

Social protection and state-citizen relations

A review of the literature

Ulriksen, Marianne S.; Plagerson, Sophie

Published in:
Social Policy and Administration

DOI:
10.1111/spol.12959

Publication date:
2023

Document version:
Final published version

Document license:
CC BY-NC-ND

Citation for pulished version (APA):
Ulriksen, M. S., & Plagerson, S. (2023). Social protection and state-citizen relations: A review of the literature. *Social Policy and Administration*, 57(6), 841-854. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12959>

Go to publication entry in University of Southern Denmark's Research Portal

Terms of use

This work is brought to you by the University of Southern Denmark.
Unless otherwise specified it has been shared according to the terms for self-archiving.
If no other license is stated, these terms apply:

- You may download this work for personal use only.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying this open access version

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details and we will investigate your claim.
Please direct all enquiries to puresupport@bib.sdu.dk

Social protection and state-citizen relations: A review of the literature

Marianne S. Ulriksen^{1,2}  | Sophie Plageron² 

¹Department of Political Science, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark

²Centre for Social Development in Africa, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

Correspondence

Marianne S. Ulriksen, Department of Political Science, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark.

Email: mu@sam.sdu.dk

Abstract

It is frequently assumed that social protection can play a key role in positively transforming state-citizen relations in the global South. We examine the evidence with a focus on recipients and non-recipients, both citizens and non-citizens. Based on a systematic literature review, we identify three levels of analysis: activity, perceptions and expectations. A common thread through these levels is the bifurcated and hierarchical nature of relationships between social protection recipients on the one side and the state and non-recipients on the other. Thus, the cross-section of evidence does not conclusively support the oft-assumed transformative potentials of social protection. Arguably, theoretical frameworks on activities, perceptions and expectations allow us to explore further the differentiated relationships shaped by social protection.

KEYWORDS

inequality, low- and middle-income countries, social protection, state-citizen relations, transformative

1 | INTRODUCTION

As the scope and scale of social protection has grown across the Global South, the theme of state-citizen relations has become an increasingly important area of research. Recent theorization of dynamics ‘from above’ has taken as a starting point the position of the political elite, state, or external actors; for instance on how ruling elites provide

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2023 The Authors. Social Policy & Administration published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

social protection for electoral advantages and expectations of improved legitimacy (Hickey et al., 2020; Lavers, 2022; Loewe & Zintl, 2021). Alik-Lagrange et al. (2021) provide an overview of the dialectic nature of state-citizen interactions in insecure states. However, there has been less systematic focus 'from below' considering how groups of citizens perceive and engage with states' social protection policies. This imbalance weakens the integrated understanding of the interaction between social protection and state-citizen relations, resulting in the fragmented landscape of evidence on this theme.

In this article, we present our analysis of a systematic literature review on how social protection shapes state-citizen relations taking citizens' behaviour and understandings as the starting point. We do so with the intention to theoretically inform the special issue on *States, Citizens and Social Protection in Africa*. Much of the social protection literature carries assumptions that the provision of benefits can improve citizens' relations to the state in ways that activate and empower citizens to lay claims on the state and expect an even share of rights and obligations. Yet our review shows very mixed results as to how social protection fosters state-citizen relations. Underlying the complexity of nuances, we find a distinct differentiation of social protection recipients vis-à-vis other citizens and the state. Even inclusive social protection programmes that emphasise equal citizen rights struggle to consistently overcome deeply held assumptions of uneven rights and responsibilities that in subtle ways maintain unequal relations between citizens benefiting from social protection on the one side and state as well as powerful citizens on the other.

Our review includes academic peer-reviewed articles for the period 2000–2021 covering low- and middle-income countries. Since our intention is to inform theory, we include studies from the global South broadly. Using keywords for social protection and state-citizen relations¹ in titles and abstracts, a search on Web of Science Social Sciences Citation Index was conducted. From the initial search of 684 records, after excluding studies in high-income countries 383 studies remained. Next, we excluded studies not fitting the ILO definition of social protection,² as well as studies not addressing state-citizen relations or only doing so from a state/political elite perspective. