

SUSTAINABLE CARE SERIES

SOCIAL CARE IN THE UK'S FOUR NATIONS

Between Two Paradigms

Catherine Needham and Patrick Hall



SOCIAL CARE IN THE UK'S FOUR NATIONS

Sustainable Care

Series Editors: **Sue Yeandle**, University of Sheffield, **Jon Glasby**, University of Birmingham, **Jill Manthorpe**, King's College London and **Kate Hamblin**, University of Sheffield

Arising from research in the *ESRC Sustainable Care: connecting people and systems* programme, this series provides novel, interdisciplinary and internationally informed contributions to understanding care systems, care work and care relationships. Contributions are based on studies conducted in the UK, with international partners studying linked topics in their own countries.

The series focuses on 'sustainable care', a concept which contributors theorise in new and distinctive ways. It makes an innovative and distinctive contribution to understandings of future care challenges and how care arrangements could be made more sustainable in the future.

Forthcoming in the Series

Care Technologies for Ageing Societies
An International Comparison

Edited by **Kate Hamblin** and **Matthew Lariviere**

Combining Work and Care
Carer Leave and Related Employment Policies in an International Context

Edited by **Janet Fast**, **Kate Hamblin** and **Jason Heyes**

Find out more

[policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/
sustainable-care](http://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/sustainable-care)

SOCIAL CARE IN THE UK'S FOUR NATIONS

Between Two Paradigms

Catherine Needham and Patrick Hall



First published in Great Britain in 2023 by

Policy Press, an imprint of
Bristol University Press
University of Bristol
1–9 Old Park Hill
Bristol
BS2 8BB
UK
t: +44 (0)117 374 6645
e: bup-info@bristol.ac.uk

Details of international sales and distribution partners are available at
policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk

© Bristol University Press 2023

The digital PDF of Chapters 4 and 7 are available Open Access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>) which permits reproduction and distribution for non-commercial use without further permission provided the original work is attributed.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4473-6464-1 hardcover
ISBN 978-1-4473-6466-5 ePub
ISBN 978-1-4473-6467-2 ePdf

The right of Catherine Needham and Patrick Hall to be identified as authors of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved: no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of Bristol University Press.

Every reasonable effort has been made to obtain permission to reproduce copyrighted material. If, however, anyone knows of an oversight, please contact the publisher.

The statements and opinions contained within this publication are solely those of the authors and not of the University of Bristol or Bristol University Press. The University of Bristol and Bristol University Press disclaim responsibility for any injury to persons or property resulting from any material published in this publication.

Bristol University Press and Policy Press work to counter discrimination on grounds of gender, race, disability, age and sexuality.

Cover design: Robin Hawes
Front cover image: iStock/Andrey Danilovich
Bristol University Press and Policy Press use environmentally responsible print partners.
Printed and bound in Great Britain by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY



Contents

Series editors' preface	vi
List of figures, tables and boxes	viii
About the authors	x
Acknowledgements	xi
1 Comparing adult social care systems in the UK	1
2 What is social care policy for?	22
3 What is in crisis? The context of care policy in the four nations	44
4 The mechanisms of social care reform	77
5 The outcomes of social care reform	100
6 Territorial policy communities: scale, style and scope	127
7 The limits of social care reform	152
8 Conclusion: between care paradigms	171
References	180
Index	207

Series editors' preface

Sue Yeandle (University of Sheffield)
Jon Glasby (University of Birmingham)
Jill Manthorpe (King's College London)
Kate Hamblin (University of Sheffield)

This book series arises from the *Sustainable Care: connecting people and systems* research programme delivered by a multidisciplinary partnership of 35 scholars in eight universities, funded by a UK Economic and Social Research Council Large Grant. It offers novel, internationally-informed interdisciplinary contributions based on work by linked research teams studying care systems, care work and care relationships.

The focus of the book series is timely and important. We hope it will inform and inspire scholars, policymakers, employers, practitioners and citizens interested in care. Books in the series offer new empirical, conceptual and methodological writing, in scholarly but accessible form, and aim to make an innovative and distinctive contribution to understandings of care challenges and how these can be addressed.

The books bring together data, practices, systems, structures, narratives and actions relevant to social care. Some relate specifically to the UK's unique policy, demographic, cultural and socio-economic circumstances, but all have clear global relevance. Similar concerns are salient around the world, especially in other advanced welfare states, where population ageing is profoundly changing age structures; developments in technology and healthcare mean more people who are ill or have long-term conditions need support at home; and 'traditional' gendered sources of daily caring labour are dwindling, as levels of female labour force participation rise, and family networks become more dispersed. The Covid-19 pandemic has amplified all these challenges.

Subject areas, disciplines and themes

The series critically engages with crucial contemporary debates about care infrastructure; divisions of caring labour and the political economy of care; care ethics, rights, recognition and values; care technologies and human-technological interactions; and care relations in intergenerational, emotional, community and familial context. Within its overarching concept, sustainable care, its subject areas span social and welfare policy and systems; family and social gerontology; ageing and disability studies; employment and workforce

organisation; diversity (including gender and ethnicity); social work and human resources; migration and mobility; and technology studies.

The new multi-disciplinary work on care we offer embraces progress in global scholarship on diversity, culture and the uses of technology, and engages with issues of inequality, political economy and the division of labour. These distinctive features of the Sustainable Care programme are highlighted and developed in the book series. We are grateful to all who contributed as researchers, programme administrators and research participants, to our funders, our advisory group, and to members of the public who have engaged with our studies so far. Our work continues in new developments, including the ESRC Centre for Care and IMPACT, the UK's new adult social care evidence implementation centre. We hope books in this new series reflect the quality of our colleagues' contributions, and thank each book's editors, authors and Policy Press for their commitment to sharing new ideas, knowledge and experiences about care.

List of figures, tables and boxes

Figures

3.1	The percentage of the population over 65 in the four nations, 1990–2020	47
3.2	Disability prevalence in the four nations, 2010–19	47
3.3	Percentage of the population providing unpaid care in the four nations	52
3.4	Total public expenditure on social care, 2017/18, per head	57
3.5	Public spending on adult social care per person, 2004/05 to 2018/19 (at 2019/20 prices)	58
3.6	Proportion of the overall population who are fully or mainly state-supported care or nursing home residents	59
3.7	Spending on care-relevant benefits in the four nations per 100,000 of the population	60
3.8	Self-funders versus local authority/HSCT-funded in residential and nursing care	64
5.1	Satisfaction with social care services, 2013/14 to 2019/20	103
5.2	Number of state-funded clients (as organised by local authority or HSCT) per 100,000 of population age-group (2017)	106
5.3	Number of those aged 65+ receiving home care in Scotland, 2006/07 to 2020/21	108
5.4	Spending on direct payments as a percentage of total care spending, 2000/02 to 2018/19	111
7.1	Neil Crowther tweet on wellbeing	166
7.2	James Bullion tweet on integration	169

Tables

1.1	Social care spending per head in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Wales and the UK: real spending (2018/19 prices) and percentage change between 2011/12 and 2015/16	3
1.2	Social care-relevant policy documents in the four nations, 1997–2022	16
1.3	Interviewees	19
3.1	Percentage of people saying they can rely on family in the four nations	51
3.2	Percentage of adults who were carers in the four nations, 1991–2018	53
3.3	Spending per person combining old-age and sickness and disability spending in the four nations, 2019/20	61

List of figures, tables and boxes

3.4	Proportion of care homes owned by local authority or HSCT	62
3.5	Percentage in the four nations strongly agreeing with statements about kindness in communities	74
5.1	Percentage in each jurisdiction strongly agreeing that they experience kindness when using key public services	104
7.1	Two paradigms of social care	165

Boxes

1.1	Social care-relevant policy developments in the four nations, 1997–2022	10
2.1	The centrality of rights-based approaches to social care in the policy documents	37

About the authors

Catherine Needham is Professor of Public Policy and Public Management at the Health Services Management Centre, University of Birmingham. Her research focuses on social care, including personalisation, co-production, personal budgets and care markets. She has published a wide range of articles, chapters and books for academic and practitioner audiences. Catherine led the Care in the Four Nations work package within the ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) Sustainable Care team. She is now leading research on care systems as part of the ESRC Centre for Care and is also a member of IMPACT, the UK centre for evidence implementation in adult social care. She tweets as @DrCNeedham.

Patrick Hall is a social care policy researcher, currently undertaking an ESRC-funded PhD at the University of Birmingham on care commissioning. He was the main researcher on the Care in the Four Nations work package within the ESRC Sustainable Care team. Prior to that he contributed to the European Commission's 2018 peer review of Germany's latest long-term care reforms. Patrick is a former Fellow of the King's Fund, where he co-authored two key publications on social care for older people. Before the King's Fund, he worked with the Department of Health and Social Care, local authorities and NHS organisations on the implementation of the Care Act 2014.

Acknowledgements

The research that underpins this book was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) as part of the Sustainable Care: Connecting People and Systems programme grant (ES/P009255/1, 2017–21). The Sustainable Care programme was led by Professor Sue Yeandle, and we would particularly like to thank Sue for her support for the four nations research. Sue, along with Kate Hamblin and Jill Manthorpe, also gave very insightful comments on drafts of this manuscript and we are very grateful for their input. The broader Sustainable Care programme team helped shape our thinking on care in the four nations and more generally were a great group of colleagues who we hope to continue working with in the future.

Jennie Knight gave invaluable research assistance with some of the care data used in the book. We are also grateful to Natasha Curry and Camille Oung at the Nuffield Trust, along with Graeme Atkins, Grant Dalton, Andrew Phillips and Alex Stojanovic from the Institute for Government, who let us use their four nations care data in the book, and whose own comparative work has been a really helpful guide to our own.

We are really grateful to the people we interviewed who gave up their time, despite the many pressures of their work. The COVID-19 pandemic began part-way through the research and writing of this book, with its devastating consequences for many people linked to social care. It stopped all of us in our tracks, and reminded us why better social care is so vital.

Sustaining the momentum to write a book is a collaborative effort at home as well as at work. Catherine would like to thank Blake, Ray and Jean for the cups of tea and pep talks. Patrick would like to thank Radha for her support and Roshan and Arun for arriving during this project!

The mechanisms of social care reform

To realise the values articulated in [Chapter 2](#), in the context of the supply and demand pressures set out in [Chapter 3](#), policy makers in the four nations have instituted a series of reforms. These have focused on questions such as:

- How should care be *funded and allocated* (including more individualised approaches)?
- Who should *access* it and when (including efforts to delay or slow down formal access to care through preventative and asset-based approaches)?
- How should it be *integrated* with health?
- How should people *providing care* (unpaid carers and the paid workforce) be supported?

In this chapter we look at what [Pollitt \(2002\)](#) calls ‘decisional convergence’ around adult social care in the four nations. In [Chapter 2](#) we looked at discursive convergence on what social care is for, highlighting the goals of wellbeing, fairness, rights and quality as the basis of a sustainable care system. In focusing here on decisional convergence, we look at the following mechanisms that have been used in all four nations across the previous 25 years. These are:

- redistribute the costs of care
- personalise support
- support unpaid carers
- invest in prevention
- integrate with health
- professionalise the workforce.

All of these policies are priorities in the four nations, but the balance between them and the specific policies introduced vary. [Chaney \(2022\)](#), in his analysis of 20 years of manifesto commitments on social care in the four nations, finds that the manifestoes of English parties focus on funding solutions, whereas in Wales the foremost issue is integration with health. Addressing care worker pay and conditions is the lead social care issue in party manifestoes in Scotland and Northern Ireland. We discuss these issues and the balance between them in the sections that follow.

Redistribute the costs of care

The question of who should pay for social care has been one of the big unresolved public policy issues of recent decades. Whereas health is provided free at the point of use by the NHS, social care has to be purchased privately by individuals who have assets above the means test threshold. In all four jurisdictions, it is recognised that the funding system requires reform, as set out in [Chapter 2](#). The lack of risk pooling for social care along the lines of health means that people potentially face very high care costs that undermine fairness, wellbeing and sustainability. The Labour-appointed Sutherland Commission in 1999 recommended a tax-funded system, ruling out private forms of risk pooling: ‘Private insurance will not deliver what is required at an acceptable cost, nor does the industry want to provide that degree of coverage’ ([Sutherland, 1999](#)). In 2011, the Dilnot Commission, appointed by David Cameron’s Conservative–Liberal Democrat coalition government to look at care funding, again concluded that a private insurance model was not appropriate for social care ([Dilnot, 2011](#)).

With private insurance off the table, two main options for redistributing the costs of care have been considered. The first, which gained the highest level of support in New Labour’s 2009 public consultation on social care, was what they called the ‘comprehensive offer’. This was defined as: ‘people get their care free when they need it in return for a compulsory contribution’ ([DH, 2009](#): 12). Such an approach would bring social care funding into closer alignment with the way that the NHS is funded and was in line with the recommendation of the 1999 Sutherland Report. The second option was a cap on private care costs, which was recommended by the 2011 Dilnot Report and was passed into law in the Care Act 2014 (although not implemented). These approaches are looked at in turn.

Free personal care

The majority report from the Sutherland Commission ([1999](#)) recommended ‘free personal care’, with the state paying the costs of activities such as personal washing, dressing, eating and drinking for anyone who met a needs threshold. Even in this ‘comprehensive offer’, accommodation costs in residential care were to be paid for privately, subject to a means test. Nonetheless, this proposal was rejected for England and Wales, with the Westminster government agreeing with the minority report from the Sutherland Commission, which said it was unaffordable ([Brindle, 2009](#)). It was also noted that ending private payment for social care would mainly benefit the better-off. Bosanquet and Haldenby put it this way in a letter to *The Guardian* in 2021 when options for funding care in England were again being considered: ‘[Free care] would be a massive subsidy to the longer

lived, mainly the more affluent in the south-east – ie an end to levelling up before it had started’ (Bosanquet and Haldenby, 2020).

In Scotland, in the first major policy divergence from England and Wales after devolution, the Sutherland proposals were accepted (Hassan and Shaw, 2020). Free personal care was introduced initially for people over 65 (in 2002) and later (2019) for disabled people of working age. People in Scotland who meet needs assessment criteria are entitled to ‘free personal care’ (including support with washing, dressing and eating). Local authorities are still able to charge people for other types of care (including meals on wheels, transport, day services, laundry, alarms and aids and adaptations). A fixed rate was established for personal care and nursing costs in residential care homes in Scotland (£212.85 and £95.80 respectively per week in 2022), with accommodation and food costs for people in residential care chargeable for people with assets above the means test threshold (£28,750 in 2022). It is estimated that free personal care meets about 25 per cent of the total weekly cost of a residential care home place (Bell, 2018). Withdrawal of Attendance Allowance for Scottish care home residents following the introduction of free personal care meant they lost up to £86 per week in social security benefits.

The Health Foundation (Bell, 2018) has warned against seeing free personal care as central to Scotland’s care system, noting that it only constitutes 20 per cent of total public expenditure on care homes (the remainder is spent on people whose income and assets are below the means test threshold). The Feeley Review (2021) noted that the amount paid for personal care and nursing care for self-funders had fallen behind what was paid for state-funded residents, recommending that these should be brought into line.

A funding cap

A second option for funding care, recommended by the Dilnot Commission (2011) and passed into law in England’s Care Act 2014, was to ‘cap’ lifetime payments for care to a fixed maximum amount. The Dilnot Commission proposed both a lifetime limit on care contributions of £35,000 and raising the means test threshold for individuals to £100,000 (based on income and assets). Drafting of the Care Act 2014 took inspiration from its report but did not take all its calculations on board. It legislated for a lifetime cap of £72,000 and left the means test threshold unchanged. This was a big step forward in terms of limiting the liabilities faced by private individuals. In practice, however, this cap was never implemented. Following a warning from English local authorities that they could not administer the cap amid other financial pressures facing them, this part of the Care Act was postponed and eventually abandoned (Foster, 2021).

There have been various efforts since to revive or reinvent the Dilnot Commission's cap on care costs for individuals. The Conservative Party's incoherent and unpopular reforms proposed in the 2017 General Election (a 'floor' on spending enabling people to keep £100,000 of assets and incorporating the value of their housing assets into the means test for home care) are one such example. These were quickly dubbed a 'dementia tax' by opposition parties and the tabloid press, and effectively abandoned after several days of negative coverage (BBC News, 2017). The perceived damage done to the Tories' poll rating during the rest of that election campaign was a reminder of how politically toxic care funding reform can be. It draws attention to new winners and losers, often failing to remind people how many people are already losers in relation to care expenditure.

Boris Johnson became Prime Minister in 2019 and promised that he had a social care plan ready that would fix social care 'once and for all' (Campbell, 2019). However, it was another two years before the plan emerged (with some of this delay being due to the COVID-19 pandemic). In relation to paying for care, the key element turned out to be a revival of Part 18(3) of the Care Act 2014, which had legislated to introduce the cap. The new proposals put the maximum care contribution at £86,000 for care expenditure incurred after October 2023, with plans to make the means test more generous so fewer people would be required to fully self-fund their care. New 'fair costs of care' proposals were set out by the Department of Health and Social Care (HM Government, 2021). These would require local authorities to work with providers to set realistic fee levels and ensure self-funders could have their care purchased for them by their local authority, ending the self-funder subsidy (HM Government, 2021). As the detailed proposals emerged in autumn 2021, however, it transpired that they were less generous than those in the Care Act, and likely to hit people with assets close to the £86,000 threshold harder than the more affluent (Tallack and Sturrock, 2022). During preparations for these reforms ahead of implementation in 2023, major concerns emerged from local authorities and care providers about the investment required and rapid implementation timetable (CCN, 2022). In autumn 2022, the Chancellor announced that implementation of the cap would yet again be postponed, at least until 2025 (HM Treasury, 2022).

Incremental change

Wales has made some progress on reforming care funding, although developments fall well short of Scotland's commitment to free personal care. The Welsh Government had planned to follow England's intended 'care cap' route, but plans were put on hold after England failed to implement the cap (Boyce, 2017). An interviewee from local government indicated that the

lack of progress on reform in England continued to influence discussions in Wales: “The conversation keeps coming back to: well, shall we see what England’s doing? And until we resolve that bit of it, I think that’s the big stumbling block.”

In place of wider-ranging reform, the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 introduced a cap on the maximum weekly charge for home care (£100 in 2022) and raised the means test threshold for free care in residential settings (set at £50,000 in 2022). These changes were designed to be short-term fixes ahead of a longer term settlement. An interministerial group on paying for care was established in 2018, and the Welsh Government has commissioned a number of reports on options for reforming the funding of social care (Holthman, 2018; LE Wales, 2020). The new Welsh income tax powers that came in 2019 create a context in which the Welsh Government can consider raising additional funding for social care (LE Wales, 2020). Following the Scottish route is one of the options being considered: “We’re certainly looking at free personal care, we’re looking at workforce options, we’re looking at some of those cliff-edge costs and how they can be possibly smoothed a little, or the kind of things that have been on the table like Dilnot” (Wales, civil servant).

