IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Public Policy For Equity: A Comparative Analysis Of Global Inclusion Frameworks

Dr. CHANDAN KUMAR SINGH

Assistant Professor, B.Ed. Department, Bundelkhand College Jhansi

Abstract

In an increasingly interconnected yet inequitable world, the pursuit of equity through public policy has become a central challenge for governments. While equality aims for uniform treatment, equity demands targeted interventions to achieve just outcomes, addressing historical and structural disadvantages faced by marginalized groups. This paper conducts a comparative analysis of global inclusion frameworks to evaluate their efficacy in promoting substantive equity. It examines three distinct policy models: the Universalist Welfare State (exemplified by the Nordic countries), the Multiculturalism Model (focusing on Canada), and the Developmental State with Affirmative Action (examining Rwanda's post-conflict framework). Through a qualitative, comparative case study methodology, this research analyzes policy documents, legislative frameworks, and secondary data on socio-economic outcomes. The analysis is structured around four key dimensions: conceptual foundations (equality vs. equity), policy instruments and implementation, outcomes and impact measurement, and contextual adaptability. The findings reveal that no single model is universally superior; rather, effectiveness is contingent on the alignment between policy design, historical context, and institutional capacity. The Nordic model excels in economic redistribution but faces challenges in recognizing ethnic diversity. Canada's multiculturalism fosters cultural recognition but shows gaps in addressing economic disparities. Rwanda's targeted approach has rapidly improved gender parity but operates within a politically constrained environment. The paper concludes that the most effective equity frameworks are hybrid, context-sensitive, and dynamically integrate redistributive measures with recognition politics to address the multifaceted nature of marginalization.

Keywords: Equity in Public Policy, Comparative Policy Analysis, Social Inclusion Frameworks, Affirmative Action, Multiculturalism

1. Introduction

The 21st century is characterized by a paradoxical confluence of unprecedented global wealth and deepening socio-economic inequalities. While the language of "inclusion" and "diversity" has been mainstreamed in global governance discourse, the translation of these concepts into tangible public policy that fosters genuine equity remains a formidable challenge. The distinction between equality and equity is critical here. Equality, often interpreted as sameness of treatment, can perpetuate injustice by ignoring differing starting points and systemic barriers. Equity, in contrast, is a principle of justice that acknowledges these differential positions and necessitates targeted, and sometimes unequal, allocation of resources and opportunities to level the proverbial playing field and achieve fair outcomes (Braveman et al., 2017).

Public policy serves as the primary instrument through which states mediate social relations, allocate resources, and shape life chances. Consequently, the design, implementation, and evaluation of inclusion frameworks are central to the project of building more equitable societies. Nations across the globe have adopted varied approaches to this end, informed by their unique historical trajectories, political philosophies, economic structures, and social compositions. These range from the universalist welfare states of Scandinavia, which emphasize decommodification and broad-based social protection, to the multicultural policies of countries like Canada, which officially celebrate cultural pluralism, and the targeted affirmative action policies seen in contexts like India, South Africa, and Rwanda, which aim to rectify historical injustices against specific groups.

This paper posits that a comparative analysis of these diverse global frameworks is not merely an academic exercise but a practical necessity for policymakers seeking to craft effective, context-sensitive solutions. By systematically examining the philosophical underpinnings, operational mechanisms, and measurable outcomes of different models, we can move beyond ideological prescriptions to an evidence-based understanding of what works, for whom, and under what conditions.

The primary research question guiding this study is: How do different global public policy frameworks for inclusion conceptualize and operationalize equity, and what are the comparative strengths and limitations of these models in achieving substantive outcomes for marginalized groups?

To address this question, the paper is structured as follows. First, a comprehensive review of literature establishes the theoretical landscape, defining core concepts and tracing the evolution of inclusion paradigms. Second, the research methodology section outlines the qualitative comparative case study approach, justifying the selection of specific country cases and describing the data collection and analysis

procedures. The subsequent discussion section presents a detailed comparative analysis of the selected frameworks, evaluating them across key dimensions such as conceptual foundations, policy instruments, and socio-economic impacts. Finally, the conclusion synthesizes the findings, discusses their implications for future policy design, and suggests directions for further research.

