

Chapter 1 : Housing policy and social inequality in Japan : Comparing social policies - oi

Social policy in the two societies, which has developed differently due to the differences in their national resources, socio-economic systems, cultural values and political agendas, is at an interesting turning point. This paper examines social policies: examines topical issues with up-to-date information; compares and contrasts selected policy areas.

The welfare state The idea of the "welfare state" means different things in different countries. The "welfare state" often refers to an ideal model of provision, where the state accepts responsibility for the provision of comprehensive and universal welfare for its citizens. Some commentators use it to mean nothing more than "welfare provided by the state". This is the main use in the USA. In many "welfare states", notably those in Western Europe and Scandinavia, social protection is not delivered only by the state, but by a combination of government, independent, voluntary, and autonomous public services. The "welfare state" in these countries is then a system of social protection rather than a scheme operated by government. This section of the website is mainly concerned with the provision of welfare in different countries. If you would like to read more on the idea of the "welfare state", including arguments for and against welfare provision, you should begin with the section on social policy. Comparing welfare states Deborah Mitchell [1] identifies five main approaches to the comparison of welfare systems: Comparison of policy, comparing the explicit terms in which actions are taken. Flora and Heidenheimer review the historical development of welfare in Europe and America. They find that welfare in different countries often develops on similar lines. Inputs are the resources which go into welfare provision. Different states operate different kinds of rules and structures. Esping-Andersen uses evidence on the organisation and delivery of specific services to define positions adopted by different welfare states. This is done by considering the detailed operation of benefits and services - what they do, how they are paid for, and how they work. The Commonwealth Fund compares health care systems on the basis of access, equity, administrative efficiency, the care process and health outcomes. The case can be made that what matters about welfare is not what is intended, nor what the process is, but whether or not people benefit from it. This is the basis of the work done by the Luxembourg Income Study in assessing and comparing social security systems in different countries. These were a guarantee of minimum standards, including a minimum income; social protection in the event of insecurity; and the provision of services at the best level possible. In practice, social welfare in the United Kingdom is very different from this ideal. Coverage is extensive, but benefits and services are delivered at a low level. The social protection provided is patchy, and services are tightly rationed. The first, central principle was that economic development was the best way to achieve social welfare. The structure of social services had to reflect this priority. Social benefits are earnings-related, and those without work records may find they are not covered for important contingencies. Less clear, but probably even more important, is the general concern to ensure that public expenditure on welfare is directly compatible with the need for economic development and growth. Second, the German economy, and the welfare system, developed through a corporatist structure. This principle was developed by Bismarck on the basis of existing mutual aid associations, and remained the basis for social protection subsequently. Social insurance, which covers the costs of health, some social care and much of the income maintenance system, is managed by a system of independent funds. Third, there is a strong emphasis on the principle of "subsidiarity". This principle is taken in Germany to mean both that services should be decentralised or independently managed, and that the level of state intervention should be residual - that is, limited to circumstances which are not adequately covered in other ways. Higher earners are not covered by the main social insurance system, but are left to make their own arrangements. The principle is used in a number of different senses. The idea seems, at first sight, to refer to co-operative mutual support. Others stress that relationships of solidarity are based in interdependence. Solidarity is usually understood, in this context, in terms of common action, mutual responsibility and shared risks. The French system of welfare is a complex, patchwork quilt of services. There are three main aspects. The third element is an emphasis on human rights, including principles governing justice and relationships with authority. The rights and defined areas of state activity relating to social welfare cover most of the issues that would conventionally be considered part of a

welfare state. Some forms of welfare provision are hierarchical and strategic; the organisation of employment support is determined centrally and delegated to local government. Some are based on delegation of authority to distinct systems: That means that both the defence of human rights and the welfare of citizens depend heavily on local resources and policies. Funding is typically allocated by competitive bids for central government grants. There are marked gaps in services, for example, for unemployed adults and for dependent older people. It goes further than the British model in its commitment to social equality. Sweden has the highest level of spending on social protection in the OECD, as well as the lowest proportion of income left to independent households - less than half its national income. This is an "ideal type", rather than a description of reality. The Swedish system, looked at in greater detail, has many of the same characteristics: Ringen describes the system as "selective by occupational experience".

