Where is the Dignity in Dependency?

An exploration of how New Zealand's welfare policies could be reformed to promote dignity for all

by

Saralee Gore

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Public Policy

The University of Auckland

November 2019

Declaration of Originality

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge and belief and in accordance with the policies of the University of Auckland, this dissertation is my own work, all sources have been properly acknowledged to the full extent of my indebtedness, and this assignment contains no plagiarism. I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work or any version of it for assessment in any other Department of Faculty or for any award offered by the University of Auckland, its partner institutions, or any other institution. I further declare that I understand the plagiarism policy of the University of Auckland and the Disciplinary Area of Politics and International Relations, including the penalties for which I am liable should my work be found to contain plagiarised material.

Signed: Date:

Abstract

This dissertation utilises the Welfare Expert Advisory Group report (2019) to explore how New Zealand's welfare system currently contributes to a loss of dignity for the people who experience it. It draws upon the most pertinent literature about dignity, to define what dignity is and how it can be achieved. Based on this theoretical foundation, this dissertation proposes three key models as solutions that most effectively enhance dignity in New Zealand's welfare system. The first model is a tikānga Māori value-based framework, influenced by the Welfare Expert Advisory Group's own focus on Maori values. The second proposed solution explores the Universal Caregiver Model, which addresses the lack of dignity associated with care work in a welfare system that is focused in reducing benefit dependency by moving benefit recipients into paid work. The third model will explore the social democratic welfare state and theorise how aspects of this political approach could enhance dignity in New Zealand's contemporary neoliberal context. This dissertation concludes with a synthesis of these three offered solutions, that have the potential to enhance dignity in New Zealand's welfare system.

Acknowledgements

I'd like to offer my sincere thanks to my supervisor, Louise Humpage, whose guidance, support and amazingly vast knowledge of the subject made this dissertation possible. Thank you Louise!

Thank you to my MPP colleagues and friends, whose encouragement and comedic relief helped me stay positive and motivated throughout this daunting process.

Lastly, thank you to my loved ones. To my family – my love for learning and inquisitive nature, not to mention my work ethic, has been inspired by you. And to my partner, Ben - I cannot express how lucky I am to have you, not only throughout the chaos and excitement of this degree, but throughout the chaos and excitement of life.

Table of contents

Introduction

This dissertation draws upon the Welfare Expert Advisory Group (WEAG) report (2019) to examine where New Zealand's welfare system leads to a loss of dignity for those subject to it. After first outlining the significance of this inquiry, it provides a brief review of the literature relating to dignity so as to identify what it is and how we might achieve it. The literature review will also include a synthesis of the most relevant scholarship on citizenship rights to provide a context for how citizenship is closely linked to the welfare state.

Using this theoretical and empirical learning, the dissertation then offers three key models as the most effective options to enhance dignity within New Zealand's welfare system. The first model is based on a tikānga Māori value-based framework and is influenced by the WEAG report (2019), which placed a significant focus on Māori values. The second substantive section will explore the Universal Caregiver Model, pioneered by Nancy Fraser (1997) and which addresses the lack of dignity associated with a devaluing of care work, particularly in a welfare system focused on getting benefit recipients into paid work. The third model will look to the social democratic welfare state, as theorised by Epsing-Andersen (1990), to examine how this political approach could work (and has worked in the past) to enhance dignity in the contemporary neoliberal context. The concluding section of the dissertation will provide an evaluation of the discussion and offer some suggestions for future research and policy making.

Significance of the inquiry

The current state, and indeed the future of New Zealand's welfare system has been pushed to the forefront of political scrutiny and debate in recent times. The National-led government's (2008-2017) focus on curbing welfare dependency strongly argued that the most desirable outcome of welfare system should be to transition people into paid work (Stuart, 2019). Although reducing benefit dependency is not a revolutionary idea, the National-led government's unwavering commitment to this goal worked in tandem with other social and economic reforms across a nine-year period to create a welfare environment that was punitive, transactional and complex (New Zealand Council of Christian Social Services, 2011; Thompson, 2015).

The National-led government's reforms were an extension of earlier reforms begun in the late 1980s, (O'Brien, 2012; O'Brien, 2013; Wilson et al., 2013). These reforms were part of a broader neoliberal reconfiguration of New Zealand's economic and political conditions, including the labour market and the provision of social services (O'Brien, 2012). The reforms resulted in a reframing of the government's responsibility for its citizens, meaning that "individuals were increasingly responsible for their own economic well-being with state assistance increasingly residualised" (O'Brien, 2008, p. 25).Labour market policies saw a significant shift in focus away from increasing the demand for labour and job creation to instead prioritise labour supply and policies that addressed supply to help curb unemployment (O'Brien, 2008; O'Brien, 2013). This was supported by the introduction of mandatory work requirements for benefit recipients, which was a neoliberal policy trend across the globe at that time (O'Brien, 2008). Other early reforms included the slashing of benefits and the abolition of the universal Family Benefit in 1991, as well as changes to taxation policy that ultimately resulted in the widening of the income inequality gap and increasing poverty rates (Roper, 2005; O'Brien, 2008; O'Brien, 2012; O'Brien, 2013; Wilson et al.).

Significantly, reforms beginning in the 1980s and continuing more recently have seen an increasing shift towards conditionality, especially through obligations and sanctions for welfare recipients. Obligations in the welfare system refer to the activities that benefit recipients must take part in to receive their benefit, such as budgeting meetings or training and education programmes. Sanctions are the consequences for welfare recipients who fail to meet these compulsory activities, acting as punishment for their lack of adherence. O'Brien (2013, p. 740) identifies some of these sanctions as the "compulsory drug testing of work tested beneficiaries, sanctions for beneficiaries who have a further child while receiving a benefit and cutting of benefits for beneficiaries who are subject to arrest warrants."

The election of the new Labour-led government in 2017 signalled an opportunity to review New Zealand's welfare system. Labour's confidence and supply agreement with the Green Party was partly influenced by a pledge by both parties to rebuild the welfare system and reintroduce a sense of respect (New Zealand Labour Party and Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand, 2018; Bracewell-Worrall, 2018). The creation of the 11-member Welfare Expert Advisory Group (WEAG) was borne of this specific context and the Group was tasked with advising on future welfare reform.

The subsequent WEAG report, released on May 3, 2019, was entitled "Whakamana Tāngata Restoring Dignity to Social Security in New Zealand". The title alone indicates a clear discursive shift from the previous Welfare Working Group's report (WWG), which was titled "Reducing Long-Term Benefit Dependency". The WEAG introduced the key tenets of 'whakamana tāngata' or restoring dignity in its foreword from the chair, setting the tone for the report with these guiding principles. The three fundamental principles are: "to provide income support sufficient for an adequate standard of living, to provide employment support to help people find and retain good and appropriate work, and to treat people receiving this support with dignity and respect" (WEAG, 2019, p.2).

The principal finding of the report is that New Zealand's social security system no longer serves its intended purpose, and drastic change is required to rebalance the social contract between the government and the public (WEAG, 2019). This conclusion is the cumulative result of the report's other findings, which can be broadly categorised into social, economic and structural impacts, though there is often overlap. The findings that can be included in the 'social' category pay special attention to the experiences of marginalised groups. The report highlights the failure of the present welfare system to deliver positive outcomes for Māori, who disproportionately account for 36 percent of all working-age benefit recipients who receive a main benefit (WEAG, 2019). People with disabilities and health conditions, and their carers (WEAG, 2019), are another group that is inadequately supported within the welfare system 53 percent of working-age benefit recipients belong to this group, and face significant challenges with accessing services, receiving adequate income and entering into paid work (WEAG, 2019). The treatment of marginalised groups in New Zealand's social security system is a primary concern for the WEAG. Although all aspects of the welfare system arguably have an economic impact, the report points to the cost of housing as a weighty contributor to the overall cost of income support in New Zealand (WEAG, 2019). This is exacerbated further by the housing affordability crisis, which has resulted in unaffordable and insufficient housing as well as the exclusion of low- and middle-income earners from home ownership (WEAG, 2019). The report also finds several deficiencies within the structure of the welfare system which contribute to its disregard of people's dignity. These structural impacts are wide ranging, and include welfare eligibility rules that no longer reflect New Zealand society in terms of family structure, that the child support system does not have the child's best interests at its heart, that the definition of 'relationship'

unfairly influences people's relationship decisions, and that the social security system lacks the cross-government approach required to effectively mitigate poverty (WEAG, 2019).

The WEAG report (2019) motivated me to explore the relationship between the welfare system and dignity. The main findings of the report, as well as the 42 recommendations, confirm that New Zealand's welfare system does not provide people with the necessary support to live a meaningful and dignified life. This context propelled me to consider what a welfare system that promotes dignity as its chief objective might look like.

Given that more than 630,000 New Zealanders receive a benefit payment each year and 345,900 New Zealand families receive a Working for Families tax credit (WEAG, 2019), the scope of the welfare system is significant. If the New Zealand welfare system does not allow each of its benefit recipients a sense of respect, we risk excluding a great proportion of our people from participating in our communities with dignity. The desire to minimise this risk is the driving force behind my inquiry.

Research question and method

Using the WEAG report (2019) as a stimulus, this dissertation will seek to answer the primary research question:

How can a welfare system enhance dignity?

 This dissertation makes a contribution to the field of public policy by providing a critical analysis of New Zealand's existing welfare policies and proposing solutions. It has been influenced by Mintrom's (2012) six steps for policy analysis: problem definition; proposing alternative responses; choosing criteria for evaluation; projecting the outcomes of alternatives; analysing trade-offs; and reporting findings while making an argument for the best alternative. Though it may not rigidly follow Mintrom's process, this dissertation includes some of these steps to produce a policy analysis that offers an alternative to New Zealand's current welfare system that are based on dignity and respect.

The dissertation also engages in comparative policy analysis by seeking to draw lessons from other policy contexts. Lesson-drawing allows policy-makers to seek policy alternatives across

both time and space that could be applied to their own problems in a contemporary context (Rose, 1991; Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000). Policy transfer or lesson-drawing is a growing trend in the policy-making process, and it is increasingly more common for countries to emulate or adapt policies from other countries, where the policy has been particularly successful (Rose, 1991; Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000). Dolowitz and Marsh (2000) advise that the rising popularity of policy transfer can be attributed to increasing globalisation, more effective means of communication and the involvement of international organisations such as the International Monetary Fund in many different policy environments. By examining how welfare systems have enhanced dignity in both other countries, and in New Zealand in other policy contexts, it may be possible to identify programmes that would improve New Zealand's current welfare system (Rose, 1991; Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000). As a result of this policy analysis, this inquiry will be able to draw pertinent insights and contribute to wider scholarship on New Zealand's welfare policies.

As a piece of desk-top research, this dissertation will utilise three main data source types - organisation and government-produced reports, theories of social and welfare policy, and peer-reviewed academic publications- to answer the research question. The government publication that is of most importance to this inquiry is the WEAG report (2019) "Whakamana Tāngata Restoring Dignity to Social Security in New Zealand", as it helps to frame the policy problem and its context as well as offer some recommendations as solutions. Since the WEAG report (2019) was published, other organisations such as the Child Poverty Action Group and New Zealand Family Violence Clearinghouse have concurred with several of its recommendations, adding legitimacy and strength to the value of this source. Other useful government and organisation-produced research is sourced from the New Zealand Government (2012; 2016) and the OECD (2016; 2019), and primarily provides quantitative evidence. The theory-based sources are notable works by scholars such as Fraser (1997), Durie (1998), Sen (1999), Sennett (2003), and Nussbaum (2011). These academics provide a theoretical basis for understanding dignity, particularly in the contexts of paid work, care work and welfare dependency. The use of peer-reviewed journal articles provides mainly qualitative evidence that often applies the theories of dignity and welfare to useful case studies.