2. Review of Literature

The pursuit of equity through public policy is a complex and contested domain, situated at the intersection of political philosophy, economics, and sociology. This literature review establishes the theoretical and empirical foundations for analyzing global inclusion frameworks. It begins by delineating the core concepts of equity, equality, and inclusion, then explores the major theoretical paradigms that underpin different policy models, and finally, surveys the empirical evidence and critical debates surrounding their implementation and outcomes.

2.1 Conceptual Foundations: Equity, Equality, and Inclusion

The distinction between equality and equity is the foundational bedrock upon which this analysis is built. While often used interchangeably in public discourse, scholars rigorously differentiate them. Equality typically refers to the state of being equal, especially in status, rights, and opportunities. It often implies sameness of treatment and the allocation of identical resources to all individuals (Braveman et al., 2017). This is embodied in policies like universal suffrage or race-blind admissions processes. However, critics argue that a strict focus on formal equality can perpetuate injustice by ignoring historical disadvantages, systemic barriers, and varying social positions that affect an individual's or group's capacity to utilize those equal rights or resources (Sen, 1999).

In contrast, Equity is a principle of justice that acknowledges these differential starting points and structural impediments. It calls for the fair treatment of all people, which may require differentiated allocation of resources and targeted interventions to achieve outcomes that are truly just. The goal of equity is not sameness, but the elimination of avoidable and unfair disparities (Whitehead, 1991). Amartya Sen's (1999) "capabilities approach" is a seminal contribution to this understanding. Sen argues that the focus should shift from resources (equality) to what people are actually able to be and do (their "capabilities"). Equity, therefore, is about ensuring that all individuals have the effective freedom to achieve valuable functionings, such as being healthy, educated, or participating in community life. This may necessitate providing extra resources or support to those facing greater obstacles.

Nancy Fraser's (1995) influential framework further enriches this conceptualization by positing that justice in the modern world requires a two-dimensional approach: redistribution and recognition. Redistribution addresses socio-economic injustice rooted in the political-economic structure (e.g., class exploitation, economic marginalization). Recognition addresses cultural or symbolic injustice rooted in

social patterns of representation, interpretation, and communication (e.g., cultural domination, non-recognition, disrespect). Fraser argues that both are fundamental and irreducible to each other; a group can suffer economic maldistribution (e.g., Indigenous peoples) and cultural misrecognition (e.g., stereotyping) simultaneously. An equitable policy framework must, therefore, tackle both dimensions.

Inclusion, then, is the active process of creating the conditions for the realization of equity. It involves the systematic and deliberate engagement of diversity and the removal of barriers to full participation in social, economic, and political life (United Nations, 2016). Inclusion is the outcome of effective equitable policies, moving beyond mere presence to meaningful participation and shared power.

2.2 Theoretical Paradigms of Inclusion in Public Policy

Nations construct their public policy frameworks based on distinct philosophical and political traditions. The literature identifies several dominant paradigms:

2.2.1 The Liberal-Individualist Model

Rooted in classical liberalism, this model prioritizes individual rights, formal equality, and non-discrimination. The state's role is to ensure a level playing field by prohibiting discrimination based on race, gender, or other ascribed characteristics (Locke, 1689). Policies emanating from this paradigm include equal opportunity legislation and anti-discrimination laws. Its strength lies in its emphasis on individual autonomy and its resonance with notions of meritocracy. However, critics like Bonilla-Silva (2017) argue that this "color-blind" ideology is often inadequate for dismantling deeply embedded structural and institutional racism. By ignoring group-based disadvantages, it can inadvertently perpetuate the status quo, as it fails to account for the cumulative effects of historical injustice and implicit bias.

2.2.2 The Social Democratic/Universalist Welfare Model

Influenced by T.H. Marshall's (1950) concept of social citizenship, this paradigm, prominent in Nordic countries, views social rights as a core component of citizenship. It advocates for a decommodifying welfare state that provides universal benefits-such as healthcare, education, and unemployment insurance-funded through progressive taxation (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The goal is to mitigate class-based inequalities and ensure a high minimum standard of living for all, regardless of market performance. The universal nature of these policies is seen to foster social solidarity and broad political support (Korpi & Palme, 1998). The primary critique, advanced by scholars like Kymlicka (1995), is that this model, often developed in contexts of relative ethnic homogeneity, can be "difference-blind." It may fail to address the specific cultural recognition and integration needs of immigrant and ethnic minority groups, leading to what is termed the "paradox of redistribution," where broad universal policies, while effective for class equity, may not close gaps for racially marginalized groups (Banting & Kymlicka, 2013).