Poster for the Social Security scheme: These issues often seem to dominate US debates on welfare: The US does not, however, have a unified welfare system. Federalism has meant that many important functions are held by the States, including public assistance, social care and various health schemes Hawaii has had mandatory health insurance and a state-funded health system since the s ; recent reforms of health care have reinforced that diversity. By comparison with other developed countries, central government has had a limited role in social welfare provision: In practice, the US is pluralistic, rather than liberal. There are significant departures from the residual model - e. In addition to federal and state activity, there are extensive private, mutualist and corporate interests in welfare provision. The resulting systems are complex: Social insurance varies by occupation and location. Social assistance offers a Minimum Livelihood Guarantee dibao. In principle, dibao extends throughout urban China, but in practice its operation and administration vary locally. There has been some extension to rural areas, but there are still gaps. The provision of welfare is localised and often inconsistent and liable to subversion through mismanagement, corruption or simply being ignored. Social protection has been introduced unevenly and late; there is no consistent pattern; the pattern of development has been restricted and conservative, rather than being taken as an instrumental aspect of development. They describe the system as fragmented, "limited and defensive in both ambition and practice. The major obstacles to extending the welfare state are excessive reliance on agriculture, informal labour economy and low levels of employment in the service sector. Large sections of the workforce have precarious access to bank accounts or insurance schemes. In the decades after independence, attempts to expand social security coverage across the population were marred by clientelism and political patronage of favoured ethnic and caste groups.

Chapter 2 : Comparing social policies: Exploring new perspectives in Britain and Japan, Izuhara

Comparing Newspapers For recent news you may find what you need on these newspaper web sites but the New York Times and Wall Street Journal do not provide all articles for free on the web. Use the library to access articles only available through subscriptions and for older editions, published in the past.

Copyright revised StudentNewsDaily. We all want the same things in life. We want freedom; we want the chance for prosperity; we want as few people suffering as possible; we want healthy children; we want to have crime-free streets. The argument is how to achieve them! Liberals believe in government action to achieve equal opportunity and equality for all. It is the duty of the government to alleviate social ills and to protect civil liberties and individual and human rights. Believe the role of the government should be to guarantee that no one is in need. Liberal policies generally emphasize the need for the government to solve problems. Conservatives believe in personal responsibility, limited government, free markets, individual liberty, traditional American values and a strong national defense. Believe the role of government should be to provide people the freedom necessary to pursue their own goals. Conservative policies generally emphasize empowerment of the individual to solve problems. And check out our page: In the United States, liberals are referred to as the left or left-wing and conservatives are referred to as the right or right-wing. In alphabetical order

Abortion Liberal A woman has the right to decide what happens with her body. A fetus is not a human life, so it does not have separate individual rights. The government should provide taxpayer funded abortions for women who cannot afford them. Women have the right to affordable, safe and legal abortions, including partial birth abortion. Conservative Human life begins at conception. Abortion is the murder of a human being. An unborn baby, as a living human being, has separate rights from those of the mother. Taxpayer dollars should not be used for the government to provide abortions. The head is then removed from the uterus.

Affirmative Action Liberal Due to prevalent racism in the past, minorities were deprived of the same education and employment opportunities as whites. The government must work to make up for that. America is still a racist society, therefore a federal affirmative action law is necessary. Due to unequal opportunity, minorities still lag behind whites in all statistical measurements of success. Conservative Individuals should be admitted to schools and hired for jobs based on their ability. It is unfair to use race as a factor in the selection process. Reverse-discrimination is not a solution for racism. Some individuals in society are racist, but American society as a whole is not. Preferential treatment of certain races through affirmative action is wrong.