Following the 2021 elections the governing Labour Party signed an agreement to work with Plaid Cymru on a number of agreed items (Welsh Government, 2021a). This included setting up an expert group to create ‘a National Care Service, free at the point of need, continuing as a public service’, with an implementation plan to be in place by the end of 2023 (Welsh Government, 2021a: 3).

Ending risk-pooling

Northern Ireland is in a different position to the three other nations in relation to care funding reform. Progress on this, as on other issues, has been hampered by the broader lack of legislative activity on social care. The long-standing integration of health and social care means that funding arrangements differ from elsewhere in the UK. Care is arranged through Health and Social Care Trusts (HSCTs), with no charges made to individuals for personal care at home. As a result of this and Northern Ireland’s socioeconomic profile, there are very few self-funders (as discussed in Chapter 3).

Our exploration of convergence and divergence indicates that in England, Scotland and Wales the focus has been on limiting individual liability for care costs through a cap or by risk-pooling. As discussed in Chapter 2, in relation to fairness, the policy debate in Northern Ireland has been focused on reform in *the opposite direction*, with proposals to introduce private payment for home care (Kelly and Kennedy, 2017: 65). However, the difficulties of

policy-making in the region have contributed to policy inaction on this issue, as on others. As one interviewee put it:

‘Now, politically, within Northern Ireland, there are two things that our politicians know probably need to happen. And because of the way Northern Ireland is, whether any politician will ever put this on the table to do it, I don’t know. One is charging for domiciliary care and two is introducing water rates. And they have been kicked around for so long and I don’t know if they can ever do it.’ (Northern Ireland, care commissioner)

One interviewee suggested that, as in Wales, a lack of progress in England had contributed to this stasis: “We do this thing here in Northern Ireland – and we don’t just do it on care, we do it with a lot of things – wait and see what happens over there” (Northern Ireland, regulatory/oversight body).

We have focused in this section on who pays for care at the point of use, rather than how funds are brought into the system, a related, but separate, issue. Given the extent to which austerity has intensified the care crisis in parts of the UK, clearly more investment is needed. In England alone, the Health Foundation has estimated that an extra £1.9 billion is needed by 2023–24 to meet demand, without addressing quality or unmet need (The Health Foundation, 2021). Government funding for care (in the form of a block grant to local authorities) has reduced in England and Wales, although it has increased in Scotland and Northern Ireland, as previously discussed. The devolved nations have some capacity to raise funds through taxation and to decide how much to allocate to social care within their block funding. In December 2021 the Scottish Government’s budget included a substantial increase in spending on social care, from less than £400 million to more than £1.1 billion, making it the policy domain with the biggest increase. Some of this money will go to local authorities to improve the pay of care workers and some to fund the creation of Scotland’s planned National Care Service (Scottish Government, 2021). The UK Government’s planned health and social care ‘levy’ (from October 2023) would have introduced a hypothecated tax, designed to increase care funding across the UK (DHSC, 2021b). However, the levy plan was abandoned in 2022, with the government reverting to short-term influxes of cash (HM Treasury, 2022). Critics have highlighted the missed opportunity to put social care on a sustainable, long-term, financial footing (Laing Buisson, 2022b).

Personalise support

Making social care more person-centred has been a key reform principle in all four parts of the UK, albeit with some differences of emphasis. The

‘personalisation agenda’, as it is sometimes called, has been a feature of decades of campaigning by disability rights organisations for choice and control over how people are supported. Since the 1980s, the human rights-oriented message demanding greater recognition of personhood (linked to the UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled Persons) has chimed with the increased ‘individualisation’ of a more consumerist welfare agenda (Needham, 2007). The Independent Living Fund, introduced in 1988, provided disabled people with cash allocations enabling them to pay for personal assistance (Glasby and Littlechild, 2016). Some local authorities were very receptive to experimenting with new, more individualised, ways of providing support, such as ‘direct payments’ (Glasby and Littlechild, 2016). Sustained campaigning by disabled people, and the framing of individualised funding as a way to minimise state spending, led to direct payment legislation being introduced by John Major’s Conservative government (Zarb and Nadash, 1994; Pearson et al, 2020). The Community Care (Direct Payments) Act 1996 gave local authorities the power to allocate funds directly to older people (and from 2000, to disabled people). This became a duty for local authorities in England and Wales in 2001, in Northern Ireland in 2002 and in Scotland in 2003 (Glasby and Littlechild, 2016).

Take-up was low and geographically patchy, however, leading to initiatives to broaden the reach of the policy (Pearson, 2000). In England, the *Putting people first* concordat was signed in 2007 by central government, local government and the social care sector, giving new momentum to this agenda. The concordat widened the focus beyond individualised funding (HM Government, 2007) to include early intervention, prevention, social capital and improved access to universal services. However, it was personal budgets – which expanded direct payments to include new forms of individualised funding that could be managed by a local authority or third party – that drew most attention and follow-up.

The Care Act 2014 reaffirmed the government’s commitment to personalisation in England. Expectations were set out in statutory guidance accompanying the Act:

Local authorities should facilitate the personalisation of care and support services, encouraging services (including small, local, specialised and personal assistant services that are highly tailored), to enable people to make meaningful choices and to take control of their support arrangements, regardless of service setting or how their personal budget is managed. (DHSC, 2022: Section 4.46)

The person-centred approach was further endorsed in the 2021 *People at the heart of care* White Paper: ‘Person-centred care is a key theme running through this [10 year] vision. Genuine choice and control about personalised

care and support can enhance quality of life and promote independence in a way that matters to individuals' (DHSC, 2021b).

The Social Care (Self-Directed Support) (Scotland) Act 2013 similarly emphasised principles of choice and control through individualised funding. Pearson (2004) notes that in Scotland the original direct payment legislation of the mid-1990s was viewed with some suspicion, as a form of 'backdoor privatisation'. The 2013 Act was broader than this, offering a range of ways in which people with an assessed care need could direct their care (Pearson et al, 2018). The Act states that all councils must offer self-directed support, through a direct payment, a managed budget, a third party or a mix of these options. As with personalisation arrangements in England, the legislation weaves together responses to disability rights campaigns for independent living and co-production with concerns for cost-efficiency and effectiveness (Pearson and Ridley, 2017).

In Wales, the 2006 *Beyond boundaries* review of local service delivery called for more personalised services, and for 'citizens (to) receive high quality, personalised, joined-up services, planned across organisational boundaries'. Nonetheless, it warned against 'relying on a simplistic version of choice between service providers, whereas what citizens may value most is different forms of choice, personalisation and the opportunity to express preferences and influence provision' (Beecham, 2006: 5). As in Scotland, the language of personalisation was later dropped. The *From vision to action* report used the language of 'citizen directed support' (Independent Commission on Social Services in Wales, 2010: 54), while other documents focused on 'voice and control', in contrast to the 'choice and control' approach favoured in England. The Welsh Government's White Paper *Sustainable social services* explained the choice of vocabulary: 'We believe that the label "personalisation" has become too closely associated with a market-led model of consumer choice' (Welsh Assembly Government, 2011: 15). The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014, implemented from 2016, made a clear commitment to voice and control through 'citizen centred support', although Llewellyn et al (2020) note that what is meant by 'voice and control' isn't clearly defined in the Act.

Northern Ireland has had the same direct payments legislation as the rest of the UK since 1996, although it lacks the more recent legislative endorsement of self-directed support and personalisation seen in the other three nations. Northern Irish policy documents confirm the importance of this agenda. The *Transforming your care* review states the first key principle of social care reform as being, 'Placing the individual at the centre of any model by promoting a better outcome for the service user, carer and their family' (Health and Social Care Northern Ireland, 2011). However, in 2015, a detailed analysis of home care (*A managed change*) noted: 'relatively modest progress when compared to other areas of the UK. In recent years the rate

of uptake has reached a plateau and there have been small reductions in some Trusts/programmes of care’ (Health and Social Care Board, 2015: 31). The document then went on to reaffirm the commitment to self-directed support: ‘Self-directed support is regarded as one of the HSCB’s [Health and Social Care Board] major reform projects in the delivery of community based care and support for older people and those with disabilities’ (Health and Social Care Board, 2015: 31). In using the language of self-directed support, Northern Ireland has drawn on the Scottish model (Pearson et al, 2018). As in Wales and Scotland, some avoid the language of personalisation. As one interviewee put it: “Personalisation is not a word that I come across too often here. To me, it is a very English word” (Northern Ireland, carers’ organisation).

Conversely, Northern Ireland’s *Power to people* report (one of whose authors, Des Kelly, has worked in England for many years) used the term ‘personalisation’ liberally, alongside self-directed support, talking also of the importance of ‘consumer sovereignty’ in social care – a concept that contrasts with the perspective adopted in Scottish and Welsh documents (Kelly and Kennedy, 2017). Just as the care funding debate evokes contested accounts of fairness, we can see in debates about person-centred care the underpinning tensions around rights and markets. These play out differently in the four jurisdictions. We can also see some reluctance in the devolved nations to use language too closely associated with England, a point of divergence we return to in later chapters.

Support for unpaid carers

In all parts of the UK, there has been increased formal recognition of the role played by unpaid carers. Their contribution is crucial to a sustainable care system, and they are increasingly recognised as needing, and being entitled to, support themselves (Yeandle et al, 2012). COVID-19 in particular was seen to magnify the strains on carers across all four nations. The UK nations, with the exception of Northern Ireland, legislated to improve the support provided to carers in the 2010s. In England, the Care Act 2014 gave carers the right to support following an assessment. A Carers Action Plan to support implementation followed (DHSC, 2018). The 2014 Act also aimed to make support for carers more consistent across local authorities (Marczak et al, 2022). Improved support for carers was a key element of the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014. As in England, it gave carers the right to support following an assessment, and established in law that they had the same rights as those they care for. The Carers (Scotland) Act 2016 gave all carers in Scotland the right to a support plan and to having their eligible needs met, as identified in their plan. The Feeley Report noted that relatively few unpaid carers receive statutory respite support and recommended a

'right to respite' (Feeley, 2021), which the Scottish Government (2021) was considering as part of its National Care Service consultation.

Northern Ireland has not enacted specific legislation on carers since the Carers and Direct Payments (Northern Ireland) Act 2002. The 2017 *Power to people* report proposed bringing Northern Ireland's rights for carers into line with those for England in the Care Act 2014, but this has not yet happened. HSCTs in Northern Ireland have a duty to inform carers of their right to an assessment, but (unlike other parts of the UK) no duty to meet needs identified by that assessment. Northern Ireland also lacks a legal definition of a carer (which other UK nations have). The definition in the Care Act 2014, for England, is 'An adult who provides or intends to provide care for another adult'; the Welsh definition is similar; and the Scottish definition includes care for disabled children as well as adults. Wales and England have national eligibility criteria for carers' support, whereas in Scotland this is decided by local authorities, and in Northern Ireland, it is at the discretion of HSCTs. Carers who meet the eligibility criteria for Carer's Allowance, a welfare benefit first established in 1976 (when it was entitled 'Invalid Care Allowance'), can receive this weekly amount in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, provided they are not receiving other 'overlapping' payments from the state (such as State Retirement Pension). In Scotland, since 2019 (following devolution of social security arrangements to Scotland) this benefit has been increased, with a Carer's Allowance Supplement designed to align its value with the unemployment benefit 'Jobseeker's Allowance'.

As we have shown, there is clear divergence in legal and financial entitlements for carers. The Scottish approach is the most generous financially. Northern Ireland lags behind on carer legislation. Implementation of legislation intended to support carers has been patchy and problematic in England, Scotland and Wales, as we discuss in the [next chapter](#), but the existence of a formal definition and of specific rights in law is nonetheless recognised as an important achievement in these three nations in the last decade.

Invest in prevention

Supporting people *before* they need statutory social care services has also been a central part of social care policy in all four nations. As Miller et al note:

[T]here is growing recognition that the system has too often concentrated only on those with the greatest and most complex needs, leaving fewer and fewer resources, financial and otherwise, to meet lower-level needs. Early intervention and prevention are seen as an essential component of achieving a more personalised social care

system through ensuring that service users are supported to retain independence for as long as possible. (Miller et al, 2013: 120)

However, whereas the areas of reform already outlined have clear mechanisms for change (for example, a funding cap, a direct payment, a carer's assessment), prevention remains ill defined. It aims to stop something happening, and less progress has been made in specifying what that means and how it could be achieved.

In England, Tew et al (2019: 10) highlight the importance of the Care Act 2014 in increasing the ambition of preventative approaches. Whereas prevention activity was underway before the Act, this focused on a relatively narrow set of interventions such as reablement, falls prevention and signposting. In contrast:

‘Second wave’ approaches to prevention and capacity building ... have become more prominent since the implementation of the Care Act 2014. ... This has involved more fundamental revisioning of the role of local services and the relationships between services, citizens and communities – and a more positive and holistic focus on enhancing wellbeing, opportunity and social connectivity, as opposed to a more defensive focus on mitigating risk and providing services in response to identified needs. (Tew et al, 2019: 10)

With this ‘second wave’ has come an interest in asset-based and strengths-based approaches that focus on people's skills, capabilities and networks rather than their needs and deficits (Milne et al, 2021). Models include ‘Local Area Coordination’, the ‘Three Conversations’ approach and ‘Asset-based Community Development’. A scoping review by Milne et al (2021) found that strengths-based approaches are increasingly mainstream within local authorities. Definitions remain fluid, however, and it is unclear how their effectiveness and feasibility should be evaluated.

Cairney et al (2016) highlight prevention as a key pillar of the ‘Scottish approach’. The Christie Report of the Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services (Christie, 2011) formed the basis for Scotland's public services strategy, and placed a strong emphasis on prevention. In its response to Christie, the Scottish Government talked of developing a ‘decisive shift towards prevention’ (Christie, 2011: 1). The subsequent National Care Service consultation reaffirmed this focus:

Done well, a focus on early intervention and prevention avoids the need for more costly action at a later stage. For example, supporting unpaid carers so that they can continue their caring relationship, supporting families to prevent family breakdown, or ensuring appropriate care to

prevent deterioration or falls resulting in a need for hospital treatment, all result in benefits for individuals and families, and for our health and care services. (Scottish Government, 2021: 6)

Similarly in Wales, the 2003 report into the health and social care system placed a strong emphasis on prevention: 'There should be a strategic adjustment of services to focus them on prevention and early intervention. Potentially this offers significant long-term cost and quality of life gains' (Welsh Assembly Government, 2003: 2). The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 gives a particular focus to its ambitions around prevention, requiring public bodies to take account of prevention as one of the 'ways of working' required by the Act. Guidance to accompany the Act indicates:

Understanding the underlying causes of the problems people and communities face can help us find different solutions, intervene early and prevent problems from getting worse or arising in the future. But this is not just about addressing problems – it is about finding enabling solutions and early interventions at the right time to make progress in achieving the well-being goals. (Welsh Government, 2015a: 23)

In Northern Ireland, investing in prevention is identified as a key principle in *Transforming your care* (Health and Social Care Northern Ireland, 2011), and has been restated subsequently. The Bengoa Report in 2016 described a prevention focus across the health and care system as vital to avoid system collapse (Bengoa, 2016). However, the 2017 *Power to people* report highlighted the lack of a prevention focus to date:

[O]ur system is currently focused almost entirely on 'Failure Demand' defined as demand caused by a failure to do something or do something right for the customer. ... We have to work out how to make a fundamental shift away from a crisis dominated system into a long-term solution focusing on prevention and early intervention in which care and support is based initially around people and their communities. (Kelly and Kennedy, 2017: 45–6)

Technology is seen as playing a key role in relation to prevention and early intervention, particularly to enable people to live at home for as long as possible (Wright, 2020). All four nations have a digital strategy that incorporates social care. The Scottish Government's *Health and social care delivery plan* notes that, 'Digital technology is key to transforming health and social care services so that care can become more person-centred' (Scottish Government, 2016: 23). England's 2021 *People at the heart of care*

White Paper includes £150 million of investment, over three years, ‘to drive digitisation across the sector; and unlock the potential of caretech innovation that enables preventative care and independent living’ (DHSC, 2021b). Wales and Northern Ireland have invested in telecare and note its importance to future care systems, although Wright (2020) observes that the Welsh Government has been more cautious than elsewhere, calling for incremental rather than rapid growth. There has been recent enthusiasm about the scope for using data collected by digital devices in a proactive way as part of a broader preventative approach (Welsh Government, 2015b; Health and Social Care Board, 2016; Scottish Government and COSLA, 2021).

There is clear convergence between the four nations in relation to the prevention focus, recognising its potential ‘win-wins’ in improving people’s quality of life and wellbeing while reducing reliance on state services. Nonetheless, as we discuss when considering policy successes in Chapter 5, it has been hard to keep focused on prevention at a time of fiscal pressures (particularly in England), and the challenge of evidencing progress on prevention remains significant.

Integrate with health

People who use social care often also use primary, community and acute health services. The NHS and local authorities that purchase and provide care services share a number of goals: keeping people well in their own homes for as long as possible; improving system efficacy; and promoting a more person- (or patient-)centred approach. However, the experience of using both NHS and care services can often be fragmented, frustrating and sometimes detrimental to wellbeing. For instance, people may find themselves in hospital unnecessarily due to insufficient coordination between hospital discharge and local authority assessment processes for social care. Integrating these services to provide a more coordinated service has been a key policy goal for all four nations for at least two decades.

There have been a number of different approaches to this challenge. These include pooled funding and the joint planning and purchasing of services, as well as merging organisations, colocating staff and centralising information systems. Miller et al (2016) differentiate between micro, meso and macro forms of integration. Micro integration describes the interactions of practitioners, for instance home care workers and district nurses. Meso integration describes joint teams of practitioners from different organisations or the development of targeted services such as integrated discharge teams. Macro integration describes the systems-level integration at play in joint boards and shared policy-making across localities. Across the UK, recent integration policy has mainly focused on macro-level changes: systems-level

funding and strategies for particular localities, with meso and micro initiatives greatly varying from place to place (Miller et al, 2016).

Northern Ireland has had structural health and social care integration for much longer than the other nations. In 1972 a Health and Personal Social Services Order established joint health and social care bodies in the province. Despite its longevity, integration remains an incomplete goal of the Northern Irish system, as evidenced in the 2011 review *Transforming your care*: 'Services provided by different parts of the health and social care system should be better integrated to improve the quality of experience for patients and clients, safety and outcomes' (Health and Social Care Northern Ireland, 2011: 40). Responding to the recommendations of this report, Northern Ireland established Integrated Care Partnerships (ICPs) that identify high-intensity users and attempt to design 'wraparound care' led by clinicians (Malone and Hayes, 2017). The 2020 Northern Ireland Executive *New decade, new approach* statement (following re-establishment of power sharing in Northern Ireland) noted that policy proposals relating to integration needed to be implemented (Reed et al, 2021: 23).