To illustrate these theoretical arguments, the dissertation draws upon three cases – the Maori, Universal Caregiver and social democratic models – to flesh out how dignity might be enhanced within New Zealand's welfare system.

Chapter One:

The loss of dignity in New Zealand's current welfare system

When explaining how a welfare system might serve to enhance dignity, it is useful to begin by first examining how the New Zealand welfare system can, in fact, diminish dignity. This section first explores how being associated with 'welfare dependency' because you must rely on government support can result in a loss of dignity. It goes on to identify four key features of New Zealand's welfare system that currently inhibit or decrease benefit recipients' sense of dignity and respect. These characteristics include: a lack of adequate income; an overly-complex system structure; strict obligations; and punitive sanctions.

Dignity and welfare dependency

Welfare dependency (or benefit dependency) is often defined as the long-term reliance on government financial support by individuals who choose not to engage in paid employment (Murray, 1984; Gustafson, 2011). Mead (1989) builds upon this concept by identifying that welfare dependency is often entrenched in families themselves, meaning that it is passed down through generations. In the context of this dissertation, it is important to highlight that meaning associated with the term 'welfare dependency' has changed over time. In their analysis of the genesis of welfare dependency in the United States, Fraser and Gordon (1994) find that not only has benefit receipt not always been framed as a morally problematic way as currently but not all people who receive a benefit are considered equally dependent. The authors maintain that individuals receiving welfare payments in the form of retirement insurance or superannuation are generally not characterised as welfare dependent (Fraser and Gordon, 1994). Instead, it is typically "the poor solo mother" who is "often figured as a young, unmarried black woman (perhaps even a teenager) of uncontrolled sexuality" that represents welfare dependence (Fraser and Gordon, 1994, p. 311). This characterisation has racial, gendered and socioeconomic connotations, which is reiterated by Gray (2017) who finds that single mothers in New Zealand are often illustrated in a similar way. Through understanding how dignity may be expressed or experienced by different kinds of welfare recipients it is possible to identify the higher level of dignity associated with self-reliance than with dependency (Halvorsen, 1998; Wax, 2003).

Sennett's (2003, p.101) work in the United States also talks about 'the shame of dependence', which represents the loss of dignity because of an inability to be self-sufficient. Sennett (2003) draws upon theories of adulthood which position dependency as infantilising - to be dependent is to be childlike, and to be self-sufficient is to be an adult. Adult individuals who are dependent on the state are, according to Sennett (2003), demeaned and denied the respect afforded to those who partake in paid employment. Gray (2017) echoes this in her study of lone mothers receiving Sole Parent Support in New Zealand. Gray (2017, p. 144) found that the solo mothers shared a collective experience of diminished dignity, through an accumulated negative affect that describes welfare dependents as "scroungers" and "bludgers". According to the literature, the shame of dependency thus has a direct connection to the denial of dignity (Fraser and Gordon, 1994; Halvorsen, 1998; Sennett, 2003; Gray, 2017).

Lack of adequate income

The WEAG report (2019) highlights inadequacy of income as a source of great distress for both unemployed benefit recipients and those in low-paying work. The WEAG consistently maintains that an adequate level of income is integral to people's meaningful participation in their communities, with participation regarded as closely linked to the promotion of dignity (WEAG, 2019). The WEAG (2019) argues that New Zealand's current income support system falls short of covering the most basic needs, and certainly does not extend to allowing for significant inclusion in communities as the following examples illustrate.

This claim is based on a study the WEAG commissioned into whether the level of financial support provided to benefit recipients was sufficient in providing a decent quality of life (WEAG, 2019). The study found a deficit across all configurations of people and families receiving a benefit (WEAG, 2019c). For single people the shortfall was at minimum $130 per week while sole parents experienced a deficit of at least $110 each week with one child and a shortfall of $250 a week for three children (WEAG, 2019). Households with two parents receiving a benefit each saw a shortfall of $350 each week with 2 children (WEAG, 2019). The study supports the notion that New Zealanders receiving a benefit likely do not receive sufficient income support to cover all basic needs and have a meaningful place in their community.

An analysis by the Child Poverty Action Group (CPAG) of the 2019 Budget similarly finds that the level of income benefits provide is seriously lacking and needs to be increased urgently. CPAG notes that, in its 2019 Budget, the Labour-led government has pledged to index welfare benefits to wages, rather than simply to inflation, which will cost approximately $542 million across the next four years (CPAG, 2019a). This is, however, significantly less than the WEAG recommendation that $5.2 billion is required to exact fundamental change for welfare recipients (CPAG, 2019a). Therefore, 2019 Budget's policy solutions do not sufficiently address the lack of adequate income for benefit recipients.

Not having enough income to enjoy an adequate standard of living contributes to a cycle of poverty for welfare recipients and their children, which in turn has long-lasting effects. A multitude of studies illustrate the enduring effects of poverty, which include lower health outcomes, cognitive development and educational attainment, as well as a higher risk of mental illness (Fletcher and Dwyer, 2008; CPAG, 2016; WEAG, 2019). The fact that many benefit recipients in New Zealand live in poverty and hardship means that there is a deficit of dignity in their lives, especially when compared to the rest of the community.

Overly-complex system structure

Another key feature of the welfare system that diminishes dignity is the "unmanageably complex" (WEAG, 2019, p.6) structure of the system, and the processes involved with accessing benefits and tax credits. Some of this complexity derives from the management of welfare recipients, as well as the eligibility criteria to receive a benefit, both of which have been discussed in depth by the report (WEAG, 2019).

It is important to first note that all income support payments, including Working for Families tax credits, are assessed on a discretionary basis by a Ministry of Social Development case manager (WEAG, 2019). Case management is generally received positively across other countries with welfare states, particularly when an assigned case manager is able to engage with their client to understand and address their needs (Gladstone et al., 2012; Hasluck & Green, 2007; Mandlik et al., 2014; WEAG, 2019). In New Zealand, however, most welfare recipients do not have a dedicated case manager and instead are served by a different manager each time (WEAG, 2019). This is a significant barrier for both parties, as welfare clients often have to continually repeat their background and situation and case managers

have insufficient time to understand their clients' needs and provide them with the most effective support (WEAG, 2019). This system fails to provide the opportunity to build trust and rapport within the case manager- client relationship, leaving many benefit recipients feeling stressed, neglected and isolated (WEAG, 2019).

The strict rules around eligibility for income support also contribute to the unreasonable complexity and lack of dignity within New Zealand's welfare system. One illustrative example is the significant disparity in income support provided to people with disabilities and health conditions, depending on whether they meet eligibility criteria for Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) support or whether they receive support provided through the welfare system (WEAG, 2019). ACC provides support, which includes income replacement, when a person has suffered an injury as a result of an accident (ACC, 2019). If a person's inability to work derives from an illness, disability or health condition that is non-accidental, then their income support is provided through the mainstream benefit system (WEAG, 2019). This means that although two different individuals' ability to work may be equally impacted by their health condition or disability, one person will receive a higher level of income support if their situation is a result of an accident.

Another crucial element of how the eligibility criteria acts as a barrier to access is the current definition of 'relationship' in the welfare system, and its implications on people's choices (WEAG, 2019). In the current welfare system, 'relationship' is defined as 'in the nature of marriage' and is considered to be valid if a couple have been seeing each other for at least six weeks or have an existing sexual relationship (CPAG, 2019b; WEAG, 2019; Ministry of Social Development, n.d.). People who are in a relationship and on a benefit receive a substantially reduced level of income support due to their relationship status (CPAG, 2019b; WEAG, 2019). For example, in the context of the previous paragraph, a single person receiving a benefit for a health condition or disability not covered by ACC would receive a total of $343.34 net per week, whereas a person in a relationship would receive just $177 net per week, in the same circumstances (WEAG, 2019, p. 145). The literal cost of being in a relationship is an unfair influence on people's decisions about their personal life and represents another way the current system causes stress for those who come into contact with it (CPAG, 2019b; WEAG, 2019).

Strict obligations and punitive sanctions

The WEAG (2019) highlights that the welfare state was initially established in 1938 as a social contract between the Government, who would grant financial assistance to those who needed it, and the citizens of the nation, who would fulfil obligations to attain education or seek work in return (McLintock, 1966 cited in WEAG, 2019). The WEAG (2019) argues that this social contract is now heavily skewed and out of balance, resulting in a system that is highly conditional and unjust. As a result, welfare recipients find that "the system diminishes trust, causes anger and resentment, and contributes to toxic levels of stress" (WEAG, 2019, p. 07). Much of this animosity stems from the use of obligations and sanctions by the government to influence the behaviour and decisions of welfare recipients. The obligations and sanctions currently enforced in New Zealand's welfare system are far ranging, and include pre-benefit activities before welfare payments can start, the cancelling of benefit payments when there is an arrest warrant issued on an individual, work-testing for people with disabilities or health conditions, as well as the arbitrary requirement for recipients to reapply for their welfare benefit every 52 weeks (WEAG, 2019).

An illustrative example of how these obligations and sanctions serve to reduce dignity is the application of income management policy for Youth Payment (YP) and Youth Parent Payment (YPP) recipients in New Zealand. Introduced as part of the Youth Service Package, income management (also known as welfare quarantining) reduces the ability for the young benefit recipients to manage their own funds (Fletcher, Hanna and Anderson , 2013; Humpage, 2016). This involves a person's rent, utilities and debt repayments being automatically deducted, and an allowance of up to $50 is paid directly to the recipient (Fletcher, Hanna and Anderson, 2013). If there are funds remaining, they are deposited onto a Payment Card, which is a debit card able to be used at approved retailers and not to buy alcohol, cigarettes or electronic goods (Fletcher, Hanna and Anderson, 2013). The justification behind the Payment Card is based on the assumption that young people on a benefit are unable to manage their funds responsibly and need state intervention to do so (Fletcher, Hanna and Anderson, 2013; Humpage, 2018).

In the case of income management, the relationship between obligations and sanctions is a close and often punitive one. While benefit recipients can earn extra money for their in-hand allowance if they meet obligations, these 'incentives' serve to ensure they strictly follow the

behavioural modification interventions required by the state (Fletcher, Hanna and Anderson, 2013; Youth Service, n.d). For example, young people receiving the Youth Payment are able to earn an additional $10 per week after six months of successful enrolment in training, education or work-based learning, and a further $10 per week after completing a budgeting course and attending regular budgeting meetings (Youth Service, n.d.).

Despite being promoted as incentives, these requirements are in fact obligations which are paired with sanctions should the benefit recipient fail to fulfil them. In the case of the Youth Payment, a failure to meet the obligations for the first or second time results in the withholding of the recipient's in-hand allowance, and the cancellation of the extra incentive payments. The recipient is allowed a four-week period to meet their obligations, or face the full Youth Payment being stopped (Youth Service, n.d.). Should they fail to meet the obligations for a third time, the benefit recipient will lose their Youth Payment (Youth Service, n.d.).