Death Penalty Liberal The death penalty should be abolished. Imprisonment is the appropriate punishment for murder. Every execution risks killing an innocent person. Economy Liberal A market system in which government regulates the economy is best. Government must protect citizens from the greed of big business. Unlike the private sector, the government is motivated by public interest. Government regulation in all areas of the economy is needed to level the playing field. Conservative The free market system, competitive capitalism, and private enterprise create the greatest opportunity and the highest standard of living for all. Free markets produce more economic growth, more jobs and higher standards of living than those systems burdened by excessive government regulation. Vouchers take money away from public schools. Government should focus additional funds on existing public schools, raising teacher salaries and reducing class size. Conservative School vouchers create competition and therefore encourage schools to improve performance. Vouchers will give all parents the right to choose good schools for their children, not just those who can afford private schools. It is necessary and ethical for the government to fund embryonic stem cell research, which will assist scientists in finding treatments and cures for diseases. An embryo is not a human. The tiny blastocyst embryos used in embryonic stem cell research has no human features. Embryonic stem cells have the potential to cure chronic and degenerative diseases which current medicine has been unable to effectively treat. Embryonic stem cells have been shown to be effective in treating heart damage in mice. Conservative Support the use of adult and umbilical cord stem cells only for research. It is morally and ethically wrong for the government to fund embryonic stem cell research. Human life begins at conception. The extraction of stem cells from an embryo requires its destruction. In other words, it requires that a human life be killed. Adult stem

cells are derived from umbilical cords, placentas, amniotic fluid, various tissues and organ systems like skin and the liver, and even fat obtained from liposuction. Embryonic stem cells have not been successfully used to help cure disease. Energy Liberal Oil is a depleting resource. Other sources of energy must be explored. The government must produce a national plan for all energy resources and subsidize partially pay for alternative energy research and production. Support increased exploration of alternative energy sources such as wind and solar power. Support government control of gas and electric industries. Conservative Oil, gas and coal are all good sources of energy and are abundant in the U. Oil drilling should be increased both on land and at sea. Increased domestic production creates lower prices and less dependence on other countries for oil. Support increased production of nuclear energy. Wind and solar sources will never provide plentiful, affordable sources of power. Support private ownership of gas and electric industries. A person has a right to die with dignity, by his own choice. A terminally ill person should have the right to choose to end pain and suffering. It is wrong for the government to take away the means for a terminally ill person to hasten his death. It is wrong to force a person to go through so much pain and suffering. Legalizing euthanasia would not lead to doctor-assisted suicides of non-critical patients. Permitting euthanasia would reduce health care costs, which would then make funds available for those who could truly benefit from medical care. Conservative Neither euthanasia nor physician-assisted suicide should be legalized. It is immoral and unethical to deliberately end the life of a terminally ill person euthanasia , or enable another person to end their own life assisted suicide. The goal should be compassionate care and easing the suffering of terminally ill people. Legalizing euthanasia could lead to doctor-assisted suicides of non-critical patients. If euthanasia were legalized, insurance companies could pressure doctors to withhold life-saving treatment for dying patients. Many religions prohibit suicide and euthanasia. These practices devalue human life. Proposed laws to reduce carbon emissions in the U. Many reputable scientists support this theory. Conservative Change in global temperature is natural over long periods of time. Proposed laws to reduce carbon emissions will do nothing to help the environment and will cause significant price increases for all. Gun Control Liberal The Second Amendment does not give citizens the right to keep and bear arms, but only allows for the state to keep a militia National Guard. Individuals do not need guns for protection; it is the role of local and federal government to protect the people through law enforcement agencies and the military. Additional gun control laws are necessary to stop gun violence and limit the ability of criminals to obtain guns. More guns mean more violence. Conservative The Second Amendment gives citizens the right to keep and bear arms. Individuals have the right to defend themselves. There are too many gun control laws “ additional laws will not lower gun crime rates. What is needed is enforcement of current laws. Gun control laws do not prevent criminals from obtaining guns. More guns in the hands of law-abiding citizens mean less crime. Full text of the Second Amendment to the U. Every American has a right to affordable health care. The government should provide equal health care benefits for all, regardless of their ability to pay. Conservative Support competitive, free market health care system. All Americans have access to health care. The debate is about who should pay for it.