2.2.3 The Multiculturalism Model

As a direct response to the limitations of the liberal-individualist and universalist models, multiculturalism, articulated by theorists like Will Kymlicka (1995), argues that true integration requires the state to not only protect individual rights but also to recognize and accommodate group-differentiated rights. This is based on the premise that culture is a primary context of choice and identity. Policies under this model include official multiculturalism acts, funding for ethnic associations, heritage language programs, and legal exemptions (e.g., for religious dress). Proponents argue this fosters a stronger sense of belonging and civic participation among minority groups (Bloemraad, 2006). Critics, however, contend that it can foster segregation, undermine national unity, and reify cultural boundaries (Barry, 2001). Furthermore, critics note that multiculturalism's focus on cultural recognition may not adequately address economic disparities, leading to a "vertical mosaic" where cultural diversity coexists with socio-economic stratification (Reitz & Banerjee, 2007).

2.2.4 The Affirmative Action and Group-Specific Redress Model

This approach justifies preferential treatment or targeted policies for historically disadvantaged groups to achieve substantive equality. The justifications are multifaceted: compensatory justice (to remedy past wrongs), instrumental diversity (to enhance organizational performance and democratic representation), and social justice (to create a more representative society) (Sabbagh, 2007). This model is explicitly group-based and results-oriented, employing instruments like quotas in education and politics, set-asides in government contracting, and targeted welfare schemes. It is perhaps the most contentious model, facing criticism for potentially perpetuating group identities, fostering resentment among non-beneficiary groups, and sometimes benefiting the most advantaged members of the disadvantaged group ("the creamy layer") (Desai & Kulkarni, 2008).

2.3 Empirical Evidence and Critical Debates

The empirical literature on the outcomes of these frameworks reveals a complex picture with significant trade-offs.

2.3.1 The Performance and Pitfalls of Universalism

Studies consistently show that Nordic countries achieve some of the world's lowest levels of income inequality and highest levels of social mobility and gender parity in labour force participation (OECD, 2021). The institutional architecture of universal welfare states effectively reduces poverty and precarity for the entire population. However, a growing body of research highlights persistent challenges. Banting and Kymlicka (2013), in their comparative work, find that while these states are successful in terms of redistribution, they often perform less well on "immigrant integration" metrics, such as employment gaps and residential segregation, compared to more multicultural countries like Canada. This suggests that

universalism, while powerful, may need to be supplemented with targeted recognition policies to achieve equity for diverse populations.

2.3.2 The Recognition-Redistribution Gap in Multiculturalism

Canada is frequently cited as a successful case of managing diversity, with high levels of public support for multiculturalism and strong senses of national belonging among immigrants (Bloemraad, 2006). However, empirical studies reveal a gap between cultural recognition and economic integration. Reitz and Banerjee (2007) document persistent "ethnic inequality" in the Canadian labour market, where visible minorities, particularly recently arrived immigrants, earn less than their native-born counterparts with similar qualifications. This indicates that official multiculturalism, while successful as a nation-building project, has not automatically dismantled systemic barriers in the economic sphere, pointing to the need for more robust redistributive and anti-discrimination measures alongside recognition policies.

2.3.3 The Efficacy and Controversies of Targeted Redress

The empirical record of affirmative action is mixed and highly context-dependent. In India, the world's largest affirmative action system ("reservations") for Scheduled Castes and Tribes has been instrumental in increasing political representation and creating a middle class within these communities. However, studies by Desai and Kulkarni (2008) show that its impact on eradicating caste-based stigma and poverty at the grassroots level remains limited. In Rwanda, post-genocide gender quotas have been remarkably successful, resulting in the highest percentage of women in parliament globally (Powley, 2005). This has directly influenced legislation on gender-based violence and property rights. However, scholars note that this top-down, state-driven approach operates within a politically restrictive environment, raising questions about the sustainability of these gains and the depth of societal transformation beyond numerical representation (Burnet, 2011).

2.4 Synthesis and Identification of the Research Gap

The existing literature provides a robust understanding of the individual models and their respective strengths and weaknesses. A clear consensus emerges that context-historical, political, and social-is a paramount factor in determining the success of any inclusion framework. Furthermore, the theoretical tension between redistribution and recognition, as outlined by Fraser (1995), is empirically evident across all cases.