In Scotland, the government has taken a more direct legislative approach to integration. The Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act 2014 placed a duty on NHS organisations and local government to delegate health and care functions and budgets to new integrated authorities, with a view to making these new authorities the joint commissioner of health and care. Five years on, recognising limitations in what had been achieved through this approach, the 2021 National Care Service (NCS) consultation document put forward further structural reforms:

[W]e propose that IJBs [Integration Joint Boards] will become Community Health and Social Care Boards (CHSCBs) and will be the local delivery body for the NCS, funded directly by the Scottish Government. This will be the sole model for local delivery of community health and social care in Scotland. The functions of CHSCBs will be consistent across the country and will include all community health and social care support and services that the Scottish population requires. (Scottish Government, 2021: 90)

In Wales, in 2009, Health Boards were established to coordinate health and social care across regions, but stopped short of full integration:

We are not persuaded that some social services should transfer to the NHS. This would undermine the integrated support, protection and inclusion for the vulnerable provided by the local government family. There are faster and less disruptive ways to address the issues encountered at the interface between health and social care. We recommend that

social services and social care for adults and children should remain a local government responsibility. (Independent Commission on Social Services in [Wales, 2010](#): 7)

The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 established a legal duty on local government to promote integration, implemented through seven Regional Partnership Boards (RPBs). The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 established 19 Public Service Boards (PSBs) that are required to promote wellbeing in their local areas ([Heenan and Birrell, 2018](#)). Although the RPBs and PSBs are expected to work in coordinated ways, in practice there has been confusion about their operational distinction ([Reed et al, 2021](#): 43). In 2021, the *Rebalancing care and support* White Paper proposed to put RPBs onto a legal footing, enabling them to employ staff, hold budgets, undertake commissioning and shape markets ([Welsh Government, 2021b](#): 19).

Integration has been a policy goal in England for several decades, but structures have not had a legal basis comparable to that in the other nations ([Reed et al, 2021](#): 3). In England, the Better Care Fund, established in 2013, sought to transform local health and care systems using a joint pot of money spent on shared priorities. These local priorities are agreed and signed off at local Health and Wellbeing Boards – another macro integration intervention (enshrined in the Health and Social Care Act 2012) to develop joint health and care strategies. In 2015, NHS England announced a range of pilots to explore organisational alignment between different aspects of health and social care services. These ‘vanguard sites’ sought to develop new models of care based on new contractual structures, payment regimes and joint organisations ([Miller et al, 2016](#)). Since 2015, these new organisations and partnerships have developed ‘place-based’ approaches: collaborations that seek to manage demand into acute services and promote wellbeing and the prevention of ill health. NHS England developed these loose partnerships into ‘Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships’ and more recently into more formal ‘Integrated Care Organisations’ ([Miller et al, 2021](#)). In yet another development, in 2021 the Department of Health and Social Care introduced proposals for Integrated Care Systems, which are legal structures, bringing England into line with the other nations ([DHSC, 2021a](#)).

Professionalise the workforce

High staff turnover and rising vacancy rates are symptoms of problems within the social care workforce. Skills for Care data shows a pattern of growth in staff vacancies over time, with figures for England in 2020–21 showing vacancies at around 105,000 at any one time (Skills for [Care, 2021](#)). The

report also showed that turnover rates were highest for people on zero-hour contracts. An All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) report on social care covering the four nations noted that half of care workers leave their job within the first year. A care provider giving evidence to its inquiry reported:

There are simply too few people wanting to join and stay in adult social care roles. Despite regular efforts by government, Skills for Care, and employers, including a recent national recruitment campaign in England, the tide has not been turned whilst the demand for care continues to grow. ... The inability to access enough qualified, motivated and values-based carers and nurses is the biggest single threat facing the sector. (Quoted in [Hayes et al, 2019: 17](#))

Key issues reported to the APPG were low pay, availability of easier jobs in hospitality and retail, lack of training and career development and Brexit uncertainty. These point to clear problems for service user outcomes:

The lack of funding, training and professionalisation evident across much of the social care workforce is clearly a major factor in negative service user experiences, and during the course of this inquiry, we have heard accounts of the use of multiple care workers to support someone, and the associated unfamiliarity with people, insufficient time allocated for care duties, a lack of continuity of care, and indeed a lack of any kind of care worker at all. ([Hayes et al, 2019: 33](#))

New Labour's 2010 White Paper, *Building the National Care Service*, indicated its intention to introduce a licensing scheme for all social care workers (encompassing residential care, homecare and personal assistants [PAs]) ([HM Government, 2010](#)). The change of government later that year meant these changes never happened. In 2011, the coalition government Health Minister Andrew Lansley announced:

The risk to service-users and the general public posed by groups of unregulated health and social care workers is not considered to be such that regulation of individual workers is necessary ... the Government does not believe that the extension of statutory regulation to all workers in the health sector across the UK and the social care sector in England would be a proportionate response. The emphasis should be on employers of unregulated workers to take responsibility for the quality of services provided. (Cited in [Hayes et al, 2019: 31](#))

A decade on, the 2021 White Paper, *People at the heart of care*, appeared to revive earlier plans, and included proposals for a voluntary 'skills passport'

that would be used for ‘establishing a foundation for registration of staff in the future’ (DHSC, 2021b: 76).

In Scotland, worker registration is mandatory in some care settings. The Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC) has a remit for adult day care and residential care, care at home and housing support services. The majority of the social services workforce must register with the SSSC within six months of starting work. Workers are not required to have a relevant qualification in order to register, but must acquire one within five years; most are paid the Scottish Living Wage, and are entitled to travel time, holiday and sick pay and sleepover payments (Hayes et al, 2019). The Resolution Foundation found that Scottish care workers were the best paid in the UK (Cominetti et al, 2020). As one of the interviewees working in the third sector in Scotland put it:

‘[W]e now have the bones of an adult social care reform programme, which is going to tackle all of these things that I’ve been talking about in the workforce. Living wage, sustainability, different service models, they’ve accepted, totally, that is where they should be focused. I’m kind of moaning about how terrible everything is, but actually, in policy terms, it’s pretty bloody good! Actually, it really is, it really is, comparatively.’

In Scotland, as elsewhere, the PA or directly employed workforce is unregulated and operates outside state visibility:

‘So I guess we didn’t really know how big our PA workforce was until Covid happened and we tried to pay them the £500 payment or get their ID card and their PPE. We realised, oh we don’t really know where they are and what they do or how they’re trained.’ (Scotland, civil servant)

The National Care Service consultation in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2021: 130) is looking at whether a register and national minimum employment standards for PAs should be introduced.

The Northern Ireland Social Care Council is the regulator for the social services workforce there. People working in social care in Northern Ireland have been required to register with the Council since the end of 2017. Registration in Northern Ireland covers residential care workers and is being extended to home care workers. No qualifications are required to join the register. Given the relatively high proportion of in-house staff in social care, an issue for Northern Ireland is the pay differential between care staff employed by a Trust and those employed in the private sector, as discussed in Chapter 3.

In Wales, social care staff in domiciliary and care home settings are required to register with Social Care Wales. To be eligible for registration,

they must have suitable qualifications and agree to abide by professional standards. The Welsh Government describes registration as 'serving the dual purposes of professionalising and raising the status of the social care workforce, and reassuring service-users and their families that workers have the qualifications and skills required to perform their work professionally' (Hayes et al, 2019: 20).

England is, therefore, alone among the four nations not to have mandatory registration (beyond professions such as social workers and nurses). Oung et al (2020) point to the difficulties of introducing registration in England:

One of the biggest challenges with the professionalisation of the English social care workforce is its size, as well as the vast number of settings in which the workforce operates. Developing mandatory registration as a first formal step in professionalising the workforce would require large amounts of planning and resources, especially if registration is to increase the attractiveness of working in the sector. (Oung et al, 2020)

A further complexity arises where staff work across the England-Wales or England-Scotland borders and would become subject to separate registration frameworks. The APPG report called for recognised compatibility standards between England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland (APPG on Adult Social Care, 2019: 12).

Many of the interviewees made the case for professionalisation, seeing it as crucial to increasing the skills and prestige of the sector:

'I want also some proper remuneration recognition for social care staff, because these people are dealing with very complex people and very complex issues and they should not be seen as people who do a minimum wage job. They are people that should be on a career pathway, because they are professionals, they should have acknowledgement of that. They should also have the qualifications for that. And also I think registration would help with the status because it would also help us to be really clear about the support that is offered to the worker, but also the worker's responsibility and accountability for the quality of the service they provide.' (England, provider representative)

For many it was also an important way to acknowledge and recruit for the level of expertise required. Comparisons to other parts of the NHS were common:

'I want proper career pathways and escalators for social care, just as we have them in other parts of the system around the NHS.' (England, provider representative)

‘You can go in, now, and start working in a nursing home or for a domiciliary care provider. Maybe you’re looking after people who are terminally ill, for example. You maybe worked in a garage the week before. ... They’re put through training and stuff once they start but if you compare that to what someone who wants to be a GP or a doctor has to go through, it’s two completely different things. Then we’re surprised when people complain about the standard of care in the nursing home or they refuse domiciliary care because it’s not good enough.’ (Northern Ireland, third sector)

Professionalising care workers is about more than just registering them. The title of an [APPG on Adult Social Care \(2019\)](#) report on care workers in 2019 identified three strands: elevation, registration and standardisation. [Hayes et al \(2019: 3\)](#) note that addressing aspects of professionalisation and sector reform cannot be done effectively if this happens piecemeal: “Training, occupational registration, concern for safeguarding, terms and conditions of work and funding are intricately connected and improvements must be made on all fronts to recognise and reward the skills and professionalism of care workers.”

[Hayes et al \(2019\)](#) also highlight that other changes in care systems, such as the trend towards personalised or self-directed support, have implications for the workforce that need to be considered. As the *Domiciliary care workforce review* for Northern Ireland (2016–21) put it: ‘In line with the principles of personalisation, the role of the professional and the care worker within SDS [self-directed support] will become less about being a “fixer” of problems and more about being a co-facilitator of solutions working in collaboration and co-production based on power sharing and mutual respect’ (DH, 2018: 30).

There is also a need to recognise how diversity across the four nations in relation to affluence and diversity and urban and rural factors affects workforce availability and the sorts of issues that are required to attract staff. Interviewees in Scotland emphasised the challenge of getting sufficient providers and staff in rural and remote areas:

‘Attracting providers into some remote and rural areas is quite challenging, because of the problems with actually recruiting the workforce and all the issues around about things like travel time. ... Some of the island communities in particular have issues in attracting providers, and quite often have to pay additional subsidies in terms of hourly rates.’ (Scotland, local government representative)

Similarly, interviewees in Northern Ireland highlighted the rural and urban divide:

'If you're in the city ... [it's] not the most stable of workforces, but providers would tell us that they find it easier to get the staff to work in the cities. There is the turnover, but you can get the people. In rural areas, obviously the pool that you're recruiting from is shallow, but also there are additional difficulties. The contract price, particularly for domiciliary care, is low and a lot of providers squeeze their staff in terms of payment of travel time, or travel expenses, mileage. Now, that's less significant if you're able to work by walking to and from a dozen streets, surrounding the street you live in. But if you have to have a car and you have to drive to your clients that becomes an issue.'
(Northern Ireland, civil servant)

It can be particularly hard to find social care staff in areas where wages are high and there are plentiful alternative forms of employment. One of the local councillor interviewees from England noted that the lack of this dynamic in their area made recruitment easier: "The fact that we have a low wage-base economy means that we can afford to keep [social care] going pretty well, actually, when compared to some other places."

In Wales, the Welsh language is an important aspect of staff recruitment, particularly in the areas where Welsh speaking is most prevalent. The right to speak Welsh was added to the definition of wellbeing in Wales in 2017 (Hamblin, 2019), but, as has been pointed out, 'just 16 percent of staff working in regulated services and 10 per cent of staff working for commissioned care providers can communicate effectively through the medium of Welsh' (Hayes et al, 2019: 15). This may in part be because Welsh speaking is unevenly distributed across Wales (Jones and Lewis, 2019). One of the interviewees from the NHS in Wales commented:

'I don't get a double decker bus arriving in [the local town] with 16 [occupational therapists] on it who can speak Welsh. So you've always got to be thinking outside the box. You've got to have good links with the universities, offer placements for students, encourage people when they do go away to train that they're more than welcome to come back.'

Addressing workforce challenges requires recognition of these different aspects of diversity, and the ways in which different levers will be required in different localities.

Assessing progress

As is evident from the range of issues discussed in this chapter, reforming the care system is a daunting task, equivalent to the foundational work that went into constructing a comprehensive welfare state in the UK after the

Second World War. We identify two groups among the four nations: those with a wide-ranging care act (a ‘big bang’ approach, adopted in England and Wales) and those that have reformed their care system in more gradual way (Scotland and Northern Ireland). England had a large set-piece Act – the Care Act 2014 – which was the most wide-ranging care legislation since the National Assistance Act 1948, codifying over 50 years of care policy and guidance (Spencer-Lane, 2011). The breadth of the Care Act 2014 has been seen by some people as a disadvantage. As an English civil servant in our study put it, “The Care Act is quite kind of aspirational in its drafting and therefore probably is going to be true for all time that if you ask user representative charities, do you feel that the Care Act has been beautifully delivered over the country, they’re always going to say no”.

In England a new Health and Care Act was passed by Parliament in 2022 to further progress integration between health and social care and give the Care Quality Commission the power to inspect local authority commissioning (DHSC, 2021a).

The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act was seen by Welsh interviewees as the key legislation, albeit alongside other Acts that established new approaches:

‘We had new legislation with the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act. That was all about the design of the system, if you like, the expectations, more voice and control, more collaboration. Looking at early intervention, focusing more on safeguarding, so that was the policy principles. The sister Act was RISCA, Regulation and Inspection of Social Care. That established new responsibilities for [the] Care Inspector of Wales. That’s the service regulator – and new responsibilities for us as the workforce regulator.’ (Wales, regulatory/oversight body)

The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 was also seen as important legislation, supporting and taking further the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act. A Welsh civil servant described it as a ‘top of the tree’ Act in terms of shaping the context for other policies. However, another respondent noted that the links between the legislation were not always clear:

‘So you’ve got the Future Generations Act. ... Then you’ve got *A healthier Wales*, which is just a sort of policy document, but that’s the road they want to go down. And you’ve got all these people then working in Welsh Government, in their different little silo departments, not understanding these other policies, and these other pieces of legislation, might actually fit into the future sort of direction of their

work. So you've got departments there who don't talk to each other.'
(Wales, carers' organisation)

Scotland has no equivalent to the wide-ranging Acts in England and Wales, but has pursued an iterative approach to care reform, developing a series of new laws for different issues in the care system. In contrast, Northern Ireland has lacked legislative change in social care. As one interviewee put it: "Legislation is a blunt tool but, well, we don't have an adult safeguarding bill ... and every other part of the UK does. ... We haven't got the care bill or any equivalent" (Northern Ireland, regulatory/oversight body).

There is a sense of 'playing catch up' (Chapman, 2018). As another Northern Irish interviewee from the Health and Social Care Board put it: "It is very outdated, the legal framework underpinning the delivery of social care [in Northern Ireland]. It was in the '72, '73 order here ... and to support there has been circulars produced by government with particular 2010 circulars that everyone kind of still relies on."

In Northern Ireland, the 2020 power-sharing agreement re-establishing the Executive indicated an intention to implement the proposals in the *Transforming your care* and *Power to people* reports (Northern Ireland Executive, 2020). In January 2022, the Department of Health announced that it was consulting on its response to the *Power to people* report (DH, 2022a). Proposed actions by the Executive included the introduction of comprehensive legislation on social care and a review of charging arrangements, although it remained a draft consultation framework rather than a clear plan for change.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have set out the six mechanisms that have been used to advance care reform in the four nations, noting areas where they are converging and diverging in decisions being made. Much as we found when looking at care values in Chapter 2, the broad goals of reform across the nations are very similar. All six of the mechanisms we have looked at here are being attempted, although the tactics through which this has been done are different. Scotland is the nation that has made most progress on care reform. We can summarise the findings presented in this chapter in the following way:

Active: Scotland has pursued an iterative approach to care reform, developing a series of small pieces of legislation for different issues in the care system. It has: introduced free personal care for over-65s, later extending it to working-age adults; introduced care worker registration and improved pay and conditions; developed a more centralised

infrastructure for integration than exists in England; and brought in a standard national fee rate for care homes.

Emergent: Wales had weaker powers than Scotland following devolution and had to overcome public ambivalence about the new institutions. This led to delays in pursuing a distinctive social care agenda from England. The Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 was a large and ambitious piece of legislation. It introduced new rights for carers, a maximum weekly charge for home care and an increase in the means test threshold. Wales has also introduced mandatory care worker registration.

Symbolic: the wide-ranging Care Act 2014, applicable to England, was seen at the time as a new settlement for care, equivalent to the National Assistance Act 1948. However, it has only been partly implemented. Successive prime ministers have talked about the importance of reforming care spending, with a particular focus on protecting people's homes (a bigger issue in England than elsewhere, due to higher levels of self-funding). An adapted version of the care cap model from the Care Act 2014 has also been passed into law in the Health and Care Act 2022 but its implementation has already been postponed from 2023 to 2025.

Stalled: much of Northern Ireland's care settlement was shaped by its structural integration of health and care in the 1970s (itself in part a response to the political violence of that era). As a result of this long history of integration, it has some features that other parts of the UK are seeking to emulate, for example, *de facto* free personal care at home; registration of the workforce; and a strong civil society. However, its lack of policy capacity over the last 25 years (with repeated suspensions of the Northern Ireland Assembly) has prevented progress on key issues such as carers' rights. Much of its legislative framework for care is still derived from the National Assistance Act 1948.

In the [next chapter](#), we focus on how reforms in each of these areas have fared, in order to understand the practice and results element of convergence and divergence (Pollitt, 2002). We explore this through the lens of outcomes, starting by discussing the growth of an outcomes orientation in all four nations, and then looking in detail at outcomes for the six mechanisms discussed in this chapter.

