbaum's Capabilities Approach' by Ian Gough (March 2003)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed01.pdf>

WeD 02 'Research on Well-Being: Some Advice from Jeremy Bentham' by David Collard (May 2003)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed02.pdf>

WeD 03 'Theorising the Links between Social and Economic Development: The Sigma Economy Model of Adolfo Figueroa' by James Copestake (September 2003)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed03.pdf>

WeD 04 'Discursive Repertoires and the Negotiation of Well-being: Reflections on the WeD Frameworks' by Hartley Dean (September 2003)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed04.pdf>

WeD 05 'Poverty Studies in Peru: Towards a more Inclusive Study of Exclusion' by Teofilo Altamirano, James Copestake, Adolfo Figueroa and Katie Wright (December 2003)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed05.pdf>

WeD 06 'Exploring the Structured Dynamics of Chronic Poverty: A Sociological Approach' by Philippa Bevan (May 2004)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed06.pdf>

WeD 07 'Administrative Allocation, Lease Markets and Inequality in Land in Rural Ethiopia: 1995-97' by Bereket Kebede (July 2004)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed07.pdf>

WeD 08 'Participatory Approaches and the Measurement of Well-being' by Sarah White and Jethro Pettit (August 2004)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed08.pdf>

WeD 09 'Subjective and Objective Well-Being In Relation To Economic Inputs: Puzzles and Responses' by Des Gasper (October 2004)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed09.pdf>

WeD 10 'Happiness and the Sad Topics of Anthropology' by Neil Thin (May 2005)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed10.pdf>

WeD 11 'Exploring the Quality of Life of People in North Eastern and Southern Thailand' by Darunee Jongudomkarn and Laura Camfield (August 2005)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed11.pdf>

WeD 12 'Sen and the art of quality of life maintenance: towards a working definition of quality of life' by Danny Ruta, Laura Camfield, Cam Donaldson, (January 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed12.pdf>

WeD 13 'Autonomy or Dependence – or Both? Perspectives from Bangladesh' by Joe Devine, Laura Camfield, and Ian Gough (January 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed13.pdf>

WeD 14 'Relationships, Happiness and Wellbeing: Insights from Bangladesh' by Laura Camfield, Kaneta Choudhury, and Joe Devine (March 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed14.pdf>

WeD 15 'The Cultural Construction of Wellbeing: Seeking Healing in Bangladesh' by Sarah White (March 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed15.pdf>

WeD 16 'Exploring the relationship between happiness, objective and subjective well-being: Evidence from rural Thailand' by Mònica Guillén Royo and Jackeline Velazco (March 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed16.pdf>

WeD 17 'Measuring wealth across seven Thai communities' by Richard Clarke (April 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed17.pdf>

WeD 18 'Public Goods, Global Public Goods and the Common Good' by Séverine Deneulin and Nicholas Townsend (September 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed18.pdf>

WeD 19 'Theorising wellbeing in international development' by Ian Gough, J.Allister McGregor and Laura Camfield (September 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed19.pdf>

WeD 20 'Researching wellbeing: From concepts to methodology' by J. Allister McGregor (September 2006)

<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed20.pdf>

WeD 21 'Multiple Dimensions of Social Assistance: The Case Of Peru's 'Glass of Milk' Programme' by James Copestake (September 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed21.pdf>

WeD 22 'Using Security To Indicate Wellbeing' by Geof Wood (October 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed22.pdf>

WeD 23 'Wellbeing, Livelihoods and Resources in Social Practice' by Sarah White and Mark Ellison (October 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed23.pdf>

WeD 24 'Poverty And Exclusion, Resources And Relationships: Theorising The Links Between Economic And Social Development ' by James Copestake (October 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed24.pdf>

WeD 25 'Researching Wellbeing Across The Disciplines: Some Key Intellectual Problems And Ways Forward ' by Philippa Bevan (October 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed25.pdf>

WeD 26 'The Why and How of Understanding 'Subjective' Wellbeing: Exploratory work by the WeD group in four developing countries' by Laura Camfield (December 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed26.pdf>

WeD 27 'Conducting Focus Group Research across Cultures: Consistency and Comparability' by Janet Mancini Billson (December 2006)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed27.pdf>

WeD 28 'Asking people what they want or telling them what they 'need'? Contrasting *A Theory of Human Need* with local expressions of goals' by Tom Lavers (February 2007)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed28.pdf>

WeD 29 'Labels, Welfare Regimes and Intermediation: Contesting Formal Power' by Geof Wood (March 2007)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed29.pdf>

WeD 30 'Structures, Regimes and Wellbeing' by Julie Newton (April 2007)
<http://www.welldev.org.uk/research/workingpaperpdf/wed30.pdf>