However, a salient gap exists in the form of a systematic, multi-dimensional comparative analysis that places these distinct models in direct dialogue using a consistent analytical framework focused squarely on the principle of equity. Many studies compare two models (e.g., welfare states vs. liberal states) or focus on a single policy domain (e.g., immigration). Fewer works attempt a holistic comparison that evaluates the conceptual foundations, policy instruments, measurable outcomes, and contextual challenges of a universalist, a multiculturalist, and a targeted redress model simultaneously. This paper aims to fill this gap by conducting such a comparative analysis, arguing that the future of equitable policy

lies not in adopting one pure model, but in understanding the strategic hybridity required to address the multifaceted nature of marginalization in the 21st century.

3. Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design, specifically a comparative case study approach. This methodology is particularly suited for investigating complex social phenomena within their real-life contexts, allowing for an in-depth, holistic understanding of how different public policy frameworks operate (Yin, 2018).

3.1 Case Selection

A "most different systems" design is utilized to select cases that represent the major paradigms identified in the literature review. The selected cases are:

1. The Nordic Universalist Model (Sweden): Representing the social democratic welfare state, with a strong emphasis on universalism, high taxation, and extensive social safety nets.
2. The Multiculturalism Model (Canada): Representing a liberal society that has officially adopted multiculturalism as state policy, combining universal welfare with a strong ethos of cultural recognition.
3. The Developmental State with Targeted Action (Rwanda): Representing a post-conflict state that has employed deliberate, state-led policy with strong affirmative action, particularly in gender representation, to drive national rebuilding and equity.

These cases vary significantly in their history, political systems, economic development, and primary policy instruments, allowing for a robust exploration of different pathways to equity.

3.2 Data Collection and Sources

The study relies on secondary data analysis, a method appropriate for synthesizing existing knowledge and drawing comparative insights. Data sources include:

• Policy and Legislative Documents: Official government white papers, legislation (e.g., Sweden's Gender Equality Policy, Canadian Multiculturalism Act, Rwandan Constitution), and national strategy documents.

• International Reports: Data and analysis from organizations like the World Bank, OECD, UNDP, and World Economic Forum, which provide comparative statistics on indicators such as the Gini coefficient, gender gap indices, and educational attainment.

• Academic Literature: Peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and scholarly critiques providing empirical evidence and theoretical analysis of the outcomes and challenges of each framework.

3.3 Analytical Framework

The collected data will be analyzed using a structured, qualitative content analysis. The comparison will be organized around four key analytical dimensions:

1. Conceptual Foundation: How is "equity" defined and justified within the policy framework? (e.g., as socio-economic redistribution, cultural recognition, or corrective justice).

2. Policy Instruments: What specific tools are used? (e.g., universal benefits, cultural accommodations, legislative quotas, targeted funding).

3. Outcomes and Measurement: What are the measurable socio-economic outcomes for marginalized groups (e.g., income, education, health, political representation)? How is success defined and measured?

4. Contextual Factors and Challenges: How do historical, political, and economic contexts shape the implementation and effectiveness of the framework? What are the primary critiques and limitations?

This framework ensures a systematic and multi-faceted comparison, moving beyond mere description to a critical evaluation of the logic, implementation, and impact of each model.

4. Discussion

This section presents the comparative analysis of the three selected cases using the analytical framework outlined above.

4.1 Conceptual Foundations of Equity

• **Sweden (Universalist):** Equity is conceptualized primarily through the lens of class and gender, framed as a matter of social citizenship and solidarity. The goal is to de-commodify life chances by ensuring that welfare is not dependent on market performance (Esping-Andersen, 1990). While recent policies address discrimination, the primary driver is universalism, which aims to pre-emptively create a level playing field through broad-based investment in human capital and social security.

• **Canada (Multiculturalist):** Equity is defined as a combination of liberal equality of opportunity and the positive recognition of cultural difference. The state's role is to protect individual rights while simultaneously fostering a society where diverse cultural identities are preserved and valued (Kymlicka, 1995). This creates a dual focus: ensuring fair distribution of economic resources and promoting a symbolic and institutional sense of belonging for ethnic and immigrant communities.

• **Rwanda (Targeted Redress):** Equity is framed explicitly as a necessary corrective for profound historical injustice-specifically the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi and the historical marginalization of women. The conceptual foundation is instrumental and pragmatic; equity is seen as essential for national unity, social cohesion, and economic development (Powley, 2005). It is less about individual rights and more about rebalancing group-based power dynamics, particularly between ethnic groups and genders.