References

- Age UK (2019) *Estimating need in older people: Findings for England*, London, www.ageuk.org.uk/globalassets/age-uk/documents/reports-and-publications/reports-and-briefings/active-communities/id204303-estimating-needs-report.pdf [Accessed 24 March 2022].
- Abrams, F. (1978) *Neighbourhood care and social policy: A research perspective*, Berkhamstead: The Volunteer Centre.
- Alarilla, A., Grimm, F. and Stafford, M. (2021) ‘What happened to unpaid caring during the COVID-19 pandemic?’, UK Data Service, Data Impact blog, 8 June, <https://blog.ukdataservice.ac.uk/unpaid-caring-during-covid19> [Accessed 9 February 2022].
- Alberti, A., Forde, C., Graham, G., Bessa, I., Cutter, J., Ciupijus, Z. et al (2022) *From a health crisis to a labour crisis: Omicron, Brexit and labour shortages*, Centre for Employment Relations, Innovation and Change blog, 13 January, <https://cericleeds.wordpress.com/2022/01/13/from-a-health-crisis-to-a-labour-crisis-omicron-brexit-and-labour-shortages> [Accessed 19 January 2022].
- Allan, G., Hawker, S. and Crow, G. (2001) ‘Family diversity and change in Britain and Western Europe’, *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(7): 819–37.
- Allen, K. and Glasby, J. (2013) ‘“The billion dollar question”: Embedding prevention in older people’s services – Ten ‘high-impact’ changes’, *British Journal of Social Work*, 43(5): 904–24.
- Allen, K., Burn, E., Hall, K., Mangan, C. and Needham, C. (2023) ‘“They made an excellent start ... but after a while, it started to die out”: Tensions in combining personalisation and integration in English adult social care’, *Social Policy and Society*, 22(1): 172–86.
- APPG (All Party Parliamentary Group) on Adult Social Care (2019) *Elevation, registration and standardisation: The professionalisation of social care workers*, London: APPG on Adult Social Care, www.gmb.org.uk/sites/default/files/APPG_SOCIALCARE_REPORT.pdf [Accessed 27 October 2021].
- Alliance Scotland (2018) *Adult social care reform in Scotland: A discussion paper*, <https://www.alliance-scotland.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ALLIANCE-response-Discussion-paper-on-Adult-social-care-reform-for-Scotland.pdf> [Accessed 18 February 2022].
- Andrews, L. (2021) ‘The forward march of devolution halted – and the limits of progressive unionism’, *The Political Quarterly*, 92(3): 512–21.
- Andrews, L. (2022) ‘Performing Welsh Government 1999–2016: How insider narratives illuminate the hidden wiring and emergent cultural practices’, *Contemporary British History*, 36(1): 124–56.
- Ansell, C. and Torfing, J. (2015) ‘How does collaborative governance scale?’, *Policy & Politics*, 43(3): 315–29.

- Archer, M.S. (2012) *The reflexive imperative in late modernity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnott, M. (2019) 'The Scottish Government', in G. Hassan (ed) *The story of the Scottish Parliament: The first two decades explained*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp 52–63.
- Asthana, A. (2017) 'Take care of your elderly mothers and fathers says Tory minister', *The Guardian*, 3 January, www.theguardian.com/society/2017/jan/31/take-care-of-your-elderly-mothers-and-fathers-says-tory-minister [Accessed 26 November 2020].
- Atkins, G., Dalton, G., Phillips, A. and Stojanovic, A. (2021) *Devolved public services: The NHS, schools and social care in the four nations*, London: Institute for Government, www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/devolved-public-services.pdf [Accessed 14 November 2021].
- Audit Scotland (2018) *Health and social care integration: Update on progress*, Health and social care series, Edinburgh, www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/uploads/docs/report/2018/nr_181115_health_socialcare_update.pdf [Accessed 12 July 2020].
- Audit Wales (2020) *So, what's different? Findings from the Auditor General's sustainable development principle examinations*, Cardiff, www.wao.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Well-being-of-Future-Generations-report-eng_11.pdf [Accessed 2 March 2022].
- Austin, A. (2020) *A universal declaration of human well-being*, London: Springer International Publishing.
- Bache, I. and Reardon, L. (2013) 'An Idea whose time has come? Explaining the rise of well-being in British politics', *Political Studies*, 61(4), <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12001>.
- Ballard, C., Orrell, M., Moniz-Cook, E., Woods, R., Whitaker, R., Corbett, A. et al (2020) *Improving mental health and reducing antipsychotic use in people with dementia in care homes: The WHELD research programme including two RCTs*, Programme Grants Application, Res 2020, 8(6), <https://evidence.nihr.ac.uk/alert/wheld-dementia-care-homes-person-centred-care> [Accessed 21 February 2021].
- Barclay, P. (1982) *Social workers: Their role and tasks* (Barclay Report), London: Bedford Square Press.
- Barker, K. (2014) *A new settlement for health and social care* (Barker Report), London: The King's Fund.
- Bartels, K.P. (2013) 'Public encounters: The history and future of face-to-face contact between public professionals and citizens', *Public Administration*, 91(2): 469–83.
- Bartels, K. and Turnbull, N. (2020) 'Relational public administration: A synthesis and heuristic classification of relational approaches', *Public Management Review*, 22(9): 1324–46.

- BBC News (2017) 'General Election: Theresa May denies social care U-turn', 22 May, www.bbc.co.uk/news/election-2017-40001221 [Accessed 30 October 2020].
- Beecham, J. (2006) *Beyond boundaries: Citizen centred local services for Wales* (Beecham Review), Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.
- Béland, D. and Powell, M. (2016) 'Continuity and change in social policy', *Social Policy & Administration*, 50(2): 129–47.
- Béland, D., Rocco, P. and Waddan, A. (2016) 'Reassessing policy drift: Social policy change in the United States', *Social Policy & Administration*, 50(2): 201–18.
- Béland, D., Howlett, M., Rocco, P. and Waddan, A. (2020) 'Designing policy resilience: Lessons from the Affordable Care Act', *Policy Sciences*, 53(2): 269–89.
- Bell, D. (1973) *The coming of post-industrial society*, New York: Basic Books.
- Bell, D. (2018) *Free personal care: What the Scottish approach to social care would cost in England*, London: The Health Foundation, www.health.org.uk/newsletter-feature/free-personal-care-what-the-scottish-approach-to-social-care-would-cost-in [Accessed 26 November 2020].
- Bell, D. and Rutherford, A. (2013) 'Individual and geographic factors in the formation of care networks in the UK', *Population, Place and Space*, 19(6): 727–37.
- Bengoa, R. (2016) *Systems not structures: Changing health and social care* (Bengoa Report), Belfast: Expert Advisory Panel.
- Bengtson, V.L. and Martin, P. (2001) 'Families and intergenerational relationships in aging societies: Comparing the United States with German-speaking countries', *Zeitschrift für Gerontologie und Geriatrie*, 34(3): 207–17.
- Benz, A. (2012) 'Yardstick competition and policy learning in multi-level systems', *Regional and Federal Studies*, 22(3): 251–67.
- Benz, A. and Fürst, D. (2002) 'Policy learning in regional networks', *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 9(1): 21–35.
- Beresford, B.A., Mann, R.C., Parker, G.M., Kanaan, M., Faria, R., Rabiee, P. et al (2019) 'Reablement services for people at risk of needing social care: The MoRe mixed-methods evaluation', *Health Services and Delivery Research*, 1–254, doi:10.3310/hsdr07160.
- Bergene, A. (2007) 'Towards a critical realist comparative methodology: Context-sensitive theoretical comparison', *Journal of Critical Realism*, 6(1): 5–27.
- Berrington, A. (2017) 'Childlessness in the UK', in M. Kreyenfeld and D. Konietzka (eds) *Childlessness in Europe: Contexts, causes, and consequences*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp 57–76.
- Bertin, G. and Carradore, M. (2016) 'Differentiation of welfare regimes: The case of Italy', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 25(2): 149–60.

- Bevan, A. (1952) *In place of fear*, London: Quartet.
- Bigby, C. (2020) ‘Dedifferentiation and people with intellectual disabilities in the Australian National Disability Insurance Scheme: Bringing research, politics and policy together’, *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 45(4): 309–19.
- Birrell, D. and Gray, A.M. (2018) ‘Outcomes-based approaches and the devolved administrations’, *Social Policy Review* 30, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 67–86.
- Bolton, J. (2015) *Emerging practice in outcome-based commissioning for social care*, Discussion Paper, April, Oxford: Institute for Public Care, https://ipc.brookes.ac.uk/files/publications/John_Bolton_Outcome_Based_Commissioning_Paper_April_2015.pdf [Accessed 12 May 2020].
- Bosanquet, N. and Haldenby, A. (2020) ‘There is no magic fix for our social care crisis’, *The Guardian*, 30 July, www.theguardian.com/society/2020/jul/30/there-is-no-magic-fix-for-our-social-care-crisis [Accessed 31 July 2021].
- Bottery, S. (2020) ‘Twelve social care personas: Which one(s) are you?’, The King’s Fund blog, 23 November, www.kingsfund.org.uk/blog/2020/11/twelve-social-care-personas [Accessed 26 March 2022].
- Bovaird, T. (2014) ‘Attributing outcomes to social policy interventions – “gold standard” or “fool’s gold” in public policy and management?’, *Social Policy & Administration*, 48(1): 1–23.
- Boyce, S. (2017) *Paying for social care*, Cardiff: National Assembly for Wales.
- Bradbury, J. and Andrews, R. (2010) ‘State devolution and national identity: Continuity and change in the politics of Welshness and Britishness in Wales’, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 63(2): 229–49.
- Brindle, D. (2009) ‘Taking the long view: Social care reform’, *The Guardian*, 25 February, www.theguardian.com/society/2009/feb/25/interview-stewart-sutherland [Accessed 20 March 2022].
- Brooks, L. (2021) ‘Sturgeon says second independence vote “a matter of when, not if”’, *The Guardian*, 9 May, www.theguardian.com/politics/2021/may/09/scottish-indyref2-battle-distraction-covid-michael-gove [Accessed 18 September 2021].
- Brown, T. (2021) *Social care provision in the UK and the role of carers*, London: House of Lords Library.
- Bulmer, M. (1987) *The social basis of community care*, London: Routledge.
- Burke, S. (2021) ‘Post-pandemic challenges for all ages in an ageing society’, *Quality Ageing for Adults*, 22(3/4): 172–7.
- Burn, E. and Needham, C. (2014) *Implementing the Care Act, 2014 – a synthesis of project reports on the Care Act commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham, <https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/college-social-sciences/social-policy/publications/implementing-the-care-act-2014.pdf> [Accessed 13 March 2022].

- Burns, D., Rees Jones, I., Earle, J., Froud, J., Williams, K., Cowie, L. et al (2016) *Where does the money go? Financialised chains and the crisis in residential care*, CRESC Public Interest Report, Manchester: Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (CRESC), University of Manchester.
- Caiels, J., Forder, J., Malley, J., Netten, A. and Windle, K. (2010) *Measuring the outcomes of low-level services*, Discussion Paper 2699, Canterbury: University of Kent.
- Caiels, J., Milne, A. and Beadle-Brown, J. (2021) 'Strengths-based approaches in social work and social care: Reviewing the evidence', *Journal of Long-Term Care*, 401–22, <https://journal.ilpnetwork.org/articles/10.31389/jltc.102> [Accessed 1 March 2023].
- Cairney, P., Russell, S. and St Denny, E. (2016) 'The "Scottish approach" to policy and policymaking: What issues are territorial and what are universal?', *Policy & Politics*, 44(3): 333–50.
- Cambridge, P. and Carnaby, S. (2005) *Person centred planning and care management with people with learning disabilities*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Campbell, D. (2019) 'Pledges to fix social care could cost Boris Johnson dearly', *The Guardian*, 1 August, www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/aug/01/promising-to-fix-social-care-could-cost-boris-johnson-dearly [Accessed 16 September 2020].
- Carers UK (2020) *Caring behind closed doors: Six months on*, London, www.carersuk.org/images/News_and_campaigns/Behind_Closed_Doors_2020/Caring_behind_closed_doors_Oct20.pdf [Accessed 2 February 2021].
- Carey, G., Kay, A. and Nevile, A. (2019) 'Institutional legacies and "sticky layers": What happens in cases of transformative policy change?', *Administration & Society*, 51(3): 491–509.
- Carey, G., Dickinson, H., Malbon, E. and Reeders, D. (2018) 'The vexed question of market stewardship in the public sector: Examining equity and the social contract through the Australian National Disability Insurance Scheme', *Social Policy & Administration*, 52(1): 387–407.
- Cascio, M.A., Lee, E., Vaudrin, N. and Freedman, D. (2019) 'A team-based approach to open coding: Considerations for creating intercoder consensus', *Field Methods*, 31(2): 116–30.
- CCN (County Councils Network) (2022) 'New analysis warns government has "seriously underestimated" the costs of adult social care charging reforms', CNN News, 18 March, www.countycouncilsnetwork.org.uk/new-analysis-warns-government-has-seriously-underestimated-the-costs-of-adult-social-care-charging-reforms [Accessed 12 July 2022].
- CCPS (Coalition of Care and Support Providers Scotland) (2021) 'A National Care Service for Scotland, CCPS Consultation Response', Edinburgh, www.cosgrovecare.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/anationalcareserviceforscotland-ccpsconsultationresponse.pdf [Accessed 12 December 2021].

- Chapman, A. (2018) 'Playing catch-up? Adult social care in Northern Ireland', *Journal of the Institute of Public Administration of Ireland*, 66(3): 99–115.
- Chaney, P.J. (2022) 'Exploring the politicisation and territorialisation of adult social care in the United Kingdom: Electoral discourse analysis of state-wide and meso elections 1998–2019', *Global Social Policy*, 22(1): 141–71.
- Chang, M.-F. (2022) 'Challenges and chances for local health and social care integration: Lessons from Greater Manchester, England', *Journal of Integrated Care*, 30(2): 146–59.
- Cheshire–Allen, M. and Calder, G. (2022) "“No one was clapping for us”: Care, social justice and family carer wellbeing during the COVID-19 pandemic in Wales', *International Journal of Care and Caring*, 6(1–2): 49–66.
- Cheung, A. (2020) *The Barnett formula*, London: Institute for Government, www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/explainers/barnett-formula [Accessed 4 November 2022].
- Christie, M. (2011) *Christie Commission on the future delivery of public services*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government, www.gov.scot/publications/commission-future-delivery-public-services/documents [Accessed 26 November 2020].
- Clarke, J., Newman, J., Smith, N., Vidler, E. and Westmarland, L. (2007) *Creating citizen-consumers: Changing publics and changing public services*, London: SAGE.
- CMA (Competition and Markets Authority) (2017) *Care homes market study: Final report*, London, <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a1fdf30e5274a750b82533a/care-homes-market-study-final-report.pdf> [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- Cochrane, F. (2020) *Breaking peace: Brexit and Northern Ireland*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Cole, A. and Stafford, I. (2015) *Devolution and governance: Wales between capacity and constraint*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Pivot.
- Cole, A., Harguindéguy, J.-B., Stafford, I., Pasquier, R. and de Visscher, C. (2015) 'States of convergence in territorial governance', *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 45(2): 297–321.
- Collie, F. (2019) *State of caring in Scotland 2019*, Edinburgh: Carers Scotland, www.carersuk.org/scotland/policy/policy-library/state-of-caring-in-scotland-and-2019 [Accessed 16 January 2021].
- Cominetti, N., Gardiner, L. and Kelly, G. (2020) *What happens after the clapping finishes? The pay, terms and conditions we choose for our care workers*, London: Resolution Foundation.
- Common Weal Care Reform Group and Smith, M. (2021) *Common Weal's manifesto for a social care service*, Common Weal, https://discovery.dundee.ac.uk/ws/portalfiles/portal/56146500/Manifesto_for_a_National_Care_Service.pdf [Accessed 7 November 2022].

- The Conservative and Unionist Party (2019) *Forward, together: Our plan for a stronger Britain and a prosperous future*, Manifesto, London, <https://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/wmatrix/ukmanifestos2017/localpdf/Conservatives.pdf> [Accessed 25 November 2020].
- Cooke, K., Iredale, R., Williams, R. and Wooding, N. (2019) *Measuring the mountain: What really matters in social care to individuals in Wales*, Pontypridd: University of South Wales.
- COPNI (Commissioner for Older People for Northern Ireland) (2015) *Prepared to care: Modernising adult social care in Northern Ireland*, Belfast.
- COSLA (Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) (2021) 'COSLA response to consultation on national care service', News, www.cosla.gov.uk/news/2021/cosla-response-to-consultation-on-national-care-service [Accessed 3 September 2022].
- Courtin, E. and Knapp, M. (2017) 'Social isolation, loneliness and health in old age: A scoping review', *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 25(3): 799–812.
- CQC (Care Quality Commission) (2017) *The state of health care and adult social care in England*, London: CQC, https://www.cqc.org.uk/sites/default/files/20171123_stateofcare1617_report.pdf [Accessed 16 February 2019].
- Crowther, N. (2018) 'Don't panic! Why the social care crisis will not be solved by making a crisis out of social care', #socialcarefuture Blog, 14 March, <https://socialcarefuture.blog/2018/03/14/dont-panic-why-the-social-care-crisis-will-not-be-solved-by-making-a-crisis-out-of-social-care> [Accessed 9 August 2020].
- Curry, N. and Oung, C. (2021) *Fractured and forgotten? The social care provider market in England*, London: Nuffield Trust, www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/fractured-and-forgotten-the-social-care-provider-market-in-england [Accessed 6 December 2021].
- Curtice, J. Scholes, A., Ratti, V., Cant, J., Bennett, M., Hinchcliffe, S. et al (2022) *British Social Attitudes Survey 39*, London: NatCen, <https://natcen.ac.uk/our-research/research/british-social-attitudes/> [Accessed 2 December 2022].
- Dahl, H.M. (2021) 'The "care crisis": Its scientific framing and silences', in L.L. Hansen and H.M. Dahl (eds) *A care crisis in the Nordic welfare states? Care work, gender equality and welfare state sustainability*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 20–38.
- Daly, M. (2020) 'COVID-19 and care homes in England: What happened and why?', *Social Policy & Administration*, 54(7): 985–98.
- Daly, M. and Lewis, J. (2000) 'The concept of social care and the analysis of contemporary welfare states', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51(2): 281–98.
- Danermark, B., Ekström, M. and Karlsson, J.C. (2019) *Explaining society: Critical realism in the social sciences*, London: Routledge.