The relationship between obligations and sanctions is similar for those receiving the Youth Parent Payment, with added obligations pertaining to parenting classes and ensuring children are registered with a healthcare provider (Youth Service, n.d.). Once again, a failure to meet obligations for the first or second time results in the suspension of the Youth Parent Payment with a four week allowance to remedy the situation. The third failure results in the cancellation of the payment in full (Youth Service, n.d.).

The sanctions imposed on YP and YPP recipients cannot be proven to affect the behaviour and decisions of young people (Humpage, 2018). In fact, there is evidence to suggest that the use of sanctions and obligations can result in significant social harm (WEAG, 2019). The use of these mechanisms in the case of income management is just one example of the skewed social contract within New Zealand's welfare system. The current "obligations and sanctions regime" is paternalistic, punitive and diminishes the Government's responsibility to safeguard the wellbeing and dignity of its citizens (WEAG, 2019).

Summary

In its current state, New Zealand's welfare system contributes to the loss of dignity for those who experience it in some significant ways. From a theoretical perspective, the notion of

welfare dependency invokes feelings of shame for benefit recipients, who are often framed as 'leeches' on the state (Fraser and Gordon, 1994; Halvorsen, 1998; Sennett, 2003; Gray, 2017). Through narrowing down on the specific features of the welfare system, the WEAG (2019) found that the inadequacy of incomes and the complicated structure of the system creates stress for benefit recipients, which has great impact on their well-being and dignity. The focus on conditionality through obligations and sanctions means that the New Zealand welfare system is coercive and unjust, which strips its benefit recipients of the ability to lead a dignified life (WEAG, 2019)

This section will draw upon the most prevalent and pertinent literature surrounding the concept of dignity, to provide a theoretical basis for subsequent discussion. It will first define dignity itself in three key ways: as a human right; as recognition; and as capability. The review will then move on to examine how dignity is presented in relation to both paid and unpaid work. These characterisations of dignity are particularly significant in the area of welfare, as they demonstrate how employment status has different implications for a person's level of dignity. This section then reviews literature dealing with dignity and welfare dependency then briefly explores the most relevant literature surrounding citizenship rights to help establish a foundation for later exploration of possible models of the welfare state.

Dignity as a human right

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948, p. 2) begins with the proclamation that "all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights". From this view, dignity is granted to all human beings simply through their membership of the human race (Nussbaum, 2006; Gundersen, 2010; Rosen, 2012; Laitinen et al., 2016). Individuals do not need to earn human dignity and are instead automatically entitled to it irrespective of their achievements (Gundersen, 2010; Laitinen et al., 2016). The inalienable right to dignity has proliferated international and national politics since the end of the Second World War, appearing in the German Constitution after the atrocities of World War Two, as well as being included in the rhetoric of public figures such as former President Barack Obama and Pope Francis (Rosen 2012; Valentini, 2017; Hodgkiss, 2018).

However, Valentini (2017) and Rosen (2012) argue that a new characterisation of dignity as a human right is necessary, as current definitions are uninformative and vague. Valentini (2017) proposes that we move beyond inherent dignity (such as that described above) to 'status dignity', which she defines as "a status an entity possesses, comprising stringent normative demands" (Valentini, 2017, p. 865). The normative demands that Valentini (2017) refers to frame how human beings should be treated by others. If a person being is mistreated, then their status dignity is violated (Valentini, 2017). This notion is particularly important

when considering the relationship between individuals and the sovereign state. All humans have inherent dignity, but status dignity is dependent on their treatment by others, including their government (Valentini, 2017).

Dignity as recognition

The concept of dignity is often defined in the literature as being nearly synonymous with 'recognition'. In this context, recognition transcends its legal characterisation where legislation is framed in a way that acknowledges the needs of different groups of people (Sennet 2003; Rosen, 2012). Instead, dignity as recognition refers to the right of each person to have their "intrinsic worth" be appreciated by others (Hodgkiss, 2018, p. 3). Hodgkiss (2018) maintains that this recognition of worth by other human beings is necessary for individuals to recognise their own self-worth. The political philosopher Rawls (1972) also famously identifies that recognition by other people is essential to the notion of self-respect, which all citizens need in their quest for a good and just life. Self-respect, self-esteem or self-worth as a product of recognition, are key components of dignity (Rawls, 1972; Gundersen, 2010; Laitinen et al., 2016).

Fraser (1997; 2001) is another notable academic whose theorising of recognition and dignity are important. Her examination of redistribution and recognition aims to identify which one of these would best remedy economic and cultural injustices (Fraser, 1997; 2001). Fraser (1997; 2001) argues that not every claim for recognition is warranted even though recognition is necessary for the development and maintenance of self-respect. This is because recognition to enhance dignity for one group of people may serve to diminish the dignity of another group of people. Fraser (2001) gives the illustrative example that recognition of racial supremacists may develop their sense of self-worth through their contrast with other racial groups, but this would likely impair other groups' sense of self-esteem. This is an important theoretical argument when considering how the recognition of dignity for some people may have implications on the recognition of dignity for other people.

Dignity as capability

Another key conceptualisation of dignity is the notion of capability, a theory pioneered by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum (1993). Sen (1999, p. 75) characterises capability as "a

kind of freedom" where a person can make choices to live a certain way and achieve a certain kind of life. Every person has a different 'capability set', which determines what choices they can make to serve what function (Sen, 1999). Sen (1999) builds upon this theory further by recognising the impact of poverty (particularly through inadequate income) on capability. The author argues that income deprivation is closely linked to capability deprivation, and identifies that this occurs at varying degrees depending on age, gender, location, employment status and familial connections (Sen, 1999). This is a particularly salient point when considering that experiences of the welfare system are also significantly influenced by these same factors (WEAG, 2019).

Nussbaum (1995; 2006) similarly identifies that each human being has a different capability set, but goes further to list the ten key capabilities necessary for a dignified life. These are: life; bodily health; bodily integrity; senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliations; other species; play; and control over one's environment (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 75-76). Her theoretical approach has been particularly pervasive in the academic study of dignity and the welfare system, as it grants a conceptual explanation for how people experience the welfare system depending on their capabilities. For example, Gundersen (2010, p. 388) discusses how parents of children with disabilities experience a lack of dignity in the Norwegian welfare system based on "the failure of the state to recognise and respect them" for trying to develop their children's capabilities.

Dignity as capability can also be characterised through the Māori concept of 'tino rangatiratanga' (self-determination). While Sen and Nussbaum's capabilities approach can largely be classified as individualistic; tino rangatiratanga instead describes a collective capability to advance the Māori identity (Durie, 1998). Durie (1998) views this power to develop Māori identity as essential to the notion of self-worth and dignity for Māori. While tino rangatiratanga is a Māori concept, it fits within the idea of dignity as capability by recognising the need for people and communities to be able to determine their life trajectory through their own control (Durie, 1998).

Citizenship rights

The notion of citizenship is often characterised as a legal status within a sovereign nation-state, which leads to a collection of citizenship rights (Heater, 1990; Castles and Davidson, 2000; Isin and Turner, 2002; Bauböck, 2006). This conceptualisation of is often attributed to Marshall's (1950) typology of the evolution of rights, which identifies three distinct categories of citizenship rights that develop chronologically. These three types of rights are civil rights such as freedom of speech; political rights such as political engagement in parliament and government; and social rights, which includes financial and social security, such as offered by the welfare system (Marshall, 1950).

Citizenship is also associated with responsibilities and obligations to a nation-state . Janoski and Gran (2002, p. 19) affirm that "the relationship between rights and obligations is contractual or one of immediate reciprocity; that is, for each right there generally is an equal obligation". This means that the state's provision of rights is dependent on citizens' ability to meet their responsibilities. The intensity of this relationship varies, once again, by state and is largely informed by which model of citizenship a state subscribes to: liberal, republican or communitarian (Isin and Turner, 2002).

The liberal model of citizenship views the social contract being between the individual and the state and prioritises the protection of freedom and rights, with little emphasis on obligations outside of obeying the law (Schuck, 2002; Honohan, 2017). Republicanism, on the other hand, places a far greater weight on obligations through self-government (Honohan, 2017). In the republican model of citizenship the social contract is shared between citizens, who are tasked with actively promoting the common good as opposed to individual freedom (Honohan, 2017). The third model of citizenship, communitarianism, is unique in that it does not emphasise rights nor responsibilities and instead views citizenship as culturally constructed (Delanty, 2002; Isin and Turner, 2002). These three models of citizenship (and their frameworks of rights and responsibilities) are integral to this discussion of the welfare state, as citizenship rights will prove to be an essential component. Notably, New Zealand has historically been associated with liberal models of citizenship so has tended to focus on individual rights.

Chapter Three:
The Māori Model

When answering the question of how a welfare system can enhance dignity in the New Zealand context, it is imperative to examine a Māori model. This is not only because Māori as a group are disproportionately represented in New Zealand's welfare system but because New Zealand's bicultural political environment requires Māori to be partners in creating new institutions that affords Māori dignity and recognition (WEAG, 2019).

Although they endure the long-lasting effects of colonisation, Māori have maintained their own system of beliefs, values and laws known as tikānga Māori (Te Aho, 2007). This section will first present a tikānga Māori framework for the welfare system that was developed by the WEAG (2019) by Māori academics and experts in close consultation with the Māori community. The section will then examine two illustrative examples - the establishment of the Whānau Ora approach and the Ngāi Tūhoe Treaty Settlement - to evaluate how a Māori value-based model can work to enhance dignity. The section will conclude with a brief discussion of how a tikanga Māori framework might be applied to public policies for welfare system, to enhance dignity for all people - not just Māori.

Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata

The central focus of the WEAG (2019) report is whakamana tāngata or the Māori conceptualisation of restoring dignity in the welfare system. The report subsequently proposes a value-based model that is intrinsically rooted in - tikānga Māori (Māori principles and law) . The framework the WEAG (2019) developed to underpin New Zealand's welfare system aims to ensure all people live a dignified life. The framework is a collection of values, known as 'Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata' and forms the basis for the Group's 41 further recommendations (WEAG, 2019). Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata includes six kaupapa Māori values, which will be discussed briefly below.

The first principle is manaakitanga, which the WEAG (2019, p. 19) defines as "caring with dignity and respect". McMeeking et al. (2019), who have explored Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata in a public policy setting, interpret this to mean treating people with dignity in order for them to live a dignified life. Ōhanga, or economics, is the second principle included in

Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata and, in the context of the WEAG report (2019), it refers to the adequacy of incomes to support a decent standard of living (McMeeking et al., 2019). Whanaungatanga is another value that the WEAG (2019) advocates for, referring to kinship ties and family connections. In their analysis of Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata, McMeeking et al. (2019) argue that, in the whakamana tāngata approach, whanaungatanga represents a welfare system that acknowledges ties to family and community. The inclusion of kotahitanga, meaning unity, allows for all people to participate and contribute to their communities in a meaningful way (WEAG, 2019; McMeeking et al., 2019). Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata also includes the value of takatūtanga or preparedness (WEAG, 2019). In the context of restoring dignity, takatūtanga would mandate a welfare system that proactively addresses issues that may arise in the future, particularly by ensuring people are able to continue participating in their communities as economic conditions change (McMeeking et al., 2019). The sixth and final value included in Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata is kaitiakitanga or guardianship (WEAG, 2019). McMeeking et al. (2019) define kaitiakitanga as stewardship over a welfare system that is viable and sustainable for future generations, over a long period of time.