4.2 Policy Instruments and Implementation

• **Sweden:** Instruments are predominantly universal and institutional. These include extensive publicly funded childcare, education, and healthcare; progressive taxation; generous parental leave; and active labour market policies. Gender equality is pursued through policies that encourage dual-earner/dual-carer families. Specific anti-discrimination laws exist but operate within this overarching universalist structure.

• **Canada:** The toolkit is mixed. It retains universal welfare elements (like public healthcare) but layers on multiculturalism-specific instruments. These include the official Multiculturalism Act, funding for ethnic community organizations, support for heritage language programs, and a points-based immigration system that is relatively neutral regarding country of origin. Employment Equity legislation represents a more targeted approach, aiming to improve the representation of four designated groups (women, Indigenous peoples, persons with disabilities, visible minorities) in federally regulated sectors.

• **Rwanda:** The approach is highly targeted and prescriptive. The most prominent instrument is constitutional and legislative quotas, mandating that women must hold at least 30% of decision-making positions and that all ethnic groups must be represented in government. This is supported by the National Gender Policy, the Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion, and Gacaca community courts, which were used for post-genocide justice and reconciliation. Policy is top-down and driven strongly by the central government.

4.3 Outcomes and Impact

• **Sweden**: Outcomes in terms of income equality, social mobility, and gender equality in labour force participation are among the best globally (OECD, 2021). Child poverty rates are low. However, a significant "immigrant-native gap" persists in employment and incarceration rates, suggesting that the universalist model, while powerful for class-based equity, is less effective in automatically addressing barriers related to ethnicity and race (Banting & Kymlicka, 2013).

• **Canada:** The model has been remarkably successful in fostering a positive national identity around diversity and achieving high naturalization rates among immigrants (Bloemraad, 2006). However, outcomes are mixed. While some visible minority groups excel, others, along with Indigenous populations, experience significant disparities in income, health, and over-representation in the criminal justice system. This reveals a gap between cultural recognition and economic integration (Reitz & Banerjee, 2007).

• **Rwanda:** The outcomes in political representation are stunning; Rwanda leads the world in the percentage of women in parliament (over 60%). This has translated into progressive laws on land ownership, inheritance, and gender-based violence (Powley, 2005). Poverty has been reduced significantly. However, the political space is tightly controlled, and the top-down, quota-driven approach, while effective in achieving specific numerical targets, raises questions about the depth of cultural change and the sustainability of these gains without broader political freedoms.

4.4 Synthesis: Trade-offs and Contextual Imperatives

The comparison reveals a series of critical trade-offs. The Universalist Model excels at economic redistribution but can be blind to cultural and racialized disadvantage. The Multiculturalist Model fosters cultural inclusion but may not adequately ensure economic redistribution across ethnic lines. The Targeted Redress Model can achieve rapid, transformative results in specific domains (like political representation) but often operates within a constrained political environment and can be critiqued for its group-based categorization.

The context is decisive. Sweden's model is built on a historical foundation of ethnic homogeneity and strong social trust. Canada's is a product of its bi-national (English-French) foundation and its self-conception as a "nation of immigrants." Rwanda's framework is a direct response to state collapse and genocide. This suggests that policy transfer is fraught with difficulty; a model cannot be simply transplanted without deep adaptation to local historical, political, and social realities.

5. Conclusion

This comparative analysis of global inclusion frameworks demonstrates that the pursuit of equity through public policy is a complex, multifaceted endeavor with no one-size-fits-all solution. The Nordic universalist, Canadian multiculturalist, and Rwandan targeted models each offer distinct pathways, grounded in different philosophical traditions and contextual realities, and each reveals a unique set of strengths and limitations.

The primary conclusion is that the most effective and resilient frameworks for equity are likely to be hybrid and adaptive. They must intelligently combine the broad, solidarity-building power of universal social policies with the precise, barrier-breaking capacity of targeted measures for recognition and redress. A purely universalist approach may overlook specific historical disadvantages faced by particular groups, while a purely group-specific approach can be divisive and may fail to build the broad coalitions necessary for sustained political support. The future of equitable public policy lies in its ability to navigate this tension, designing systems that are both universally supportive and particularly attentive.