- Dayan, M. and Heenan, D. (2019) *Change or collapse: Lessons from the drive to reform health and social care in Northern Ireland*, London: Nuffield Trust, www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/research/change-or-collapse-lessons-from-the-drive-to-reform-health-and-social-care-in-northern-ireland [Accessed 18 June 2020].
- Dayrell, C., Semino, E., Kinloch, K. and Baker, P. (2020) *Social care in UK public discourse*, Lancaster: University of Lancaster.
- Demos (2009) *A constitution for social care*, London.
- DH (Department of Health) (2009) *Shaping the future of care together*, London.
- DH (2010) *A vision for adult social care: Capable communities and active citizens*, London.
- DH (2012) *Transforming care: A national response to Winterbourne View Hospital*, London, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213215/final-report.pdf [Accessed 22 July 2021].
- DH (2018) *Domiciliary care workforce review: Northern Ireland 2016–2021*, Belfast, www.health-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/health/Workforce%20Plan%20Domiciliary%20Care%202016%20-%202021.pdf [Accessed 2 June 2021].
- DH (2022a) *Consultation on Power to people*, Belfast, www.health-ni.gov.uk/articles/power-people [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- DH (2022b) *Quarterly direct payment statistics, December 2021*, Belfast, www.health-ni.gov.uk/publications/quarterly-direct-payments-statistics-december-2021 [Accessed 2 June 2021].
- Department of Health and Social Services (1990) *People first: Community care in Northern Ireland in the 1990s*, Belfast: HMSO.
- DHSC (Department of Health and Social Care) (2018) *Carers action plan: 2018–2020*, London, www.gov.uk/government/publications/carers-action-plan-2018-to-2020 [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- DHSC (2021a) *Integration and innovation: Working together to improve health and social care for all*, London: The Stationery Office, www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-improve-health-and-social-care-for-all/integration-and-innovation-working-together-to-improve-health-and-social-care-for-all-html-version [Accessed 3 March 2022].
- DHSC (2021b) *People at the heart of care: Adult social care reform*, White Paper, London: The Stationery Office, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1061870/people-at-the-heart-of-care-asc-reform-accessible-with-correction-slip.pdf [Accessed 3 March 2022].
- DHSC (2021c) *Market sustainability and fair cost of care fund: Purpose and conditions 2022 to 2023*, London, www.gov.uk/government/publications/market-sustainability-and-fair-cost-of-care-fund-2022-to-2023/market-sustainability-and-fair-cost-of-care-fund-purpose-and-conditions-2022-to-2023 [Accessed 3 March 2022].

- DHSC (2022) *Adult social care charging reform: Further details*, London, www.gov.uk/government/publications/build-back-better-our-plan-for-health-and-social-care/adult-social-care-charging-reform-further-details [Accessed 3 March 2022].
- Dilnot, A. (2011) *Fairer care funding: The Report of the Commission on Funding of Care and Support* (Dilnot Report), London: The Stationery Office.
- Drakeford, M. (2005) 'Wales and a third term of New Labour: Devolution and the development of difference', *Critical Social Policy*, 25(4): 497–506.
- Dromey, J. and Hochlaf, D. (2018) *Fair care: A workforce strategy for social care*, Newcastle: IPPR North, www.ippr.org/research/publications/fair-care [Accessed 30 November 2020].
- Elliott, I.C., Bottom, K.A., Carmichael, P., Liddle, J., Martin, S. and Pyper, R. (2022) 'The fragmentation of public administration: Differentiated and decentered governance in the (dis) United Kingdom', *Public Administration*, 100(1): 98–115.
- Entwistle, T., Downe, J., Guarneros-Meza, V. and Martin, S. (2014) 'The multi-level governance of Wales: Layer cake or marble cake?', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 16(2): 310–25.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ettelt, S., Damant, J., Perkins, M., Williams, L. and Wittenberg, R. (2020) *Personalisation in care homes for older people: Final report*, London: Policy Innovation and Evaluation Research Unit, https://piru.ac.uk/assets/files/Personalisation_in_care_homes-Final-report.pdf [Accessed 22 February 2022].
- Etzioni, A. (2012) 'A communitarian critique of human rights', in T. Cushman (ed) *Handbook of human rights*, London: Routledge, pp 153–8.
- Fair Work Convention (2016) *Fair work framework 2016*, Edinburgh, www.fairworkconvention.scot/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Fair-Work-Convention-Framework-PDF-Full-Version.pdf [Accessed 19 May 2022].
- Feeley, D. (2021) *Independent review of adult social care in Scotland* (Feeley Report), Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Ferguson, I. (2007) 'Increasing user choice or privatizing risk? The antinomies of personalization', *British Journal of Social Work*, 37(3): 387–403.
- Ferguson, Z. (2019) 'The Scottish Civil Service', in G. Hassan (ed) *The story of the Scottish Parliament: The first two decades explained*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp 64–72.
- Ferrant, G., Pesando, L.M. and Nowacka, K. (2014) *Unpaid care work: The missing link in the analysis of gender gaps in labour outcomes*, Boulogne-Billancourt: OECD Development Centre.
- Fine, M.D. (2007) *A caring society? Care and the dilemmas of human service in the twenty-first century*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Flanagan, K., Uyarra, E. and Laranja, M. (2011) 'Reconceptualising the "policy mix" for innovation', *Research Policy*, 40(5): 702–13.

- Flynn, S., Caton, S., Gillooly, A., Bradshaw, J., Hastings, R.P., Hatton, C. et al (2021) 'The experiences of adults with learning disabilities in the UK during the COVID-19 pandemic: Qualitative results from Wave 1 of the Coronavirus and people with learning disabilities study', *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 26(4): 224–29.
- Folbre, N. (2006) 'Measuring care: Gender, empowerment, and the care economy', *Journal of Human Development*, 7(2): 183–99.
- Foster, D. (2021) *Reform of adult social care funding: Developments since July 2019 (England)*, London: House of Commons Library, <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8001> [Accessed 4 April 2022].
- Foster, D. (2022) *Adult social care funding (England)*, London: House of Commons Library, <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-7903/CBP-7903.pdf> [Accessed 3 September 2022].
- Fox, A. (2018) *A new health and care system: Escaping the invisible asylum*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Fraser, G. (2019) 'Why won't Remainers talk about family', UnHerd, 22 February, <https://unherd.com/2019/02/why-wont-remainers-talk-about-family> [Accessed 12 May 2020].
- Friedman, M. (2005) *Trying hard is not good enough: How to produce measurable improvements for customers and communities*, Victoria, BC: Trafford Publishing.
- Future Care Capital (2018) *Facilitating care insight to develop caring economies*, London, <https://futurecarecapital.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Full-Report-%E2%80%93Facilitating-Care-Insight-to-Develop-Caring-Economies.pdf> [Accessed 5 January 2022].
- Gallagher, J. (2019) 'Devolution: An assessment', in G. Hassan (ed) *The story of the Scottish Parliament: The first two decades explained*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp 242–51.
- Gerlich, K. and Farquharson, C. (2020) 'Experts debate: Registering care workers', *The Guardian*, 27 February, www.theguardian.com/society/2020/feb/27/experts-debate-registering-care-workers [Accessed 19 March 2022].
- Giddens, A. (1990) *The consequences of modernity*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Giddens, A. and Pierson, C. (1998) *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making sense of modernity*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gilleard, C. and Higgs, P. (2010) 'Aging without agency: Theorizing the fourth age', *Aging and Mental Health*, 14(2): 121–8.
- Gingrich, J.R. (2011) *Making markets in the welfare state: The politics of varying market reforms*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Glasby, J. (2007) *Understanding Health and Social Care*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Glasby, J. and Littlechild, R. (2016) *Direct payments and personal budgets: Putting personalisation into practice*, Bristol: Policy Press.

- Glasby, J., Duffy, S. and Needham, C. (2011) 'Debate: A Beveridge report for the 21st century? The implications of self-directed support for future welfare reform', *Policy & Politics*, 39(4): 613–17.
- Glasby, J., Zhang, Y.N., Bennett, M.R. and Hall, P. (2021) 'A lost decade? A renewed case for adult social care reform in England', *Journal of Social Policy*, 50(2): 406–37.
- Gori, C., Fernandez, J. and Wittenberg, R. (2016) 'Conclusion: Looking ahead in long-term care policies', in C. Gori, J. Fernandez and R. Wittenberg (eds) *Long-term care reforms in OECD countries*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 293–306.
- Gorski, P.S. (2013) 'What is critical realism? And why should you care?', *Contemporary Sociology*, 42(5): 658–70.
- Gray, A.M. and Birrell, D. (2013) *Transforming adult social care: Contemporary policy and practice*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Greenhalgh, T. (2002) 'Understanding family values', *Young Consumers*, 4(1): 13–20.
- Gregory, A. (2022) 'Number of adults with dementia to exceed 150m by 2050, study finds', *The Guardian*, 6 January, www.theguardian.com/society/2022/jan/06/number-adults-with-dementia-exceed-150-million-2050-study?utm_term=AutofeedandCMP=twt_b-gdnnewsandutm_medium=Socialandutm_source=Twitter [Accessed 7 January 2022].
- Hacker, J.S. (2004) 'Privatizing risk without privatizing the welfare state: The hidden politics of social policy retrenchment in the United States', *American Political Science Review*, 98(2): 243–60.
- Hamblin, K. (2019) *Adult social care and wellbeing policy in the four nations of the UK*, Sheffield: University of Sheffield, http://circle.group.shef.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/WPO_final-v2.pdf [Accessed 1 December 2021].
- Hamblin, K. (2020) *Care system sustainability: What role for technology? An evidence review*, Sustainable Care Paper 3, Sheffield: University of Sheffield.
- Hanssen, J.I., Pettersen, P.A. and Tveit Sandvin, J. (2001) 'Welfare municipalities: Economic resources or party politics? Norwegian local government social programs of the 1920s', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 10(1): 27–44.
- Harvey, M. (2020) 'Devolution', in M. Keating (ed) *The Oxford handbook of Scottish politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 371–85.
- Hassan, G. (2019) *The story of the Scottish Parliament: The first two decades explained*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hassan, G. and Shaw, E. (2020) 'The Scottish Labour Party', in M. Keating (ed) *The Oxford handbook of Scottish politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 255–77.
- Hastings, A. (1997) *The construction of nationhood: Ethnicity, religion and nationalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hayes, L., Johnson, E. and Tarrant, A. (2019) *Professionalisation at work in adult social care*, London: GMB, www.gmb.org.uk/sites/default/files/Professionalisation_at_Work_0309.pdf [Accessed 12 February 2022].
- Heald, D. (2020) 'The politics of Scotland's public finances', in M. Keating (ed) *The Oxford handbook of Scottish politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 512–42.
- Health and Social Care and Housing, Communities and Local Government Committees (2018) *Long-term funding of adult social care*, London: The Stationery Office, <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmsellect/cmcomloc/768/768.pdf> [Accessed 22 May 2019].
- Health and Social Care Board (2015) *A managed change: An agenda for creating a sustainable basis for domiciliary care in Northern Ireland*, Belfast.
- Health and Social Care Board (2016) *eHealth and care strategy for Northern Ireland*, Belfast.
- Health and Social Care Northern Ireland (2011) *Transforming your care: A review of health and social care in Northern Ireland*, Belfast: Northern Ireland Executive.
- Health Foundation, The (2021) *Social care funding gap*, London, www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/charts-and-infographics/REAL-social-care-funding-gap [Accessed 8 June 2022].
- Heenan, D. and Birrell, D. (2018) *The integration of health and social care in the UK*, London: Macmillan.
- Heitmueller, A. (2007) 'The chicken or the egg? Endogeneity in labour market participation of informal carers in England', *Journal of Health Economics*, 26(3): 536–59.
- HM Government (2007) *Putting people first: A shared vision and commitment to the transformation of adult social care*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Government (2009) *Shaping the future of care together*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Government (2010) *Building the National Care Service*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Government (2012) *Caring for our future: Reforming care and support*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Government (2019) *Review of UK government union capability* (Dunlop Review), London, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/972987/Lord_Dunlop_s_review_into_UK_Government_Union_Capability.pdf [Accessed 20 March 2022].
- HM Government (2021) *Build back better: Our plan for health and social care*, London: Department of Health and Social Care.
- HM Government (2022) *Health and Care Act*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HM Treasury (2016) 'Country and regional analysis', www.gov.uk/government/collections/country-and-regional-analysis [Accessed 13 November 2021].

- HM Treasury (2017) 'Public expenditure Statistical analyses 2017', London: HMSO, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/630570/60243_PESA_Accessible.pdf
- HM Treasury (2022) *Autumn Statement*, London: HM Treasury, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/autumn-statement-2022-documents/autumn-statement-2022-html#:~:text=The%20Autumn%20Statement%20sets%20out%20a%20package%20of%20targeted%20support,bill%20increases%20following%20the%20revaluation.> [Accessed 24 November 2022].
- Hochschild, A.R. (2015) 'Global care chains and emotional surplus value', in D. Engster and T. Metz (eds) *Justice, politics, and the family*, London: Routledge, pp 249–61.
- Hoggett, P. (2006) 'Conflict, ambivalence, and the contested purpose of public organizations', *Human Relations*, 59(2): 175–94.
- Holmes, J. (2021) *Brexit and the end of the transition period: what does it mean for the health and care system?* London: King's Fund, <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/articles/brexit-end-of-transition-period-impact-health-care-system> [Accessed 23 November 2022].
- Holthman, G. (2018) *Paying for social care: An independent report commissioned by the Welsh Government*, Cardiff: Welsh Government.
- Housden, P. (2014) 'This is us: A perspective on public services in Scotland', *Public Policy & Administration*, 29(1): 64–74.
- Howlett, M. and Rayner, J. (2007) 'Design principles for policy mixes: Cohesion and coherence in "new governance arrangements"', *Policy and Society*, 26(4): 1–18.
- Howlett, M. and Tosun, J. (eds) (2018) *Policy styles and policy-making: Exploring the linkages*, London: Routledge.
- Howlett, M. and Tosun, J. (eds) (2021) *The Routledge handbook of policy styles*, London: Routledge.
- Hudson, B. (2011) 'Big society: A concept in pursuit of a definition', *Journal of Integrated Care*, 19(5): 17–24.
- Hudson, B. (2021) *Clients, consumers or citizens? The privatisation of adult social care in England*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Hudson, B., Hunter, D. and Peckham, S. (2019) 'Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: Can policy support programs help?', *Policy Design and Practice*, 2(1): 1–14.
- Humpherson, E. (2021) 'Glimmers of light for social care statistics', Office for Statistics Regulation, 8 July, <https://osr.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/glimmers-of-light-for-adult-social-care-statistics> [Accessed 4 January 2022].
- Humphries, R. and Timmins, N. (2021) *Stories from social care leadership: Progress and pestilence and penury*, London: The King's Fund, www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/social-care-leadership [Accessed 30 January 2022].

- Hupe, P. and Hill, M. (2016) “‘And the rest is implementation’”: Comparing approaches to what happens in policy processes beyond Great Expectations’, *Public Policy & Administration*, 31(2): 103–21.
- IFS (Institute for Fiscal Studies) (2017) *Public spending on adult social care in England*, London.
- Independent Age (2015) *Moved to care: The impact of migration on the adult social care workforce*, London.
- Independent Commission on Social Services in Wales (2010) *From vision to action: The report of the Independent Commission on Social Services in Wales*, Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.
- ISER (Institute for Social and Economic Research) (2022) *Understanding society: Waves 1–11, 2009–2020 and harmonised BHPS: Waves 1–18, 1991–2009* [data collection], 16th edn, UK Data Service, University of Essex, SN: 6614, doi:10.5255/UKDA-SN-6614-17.
- Jenson, J. (2015) ‘Social innovation: redesigning the welfare diamond’, in A. Nicholls, J. Simon and M. Gabriel (eds) *New frontiers in social innovation research*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 89–106.
- Jenson, J. and Saint-Martin, D. (2003) ‘New routes to social cohesion? Citizenship and the social investment state’, *Canadian Journal of Sociology/ Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 28(1): 77–99.
- Jones, R. and Lewis, H. (2019) ‘Wales and the Welsh language: Setting the context’, in R. Jones and H. Lewis (eds) *New geographies of language*, London: Springer, pp 95–145.
- Jordan, A.G. and Richardson, J.J. (1983) ‘Policy communities: The British and European policy style’, *Policy Studies Journal*, 11(4): 603–15.
- Joseph, J. and McGregor, J.A. (2019) *Wellbeing, resilience and sustainability: The new trinity of governance*, Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
- Karlsberg Schaffer, S. (2015) ‘The effect of free personal care for the elderly on informal caregiving’, *Health Economics*, 24: 104–17.
- Katzenstein, P.J. (2016) *Small states in world markets: Industrial policy in Europe*, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Keating, M. (2015) ‘The political economy of small states in Europe’, in M. Keating (ed) *Small states in the modern world*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 3–20.
- Keating, M. and Wilson, A. (2014) ‘Regions with regionalism? The rescaling of interest groups in six European states’, *European Journal of Political Research*, 53(4): 840–57.
- Keating, M., Cairney, P. and Hepburn, E. (2009) ‘Territorial policy communities and devolution in the UK’, *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 2(1): 51–66.
- Keating, M., Cairney, P. and Hepburn, E. (2012) ‘Policy convergence, transfer and learning in the UK under devolution’, *Regional and Federal Studies*, 22(3): 289–307.

- Keating, N., McGregor, J.A. and Yeandle, S. (2021) 'Sustainable care: Theorising the wellbeing of caregivers to older persons', *International Journal of Care and Caring*, 5(4): 611–30.
- Kelly, D. and Kennedy, J. (2017) *Power to people: Proposals to reboot adult care and support in NI*, Belfast: Department of Health, www.health-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/health/power-to-people-full-report.PDF [Accessed 4 November 2022].
- King's Fund, The (2021) *Social Care 360*, London, www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/2021-05/social-care-360-2021_0.pdf [Accessed 20 February 2022].
- Kingston, A., Comas-Herrera, A. and Jagger, C. J. (2018) 'Forecasting the care needs of the older population in England over the next 20 years: Estimates from the Population Ageing and Care Simulation (PACSim) modelling study', *The Lancet Public Health*, 3(9): e447–e455.
- Kirkegaard, S. and Andersen, D. (2018) 'Co-production in community mental health services: Blurred boundaries or a game of pretend?', *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 40(5): 828–42.
- Kittay, E.F. (2013) *Love's labor: Essays on women, equality and dependency*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Knapp, M., Hardy, B. and Forder, J. (2001) 'Commissioning for quality: Ten years of social care markets in England', *Journal of Social Policy*, 30(2): 283–306.
- Knapp, M., Cyhlarova, E., Comas-Herrera, A. and Lorenz-Dant, K. (2021) *Crystallising the case for deinstitutionalisation: COVID-19 and the experiences of persons with disabilities*, London: Care Policy and Evaluation Centre, www.lse.ac.uk/cpec/assets/documents/CPEC-Covid-Desinstitutionalisation.pdf [Accessed 18 April 2022].
- Knijn, T. and Ungerson, G. (1997) 'Introduction: Care work and gender in welfare regimes', *Social Politics*, 4(3): 323–7.
- Kotecha, V. (2020) 'The hidden profits behind collapsing care homes', Centre for Health and the Public Interest blog, 28 May, <https://chpi.org.uk/blog/the-hidden-profits-behind-collapsing-care-homes> [Accessed 2 June 2021].
- Kröger, T. (2011) 'Retuning the Nordic welfare municipality: Central regulation of social care under change in Finland', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 31(3/4): 148–59.
- Laffin, M. (2004) 'Is regional centralism inevitable? The case of the Welsh Assembly', *Regional Studies*, 38(2): 213–23.
- Laing Buisson (2022a) *Care homes for older people: UK market report*, London.
- Laing Buisson (2022b) *Impact assessment of the implementation of Section 18(3) of the Care Act 2014 and Fair Cost of Care*, London.
- Laslett, B. and Brenner, J. (1989) 'Gender and social reproduction: Historical perspectives', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15(1): 381–404.