Although the conceptualisation of these six values as a collective is specific to the WEAG report (2019), the salience and meaning of each value permeates Māori understanding of well-being and dignity. It is important to note that Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata does not explicitly include the concepts of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) or mana motuhake (control over ones' own destiny) (Durie, 1998). It is possible the WEAG declined to include these values given they are political in their nature, supporting indigenous claims to sovereignty. Despite this omission, self-determination is a key aspect of the idea of dignity as capability (Durie, 1998), and is arguably required for meaningful participation in communities and society. The subsequent two examples will demonstrate how a Māori model based on values such as those included in Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata as well as tino rangatiratanga can enhance both collective and individual dignity.

Whānau Ora

Throughout modern history, the New Zealand Government has implemented several different policies in an attempt to improve the disparately low health, social and economic outcomes of

Māori (Boulton and Gifford, 2014). The most recent to address this wellbeing gap is known as the 'Whānau Ora Approach to Social Service Delivery' (Taskforce on Whānau-Centred Initiatives, 2010). This initiative was a joint endeavour by Te Puni Kōkiri (the Ministry of Māori Development) and the Ministries of Health and Social Development (Durie, 2012; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2018).

The approach provides a value-based framework to benefit whānau ora, meaning "the wellbeing of the extended family" (Boulton and Gifford, 2014, p. 1). The framework clearly focuses on the empowerment of the whānau or family as a collective, rather than prescribing to Western health and social philosophies that prioritise the individual (Kara et al., 2011; Durie, 2012; Boulton and Gifford, 2014; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2018). Furthermore, the Whānau Ora Approach acknowledges, in line with many other Indigenous groups, that well-being and dignity is optimised when all aspects of a person's health - "cultural, spiritual, physical, emotional, environmental and economic" - are addressed in tandem (Boulton and Gifford, 2014, p. 2). The Māori philosophy of hauora, which views physical, mental, social and spiritual health as being intrinsically connected, represents this concept of well-being and is closely linked to the formulation of Whānau Ora as a policy (Kara et al., 2011).

In its practical application, Whānau Ora is administered by three Commissioning Agencies, one each for the North and South Island's whānau, and a third for Pacific Island families (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2018). The Commissioning Agencies are tasked with allocating funds and partnering with other regional and local organisations, known as Whānau Ora Navigators, to deliver health, social, cultural and financial services to whānau and families (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2018). Special focus is paid to self-empowerment and self-determination of whānau, which is a key facet of dignity as capability, particularly for Māori and Indigenous peoples (Durie, 1998; Durie, 2012; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2018). As a result of this empowerment, the Whānau Ora Approach anticipates that whānau will be capable of living healthy lives, with strong social connection to both Te Ao Māori (the Māori World) and mainstream society, and will achieve a level of financial security necessary to lead meaningful lives (Durie, 2012; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2018).

An evaluation of the policy by Smith et al. (2019) frames Whānau Ora as 'an Indigenous policy success story'. Despite being relatively new, the approach has already demonstrated some positive policy outcomes, which Smith et al. (2019, p. 506-507) categorise as

'programmatic, process, political, and endurance'. The *programmatic* policy wins are evident in the ability of Whānau Ora to connect whānau to social service providers when they were previously disengaged from mainstream services (Smith et al., 2019). In terms of *process*, Smith et al. (2019) highlight that the policy includes a significant level of Māori representation to legitimise its approach. The authors argue that, despite some early criticism: "Whānau Ora evolved and has been embedded as a unique policy innovation, improving Māori governance over services for Māori" (Smith et al., 2019, p. 507). The policy is also evaluated as a clear *political* success, given that it was spearheaded by a motivated and invested politician - Dame Tariana Turia - and then implemented in a policy environment that was largely disinterested in Māori-focused policies (Smith et al., 2019). Finally, Smith et al. (2019) utilise Patashnik's 2008 model to evaluate the policy's *endurance* and likelihood of survival and surmise that social service providers are integrating the approach into their practice in a sustainable way. The analysis therefore points to a policy that is beginning to reach its goals through generally positive outcomes.

Though not explicitly stated, the values underpinning the implementation and goals of Whānau Ora are intrinsically rooted in the same kaupapa Māori values that make up Kia Piki Ake Te Mana Tangata. The utilisation of this framework of values similarly generates a policy environment conducive to the promotion of dignity and well-being for some of New Zealand's most vulnerable citizens. This is achieved through a focus on tino rangatiratanga, which emphasises the capability of families to improve the quality of their lives. Dignity is also enhanced through the integration of this framework by social service providers, as it means that whānau receive service that is consistent with the values that have influenced the policy.

Ngāi Tūhoe Service Management Plan

Another key example of a policy based on tikanga Māori values and beliefs is the Ngāi Tūhoe Treaty Settlement and subsequent Crown Service Management Plan. Ngāi Tūhoe (further referred to as 'Tūhoe') are a Māori iwi or tribe based in the Hawkes Bay and Bay of Plenty regions in New Zealand's North Island (Tūhoe, 2013). Like most iwi, Tūhoe engaged in negotiations with the Crown to make claims against the historic injustices brought forth by the Treaty of Waitangi (Williams, 2012). The result of these negotiations were a Treaty settlement, partially through two new legislations: the Tūhoe Claims Settlement Act 2014 and

Te Urewera Act 2014 (Stephens, 2014). More significantly, however, is the Tūhoe and Crown agreement over the Service Management Plan - a unique policy in New Zealand's history.

The Service Management Plan is a joint relationship agreement between Tūhoe and the Ministries of Business, Innovation and Employment, Education, and Social Development (Social Service Taskforce, 2012; Williams, 2012; Stephens, 2014). While it is not a legally binding document, it represents the Crown's commitment to improving the social circumstances of Ngāi Tūhoe over a significant period of time - forty years (Social Service Taskforce, 2012; Stephens, 2014). The agreement includes goals and five-year action plans across four key areas: business, innovation and employment; health; social development; and education (Social Service Taskforce, 2012; Stephens, 2014).

The defining characteristic of the Service Management Plan, and what makes it a valuable case study, is its unique definition of mana motuhake redress - its approach to restoring sovereignty and dignity for Ngāi Tūhoe (Social Service Taskforce, 2012; Stephens, 2014; New Zealand Government, 2019). Although the agreement involves three ministries, the primary goal is to support Tūhoe in managing their own affairs as autonomously as possible - a new concept in the realm of Treaty Settlement (Stephens, 2014). The Service Management Plan elaborates on this notion:

Mana Motuhake is defined within the terms of this agreement as: "*Progressively enhancing Tūhoe's autonomy in decision making matched by its growth in infrastructure, capability and leadership in social service provision. This is balanced by the Crown's governance role under Te Tiriti O Waitangi. Through the Treaty Settlement practical steps will be taken for Tūhoe to manage their affairs within their core area of interest with the maximum autonomy possible in the circumstances*" (Social Service Taskforce, 2012, p.40).

Tāmati Kruger (2017), the Tūhoe leader tasked with leading settlement negotiations with the Crown, discusses the implications of mana motuhake in the context of Oranga Tamariki and child welfare. Kruger (2017) frames mana motuhake as the repatriation of responsibility away from the Crown to allow for Tūhoe to look after their children themselves. He states that mana motuhake is "not about taking more money from the Crown, but it's merely saying

that, if you are Tūhoe, you care for each other, you care about each other, and you will do whatever you wish you can do to raise each other to be Tūhoe people" (Kruger, 20178). This significantly reshapes the child welfare policy environment and empowers iwi to independently and autonomously address the issues faced by its community with little intervention of the government.

The Tūhoe model of mana motuhake redress makes an especially significant contribution to the elevation of dignity for Tūhoe by reconciling (some) of their loss of tino rangatiratanga. As previously mentioned, tino rangatiratanga represents the notion of dignity as capability within tikanga Māori (Durie, 1998). The Service Management Plan, although formally sanctioned by the government, aims to transfer the decision-making responsibilities over Tūhoe from the Crown to Tūhoe themselves (Stephens, 2014). This is not only a political endeavour, but a moral one, which recognises Tūhoe's own aspirations and claims for tino rangatiratanga as equal to their claims for financial, cultural and environmental compensation (Stephens, 2014).

The Māori model and New Zealand's welfare system

The Whānau Ora and Ngāi Tūhoe examples illustrate how social policies can effectively incorporate kaupapa Māori values at their core. Whānau Ora has already proven to have some positive impact on Māori (Smith et al., 2019), although both policy solutions are relatively new, meaning their effects cannot yet be accurately evaluated. It is hoped that in the long-term, the emphasis on tino rangatiratanga, will address the need for agency and autonomy when building dignity and well-being.

The primary limitation of these examples is that Whānau Ora and the Service Management Plan are policies designed largely for Māori (although Whānau Ora also includes non- Māori families). While the WEAG report (2019) identifies Māori as being one of the most disproportionately impacted groups in the New Zealand welfare system, the report also emphasises that nearly all people who encounter the welfare system experience a reduction of dignity in some way. This means that while the case studies provide a good starting point, they do not fully explain how a Māori value-based model might benefit all welfare recipients, not just Māori recipients. As the WEAG (2019) recommends, amending the Social Security Act to statutorily entrench this tikanga Māori framework into the guiding principles and

performance measures of agencies such as Work and Income would help to ground the welfare system in values that specifically seek to enhance dignity. This would hopefully reshape the New Zealand's policy environment so that it incorporates these values in future welfare and social policies, to the benefit of all its citizens.

<center>**Chapter Four:**</center>
<center>**The Universal Caregiver Model**</center>

It was earlier noted that the welfare system currently associates dignity with paid work and devalues unpaid work (Fraser, 1997; Sennett, 2003). Often characterised in the literature as 'care work' (Fraser, 1997; Sennett, 2003; WEAG, 2019), unpaid caregiving is given lesser value in a society that prioritizes paid work as the most meaningful way to contribute. This section will look to explore how a 'Universal Caregiver Model' (Fraser, 1997) can help to enhance dignity by changing how the welfare system values unpaid care work. This is a valuable endeavour, as New Zealand's welfare system currently neglects and diminishes the dignity of some of its key stakeholders, who do unpaid care work as their primary occupation (WEAG, 2016).

This section will begin by presenting the most prevalent theories that differentiate between the levels of dignity associated with paid work and unpaid work. The section will go on to examine how some aspects of the Universal Caregiver Model are currently applied in Sweden and the Netherlands. Finally, this section will evaluate how the Universal Caregiver Model works (or does not work) in New Zealand's current policy context, with respect to the individuals who undertake care work and their sense of dignity and value.

Dignity and paid work

It is useful to begin by examining the relationship between dignity and paid work, as it will help to provide a contrast with the following discussion around dignity and unpaid work. Sennett (2003) contends that modern capitalist society has seen the 'dignity of labour' emerge as a near-universal value. Fraser and Gordon (1994) echo this sentiment, by identifying that 'the worker' is now the focus of society, and that all people are expected to be workers. In terms of dignity, this idea closely builds on Weber's (1905) characterisation of the (Protestant) work ethic, where people justify their worth (or dignity) through work. The dignity of labour takes on further meaning if we apply the neoliberal concept of self-reliance or self-sufficiency, which places greater value or worth on those who are able to support themselves through work without any dependence on the government (Wax, 2003).

<center>25</center>

The positioning of dignity in relation to paid work highlights a broader societal theme that elevates paid work above all other forms of activity (Sennett, 2003; O'Brien, 2013; Gray, 2017). Through engaging in paid work, individuals are viewed as more productive citizens than those in unpaid work or unemployment (O'Brien, 2013; Gray, 2017). This idea is the core component of the WWG's (2011) report on 'Reducing Long-Term Benefit Dependency', with moving people away from welfare into paid work is regarded as the primary aim of the welfare system.