Chapter 3 : What's the difference between social policy and public policy? | eNotes

The Nordstrom social media guidelines are similar to many of the aforementioned policies. But one part of the policy that is different than others is its bullet point for conflict of interest. Intel is the only other company to mention competition and they do so in a very general manner.

Posted in Advertising Social media is an unchecked wild fire that burns throughout society. Whether the motivation is pure entertainment, the ability to connect and interact, or perhaps the promise of fame and fortune, children and adults flock to the various social media outlets and pour content in. This content, whether created by the user or obtained from another source, is subject to copyright law and may touch on other property rights such as trademark, publicity or privacy rights. In addition, other regulations apply to govern posting of sponsored content. Finally, end-user agreements that are given about as much attention as the wrapper on a candy bar often govern disputes over these rights. These agreements also address the consequences for improper or unlawful conduct and the rights of the social media site to make additional use of posted content, user interactions and data obtained therefrom. Apart from the individual user, corporate users must consider the implications of employee-posted content, sponsored content, third-party posts or interactions with their social media, and infringement of intellectual property rights. The following series of posts will look at the current legal landscape on popular social media sites to better understand the rights and ramifications relating to their use. Additional posts will look at the user agreements to see what rights users have when they post material, and what rights the social media sites obtain in posted content. As outside counsel, we are often called on to address these issues when clients find their protected material posted by third parties or when another party has complained that their protected material has been posted by the client or its employee. Usually, we are dealing with material on one specific social media site such as YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, etc. While the Digital Millennium Copyright Act DMCA largely defines how these sites respond to claims of copyright infringement, each site has its own policy, and as a practical matter some sites are more responsive than others. To that end, we thought it would be useful to compare the policies of some of the more popular social media sites. This means that the notice is made with a good faith belief that the use is unauthorized, that the notice provides a description of the infringement and its location on the social media site, and that the notice includes a statement, under penalty of perjury, that the person providing notice is the owner of the work or otherwise has an exclusive right in the work. Image- and video-driven sites present a unique challenge in communicating the scope of infringement when a particular image or video has gone viral. Other sites recommend including the URL and indicating that if there is widespread infringement, each URL should be identified in the notice to have the infringing works taken down. On the flip side, the DMCA requires service providers to give the alleged infringer an opportunity to respond and have the material reposted if a response is provided. The following summarizes copyright policies on the surveyed social media sites. Click image for full view For trademarks, there is no equivalent provision to the DMCA that requires service providers to take down infringing works, but the sites we surveyed all have written trademark policies and often provide an online form for notices. From personal experience, Facebook and YouTube are responsive to these requests, and it is expected that the other sites would also be responsive. Apart from traditional trademark infringement, some sites have developed their own policies on permitted uses of trademarks. For example, Twitter has a trademark policy for promoted products that prohibits: Including other brands within your Promoted Tweets in a misleading way: Including other brands in your off-Twitter content in a misleading way: This includes content within Promoted Tweets as well as account information such as background, profile photo, profile header, bio and website. Featuring brands within your Promoted Trends in a misleading way: Vimeo recommends that users try to resolve trademark disputes themselves by contacting the infringer first before filing a complaint form. YouTube is unique in that it has separate online forms for reporting trademark infringement and advertisements of counterfeit goods on its site. The following table summarizes our findings.

DOWNLOAD PDF COMPARING SOCIAL POLICIES

Chapter 4 : Comparing Social Welfare Policies and Programs Research Paper

Comparing Social Policies Exploring New Perspectives In Britain And calendrierdelascience.com Welfare in Japan - Wikipedia Fri, 02 Nov GMT Social welfare, assistance.

Chapter 5 : Compare & Contrast - Social Policies/Programs - Research Guides at University of Michigan L

Social policy in the two societies, which has developed differently due to the differences in their national resources, socio-economic systems, cultural values and political agendas, is at an interesting turning point.

Chapter 6 : Conservative vs. Liberal Beliefs

Olya Homonchuk '15 has been accepted to Oxford University's Masters of Philosophy program in Comparative Social Policy, a specialized program that accepts only four students annually.