- Law Commission, The (2011) *Adult social care*, London: The Stationery Office, https://s3-eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/lawcom-prod-storage-11jsou24uy7q/uploads/2015/03/lc326_adult_social_care.pdf [Accessed 8 November 2021].
- Lee, T. and Stoye, G. (2017) *UK health and social care spending*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Leece, J. (2010) 'Paying the piper and calling the tune: Power and the direct payment relationship', *British Journal of Social Work*, 40(1): 188–206.
- Lemmon, E. (2020) 'Utilisation of personal care services in Scotland: The influence of unpaid carers', *Journal of Long-Term Care*, 54–69, doi: <http://doi.org/10.31389/jltc.23>.
- Lemmon, E. and Bell, D. (2019) *Variations in domiciliary free personal care across Scottish local authorities*, Working Paper 91, Centre for Population Change, January, www.cpc.ac.uk/docs/2019_WP91_Variations_in_domiciliary_free_personal_care_across_Scottish_Local_Authorities_Bell.pdf [Accessed 19 September 2021].
- LE Wales (2020) *Use of additional funding for social care*, Cardiff: Welsh Government, <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2021-04/use-of-additional-funding-for-social-care-final-report.pdf> [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- Lewis, J. (1992) 'Gender and the development of welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2(3): 159–73.
- Lewis, J. and Glennerster, H. (1996) *Implementing the new community care*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lipsky, M. (1980) *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Llewellyn, M., Verity, F. and Wallace, S. (eds) (2020) *Evaluation of the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014: Literature review*, Cardiff: Welsh Government, GSR report number 60/2020, <https://gov.wales/evaluation-social-services-and-well-being-wales-act-2014-literature-review> [Accessed 12 February 2021].
- Lowndes, V. and Lemprière, M. (2018) 'Understanding variation in processes of institutional formation', *Political Studies*, 66(1): 226–44.
- Macmillan, R. and Paine, A.E. (2021) 'The third sector in a strategically selective landscape: The case of commissioning public services', *Journal of Social Policy*, 50(3): 606–26.
- Mahoney, J. and Thelen, K. (2010) 'A theory of gradual institutional change: Explaining institutional change', *Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*, 1: 1–37.
- Malone, S. and Hayes, M. (2017) 'Integrated care partnerships Northern Ireland – leading integration: Delivering better outcomes', *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 17(5): 1–8.
- Mansell, J. and Beadle-Brown, J. (2004) 'Person centred planning or person-centred action? Policy and practice in intellectual disability services', *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 17(1): 23–6.

- Manthorpe, J., Woolham, J., Norrie, C. and Samsi, K. (2020) 'Family matters: Personal assistants' experiences of engaging and working with their employers' families', *International Journal of Care and Caring*, 4(4): 497–511.
- Marczak, J., Fernandez, J.L., Manthorpe, J., Brimblecombe, N., Moriarty, J., Knapp, M. et al (2022) 'How have the Care Act 2014 ambitions to support carers translated into local practice? Findings from a process evaluation study of local stakeholders' perceptions of Care Act implementation', *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 30(5): e1711–e1720.
- Marsh, D. (2008) 'Understanding British government: Analysing competing models', *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 10(2): 251–68.
- McConnell, A. (2010) *Understanding policy success: Rethinking public policy*, Basingstoke: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- McConnell, A., Greal, L. and Lea, T. (2020) 'Policy success for whom? A framework for analysis', *Policy Sciences*, 53(4): 589–608.
- McCormick, J., McDowell, E. and Harris, A. (2009) *Policies for peace of mind? Devolution and older age in the UK*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research, www.ippr.org/publications/policies-for-peace-of-mind-devolution-and-older-age-in-the-uk [Accessed 17 June 2019].
- McGarvey, N. (2019) 'British political tradition and Scottish local government', in G. Hassan (ed) *The story of the Scottish Parliament: The first two decades explained*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp 116–22.
- McHale, J. and Noszlopy, L. (2021) *Adult social care provision under pressure: Lessons from the pandemic*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham, www.birmingham.ac.uk/documents/college-artslaw/law/research/adult-social-care-provision-under-pressure-lessons-from-the-pandemic-november-2021.pdf [Accessed 20 January 2022].
- Miller, R., Brown, H. and Mangan, C. (2016) *Integrated care in action: A practical guide for health, social care and housing support*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Miller, R., Glasby, J. and Dickinson, H. (2021) 'Integrated health and social care in England: Ten years on', *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 21(4): 6, 1–9.
- Miller, R., Williams, I., Allen, K. and Glasby, J. (2013) 'Evidence, insight, or intuition? Investment decisions in the commissioning of prevention services for older people', *Journal of Care Services Management*, 7(4): 119–27.
- Ministry of Housing and Local Government (1968) *Report of the Interdepartmental Committee on Local Authorities and Allied Personal Social Services* (Seebohm Report), London: The Stationery Office.
- Morris, J. (1993) *Independent lives: Community care and disabled people*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

References

- Moon, D.S. and Evans, T. (2017) 'Welsh devolution and the problem of legislative competence', *British Politics*, 12(3): 335–60.
- Morel, N. (2007) 'Providing coverage against new social risks in Bismarckian welfare states: The case of long-term care', in K. Armingeon and G. Bonoli (eds) *The politics of post-industrial welfare states*, London: Routledge, pp 245–65.
- Morphet, J. (2021) *The impact of COVID-19 on devolution: Recentralising the British state beyond Brexit?*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Moussa, M.M. (2019) 'The relationship between elder care-giving and labour force participation in the context of policies addressing population ageing: A review of empirical studies published between 2006 and 2016', *Ageing & Society*, 39(6): 1281–310.
- Mulhall, S. and Swift, A. (1992) *Liberals and communitarians*, Oxford: Blackwell Oxford.
- NAO (National Audit Office) (2021) *The adult social care market in England*, London, www.nao.org.uk/report/adult-social-care-markets [Accessed 20 January 2022].
- Needham, C. (2007) *The reform of public services under New Labour: Narratives of consumerism*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Needham, C. (2011) *Personalising public services: Understanding the personalisation narrative*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Needham, C. and Carr, S. (2009) *Co-production: An emerging evidence base for adult social care transformation*, London: Social Care Institute for Excellence.
- Needham, C. and Dickinson, H. (2018) "'Any one of us could be among that number": Comparing the policy narratives for individualized disability funding in Australia and England', *Social Policy & Administration*, 52(3): 731–49.
- Needham, C. and Hall, P. (2022) 'Dealing with drift: Comparing social care reform in the four nations of the UK', *Social Policy & Administration*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12858>.
- Needham, C., Allen, K., Burn, E., Hall, K., Mangan, C., Al-Janabi, H. et al (2022) 'How do you shape a market? Explaining local state practices in adult social care', *Journal of Social Policy*, 1–21, doi:10.1017/S0047279421000805.
- Nesom, S. and MacKillop, E. (2021) 'What matters in the implementation of sustainable development policies? Findings from the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act, 2015', *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 23(4): 432–45.
- NIHR (National Institute of Health Research) (2021) *Improving the quality of care homes, What does the evidence tell us?*, London.
- Noddings, N. (2013) *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Northern Ireland Executive (2020) *New decade, new approach*, Belfast: Northern Ireland Executive, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/856998/2020-01-08_a_new_decade__a_new_approach.pdf [Accessed 30 October 2021].
- Nuffield Trust (2020) 'How much social care does each country fund?', Nuffield Trust, 28 March, <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/news-item/how-much-social-care-does-each-country-fund>
- O'Dowd, A. (2016) 'NHS is pushed to the limit as adult social care system reaches "tipping point", warns regulator', *British Medical Journal*, 355: i5553.
- O'Neil, M., Gerstein Pineau, M., Kendall-Taylor, J., Volmert, D. and Stevens, A. (2017) *Finding a better frame: How to create more effective messages on homelessness in the United Kingdom*, London: Crisis.
- ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2015) 'Internal migration, England and Wales: Year ending June 2015', www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/migrationwithintheuk/bulletins/internalmigrationbylocalauthoritiesinenglandandwales/yearendingjune2015 [Accessed 14 May 2021].
- ONS (2016) '2011 Census analysis: Internal and international migration of older residents (aged 65 and over) in England and Wales in the year prior to the 2011 Census', <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/census/2011-census-analysis/internal-and-international-migration-of-older-residents--aged-65-and-over--in-england-and-wales-in-the-year-prior-to-the-2011-census/story-on-internal-and-international-migration.html> [Accessed 14 May 2021].
- ONS (2020) 'Care homes and estimating the self-funding population, England: 2019 to 2020', www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/socialcare/articles/carehomesandestimatingtheself-fundingpopulationengland/2019to2020 [Accessed 14 May 2021].
- ONS (2021a) 'Mid-year population estimates (2020), by Welsh local authorities, English regions and UK countries, by single year of age and sex', <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/annualmidyearpopulationestimates/mid2020> [Accessed 28 February 2022].
- ONS (2021b) 'Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland', www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland [Accessed 18 February 2022].
- ONS (2022) 'GDP – Data tables', www.ons.gov.uk/economy/grossdomesticproductgdp/datasets/uksecondestimateofgdpdatatables [Accessed 2 December 2022].

- Orloff, A.S. (1993) 'Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states', *American Sociological Review*, 58(3): 303–28.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1980) 'Markets, bureaucracies and clans', *Administrative Science*, 25(1): 129–41.
- Oung, C., Schlepper, L. and Curry, N. (2020) *Adult social care in the four countries of the UK*, Explainer Series, London: Nuffield Trust.
- Paun, A. and Munro, J. (2015) *Governing in an ever looser union: How the four governments of the UK co-operate, negotiate and compete*, London: Institute for Government, www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Governing%20in%20an%20ever%20looser%20union%20-%20final.pdf [Accessed 18 December 2021].
- Paun, A., Rutter, J. and Nicholl, A. (2016) *Devolution as a policy laboratory: Evidence sharing and learning between the UK's four governments*, London: Institute for Government, Alliance for Useful Evidence and Carnegie UK Trust, www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/Alliance%20Policy%20Laboratory%20paper%20v3.pdf [Accessed 18 December 2021].
- Pearson, C. (2000) 'Money talks? Competing discourses in the implementation of direct payments', *Critical Social Policy*, 20(4): 459–77.
- Pearson, C. (2004) 'Keeping the cash under control: What's the problem with direct payments in Scotland?', *Disability & Society*, 19(1): 3–14.
- Pearson, C. and Ridley, J. (2017) 'Is personalization the right plan at the wrong time? Re-thinking cash-for-care in an age of austerity', *Social Policy & Administration*, 51(7): 1042–59.
- Pearson, C. and Watson, N. (2018) 'Implementing health and social care integration in Scotland: Renegotiating new partnerships in changing cultures of care', *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 26(3): e396–e403.
- Pearson, C., Watson, N. and Manji, K. (2018) 'Changing the culture of social care in Scotland: Has a shift to personalization brought about transformative change?', *Social Policy & Administration*, 52(3): 662–76.
- Pearson, C., Brunner, R., Porter, T. and Watson, N. (2020) 'Personalisation and the promise of independent living: Where now for cash, care and control for disability organisations across the UK?', *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 22(1): 285–95.
- Peng, I. (2016) 'Testing the limits of welfare state changes: The slow-moving immigration policy reform in Japan', *Social Policy & Administration*, 50(2): 278–95.
- Pettigrew, A., McKee, L. and Ferlie, E. (1988) 'Understanding change in the NHS', *Public Administration*, 66(3): 297–317.
- Phillips, A. and Morgan, G. (2014) 'Co-production within health and social care – The implications for Wales?', *Quality in Ageing and Older Adults*, 15(1): 10–20.

- Pierson, C. (2021) *The next welfare state? UK welfare after COVID-19*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Plant, R., Lesser, H. and Taylor-Gooby, P. (1980) *Political philosophy and social welfare: Essays on the normative basis of welfare provision*, London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Pollitt, C. (2002) 'Clarifying convergence. Striking similarities and durable differences in public management reform', *Public Management Review*, 3(4): 471–92.
- Pressman, J.L. and Wildavsky, A.B. (1973) *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Prior, L. (2003) *Using documents in social research*, London: SAGE.
- Public Health Scotland (2021) *Care home census for adults in Scotland*, Edinburgh, <https://publichealthscotland.scot/publications/care-home-census-for-adults-in-scotland/care-home-census-for-adults-in-scotland-statistics-for-2011-to-2021-part-1> [Accessed 25 January 2022].
- Razavi, S. (2007) *The political and social economy of care in a development context: Conceptual issues, research questions and policy options*, Geneva: UN Research Institute for Social Development.
- Razavi, S. (2011) 'Rethinking care in a development context: An introduction', *Development and Change*, 42(4): 873–903.
- Razavi, S. and Staab, S. (2012) *Global variations in the political and social economy of care: Worlds apart*, London: Routledge.
- Reed, S., Oung, C., Davies, J., Dayan, M. and Scobie, S. (2021) *Integrating health and social care: A comparison of policy and progress across the four countries of the UK*, London: Nuffield Trust, <https://www.nuffieldtrust.org.uk/files/2021-12/integrated-care-web.pdf> [Accessed 28 February 2022].
- Rennie, J. (2022) 'Northumbria NHS Trust to be first in England to provide home care services to community', homecare.co.uk, 13 January, www.homecare.co.uk/news/article.cfm/id/1663284/northumbria-nhs-trust-home-care [Accessed 14 January 2022].
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996) 'The new governance: Governing without government', *Political Studies*, 44(4): 652–67.
- Richardson, J. (2013) *Policy styles in Western Europe*, London: Routledge.
- Richardson, J. (2018) 'The changing British policy style: From governance to government?', *British Politics*, 13(2): 215–33.
- Roantree, B. and Vira, K. (2018) *The rise and rise of women's employment in the UK*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies, <https://ifs.org.uk/publications/rise-and-rise-womens-employment-uk> [Accessed 19 March 2022].
- Roberts, J. (2020) 'The leadership of place and people in the new English combined authorities', *Local Government Studies*, 46(6): 995–1014.

References

- Robertson, R., Appleby, J., Evans, H. and Hemmings, N. (2019) *Public satisfaction with the NHS and social care in 2018: Results from the British Social Attitudes Survey*, London: The King's Fund and Nuffield Trust.
- Robson, C.M.K. (2016) *Real world research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rocco, P. (2017) 'Informal caregiving and the politics of policy drift in the United States', *Journal of Aging and Social Policy*, 29(5): 413–32.
- Rodríguez-Pose, A. and Gill, N. (2003) 'The global trend towards devolution and its implications', *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 21(3): 333–51.
- Rose, R. (1993) *Lesson-drawing in public policy: A guide to learning across time and space*, Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.
- Rummery, K. and Fine, M. (2012) 'Care: A critical review of theory, policy and practice', *Social Policy & Administration*, 46(3): 321–43.
- Rummery, K. and McAngus, C. (2015) 'The future of social policy in Scotland: Will further devolved powers lead to better social policies for disabled people?', *Political Quarterly*, 86(2): 234–9.
- Sabatier, P.A. and Weible, C.M. (2019) 'The advocacy coalition framework: Innovations and clarifications', in Sabatier, P.A. (ed) *Theories of the policy process*, London: Routledge, pp 189–220.
- Sayer, A. (1992) *Method in social science: A realist approach*, London: Psychology Press.
- Sayer, A. (1999) *Realism and social science*, London: SAGE.
- SCIE (Social Care Institute for Excellence) (2010) *At a Glance 31: Enabling risk, ensuring safety: Self-directed support and personal budgets*, London, www.scie.org.uk/publications/atagance/atagance31.asp [Accessed 20 June 2021].
- Schickler, E. (2001) *Disjointed pluralism: Institutional innovation in the US Congress*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Schmidt, V.A. (2008) 'Discursive institutionalism: The explanatory power of ideas and discourse', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11: 303–26.
- Scottish Executive (2001) *Fair care for older people*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Executive (2006a) *Care 21: The future of unpaid care in Scotland*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Executive (2006b) *Changing lives: Report of the 21st Century Social Work Review*, Edinburgh, www.gov.scot/publications/changing-lives-report-21st-century-social-work-review [Accessed 13 February 2022].
- Scottish Government (2010a) *Caring together: The carers strategy for Scotland 2010–2015*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Government (2010b) *Reshaping care for older people: A programme for change 2011–2021*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Government (2010c) *Self-directed support: A national strategy for Scotland*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Government (2012) *Integration of adult health and social care in Scotland: Consultation on proposals*, Edinburgh.

- Scottish Government (2013) *Free personal and nursing care, Scotland, 2011–12*, <https://www.gov.scot/publications/free-personal-nursing-care-scotland-2011-2012/pages/12/> [Accessed 28 February 2022].
- Scottish Government (2016) *Health and social care delivery plan*, Edinburgh, www.gov.scot/binaries/content/documents/govscot/publications/strategy-plan/2016/12/health-social-care-delivery-plan/documents/00511950-pdf/00511950-pdf/govscot%3Adocument/00511950.pdf [Accessed 13 February 2022].
- Scottish Government (2021) *A National Care Service for Scotland: Consultation*, Edinburgh.
- Scottish Government (2022) *Free personal and nursing care, Scotland, 2020–21*, <https://www.gov.scot/publications/free-personal-nursing-care-scotland-2020-21/documents/> [Accessed 28 February 2022].
- Scottish Government (2022) ‘National Care Service consultation responses published’, Edinburgh, www.gov.scot/news/national-care-service-consultation-responses-published [Accessed 18 February 2022].
- Scottish Government and COSLA (Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) (2021) *Enabling, connecting and empowering: Care in the digital age*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Parliament Health, Social Care and Sport Committee (2021) *Official report*, 28 September, www.parliament.scot/api/sitecore/CustomMedia/OfficialReport?meetingId=13339 [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- Scully, R. and Wyn Jones, R. (2015) ‘The public legitimacy of the National Assembly for Wales’, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 21(4): 515–33.
- Self Directed Support Scotland (2020) *My support my choice: People’s experiences of self-directed support and social care in Scotland*, Edinburgh, www.sdsscotland.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/MSMC-Scotland-Report-2020.pdf [Accessed 1 March 2022].
- Series, L. (2019a) ‘Disability and human rights’, in N. Watson and S. Vehmas (eds) *Routledge handbook of disability studies*, London: Routledge, pp 72–88.
- Series, L. (2019b) ‘On detaining 300,000 people: The liberty protection safeguards’, *International Journal of Mental Health and Capacity Law*, 25: 82–123.
- Series, L. (2022) *Deprivation of liberty in the shadow of the institution*, Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Sewerin, S. (2020) ‘Understanding complex policy mixes: Conceptual and empirical challenges’, in G. Capano and M. Howlett (eds) *A modern guide to public policy*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp 191–201.
- Shakespeare, T., Stöckl, A. and Porter, T. (2018) ‘Metaphors to work by: The meaning of personal assistance in England’, *International Journal of Care and Caring*, 2(2): 165–79.
- Shutt, J. and Liddle, J. (2019) ‘Are combined authorities in England strategic and fit for purpose?’, *Local Economy*, 34(2): 196–207.

- Simonazzi, A. (2009) ‘Care regimes and national employment models’, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 33(2): 211–32.
- Simons, J.J. and Green, M.C. (2018) ‘Divisive topics as social threats’, *Communication Research*, 45(2): 165–87.
- Skills for Care (2021) *The state of the adult social care sector and workforce in England, 2021*, London: Skills for Care, www.skillsforcare.org.uk/adult-social-care-workforce-data-old/Workforce-intelligence/documents/State-of-the-adult-social-care-sector/The-State-of-the-Adult-Social-Care-Sector-and-Workforce-2021.pdf [Accessed 9 January 2022].
- Sloan, B. (2021) “‘Easing” duties and making dignity difficult: COVID-19 and the Care Act 2014’, *Public Law*, 1: 37–46.
- Smith, M. (2021) ‘What is care?’, Common Weal blog, 4 November, <https://commonweal.scot/what-is-care> [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- #socialcarefuture (2019) *Talking about a brighter social care future*, www.camphillvillagetrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/iC-SCF-report-2019-d-1.pdf [Accessed 18 November 2021].
- Spencer-Lane, T. (2011) ‘The Law Commission’s final recommendations for a new adult social care statute’, *Social Care and Neurodisability*, 2(4): 226–33.
- St Denny, E. (2019) ‘The Scottish Parliament and “new politics” at twenty’, in G. Hassan (ed) *The story of the Scottish Parliament: The first two decades explained*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp 73–83.
- Sussex, J., Burge, P., Lu, H., Exley, J., King, S. and RAND Europe (2019) *Public acceptability of health and social care funding options: Funding options for the NHS and social care in the UK*, London: The Health Foundation, www.health.org.uk/sites/default/files/upload/publications/2019/Public%20acceptability%20of%20health%20and%20social%20care%20funding%20options_0.pdf [Accessed 4 May 2020].
- Sutherland, S. (1999) *With respect to old age – Report of the Royal Commission on Long-Term Care* (Sutherland Report), London: The Stationery Office.
- Sutherland, S. (2008) ‘Free personal and nursing care in Scotland’, *European View*, 7(2): 297–302.
- Talbot, C. (2010) *Theories of performance: Organizational and service improvement in the public domain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tallack, C. and Sturrock, D. (2022) *Does the cap fit? Analysing the government’s proposed amendment to the English social care charging system*, London: The Health Foundation and Institute for Fiscal Studies, www.health.org.uk/publications/reports/does-the-cap-fit-analysing-the-proposed-amendment [Accessed 18 September 2022].
- Tapper, J. (2021) “‘This is an attack on human rights”: UK care homes still denying family visits to residents’, *The Guardian*, 20 November, www.theguardian.com/society/2021/nov/20/uk-care-homes-deny-family-visits-human-rights [Accessed 15 March 2022].

- Taylor-Gooby, P. (1994) 'Postmodernism and social policy: A great leap backwards?', *Journal of Social Policy*, 23(3): 385–404.
- Tew, J., Duggal, S., Carr, S., Ercolani, M., Glasby, J., Kinghorn, P. et al (2019) *Implementing the Care Act (2014): Building social resources to prevent, reduce or delay needs for care and support in adult social care in England*, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.
- Thelen, K. (2003) 'How institutions evolve: Insights from comparative-historical analysis', in J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer (eds) *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 208–40.
- Theobald, H. and Luppi, M. (2018) 'Elderly care in changing societies: Concurrences in divergent care regimes – a comparison of Germany, Sweden and Italy', *Current Sociology*, 66(4): 629–42.
- Thompson, S. and Hoggett, P. (1996) 'Universalism, selectivism and particularism: Towards a postmodern social policy', *Critical Social Policy*, 16(46): 21–42.
- Tinker, A. (2002) 'The social implications of an ageing population', *Mechanisms of Ageing and Development*, 123(7): 729–35.
- TLAP (Think Local, Act Personal) (2019) 'Payment cards as a means of managing a personal budget', London, www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/_assets/Resources/SDS/TLAP-PaymentCardsFinal.pdf [Accessed 17 June 2020].
- Triggle, N. (2019) 'Whorlton Hall: Hospital “abused” vulnerable adults', BBC News, 22 May.
- Tronto, J.C. (1993) *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*, London: Routledge.
- Tronto, J.C. (2013) *Caring democracy: Markets, equality, and justice*, New York: New York University Press.
- TUC (Trades Union Congress) (2021) *A new deal for social care: A new deal for the workforce*, London, www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/2021-09/Social%20care%20report%20KB%20comments%20and%20additions.pdf [Accessed 3 March 2022].
- Turbett, C. (2021) 'National care service – Opportunity or setback?', Common Weal blog, 14 October, <https://commonweal.scot/national-care-service-opportunity-or-setback> [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- Turnpenney, A. and Hussein, S. (2022) 'Migrant home care workers in the UK: A scoping review of outcomes and sustainability and implications in the context of Brexit', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 23: 23–42.
- Ungerson, C. and Yeandle, S. (eds) (2007) *Cash for care in developed welfare states*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Unwin, J. (2018) *Kindness, emotions and human relationships*, Dunfermline: Carnegie UK Trust.
- Verweij, M. and Thompson, M. (eds) (2006) *Clumsy solutions for a complex world: Governance, politics and plural perceptions*, London: Springer.

- Vlachantoni, A. (2019) 'Unmet need for social care among older people', *Ageing & Society*, 39(4): 657–84.
- Walsh, K., Coleman, A., McDonald, R., Lorne, C. and Munford, L.J.B. (2016) 'Health and social care devolution: The Greater Manchester experiment', *British Medical Journal*, 352, i1495.
- Wanless, D. (2006) *Securing good care for older people* (Wanless Report), London: The King's Fund.
- Watt, T. and Varrow, M. (2018) 'The "do nothing" option: How public spending on social care in England fell by 13% in 5 years', The Health Foundation blog, 29 May, www.health.org.uk/blogs/the-%E2%80%98do-nothing%E2%80%99-option-how-public-spending-on-social-care-in-england-fell-by-13-in-five-years [Accessed 9 January 2022].
- Welsh Assembly Government (2003) *The review of health and social care in Wales*, Cardiff.
- Welsh Assembly Government (2011) *Sustainable social services for Wales: A framework for action*, Cardiff.
- Welsh Assembly Government (2020) *Connected communities*, Cardiff.
- Wales Fiscal Analysis (2020) *The cost of free personal care: Lessons from Scotland*, Cardiff, www.cardiff.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/2470152/fpnc_briefing_21102020.pdf [Accessed 18 February 2022].
- Welsh Government (2003) *Review of health and social care in Wales*, Cardiff.
- Welsh Government (2015a) *Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015: Guidance*, Cardiff, <https://gov.wales/well-being-future-generations-wales-act-2015-guidance> [Accessed 18 January 2022].
- Welsh Government (2015b) *Informed health and care: A digital health and social care strategy for Wales*, Cardiff.
- Welsh Government (2019) *Social services: The national outcomes framework for people who need care and support and carers who need support*, Cardiff, <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2019-05/the-national-outcomes-framework-for-people-who-need-care-and-support-and-carers-who-need-support.pdf> [Accessed 7 November 2022].
- Welsh Government (2021a) *The co-operation agreement: 2021*, Cardiff.
- Welsh Government (2021b) *Rebalancing care and support*, White Paper, Cardiff.
- West, K. (2013) 'The grip of personalization in adult social care: Between managerial domination and fantasy', *Critical Social Policy*, 33(4): 638–57.
- West, K. and Needham, C. (2017) 'Making it real or sustaining a fantasy? Personal budgets for older people', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 37(11/12): 683–95.
- White, C., Wray, J. and Whitfield, C. (2020) "'A fifty mile round trip to change a lightbulb": An exploratory study of carers' experiences of providing help, care and support to families and friends from a distance', *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 28(5): 1632–42.

- Williams, F. (1989) *Social policy, a critical introduction: Issues of class, race and gender*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wittenberg, R. (2016) 'Demand for care and support for older people', in C. Gori, J. Fernandez and R. Wittenberg (eds) *Long-term care reforms in OECD countries*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 9–24.
- Wright, J. (2020) *Technology in social care: A review of the UK policy landscape*, Sheffield: University of Sheffield.
- Wright, J. (2021) 'The Alexafication of adult social care: Virtual assistants and the changing role of local government in England', *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(2): 812.
- Yanow, D. (1996) *How does a policy mean? Interpreting policy and organizational actions*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Yanow, D. (2007) 'Interpretation in policy analysis: On methods and practice', *Critical Policy Analysis*, 1(1): 110–22.
- Yeandle, S. (2016) 'From provider to enabler of care? Reconfiguring local authority support for older people and carers in Leeds, 2008 to 2013', *Journal of Social Service Research*, 42(2): 218–32.
- Yeandle, S., Kröger, T. and Cass, B. (2012) 'Voice and choice for users and carers? Developments in patterns of care for older people in Australia, England and Finland', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 22(4): 432–45.
- Yeates, N.J (2009) 'Women's migration, social reproduction and care', in S. Razavi (ed) *The gendered impacts of liberalization*, London: Taylor & Francis, pp 219–43.
- Zarb, G. and Nadash, P. (1994) *Cashing in on independence: Comparing the costs and benefits of cash and services*, London: British Council of Organisations of Disabled People.
- Zhang, Y. and Bennett, M. (2019) 'The likelihood of being a carer in adult life', in Carers UK, *Will I care? The likelihood of being a carer in adult life*, London: Carers UK, www.carersuk.org/images/News__campaigns/Care rsRightsDay_Nov19_FINAL.pdf [Accessed 7 November 2022].

Index

A

abductive analysis 19–20
Abrams, F 25
access to care 32–4
active care reform 98–9, 172
Activities of Daily Living 52, 165
adult social care *see* social care
Adult Social Care Outcomes Framework (ASCOF) 3, 102
advocacy 38
Affordable Care Act (2010) 156–7
ageing population 46–7
 comparison of four nations 47
 spending per person 61
agenda capacity 142–3
All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG)
 report (2019) 92, 94, 95
Andrews, L. 136–7, 140, 141, 173–4
anxiety 176
Assessment and Treatment Centres 161
asylums 55
Atkins et al 47–8, 52, 56, 58–9, 111
Attendance Allowance 57, 60, 79, 109
Audit Scotland 119
Audit Wales report (2020) 116–17
austerity 2, 56, 82, 112, 149
Australia 155, 157

B

Barclay Report (1982) 70, 171
Barker Commission/Report (2014) 15,
 16, 34, 120, 155–6
Barnett formula 11–12
Beecham, Jeremy 84, 133
Béland et al 156–7
Bell, D. 34
Bengoa Report (2016) 17, 23, 88
Better Care Fund (2013) 91
Bevan, Aneurin 29, 159
Beveridge, William 154
Beyond Boundaries review/report
 (2006) 17, 84, 102, 133–4
Big Society 72
Bosanquet, N. and Haldenby, A. 78–9, 155
Bottery, S. 174–5
Bradbury, J. and Andrews, R. 137
Brexit (2016) 1, 7, 66, 143, 144
British Social Attitudes Survey (2021) 2
Brown, Gordon 135
Building the National Care Service (White
 Paper, 2010) 1–2, 16, 23, 28, 29, 32,
 35, 46, 72, 92, 154, 155
Bullion, James 168–9
Bulmer, M. 70

C

Cairney et al 73, 87, 116, 131, 140
care
 definition 4–6
 activity and labour 4–5
 emotion and orientation 4
 relationship 5
 globalisation of 7
 social policy problem 5
 see also social care
Care Act (2014) 10, 14, 27, 39, 62, 78, 79,
 80, 83, 85, 86, 87, 97, 99, 104, 110, 114,
 116, 125, 136, 142, 150, 154, 157, 162
care cap 29, 31, 66, 80, 99, 109–10, 125, 150
care crisis 1, 74–6
 of community 69–74
 of demand 46–9
 of family 49–54
 of the market 61–9
 of the state 54–61, 171
care diamond approach 8, 44, 74–5
care homes 48
 ownership of 62
 self-funding 63–4
 top ups 65
Care Inspectorate Scotland 40
Care Inspectorate Wales 40
care labour 6–7
care market 61–3
 characterising 63
 crisis of 61–9
 different types of provision,
 interdependence of 66
 legislative changes 61
 limitations 66–7
 location 65
 market management 67, 68
 not-for-profit sector 62
 political parties 62
 profit margins 65–6
 for-profit sector 62, 65, 67
care migration 7
care municipalities 7
Care Quality Commission (CQC) 40, 97,
 105–6, 149
care regimes 6–8
care systems, comparing 6–8
care workers
 definition 6
 intensity of work 48–9
 licensing scheme 86
 personal assistants (PAs) 160
 professionalising 91–6
 registration of 93–4, 121–3, 124, 159–60

- regulation of 92–3
 - rural and urban divide 95–6
 - staff turnover and vacancies 91–2
 - status of 123
 - carers 25
 - burnout 53
 - comparison of four nations 52–3
 - definition 6, 86
 - impact of COVID-19 on 53–4
 - unpaid 52, 114–5
 - support for 85–6, 114–15
 - Carers Action Plan (2018) 85
 - Carer's Allowance 57, 86
 - Carers and Direct Payments (Northern Ireland) Act (2002) 86
 - Carers (Scotland) Act 2016 27, 85
 - Carers' Scotland report (2019) 114
 - Carey et al 157
 - Caring for our future* (White Paper, 2012) 23, 24
 - caring labour 50
 - Chaney, P.J. 37, 62, 77
 - Changing lives* report (2006) 16, 35
 - Cheshire-Allen, M. and Calder, G. 54
 - choice and control 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 83–4, 165
 - Christie Commission/Report (2011) 73, 87, 136
 - Co-operation agreement* (2021) 109, 154
 - co-production 73, 75, 84, 95, 112, 136, 140, 152, 158, 160, 162–3, 167
 - coalition government 27, 72, 78, 130
 - Coalition of Care Providers Scotland (CCPS) 160
 - Cole, A. and Stafford, I. 133–4
 - Cole et al 137
 - Commissioner for Older People in Northern Ireland (COPNI) 24
 - community 167, 171–2
 - co-production 73
 - concept of 69–70
 - crisis of 69–74
 - definitions 69, 70
 - kindness in 73–4, 104
 - nostalgia 70
 - Community Care (Direct Payments) Act (1996) 83
 - Community Care Quarterly Key Monitoring Return 108
 - Community Health and Social Care Boards (CHSCBs) 90
 - Competition and Markets Authority report (CMA, 2017) 62, 63
 - Connected communities* strategy (2020) 17, 28
 - Conservative Party 29, 31, 34, 80, 83
 - see also coalition government
 - constructivism 12
 - Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006) 37
 - convergence 13, 22, 42, 81, 128, 152–3, 171, 172–4
 - see also contextual convergence; decisional convergence; discursive convergence; practice convergence; results convergence
 - COSLA (Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) 134–5, 147
 - costs of care 78
 - cap on costs 78
 - compromise offer 78–9
 - free personal care 78–9
 - COVID-19 pandemic 1, 17, 23, 53–4, 66, 68, 85, 144, 161, 173–4
 - crisis of community 69–74
 - crisis of demand 46–9
 - crisis of family 49–54
 - crisis of the market 61–9
 - crisis of the state 54–61, 171
 - Crowther, Neil 23, 166
- D**
- Daly, M. and Lewis, J. 5
 - Dayan, M. and Heenan, D. 118
 - de-centralisation 7
 - de-institutionalisation 69, 75
 - de-institutionalisation movement 55
 - decisional convergence 13–14, 77
 - demand, crisis of 46–9
 - dementia 34, 46, 113
 - direct payments 113–14
 - dementia tax 10, 34, 80
 - Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) 129, 139
 - devolution 8–12, 127, 128–9, 130, 140, 143, 152–3
 - as a 'natural experiment' 12–13
 - DHSC (Department of Health and Social Care) 23, 29, 36, 67, 80, 83, 142
 - see also *People at the heart of care* (White Paper, 2021)
 - differentiated care 162–4, 168, 169
 - comparison with standardised care 164–7
 - Dilnot Commission/Report (2011) 16, 23, 25, 30, 78, 79, 80
 - direct payments 39, 83, 84, 110, 111, 113, 124, 165, 166
 - Direct Payments Act (1996) 39
 - disability 46–7
 - individualised funding 83
 - spending, comparison of four nations 61
 - discursive convergence 13, 22, 42
 - discursive institutionalisation 133, 137
 - divergence 13, 42, 79, 81, 86, 100, 152–3, 171, 172–4
 - active care reform 98–9, 172
 - contextual 44
 - emergent care reform 99, 172
 - stalled care reform 99, 172
 - symbolic care reform 99, 172