Dignity and unpaid work

This assumption that dignity only comes through paid work is challenged by scholars and models that believe that unpaid work is an equal source of worth and dignity as the respect afforded to paid work. Fraser (1997) explores this idea through three specific models which are developed from the notion of 'the family wage'. The family wage historically represented the configuration of a heterosexual, nuclear family where the male breadwinner would earn enough to support his family, and his female counterpart would engage in care work within the home (Fraser, 1997). Fraser (1997) acknowledges that this familial structure is no longer viable in a post-industrial era and seeks to ameliorate the disparity between paid work and dignity (typically masculinised), and unpaid work and dignity (typically feminised).

The first model Fraser (1997, p. 51) presents is that of a 'Universal Breadwinner'. In a similar vein as the dignity of labour (Wax, 2003), the Universal Breadwinner Model advocates for women and men alike to be "citizen-workers", with paid employment viewed as the most desirable contribution to society (Fraser, 1997, p. 51). This model would see informal care work, generally undertaken by women, move away from the family to the labour market to allow for women to engage in paid work instead (Fraser, 1997).

Another relevant model in the study of dignity and unpaid work is 'The Caregiver-Parity Model' (Fraser, 1997, p. 55). Within this framework, informal labour and care work would be situated equally with paid work in order to afford individuals in each sphere the same level of dignity and respect (Fraser, 1997). The Caregiver-Parity Model specifically relates to the notion of welfare by identifying informal work as of the same monetary value as paid work, which is facilitated by the welfare state (Fraser, 1997).

In her analysis of the two approaches, Fraser (1997) highlights the inadequacy of the Universal Breadwinner and the Caregiver-Parity Models to exact meaningful change in the pursuit of gender equity. This is because the models are both based on unrealised assumptions, particularly that the public has significant sway over private corporations and that existing structures allow for sufficient taxation of both income and wealth, which is necessary in order to finance good and fit for purpose social welfare (Fraser, 1997). Most importantly, Fraser (1997) highlights that neither the Universal Breadwinner or Caregiver Parity Models are sufficient for mitigating the inequality of dignity and respect experienced by the genders under the existing schematic arrangements. Specifically, the Universal Breadwinner Model insufficiently addresses the inequality of leisure time, and the Caregiver Parity Model fails to prevent income inequality (Fraser, 1997; Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014; Chou et al., 2016).

In response to these failures, Fraser (1997) moves beyond these two polarised models and subsequently advocates for a 'Universal Caregiver Model', which would see all people combine paid employment and unpaid care work. Fraser (1997) argues that most women already experience spells of full-time employment and full-time care work, as well as a combination of the two. Under the Universal Caregiver Model, men would also experience both types of work, resulting in the deconstruction of the gendered breadwinner-caregiver disparity (Fraser, 1997). The Universal Caregiver Model proposes a society where "citizens' lives integrate wage earning, caregiving, community activism, political participation, and involvement in the associational life of civil society - while also leaving time for some fun" (Fraser, 1997, p. 62).

The Universal Caregiver Model: European case studies

When considering how the Universal Caregiver Model could be applied to the New Zealand context, it is useful to first examine how other nations have adopted this model into their welfare policies. To facilitate this analysis, I adopt Gornick and Meyers (2009) proposed policy framework for countries moving towards the Universal Caregiver Model, which consists of three key policies. These are: the rights of parents to significant paid parental leave; the availability of quality part-time jobs and the limiting of full-time working hours; and the provision of universal and free quality childcare (Gornick and Meyers, 2009; Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014). Given these policy parameters, the Universal Caregiver Model

places emphasis on the equal right - and responsibility - of both men and women to look after their children and acknowledges the need for a variety of options to be made available for parents to decide whether they use childcare services to meet this obligation, or undertake the care work themselves (Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014).

Haas and Hartel (2010) further identify that most countries' childcare policies follow one of three paths, known as the 'childcare triad'. These three different policies either promote 'public care' by the provision of publicly funded childcare, 'home care' through paid parental leave and job security for parents who take it, or the 'private external care option' which allows parents to purchase childcare privately through policy measures such as tax credits (Haas and Hartel, 2010, p. 141). These policy blueprints are useful to keep in mind during the subsequent analysis of the efforts of Sweden and the Netherlands to adopt the Universal Caregiver Model.

Sweden

The application of the Universal Caregiver Model in Sweden sees the generous provision of both financial support and time support for parents with young children (Haas and Hartel, 2010; Ciccia and Verloo, 2012). Paid parental leave of up to 80 percent of normal pay can be flexibly utilised by either parent, and parents see their jobs protected during their leave for more than 16 months, provided both parents have taken some leave (Haas and Hartel, 2010). Swedish parents are legally entitled to reduce their working hours to 75 percent of standard full-time hours until their child enters their first year of school at eight years old (Haas and Hartel, 2010; Cicca and Verloo, 2012).

Accompanying these parental leave policies is a keen focus on childcare services for all. Across Sweden, parents have a guaranteed slot at childcare providers for children aged between one and twelve years old. Childcare is largely provided publicly, although higher socio-economic groups are increasingly electing for privately provided childcare (Haas and Hartel, 2010). Despite this, public expenditure on early childhood education and childcare in Sweden represents 1.8 percent of its GDP - far higher than the OECD average of 0.7 percent of GDP (OECD, 2019). As a result, Sweden experiences a high level of maternal employment, with 75 percent of mothers with children aged between zero and fourteen years old being in paid employment (OECD, 2014).

The aspects of Universal Caregiver Model adopted by Sweden aim to engage both parents in care work, and make it possible for mothers (who typically undertake a disproportionate amount of childcare) to return to the workforce. Theoretically, this satisfies Fraser's (1997) mandate that the care-work binary be dismantled. This model is able to build dignity by recognising the value of care work and supporting the decision of parents, whether they are male or female, to look after their children themselves. The financial support and job protection provided to parents taking care of their children demonstrates a shift towards elevating care work and removing the stigma or devaluation that typically surrounds it.

Ciccia and Verloo (2012), however, critique Sweden's efforts and argue that it represents only a Limited Caregiver Model, rather than a Universal Caregiver Model. They make this claim based on the fact that Sweden, like Iceland and Finland, structures their parental leave so that it still supports the notion of full employment. Furthermore, the payment limits imposed over parental leave mean that fathers in Sweden have little to no incentives to to utilise their leave entitlements as the reduction in income has implications of its own (Ciccia and Verloo, 2012). Therefore, despite its strong political attachment to gender equality, Sweden's caregiver policies are limited in their effectiveness by still upholding the value of paid work over care work and thus diminishing to some degree the dignity of caregivers.

The Netherlands

The Netherlands is another useful case study to help understand how the Universal Caregiver Model could be practically applied. Unlike Sweden, the Netherlands does not provide income support via paid parental leave and instead focuses its policies on job protection and childcare provision. Haas and Hartel (2010) note that the emphasis of the Netherland's leave policies is to allow parents to structure their time as they wish, and to ease the transition between paid employment and unpaid care work. Both parents are entitled to three months of protected parental leave, which can be utilised full-time or part-time across a six-month period, any time before their child turns eight years old. Parents additionally have the statutory right to request part-time or full-time hours (Haas and Hartel, 2010).

The configuration of childcare also differs in the Netherlands, in that it is framed as an equal responsibility of the government, private employers and their employees, who each finance a

third of childcare costs (Haas and Hartel, 2010). The Netherlands is notably unique in that it has articulated the need to reconcile the disparity between men and women in care work through an official policy known as the 'Combination Scenario' (Haas and Hartel, 2010, p. 147). This is supported by a range of legislation and other policies that aim to help citizens combine formal and informal activities. The impact of the Netherlands' parental policies is a relatively low maternal employment rate at 51 percent, and a large proportion of working mothers being engaged in part-time employment (Haas and Hartel, 2010; OECD, 2014).

The aspects of the Universal Caregiver Model employed by the Netherlands aim to include both men and women in the combination of paid and care work advocated for by Fraser (1997). The Netherlands is able to use its parental leave policies to promote dignity through the recognition that care work is ongoing, and that both parents need to be able to engage in it. This model also enhances dignity by sharing the responsibility for childcare equally between parents, employers and the state. This acknowledges that care work has value and requires commitment from individuals and entities beyond just mothers, who are traditionally solely responsible.

Despite its stated policy of gender equity in care work, the Netherlands has not sufficiently incentivised male parents to equally engage in work reduction as just 23.5 percent of men are employed part-time - significantly less than the 76.5 percent of women employed part-time (Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014). This means that although the options are equally available to men and women, mothers typically assume the traditional role of the main caregiver while fathers continue to be breadwinners. It is also important to note that the Netherlands' welfare system has been subjected to significant reform, in that childcare has moved from being publicly-financed to a largely privatised sector, resulting in a shift away from a Universal Caregiver Model that specifies universal and publicly-funded childcare (Cicca and Bleijenbergh, 2014).

The Universal Caregiver Model and New Zealand's welfare system

The above examination of the Universal Caregiver Model in Sweden and the Netherlands demonstrates how this model applies specifically to care work and childcare. New Zealand's parental leave and childcare policies largely fail to meet Gornick and Meyers' (2009) policy blueprint in that paid parental leave is only available to the child's primary carer (typically

the mother), and childcare or early childhood education are afforded minimal subsidies (Press et al., 2018). Furthermore, childcare in New Zealand is largely privatised and for-profit, with 88% of home-based childcare in for-profit ownership (Press et al., 2018). Based on Haas and Hartel's (2010) 'childcare triad', New Zealand's childcare policies follow the path of privatisation- a notion intrinsically at odds with Fraser's (1997) Universal Caregiver Framework.

While childcare is a useful starting point, the examples from Sweden and the Netherlands notably fail to incorporate care work for individuals with disabilities or medical conditions, who require high levels of care. The WEAG report (2019) identified the lack of dignity and respect afforded to those who care for others as a key area of concern. The inadequacy of income for those who undertake care work was highlighted as a particularly significant source of distress, as people with conditions and disabilities are eligible for additional income support to cover the cost of their condition - but those who care for them are not (WEAG, 2019). As emphasised by the WEAG (2019, p.150): "high-intensity caring is associated with negative impacts on income, physical and mental health, family functioning and social networks, and these are experienced more intensely by those who are already disadvantaged". This frames the care work these individuals engage in as involving a great personal cost with little recognition of value or dignity.

Given that the Universal Caregiver Model draws on feminist theory aimed at the deconstruction of the gendered nature of paid work and care, it is important to consider how it might be extended to include the broader discussion regarding the value of care and its place in the New Zealand welfare system. The WEAG (2019, p. 46) accepts that carers, as both a wider population and within the welfare system, are "most likely to be women of working age". Despite this acknowledgement, the WEAG report (2019) does not really look to balance care work between the genders, and instead focuses more intensely on the inadequacy of incomes and strict eligibility criteria that carers face. This points to a gap in the current debate, as it does not fully consider the gendered nature of care work and its implications on society. To adopt the Universal Caregiver Model more closely, future policy analysis should seek to understand how the New Zealand welfare system can concurrently dismantle the gender-bias in care work and increase the value of care.