For policymakers, the implications are clear. First, diagnosis must precede prescription. A thorough understanding of the specific nature of marginalization-whether it stems primarily from economic structures, cultural misrecognition, or historical dispossession-is essential. Second, policy design must be multi-dimensional, addressing Fraser's (1995) twin demands of redistribution and recognition simultaneously. Finally, robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, using disaggregated data, are crucial for tracking outcomes and ensuring that policies are delivering substantive equity, not just formal equality. This study has limitations, primarily its reliance on secondary data and its focus on national-level frameworks, which may obscure sub-national variations. Future research could employ mixed-methods approaches, combining quantitative data with qualitative insights from beneficiaries and

implementers. Comparative studies focusing on specific sectors like education or healthcare, or examining the role of local governments and civil society in shaping equitable outcomes, would be valuable extensions of this work.

In conclusion, as global challenges from climate change to technological disruption threaten to exacerbate existing inequalities, the imperative for smart, effective, and just public policy has never been greater. By learning from the comparative successes and failures of diverse global models, we can better craft the inclusive and equitable frameworks necessary for a sustainable and just future for all.

References

1. Amenta, E., Bonastia, C., & Caren, N. (2001). US social policy in comparative and historical perspective: Concepts, images, arguments, and research strategies. Annual Review of Sociology, 27, 213-234.
2. Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (Eds.). (2013). Struggles for inclusion: Multiculturalism and political community in the twenty-first century. Oxford University Press.
3. Barry, B. (2001). Culture and equality: An egalitarian critique of multiculturalism. Harvard University Press.
4. Bloemraad, I. (2006). Becoming a citizen: Incorporating immigrants and refugees in the United States and Canada. University of California Press.
5. Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America (5th ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
6. Braveman, P., Arkin, E., Orleans, T., Proctor, D., & Plough, A. (2017). What is health equity? And what difference does a definition make? Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.
7. Burnet, J. E. (2011). Women have found respect: Gender quotas, symbolic representation, and female empowerment in Rwanda. Politics & Gender, 7(3), 303-334.
8. Desai, S., & Kulkarni, V. (2008). Changing educational inequalities in India in the context of affirmative action. Demography, 45(2), 245-270.
9. Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). The three worlds of welfare capitalism. Princeton University Press.
10. Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a ‘post-socialist’ age. New Left Review, 212, 68-93.
11. Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (Eds.). (2001). Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage. Oxford University Press.
12. Htun, M., & Weldon, S. L. (2018). The logics of gender justice: State action on women's rights around the world. Cambridge University Press.
13. Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence. Cambridge University Press.

14. Korpi, W., & Palme, J. (1998). The paradox of redistribution and strategies of equality: Welfare state institutions, inequality, and poverty in the Western countries. American Sociological Review, 63(5), 661-687.
15. Kymlicka, W. (1995). Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights. Oxford University Press.
16. Locke, J. (1689). Two treatises of government. Awnsham Churchill.
17. Marshall, T. H. (1950). Citizenship and social class and other essays. Cambridge University Press.
18. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism. Cambridge University Press.
19. OECD. (2021). A broken social elevator? How to promote social mobility. OECD Publishing.
20. Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press.
21. Pierson, P. (1996). The new politics of the welfare state. World Politics, 48(2), 143-179.
22. Powley, E. (2005). Rwanda: The impact of women legislators on policy outcomes affecting children and families. UNICEF.
23. Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Harvard University Press.
24. Reitz, J. G., & Banerjee, R. (2007). Racial inequality, social cohesion, and policy issues in Canada. In K. Banting, T. J. Courchene, & F. L. Seidle (Eds.), Belonging? Diversity, recognition and shared citizenship in Canada (pp. 489-545). Institute for Research on Public Policy.
25. Rothstein, B., & Uslaner, E. M. (2005). All for all: Equality, corruption, and social trust. World Politics, 58(1), 41-72.
26. Sabbagh, D. (2007). Equality and transparency: A strategic perspective on affirmative action in American law. Palgrave Macmillan.
27. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.
28. Tilly, C. (1998). Durable inequality. University of California Press.
29. United Nations. (2016). Leaving no one behind: The imperative of inclusive development. Report on the World Social Situation 2016. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
30. Whitehead, M. (1991). The concepts and principles of equity and health. Health Promotion International, 6(3), 217-228.
31. World Economic Forum. (2022). Global Gender Gap Report 2022. World Economic Forum.
32. Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.