- domiciliary care 17, 31, 66, 95, 105
see also free personal care
Domiciliary care workforce review for Northern Ireland (2016–21) 95
 Drakeford, Mark 68, 129, 137, 138, 139–40, 148
 Dunlop Review (2019) 144
 DWP (Department for Work and Pensions) 57
- E**
- Elliott et al 148
 emergent care reform 99, 172
 England
 adults as carers, percentage of 53
 ageing population and disability 47
 care cap 29, 31, 66, 109–10, 125, 150
 carers' policy 114
 city deals 11
 co-production 73
 demographics 9
 direct payments 111
 family responsibility 50–1
 health and social care levy plan 82
 integration 91
 kindness
 in communities 74
 in public services 104
 personalisation 39
 policy-making 150
 central-local relations 149
 scale 134
 scope 149
 staff turnover 143
 style 135
 prevention 87, 116
 rights-based approaches to social care 37
 self-funders/funding 24, 63, 64–5
 social care reform 78–9, 79–80, 83–4, 85, 86, 87, 88–9, 91, 91–2, 94, 97, 99
 drift approach 156
 outcomes 102, 104
 spending per head 3
 old-age, sickness and disability 61
 state-funded clients 106
 strong government thesis 135
 symbolic care reform 99, 172
 worker registration 94
 English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) 52
 Entwistle et al 144
 Esping-Andersen, Gøsta 6
 Every Australian Counts 155
 extensive research 15
- F**
- Fair care for older people* (2001) 16, 30
 Fair Work Commission (Wales) 36
 Fair Work Convention (Scotland) 36
 Fair Work Forum 36
 fairness 29–36, 171
 access to care 32–4
 intergenerational distribution of costs 31–2
 payment for care 30–2
 reciprocity 34–6
 family care 49–54
 comparison of four nations 50–1, 51–2
 family, crisis of 49–54
 Feeley Report (2021) 16, 23, 24, 28, 33, 35, 36, 38, 40, 66, 68, 79, 85–6, 105, 122, 134, 146–7, 158, 162, 163, 169
 fourth age 176
 Fox, A. 41, 55, 70, 161
 Framework of Standards (2019) 112
 free personal care 78–9, 106, 107–9, 124, 145, 153, 165, 168
 see also domiciliary care
From vision to action report (2010) 17, 40, 84
- G**
- Gallagher, J. 136
 Gingrich, J.R. 25, 31, 61, 63
 Glasby, J. 55
 Good Friday Agreement (1998) 10, 129–30
 Government of Wales Act (2006) 129
 Gray, A.M. and Birrell, D. 26, 37, 55–6, 101, 102
 Greater Manchester 130
- H**
- Hacker, J.S. 156
 Hanssen et al 7
 Hassan, G. 138
 Hayes et al 92, 94, 95
 Health and Care Act (2022) 97, 99
 Health and Personal Social Services Order (1972) 90
 Health and Social Care Act (2012) 91
 Health and Social Care Board 17, 53, 84–5, 105, 129, 146, 148
Health and social care delivery plan (2016) 88, 116
 Health and Social Care Trusts (HSCTs) 8, 62, 66–7, 81, 86, 140, 146, 171
 Health and Wellbeing Boards 91
 Health Boards 90–1
 health care
 free 33–4
 integration with social care 89–91, 118–21, 165
 Health Foundation 15, 79, 82
 Hoggett, P. 168, 176–7
 home care 47, 48
 higher levels of acuity 48
 privately funded 55
 Housden, Sir Peter 73, 128, 146

in-house provision 56, 66–7, 68, 69
 Howlett, M. and Rayner, J. 157–8
 Howlett, M. and Tosun, J. 135
 Hudson, B. 149
 Humpherson, Ed 102

I

Implementation Support Programme 157
 independent living 24, 28, 55, 84, 89
 Independent Living Fund 83
 individualisation 83
 inner context 178
 inspection 162–3
 Institute for Government 12, 15, 47, 48,
 52, 58–9, 102, 111
 institutionalisation 54, 133, 161, 165, 167
 Integrated Care Organisations 91
 Integrated Care Partnerships (ICPs) 90
 Integrated Care Systems 91
 integration 89–91, 165, 168
Integration and innovation (White Paper,
 2021) 16, 41

J

Japan 155
 Johnson, Boris 80, 130, 155
 Joint Ministerial Committee 144
 Jordan, A.G. and Richardson, J.J. 135
 Joseph, J. and McGregor, J.A. 26

K

Katzenstein, P.J. 33
 Keating et al 1, 9, 28, 46, 132, 134
 territorial policy communities 127–31,
 172–3
 Keating, M. and Wilson, A. 33, 173
 Kelly, D. and Kennedy, J. *see Power to
 people report* (2017)
 kindness
 in community 74
 in public services 104
 King's Fund 15, 16
 Kittay, E.F. 41
 Kröger, T. 7

L

Labour Party 81, 136, 142, 144
see also New Labour
 Laffin, M. 146, 148
 Lansley, Andrew 92
 Law Commission 154
 life expectancy, healthy 146
 Localism Act (2011) 149
 long-stay care institutions 161

M

macro integration 89
A managed change (HSCB, 2015) 17,
 84, 105

Marczak et al 116
 market *see care market*
 McConnell, A. 3, 14, 123
 McGarvey, N. 146
Measuring the mountain project (2019) 114
 meso integration 89
 micro integration 89
 Miller et al 86–7, 89, 91
 Milne et al 87
 Morgan, Rhodri 137
 multi-level governance 143–5
 layer cake analogy 144
 marble cake analogy 144

N

National Assistance Act (1948) 9, 54, 55,
 97, 99, 145, 154
 National Audit Office (NAO) 62
 National Care Home Contract 66, 107
 National Care Service
 England 33, 154, 155
 Scotland 4, 11, 17, 23, 33, 38, 68, 75,
 82, 86, 87–8, 90, 93, 106, 107, 119,
 134, 138–9, 146–7, 150, 160, 173
 Wales 11, 81, 142, 150, 154
*see also Building the National Care Service
 (White Paper, 2010)*
 National Disability Insurance Scheme
 (NDIS) 155, 157
 National Institute of Health Research
 (NIHR) 113–14
 National Performance Framework
 (NPF) 27, 101–2, 136
 Needham et al 39, 149, 177
 New Labour 1–2, 9–10, 30, 32, 33, 37,
 56, 78, 154, 155
*see also Building the National Care Service
 (White Paper, 2010)*
 New Labour government 9–10
 NHS and Community Care Act
 (1990) 55–6, 61, 62–3, 145, 149
 NHS Continuing Healthcare 34
 NHS England 91
 Nordic social investment model 142, 172
 Northern Ireland
 adults as carers, percentage of 53
 ageing population and disability 47
 care funding reform 81–2
 civil service 130
 co-production 73
 community services 71
 community support 70–1
 demographics 9
 direct payments 111, 113
 fairness 31
 family responsibility 50–1
 integration with health care 90, 118–19
 kindness
 in communities 74

- in public services 104
 - legislation 24, 98
 - policy-making 128, 150
 - bureaucracy 148–9
 - central-local relations 145–6, 148–9
 - scale 133, 134
 - scope 141, 145–6, 148–9
 - staff turnover 143
 - style 139, 140
 - power-sharing Assembly and
 - Executive 73, 98, 129, 129–30, 153
 - pressures on external providers 66–7
 - prevention 35, 88, 117
 - rights-based approaches to social care 37
 - sectarian tensions 128, 129, 139
 - self-directed support 85
 - social care reform 81–2, 84–5, 86, 88, 90, 93, 95–6, 98, 99
 - conversion approach 156
 - outcomes 102, 104, 105
 - spending per head 3
 - old-age, sickness and disability 61
 - stalled care reform 99, 172
 - state-funded clients 106
 - support for carers 115
 - worker registration 93
 - see also Power to people report (2017)*
 - Northern Ireland Social Care Council 93
 - Northern Irish Assembly 10
 - Nuffield Trust 15, 57, 60, 102–3, 106, 121
 - nursing homes 33, 57, 59
 - self-funders/funding 64
- O**
- ONS (Office for National Statistics) 3, 15, 52, 63
 - Index of Multiple Deprivation 63–4
 - Oung et al 56, 57, 60, 94, 106
 - Outcomes-Based Accountability (OBA) 101
 - outcomes of social care reform 100–6
 - integration with health 118–21
 - investing in prevention 116–18
 - outcomes approach
 - concerns about 101
 - value of 101
 - personalised support 110–14
 - professionalising the workforce 121–3, 165
 - redistribution of costs 106–10
 - satisfaction with 102–4
 - support for unpaid carers 114–15
 - outer context 178
 - outsourcing 26, 55–6, 68, 69, 137, 145
- P**
- particularism 167–9
 - Paun et al 28, 144–5
 - Pearson, C. 84
 - Pearson, C. and Ridley, J. 112
 - Pearson et al 39, 62, 84, 110, 112, 153
 - Peng, I. 155
 - People at the heart of care* (White Paper, 2021) 16, 36, 39, 40, 67, 75, 83–4, 89, 92–3
 - People first: Community care in Northern Ireland in the 1990s* (1990) 56
 - person-centred approaches 38–9, 55, 82–4
 - personal assistants (PAs) 92, 160
 - Personal Independence Payment, 57, 60
 - personalisation 39, 83, 84, 85, 95, 110, 113–14, 125, 153, 160
 - Pettigrew et al 178
 - Pinker, Robert 70, 171
 - Plaid Cymru 81, 109, 142
 - Police Scotland (2013) 146
 - policy-making
 - centre-local relations 145–9
 - within-country differences 145–6
 - policy mix 157–8, 173
 - scale 131–5
 - scope 140–9
 - agenda capacity 142–3
 - jurisdictional powers 141–2
 - multi-level governance 143–5
 - style 135–40
- policy success 3, 14–15, 123
 - definition 14
 - Pollitt, C. 3, 13, 22, 77, 128
 - positivism 12
 - Power to people report* (2017) 1, 17, 23–4, 31, 35–6, 39, 68, 85, 86, 88, 98, 104, 105, 116, 117, 150–1, 162, 164
 - practice convergence 13, 14, 100
 - Prepared to care* (2015) 17, 24
 - prevention 35, 166
 - investing in 86–9, 116–18
 - ‘second wave’ approaches 87
 - technology 88–9, 117
 - private insurance 78
 - professionalisation 91–6, 121–3, 159, 165
 - Public Bodies (Joint Working) (Scotland) Act (2014) 90
 - Public Service Boards (PSBs) 91
 - Putting people first concordat* (2007) 16, 38–9, 83, 162
- Q**
- quality 40–1, 165, 166, 167
- R**
- Razavi, S. 44, 49, 54
 - realism 12–13
 - reality 12
 - Rebalancing care and support* (White Paper, 2021) 17, 25–6, 32, 35, 36, 91, 105, 138, 148
 - reciprocity 34–6
 - Reed et al 46, 61, 103, 121, 146

- Regional Partnership Boards (RPBs) 91
 - regulation 162–3
 - Regulation and Inspection Act (2016) 163
 - Regulation and Inspection of Social Care (RISCA, 2016) 97
 - Regulation and Quality Improvement Authority 40
 - relational models of support 167
 - research 15–19
 - analysis 19–20
 - design 15–19
 - interviews/interviewees 15–19
 - social care-relevant policy documents 16–17
 - realist approach 12–15
 - residential care
 - self-funders/funding 64
 - spending on 47–8
 - Resolution Foundation 93
 - results convergence 13, 14, 100
 - Richardson, J. 135
 - rights 37–40, 165, 166, 171
 - Robson, C.M.K. 13, 15
 - Royal Commission on Long Term Care for Older People *see* Sutherland Commission/Report (1999)
 - Rummery, K. and Fine, M. 4, 6
 - Rummery, K. and McAngus, C. 140
- S**
- Sayer, A. 12, 13, 15
 - scale of policy-making 131–5
 - Scotland
 - active care reform 98–9, 172
 - ageing population and disability 47
 - care workers
 - registration 93
 - rural and remote areas 95
 - carers
 - adults as 53
 - support for 114
 - co-production 73
 - community 72
 - demographics 9
 - devolution 128–9
 - direct payments 111, 124
 - failing services 66
 - family responsibility 50–1
 - free personal care 79, 106, 107–9, 124, 145, 153
 - independence 129, 141–2
 - integration with health care 90, 119, 120–1
 - kindness
 - in communities 74
 - in public services 104
 - National Care Service 4, 11, 17, 23, 33, 38, 68, 75, 82, 86, 87–8, 90, 93, 106, 107, 119, 134, 138–9, 146–7, 150, 160, 173
 - policy developments 10–11
 - policy-making 128, 150
 - central-local relations 146–7
 - scale 131–2, 134
 - scope 141, 146–7
 - staff turnover 143
 - style 136, 138–9
 - prevention 35, 87–8
 - rights-based approaches to social care 37
 - self-directed support 39, 84, 107, 110–12, 124, 138
 - self-funders/funding 63, 64, 65, 109
 - social care reform 79, 82, 84, 85–6, 87–8, 90, 93, 95, 98–9, 131, 178
 - layering approach 156
 - outcomes 101–2, 104, 105, 107–9
 - spending per head 3
 - old-age, sickness and disability 61
 - state-funded clients 106
 - see also* Feeley Report (2021)
 - Scotland Act (2016) 57
 - Scottish Living Wage 93, 123
 - Scottish National party (SNP) 129
 - Scottish Parliament 10
 - Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC) 93, 122
 - Seebohm Report (1968) 27, 70
 - self-care 35
 - Self-directed support national strategy in Scotland* (2010b) 39
 - self-directed support (SDS) 39, 84, 85, 95, 107, 110, 110–12, 124, 138, 168
 - self-funders/funding 23, 63–5, 80, 109, 110
 - comparison of four nations 64
 - cross-subsidisation 66
 - selling homes 24, 31, 64–5
 - Simons, J.J. and Green, M.C. 176
 - Single Outcomes Agreements (SOAs) 102
 - Sinn Féin 129, 139
 - Skills for Care 91–2
 - Sloan, B. 29
 - social care
 - collapse 1
 - core values 165
 - costs of *see* costs of care
 - creation of 8
 - crisis *see* care crisis
 - definitions 5, 24–6
 - devolution 8–12
 - inspection and regulation 162–3
 - institutions and
 - institutionalisation 161, 167
 - integration with health care 89–91, 118–21, 165
 - ‘invisible asylum’ 161
 - local government 8
 - lottery of 23, 32

- means-tested service 8–9, 33–4
 - new models of 56
 - policy developments 10–11
 - public spending, retrenchment of 56
 - safety 162–3
 - solving the problem of 22–4
 - state withdrawal 55, 56
 - see also* differentiated care; standardised care
 - Social Care Fair Work Forum 36
 - Social Care Forum 36
 - social care personas 174–5
 - social care policy
 - fairness 29–36
 - public spending 56–7, 58–60
 - quality 40–1
 - rights 37–40
 - solving the problem of care 22–4
 - sustainability 41–2
 - wellbeing 26–9
 - see also* policy-making; policy success
 - social care reform 77
 - assessing progress 96–8
 - big bang approach 155, 156
 - clumsy solutions 176, 177
 - conversion approach 156
 - drift approach 156
 - dual approaches 158–9, 175
 - comparison between 164–7
 - differentiated care 162–4, 168, 169
 - standardised care 159–62, 168, 169, 178
 - ending of risk-pooling 81–2
 - funding cap 79–80
 - incremental change 80–1
 - integration with health 89–91, 118–21
 - investing in prevention 86–9, 116–18
 - layering approach 156, 157
 - limits of 152
 - divergence and convergence 152–3
 - incremental versus transformative change 153–7
 - policy mix 157–8, 173
 - macro goals 124–5
 - national debate 155
 - personalised support 82–5
 - outcomes 110–14
 - professionalising the workforce 91–6, 121–3, 165
 - redistribution of costs 78–82
 - outcomes 106–10
 - support for unpaid carers 85–6
 - outcomes 114–15
 - trust issues 177
 - universalism versus particularism 167–9
 - see also* policy-making; policy success
 - Social Care (Self-Directed Support) (Scotland) Act (2013) 84
 - Social Care Wales 93–4
 - Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act (2014) 10, 27, 40, 42, 81, 84, 85, 91, 97, 99, 114, 115, 116, 148, 150, 154, 156, 158–9, 162, 163
 - social systems 13
 - #socialcarefutures 178–9
 - Spending Reviews 155
 - stalled care reform 99, 172
 - standardised care 159–62, 168, 169, 178
 - comparison with differentiated care 164–7
 - professionalised and regulated workforce 159
 - state, crisis of 54–61, 171
 - Sturgeon, Nicola 23, 134, 147
 - style of policy-making 135–40
 - Sunak, Rishi 130
 - sustainability 41–2, 165, 168
 - Sustainability and Transformation Partnerships 91
 - Sustainable social services* (White Paper, 2011) 17, 39–40, 84, 137–8
 - Sutherland Commission/Report (1999) 8–9, 10, 16, 29, 30, 32, 78, 79
 - review (2008) 107
 - symbolic care reform 99, 172
- ## T
- territorial policy communities 127–31, 172–3
 - scale of policy-making 131–5
 - scope of policy-making 140–9
 - style of policy-making 135–40
 - Tew et al 87, 116
 - Think Local, Act Personal (TLAP) 110
 - third sector organisations 63
 - ‘time and task’ model 104, 105
 - Transforming your care* review (2011) 17, 84, 88, 90, 98
 - Truss, Liz 130
- ## U
- UK (United Kingdom)
 - demographics 9
 - histories of membership 9
 - spending per head 3
 - Understanding Society 25, 50, 53
 - Ungar, Roberto 70
 - universalism 167–9
 - unmet needs 22, 52, 75, 82, 115, 117, 178
 - unpaid care 25, 52, 53
 - comparison of four nations 52
 - unpaid carers *see* carers
 - Unwin, J. 73, 104
- ## V
- Verweij, M. and Thompson, M. 176, 177
 - vision for adult social care* (2010) 16, 27
 - Vlachantoni, A. 52
 - voice and control 39, 84, 97

W

Wales

- ageing population and disability 47
- care workers
 - integration 93–4
 - Welsh language 66, 96
- carers
 - adults as 53
 - support for 114–15
- Carer's Assessments 115
- co-production 73
- community 72–3
- demographics 9
- devolution 129, 140, 143, 152–3
- direct payments 111
- emergent care reform 99, 172
- failing services 66
- fairness of access 33
- family responsibility 50–1, 51–2
- integration 90–1
- kindness
 - in communities 74
 - in public services 104
- National Assembly 136–7
- National Care Service 11, 81, 142, 150, 154
- policy developments 10–11
- policy-making 128, 150
 - central-local relations 148
 - scale 132–3, 134
 - scope 141, 143, 148
 - staff turnover 143
 - style 136–7, 137–8, 139–40
- prevention 35, 88, 116–17
- rebalancing 25–6, 32, 35, 36, 67–8, 69, 91, 105, 138
- rights-based approaches to social care 37
- self-funders/funding 63, 64
- social care reform 80–1, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90–1, 93–4, 96, 97–8, 99

- layering approach 156
- outcomes 102, 104, 109
- spending per head 3
 - old-age, sickness and disability 61
- state-funded clients 106
- voice and control 39
- Welsh language speaking 33, 66, 96
 - see also Rebalancing care and support (White Paper, 2021)*
- Wales Fiscal Analysis (2020) 109
- Wanless Report (2006) 15, 16, 27–8, 30, 34–5
- Watson, Professor Nick 158, 169
- welfare benefits 57
- welfare municipalities 7
- Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act (2015) 28, 32, 88, 91, 97–8
- wellbeing 26–9, 165, 166, 168, 171, 178
- Welsh Assembly (Senedd) 10, 129
- West, K. 176
- Westminster 143
 - adversarialism 136
 - institutional continuity 134
 - majoritarianism 135
 - policy communities 135
 - policy-making 130
 - size of Parliament 131
 - Treasury, prominent role of 135–6
- women
 - caring labour 53–4
 - paid employment 50
- workforce *see care workers*
- Wright, J. 88, 89

Y

- Yeandle, S. 149

Z

- Zhang, Y. and Bennett, M. 53