Chapter Five:
The Social Democratic Model

This section will examine how the key tenets of a welfare state worked to support and enhance dignity for its citizens. It will begin with a brief overview of the social democratic model, noting that historically New Zealand had adopted some aspects of this before becoming entrenched as a liberal welfare state. It will go on to illustrate how the social democratic model could be applied through a key illustrative example - the implementation of a Universal Basic Income. The section will conclude by theorising how social democratic values could again be practiced within New Zealand's current neoliberal context.

The social democratic welfare regime

In his most notable work, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Esping-Andersen (1990) theorizes that there are three primary regimes of the welfare state: liberal, corporatist or conservative, and social democratic, and that modern capitalist states form clusters around these three models. The liberal regime of the welfare state uses public funds to provide recipients, who are usually low-income earners, with a modest level of income support that is means-tested (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Gray, 1994; Huber, 2001; Bambra, 2007). In the conservative or corporatist welfare regime, the provision of welfare is closely linked with employment and is usually administered by employers as a form of social insurance (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Gray, 1994; Huber, 2001; Bambra, 2007). The structure and features of the social democratic regime of the welfare state, popularised by the Scandinavian countries, will be discussed in detail below.

The defining feature of the social democratic regime of the welfare state is that it is universalistic (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Huber, 2001). The motivation behind this model is to promote equality, so that "all citizens are endowed with similar rights, irrespective of class or market position. In this sense, the system is meant to cultivate cross-class solidarity, a solidarity of the nation" (Esping-Andersen, 1990, p. 46). In addition to being universal, the social democratic welfare regime is far-reaching and inclusive, as it offers comprehensive benefits and services to protect all citizens from social and economic risks. Some key characteristics include the provision of financial security through flat-rate basic income and a wide range of publicly-funded services, as well as the redistribution of wealth as a means to

reduce economic inequality. There is also a significant focus on gender equity through policies that support maternal employment and seek to share care work between both parents, as demonstrated through Sweden's application of the Universal Caregiver Model in Chapter 4. The social democratic model also places an emphasis on mobilising and motivating the work-force through active labour market policies (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Gray, 1994; Huber, 2001, Bambra, 2007; Fossati, 2011).

Gray (1994) maintains that New Zealand fits into a liberal model of the welfare state, which is aimed at the lowest income earners, with an emphasis on conditionality. Castles and Mitchell (1992) famously contended that there is a fourth world of welfare capitalism that was a more appropriate fit for New Zealand's welfare system than the liberal model. The fourth welfare state regime is known as the 'wage-earner welfare state' (Castles and Mitchell, 1992). This wage-earner welfare regime was specific to Australia and New Zealand because they adopted many of the features of the liberal model such as income-testing and relatively few publicly provided services other than education and healthcare, but this was somewhat modified by a strong focus on wage regulation that supported the male breadwinner family model (Castles, 1985; Castles, 1994; Watts, 1997; Huber, 2001; Wilson et al., 2013). However, neoliberal reforms since the 1980s has entrenched New Zealand as a liberal welfare state (O'Brien 2012; O'Brien, 2013; WEAG, 2019).

Officially established by the Social Security Act 1938, the New Zealand welfare system operated under the vision that security was of utmost importance and that state provision of social security would enable all citizens to meaningfully participate in society. It is important to note that, within this model, benefit recipients were considered to have equal citizenship rights as those who engaged in paid work (Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988; O'Brien, 2008; O'Brien, 2013). In recognition of some of the principles of social democracy, the first Labour government of the time took some steps towards universalism such as through the provision of the Family Benefit (O'Brien, 2008; Humpage, 2014). However, as the Social Security Act did not include measures to ensure that benefits were adequately increased or adjusted as the cost of living changed, and also because the National Party was in power through much of the 1950s and 1960s, the move toward universalism was abandoned in favour of a flat-rate, means-tested benefit system (O'Brien, 2008; Humpage, 2014).

Two Royal Commissions into the welfare state in 1972 and 1988 moved closer towards social democratic principles by emphasising New Zealand society's "collective responsibility to ensure that the level of benefit being paid provided a basis for citizenship in which those individuals receiving a state benefit did not feel outside the society but, critically, along with their children, were able to take part in the normal range of activities in the society" (O'Brien, 2008, p. 225). An example of a policy that embodies this philosophy is the Labour-led government's 1986 Guaranteed Minimum Family Income package which granted tax credits to families and has since been expanded further through a variety of tax credits - including the most recent Working for Families package (O'Brien, 2012; O'Brien, 2013). This demonstrates an effort to include all families with children in society, by providing them with the support necessary to participate meaningfully. As demonstrated by the WEAG report (2019), however, the New Zealand welfare system does not provide all its citizens with the level of income required to feel included in society.

Universal Basic Income

The concept of Universal Basic Income (UBI) stems from the social democratic principle that all citizens should have adequate income to engage in their community and society (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Most scholars define UBI as an unconditional cash payment provided to every member of a discrete society, irrespective of their means or employment status (Klein, 2016; Rankin, 2016; Bidadanure, 2019; Ghatak and Maniquet, 2019). Hoynes and Rothstein (2019, p. 930) develop this definition further by outlining three specific features to test whether a policy is a UBI: that is provides a level of income that is adequate to live on, even if a person has no other source of income; that it is not off-set or phased out when other income rises; and that rather than being targeted at low-income earners such as sole parents, it is available to the majority of a population. Furthermore, UBI differs from other kinds of benefits in five significant ways - it is paid in cash, is individual (rather than household-based), there are no conditions attached to it, it is universally applied, and it is regular and ongoing (Bidadanure, 2019, p. 483-485).

UBI is often justified as a solution for a number of policy problems, including labour market failures (Klein, 2016; Ghatak and Maniquet, 2019; Hoynes and Rothstein, 2019). These labour market failures include job losses due to developments in automation and robotics, wage stagnation, and a decline in employment growth and job opportunities - particularly for

less-skilled workers (Klein, 2016; Ghatak and Maniquet, 2019; Hoynes and Rothstein, 2019). UBI is also valued as a policy that can reduce inequality and promote freedom, as a guaranteed income could help alleviate the "costly and demeaning aspects of low-income life in developed countries, allowing freer decisions (e.g. about careers) that feel like choices rather than necessities" (Hoynes and Rothstein, 2019, p. 934). A UBI would enhance dignity by reducing income inequality and providing all citizens, especially those without income from employment, more opportunities to participate in their community as their basic needs would be taken care of.

Although it is not necessarily a new idea, UBI has recently gained momentum and attention as a policy solution for growing rates of inequality across several countries (Klein, 2016; Bidadanure, 2019; Ghatak and Maniquet, 2019; Hoynes and Rothstein, 2019). Some European countries such as Finland, Italy and France have seriously considered implementing a UBI, with Finland going as far as testing a sample of 2000 unemployed citizens in 2017, who were each paid €560 monthly (Magnani and Piccoli, 2019). UBI is the cornerstone policy for U.S. Presidential candidate Andrew Yang's 2019 campaign, who characterises it as 'the Freedom Dividend' that would counter the job losses predicted as a result of technological advancements (Friends of Andrew Yang, 2019).

While many countries and political proponents have advocated for the concept of a UBI, challenges around its practical application hinder its actual implementation (Wehner, 2019). The two main objections to UBI, according to Wehner (2019), are the likely increase in taxes and the implications on the labour market. Opponents of UBI argue that increasing taxes would disincentivise individuals from engaging in paid work, and thus slow down the redistribution of wealth within the economy (Wehner, 2019). The other primary objection to UBI is that it would allow people to survive without having to engage in paid work, which would impact the labour supply (Wehner, 2019). Critics of UBI argue that these effects would lower basic income overall and reduce the average quality of life - meaning UBI would have the opposite of its intended outcome (Wehner, 2019).

The Social Democratic Model and New Zealand's welfare system

Rankin (2016a, p. 56) evaluates the likelihood of the implementation of a UBI in New Zealand, and finds that it is in a good position to act as a "laboratory" for this radical welfare policy. This claim is based on New Zealand's history of unconditional income policies which include universal superannuation, the universal family benefit, and the personal tax rebate - which would now be characterised as a tax credit (Rankin, 2016a). Furthermore, Rankin (2016a) argues that the policy would be feasible given New Zealand has a relatively simple tax code that can easily demonstrate how the application of a UBI is connected to productivity growth.

Despite this argument in favour of a UBI in New Zealand, Rankin (2016b) also looks at some of the political barriers to its implementation. One such barrier is the characterisation of UBI in the media. Rankin (2016b, p. 34) points to the headline of a *New York Times* article, entitled "proposal to pay people for being alive", which frames UBI as a new method to facilitate laziness. The use of the word 'utopian' in connection to UBI is equally problematic as it conceptualises the policy as "very radical, ideological and unrealistic" (Rankin, 2016b, p. 35). Mays, Marston and Tomlinson (2016) writing in *Basic Income in New Zealand and Australia: Perspectives from the Neoliberal Frontier* also point out the significant opposition against including migrants in the provision of a UBI, on the basis that recently emigrated residents have not contributed enough to the local economy to have 'earned' a UBI. These counter arguments present significant roadblocks to the implementation of UBI in New Zealand.

If we look beyond UBI, the most obvious ways to implement a social democratic welfare regime in New Zealand would be to reduce the conditionality within the welfare system and promote universality (O'Brien, 2012; O'Brien, 2013; WEAG, 2019). The WEAG (2019) strongly recommends removing some of the obligations and sanctions imposed on welfare recipients, such as drug-testing benefit recipients before placing them into work and sanctions for parents (usually mothers) who do not name the other parent on a child's birth certificate. The welfare system can promote universality through measures such as a UBI, but also through measures such as the provision of healthy and secure housing for all citizens and a universal tax credit for all children under three years of age (WEAG, 2019). By ensuring *all* its citizens are provided with the adequate support to live a dignified life, New Zealand's

welfare system would move towards the social democratic welfare regime that promotes security above all else - thus promoting dignity by removing uncertainty.

Conclusion

New Zealand's welfare system is currently in a state of disrepair, meaning it cannot serve its purpose - or its people - effectively. The WEAG report (2019) identified several factors that ultimately contribute to a significant loss of dignity amongst citizens who experience the welfare system. This dissertation has highlighted that welfare dependency is closely linked with a loss of dignity. This is due to the salience of the idea that paid employment is the only respectable way to contribute to society, and that to be dependent on the state is shameful (Sennett, 2003; Gray, 2017). The shame of dependency is intrinsically linked with the diminishing of dignity, as those who are dependent are often demeaned and stigmatised (Fraser and Gordon, 1994; Halvorsen, 1998; Sennett, 2003; Gray, 2017).

More specifically, New Zealand's welfare system strips dependent citizens of dignity through three of its current features. In general, the welfare system fails to provide New Zealanders with an adequate level of income necessary for meeting basic needs, let alone for meaningful participation in society (WEAG, 2019). The processes and structure of New Zealand's welfare system are also unnecessarily complex, making accessing support difficult for benefit recipients and providing support difficult for case managers (WEAG, 2019). Furthermore, the increasing emphasis on conditionality through obligations and sanctions has created an environment that is punitive and unjust (WEAG, 2019). By outlining the features of the welfare system which greatly impact individuals' sense of dignity and well-being, it is possible to redefine the policy problem and establish a context for subsequent discussion.

This dissertation set out to establish how a welfare system can promote dignity, and then looked to consider how these policy frameworks could be applied to the New Zealand welfare system. The exploration of three key models helped to facilitate the discussion, and ultimately answered the research question: 'how can a welfare system enhance dignity?'

The first proposed framework is the tikanga Māori model, which entrenches kaupapa Māori values within the welfare system to promote dignity and well-being. The model draws upon the WEAG's (2019) own value-based framework, coined 'Kia Piki Ake Te Mana', which includes six key tikanga Māori values that work in tandem to shape a welfare system that is just, sustainable and, above all, dignity enhancing. Although it is not an explicit feature of Kia Piki Ake Te Mana, the Māori model outlined in this dissertation also includes the concept

of tino rangatiratanga - self-determination - as it is an important facet of of dignity as capability (Durie, 1998).

The analysis of two significant policies - Whānau Ora and the Ngāi Tūhoe Service Management Plan - helped to illustrate how a tikanga Māori policy framework can effectively enhance dignity. Although these policies are fairly recent, they are already exhibiting some positive outcomes. In the case of Whānau Ora, this is demonstrated through its ability to engage typically neglected families in social services and its gradual adoption by social service providers into their regular practice (Smith et al., 2019). The Ngāi Tūhoe Service Management Plan demonstrates how the adoption of tino rangatiratanga and mana motuhake can elevate dignity and well-being by granting Tūhoe the autonomy to make decisions for themselves (Stephens, 2014). Though these policies are largely aimed at Māori, they provide a sound example of how a tikanga Māori model can enhance dignity in the welfare system and serve to legitimise the WEAG's recommendation that kaupapa Māori principles should form the basis of New Zealand's welfare system.

The Universal Caregiver Model provides another possible way the welfare system can enhance dignity. The stark contrast between the levels of dignity associated with paid work, and unpaid work propelled Fraser (1997) to theorise how unpaid work, particularly care work, could be valued to enhance dignity. The result was three different models that seek to move beyond the idea of 'the family wage' (Fraser, 1997). The most compelling model is the Universal Caregiver Model, which advocates for all citizens (regardless of gender) engaging in both paid work and unpaid care work (Fraser, 1997). This model would represent an ideological shift away from the hyper-valuation of paid work, towards a more equal valuation of care work.

By analysing the policies of two European countries, Sweden and the Netherlands, it is possible to envision what the Universal Caregiver Model looks like in practice. Sweden's application of the model combines financial support and time support for parents who wish to care for their children themselves (Haas and Hartel, 2010; Ciccia and Verloo, 2012). This is complemented by comprehensive and inclusive childcare policies, which ensure that quality childcare is publicly available for all (Haas and Hartel, 2010). The Netherlands focuses its application of the Universal Caregiver Model on its parental leave policies, which allows parents to alternate between paid work and care work without fear of job loss (Haas and

Hartel, 2010). Furthermore, the Netherlands views childcare as being the responsibility of the government and employers, in addition to parents - a clear discursive shift from the traditional framing of childcare. While Sweden and the Netherlands do not apply the Universal Caregiver Model perfectly, they are good examples of how such a model is a viable policy option for elevating the status of care work.

The third possible policy alternative is the social democratic model of the welfare state, which is universal in its provision of welfare (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Huber, 2001). Although New Zealand's welfare state currently follows a liberal (or even wage earner) welfare regime, it was once rooted in social democratic principles (O'Brien, 2008). Through the examination of Universal Basic Income, which has gained consistent traction as a policy solution to inequality, it is possible to see how a guaranteed income for all New Zealand citizens would allow for greater participation in society - and greater levels of dignity.

Therefore, the welfare system can enhance dignity : through the formal adoption of a tikanga Māori value-based framework; through the elevation of care work through the Universal Caregiver Model; or through the implementation of policies rooted in social democratic principles, such as Universal Basic Income. These three models are all capable of enhancing dignity, albeit in different ways. Most significantly, they have all proven to be viable policy options within the New Zealand welfare policy context.

There are a few important limitations to consider when evaluating this dissertation. Firstly, the dissertation is somewhat limited in its scope, meaning that the three models discussed are likely not the *only* ways a welfare state can enhance dignity. Further research into other possible models would allow for the generation of a wider range of policy solutions that could address the research question. Additionally, this dissertation is limited in that time and space did not permit a robust analysis of each policy framework within the New Zealand context. While the three models proposed were able to answer the research question in considerable depth, it would be useful to explore each one further with a greater focus on New Zealand to formulate more specific policy solutions. Finally, the dissertation dedicated a significant portion of its attention to one source in particular - the WEAG report (2019). While the report has been well received by key stakeholders, and organisations such as the Child Poverty Action Group (2019b) have articulated their consensus, it is a potential limitation in that it offers a subjective perspective of the problem. Given that the WEAG is a

government-commissioned entity and is made up of academic and industry experts, and that intense consultation was conducted, the report is a reputable and integral source.

Despite these limitations, this dissertation contributes to the wider scholarship on public policy by engaging in comprehensive policy analysis. Through the incorporation of Mintrom's (2012) six steps of policy analysis, this dissertation has been able to clearly define the policy problem and propose sound policy solutions. Furthermore, this dissertation has also looked to draw comparative lessons from other policy contexts, both inter-temporally and spatially, which is a key aspect of policy analysis (Rose, 1991; Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000). Most significantly, this dissertation contributes to the growing sociological scholarship around the relationship between the welfare system and dignity. It is likely that this will continue to be a growing area of interest for New Zealand social policy academics, especially in light of the WEAG's critique of the welfare system. This dissertation fits within the scope of both public policy and sociology, to facilitate a discussion that addresses the lack of dignity in New Zealand's welfare system in a real and practical way.

Finally, this dissertation has been motivated by a desire to contribute, even in a small way, to the promotion of dignity for all New Zealanders, but especially those who come into contact with the welfare system. The way the welfare system is currently experienced by many New Zealanders does not only diminish their dignity, but is also stressful and disheartening. It is my sincere hope that by drawing attention to this experience, our people within the welfare system can receive the dignity and respect of which they are deserving. As Nelson Mandela (2005, n.d.) stated: "Overcoming poverty is not a gesture of charity. It is an act of justice. It is the protection of a fundamental human right, the right to dignity and a decent life.``

Bibliography

Accident Compensation Corporation. (2019). What we cover. Retrieved from
https://www.acc.co.nz/im-injured/injuries-we-cover/what-we-cover/

Bambra, C. (2007). Going beyond the three worlds of welfare capitalism: Regime theory and public health research. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 61* (12), 1098-1102. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/stable/40665773

Bauböck, R (Ed.). (2006). *Migration and Citizenship: Legal Status, Rights and Political Participation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Bidadanure, J.U. (2019). The political theory of universal basic income. *Annual Review of Political Science, 22*, 481-501. Retrieved from https://www-annualreviews-org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz

Boulton, A.F. & Gifford, H.H. (2014). Whānau Ora; He whakairo ā whānau: Māori family views of family wellbeing. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 5*(12). Retrieved from: http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/iipj/vol5/iss1/1

Bracewell-Worrall, A. (2018, April 24). Welfare overhaul: Jacinda Ardern indicates big changes are coming. *Newshub*. Retrieved from https://www.newshub.co.nz/home.html

Castles, F.G. (1985). *The working class and welfare: Reflections on the political development of the welfare state in Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin/ Port Nicholson Press.

Castles, F.G. (1994). The wage earners' welfare state revisited: Refurbishing the established model of Australian social protection 1983-93. *Australian Journal of Social Issues, 29* (2), 120-145. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/?accountid=8424

Castles, F.G. & Mitchell, D. (1992). Identifying welfare state regimes: The links between politics, instruments and outcomes. *Governance, 5*(1), 1-26. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0491.1992.tb00026.x

Castles, S. and Davidson, A. (2000). Citizenship and Migration; Globalisation and the Politics of Belonging. New York: Routledge.

Child Poverty Action Group. (2016). *A band aid budget: CPAG's analysis of the 2016 government budget*. Auckland, New Zealand: Retrieved from https://www.cpag.org.nz/

Child Poverty Action Group. (2019a). *Budget summary: Improving child wellbeing? Some relief, but no transformation*. Auckland, New Zealand: Retrieved from https://www.cpag.org.nz/

Child Poverty Action Group. (2019b). *The experts can all agree: Whakamana tāngata response from Child Poverty Action Group*. Auckland, New Zealand: https://www.cpag.org.nz/

Chou, Y., Kröger, T. & Pu, C. (2016) Universal Breadwinner Versus Universal Caregiver Model: Fathers' involvement in caregiving and well-being of mother of offspring with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 29*, 34-45. doi: 10.1111/jar.12156

Ciccia, R. & Bleijenbergh, I. (2014). After the Male Breadwinner Model? Childcare services and the division of labour in European countries. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society, 21*(1), 50-79. doi:10.1093/sp/jxu002

Ciccia, R. & Verloo, M. (2012). Parental leave regulations and the persistence of the male breadwinner model: Using fuzzy-set ideal type analysis to assess gender equality in an enlarged Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy, 22*(5), 507-528. doi: 10.1177/0958928712456576

Delanty, G. (2002). Communitarianism and citizenship. In E.F Isin & B.S Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 159 - 174). Retrieved from http://sk.sagepub.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/reference/hdbk_citizen/n2.xml

Dolowitz, D.P. & Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance, 13* (1), 5-23. doi: 10.1111/0952-1895.00121

Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kāwanatanga: the politics of Māori self-determination* (1st ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2003). *Launching Māori futures* (1st ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

Durie, M. (2012). About whānau ora. Retrieved from http://whanauoraresearch.co.nz/about-whanau-ora/

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism* (1st ed.). Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Fletcher, M. & Dwyer, M. (2008). *A fair go for all children: Actions to address child poverty in New Zealand: A report for the Children's Commissioner and Barnardos*. Wellington, New Zealand: Retrieved from https://natlib-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/primo-explore/search?vid=NLNZ

Fletcher, M., Hanna, K. and Anderson, D. (2013, November). *The Introduction of Compulsory Income Management into New Zealand's Social Security System: The Case of the Youth Service Package*. Paper presented at the Labour, Employment and Work in the New Zealand Conference, Victoria University of Wellington. Retrieved from https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/LEW/article/view/1991

Fossati, F. (2011). The effect of integration and social democratic welfare states on immigrants' educational attainment: a multilevel estimate. *Journal of European Social Policy, 21*(5), 391-412. doi: 10.1177/0958928711418852

Fraser, N. & Gordon, L. (1994). A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state. *Signs, 19* (2), 309-336. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174801

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections of the "postsocialist" condition*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Friends of Andrew Yang. (2019). What is the freedom dividend? Retrieved from https://www.yang2020.com/what-is-freedom-dividend-faq/

Ghatak, M. & Maniquet, F. (2019). Universal basic income: Some theoretical aspects. *Annual Review of Economics, 11*, 895-928. Retrieved from https://www-annualreviews-org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz

Gladstone, J, Dumbrill, G, Leslie, B, Koster, A, Young, M, & Ismaila, A. (2012). Looking at engagement and outcome from the perspectives of child protection workers and parents. *Child and Youth Services Review, 34*(1), 112-118. doi: 1016/j.childyouth.2011.09.003

Gornick, J.C. & Meyers, M.K. (2009). *Gender equality: Transforming family divisions of labor*. New York, NY: Verso Press.

Gray, C. (2017). The affective economy of welfare in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *New Zealand Sociology, 32*(2), 139-155. Retrieved from https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/fullText;dn=276301088823310;res=IELNZC

Gray, D. (1994) Crisis? What crisis? The future of the welfare state. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand,* (2),

Gustafson, K.S. (2011). *Cheating welfare: Public assistance and the criminalisation of poverty*. New York, NY: New York University.

Haas, B. & Hartel, M. (2010). Towards the Universal Care Course Model. Care policies and employment patterns in Austria, The Netherlands and Sweden. *European Societies, 12*(2), 139-162. doi: 10.1080/14616690902874705

Halvorsen, K. (1998). Symbolic purposes and factual consequences of the concepts "self-reliance" and "dependency" in contemporary discourses on welfare. *Scandanavian Journal of Social Welfare, 7* (1), 56-65. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2397.1998.tb00275.x

Hasluck, C, & Green, A. (2007). *What Works for Whom: A review of evidence and meta-analysis for the Department for Work and Pensions*. Research Report 407. Leeds, United Kingdom: Department for Work and Pensions. Retrieved from https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130125102126/http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd5/rports2007-2008/rrep407.pdf

Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education*. London: Longman.

Herrmann, K. (2016). *An exploration of Ngāi Tūhoe aspirations for self-determination in relation to statutory child welfare: Current situations and change options*. (Master's Thesis). Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/fc87/ff39bfa0ab7125fbe2c325ba8da1988d7502.pdf

Hodgkiss, P. (2018) *Social though and rival claims to the moral ideal of dignity*. doi: 10.2307/j.ctt22h6qh5

Honohan, P. (2017) Liberal and republican conceptions of citizenship. In Shachar, A., Baubock, R., Bloemraad, I. & Vink, M. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Citizenship* (pp. 83 – 106). doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198805854.013.4

Hoynes, H. & Rothstein, J. (2019). Universal basic income in the United States and advanced countries. *Annual Review of Economics, 11*, 929-958. Retrieved from https://www-annualreviews-org.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz

Huber, E. (2001). The Social Democratic Welfare State. In A. Glyn (Ed.) Social democracy in neoliberal times: The left and economic policy since 1980 (pp. 276-311). doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199241378.001.0001

Humpage, L. (2014). *Policy change, public attitudes and social citizenship: Does neoliberalism matter?* Bristol, United Kingdom: Bristol University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt1t89dpv.7

Humpage, L. (2016). Income management in New Zealand and Australia: Differently framed but similarly problematic for Indigenous peoples. *Critical Social Policy, 36* (4), 551-571. doi: 10.1177/0261018316638459

Humpage, L. (2018). *Youth Service and money management in New Zealand: Preliminary research findings*. Retrieved from Conditional Welfare: A Comparative Study of Compulsory Income Management Policies, https://www.cpag.org.nz/ assets/181211%20LHumpage%20NZ%20PRELIMINARY%20YOUTH%20SERVICE%20R EPORT%20-%20FINAL%2011% 20DEC%202018.pdf

Isin, E.F and Turner, B.S. (2002). Citizenship Studies: An Introduction. In Isin, E.F and Turner, B.S (Ed.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 1-11). Retrieved from http://sk.sagepub.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/reference/hdbk_citizen/n2.xml

Janoksi, T and Gran, B. (2002). Political Citizenship: Foundations of Rights. In Isin, E.F and Turner, B.S (Ed.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 14-52). Retrieved from http://sk.sagepub.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/reference/hdbk_citizen/n2.xml

Kara, E., Gibbons, V., Kidd, J., Blundell, R., Turner, K. & Johnstone, W. (2011). Developing a kaupapa Māori framework for whanau ora. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 7*(2), 100-110. doi: 10.1177/117718011100700203

Klein, E. (2016). Universal basic income. *Arena Magazine,* (142), 6-8. Retrieved from https://arena.org.au/

Kruger, T. (2017). We are not who we should be as Tūhoe people. *E-Tangata*. Retrieved from https://e-tangata.co.nz/

Magnani, R. & Piccoli, L. (2019). Universal basic income with flat tax reform in France. *Journal of Policy Modelling,* Advance Online Publication. doi: 10.1016/j.jpolmod.2019.07.005

Mandela, N. (2005). *Make poverty history*. Retrieved from http://www.mandela.gov.za/mandela_speeches/2005/050203_poverty.htm

Mandlik, M, Glynn, M, & Hyde, K. (2014). Client contribution to professional service delivery: Implications for relationship quality. *New Zealand Journal of Applied Business Research, 12*(1): 19–34. Retrieved from https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/fullText;dn=683821228810547;res=IELNZC

Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class*. London, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Mays, J., Marston, G. & Tomlinson, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Basic income in Australia and New Zealand: perspectives from the neoliberal frontier*. doi: 10.1057/9781137535320

McMeeking, S., Kururangi, K., Kahi., H. & Maurice, E. (2019). Kia piki ake te mana tāngata: Review of the welfare expert advisory group tikanga framework. Retrieved from http://www.weag.govt.nz

Mead, L.M. (1989). The logic of welfare: The underclass and work policy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 501*(1), 156-169. doi: 10.1177/0002716289501001011

Ministry of Social Development. (n.d.). Are you in a relationship? https://www.workandincome.govt.nz/on-a-benefit/tell-us/are-you-in-a-relationship.html

Mintrom, M. (2012). *Contemporary Policy Analysis*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Murray, C. (1994, May 29). The new Victorians… and the new rabble. *Sunday Times*. Retrieved from https://gdc-gale-com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/gdc/artemis?p=STHA&u=learn

New Zealand Council of Christian Services. (2011). *A brief analysis of the Welfare Working Group recommendations, February 2011*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

New Zealand Government. (2012). Social Service Management Plan with Ngāi Tuhoe agreed. Retrieved from https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/social-service-management-plan-ng%C4%81i-tuhoe-agreed

New Zealand Government. (2016). Ngāi Tūhoe Deed of Settlement Summary 4 Jun 2013. Retrieved from ttps://www.govt.nz/treaty-settlement-documents/ngai-tuhoe/ngai-tuhoe-deed-of-settlement-summary-4-jun-2013/

New Zealand Labour Party & Green Party of Aotearoa New Zealand. (2017). *Confidence and supply agreement*. Wellington, New Zealand: Retrieved from https://www.greens.org.nz/

Nussbaum, M. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

O'Brien, M. (2008). *Poverty, policy and the state: The changing face of social security*. doi: 10.2307/j.ctt9qgs41

O'Brien, M. (2012). Lone parents working for welfare in New Zealand. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Uni, 27* (5-6), 577-592. doi: 10.1177/0269094212447161

O'Brien, M. (2013). Welfare reform in Aotearoa/New Zealand: From citizen to managed worker. *Social Policy & Administration, 47* (6), 729-748. doi: 10.1111/spol.12040

OECD. (2016). *Maternal employment rates*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/els/family/LMF_1_2_Maternal_Employment.pdf

OECD. (2019). *Public spending on childcare and early education*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/els/soc/PF3_1_Public_spending_on_childcare_and_early_education.pdf

Patashnik, E. (2008). *Reforms at Risk*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Press, F., Woodrow, C., Logan, H. & Mitchell, L. (2018). Can we belong in a neo-liberal world? Neo-liberalism in early childhood education and care policy in Australia and New Zealand. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 19*(4), 328-339. doi: 10.1177/1463949118781909

Rankin, K. (2016a). Prospects for a universal basic income in New Zealand. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare 43* (3), 51-72. Retrieved from https://home.heinonline.org/

Rankin, K. (2016b). Basic income as public equity: The New Zealand case. In J. Mays, G.Marston & J. Tomlinson (Eds.) *Basic income in Australia and New Zealand: Perspectives from the neoliberal frontier* (pp. 29-51). doi: 10.1057/9781137535320

Rawls, J. (1972). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Roper, B. (2005). *Prosperity for all? Economic, social and political change in New Zealand since 1935*. Melbourne, Australia: Thomson Dunmore Press.

Rose, R. (1991). What is lesson-drawing? *Journal of Public Policy, 11* (1), 3-30. doi: 10.1017/S0143814X00004918

Rosen, M. (2012). *Dignity: its history and meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). *Working Papers on Income Maintenance and Taxation*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Rubery, J. (2015). Regulating for Gender Equality: A policy framework to support the Universal Caregiver Vision. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society, 22*(4), 513-528. doi:10.1093/sp/jxv036

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom* (1st ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect: The formation of character in an age of inequality* (1st ed.). London, England: Penguin Books.

Stephens, M. (2014). A transforming daw? The Service Management Plan. *Māori Law Review, October 2014*, 21-18. Retrieved from https://maorilawreview.co.nz/

Smith, V., Moore, C., Cumming, J. & Boulton, A. (2019). Whānau ora: An Indigenous policy success story. In J. Luetjens, M. Mintrom, & Paul 't Hart (Eds.), *Successful public policy: lessons from Australia and New Zealand* (505-529). doi: 10.22459/SPP.2019

Social Service Taskforce. (2012). N*gāi Tūhoe Service Management Plan*. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/teurutaumatua/docs/tuhoe_-_smp_publication?e=18309847/31075420

Stuart, M. (2019). Potential liabilities: Social investment policy as biopolitics in New Zealand- An examination of the National Coalition government's welfare policies. *Policy Futures in Education, 17*(3), 421-437. doi: 10.1177/1478210318810086

Taskforce on Whānau-Centred Initiatives. (2010). *Whānau ora: Report of the taskforce on whānau-centred initiatives*. Retrieved from www.tpk.govt.nz/_documents/whanauora-taskforce-report.pdf

Te Aho, L. (2007). Tikanga Māori me te mana i Waitangi: Māori laws and values, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and human rights. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato School of Law.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2018) About whānau ora. Retrieved from https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/whakamahia/whanau-ora/about-whanau-ora

Thompson, S. (2015, September). *Welfare reform: The reality*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Child Poverty Action Group Summit, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from https://www.cpag.org.nz/assets/Summit/151029SummitProceedings.pdf

Tūhoe. (2013). Our history. Retrieved from https://www.ngaituhoe.iwi.nz/our-history

United Nations. (1948). Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/udhrbook/pdf/udhr_booklet_en_web.pdf

Valentini, L. (2017). Dignity and human rights: A reconceptualization. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 37*(4), 862-885. doi: 10.1093/ojls/gqx011

Watts, R. (1997). Ten years on: Francis G. Castles and the Australian 'wage-earners' welfare state'. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 33* (1), 1-15. doi: 10.1177/144078339703300101

Wax, A. (2003). Social welfare, human dignity, and the puzzle of what we owe each other. *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, 27*(1), 121-136. Retrieved from https://home.heinonline.org/

Wehner, B. (2019). Universal basic income and the reshaping of democracy: *Towards a citizens' stipend in a new political order* (1st ed.). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-05828-9

Welfare Expert Advisory Group. (2019). *Whakamana tāngata: Restoring dignity to social security in New Zealand*. Wellington New Zealand: Retrieved from http://www.weag.govt.nz/

Welfare Working Group. (2011). *Reducing long-term benefit dependency: recommendations*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.

Williams, T. (2012). Crown offer to settle the historical claims of Ngāi Tūhoe. *Māori Law Review, October 2012*, 19-21. Retrieved from https://maorilawreview.co.nz/

Wilson, S., Spies-Butcher, B., Stebbing, A. & St John, S. (2013). Wage-earners' welfare after economic reform: refurbishing, retrenching or hollowing out social protection in Australia and New Zealand? *Social Policy & Administration, 47* (6), 623-646. doi: 10.1111/spol.12035

Youth Service. (n.d.). Financial assistance. Retrieved from http://www.youthservice.govt.nz/ways-we-can-help/financial-assistance/index.html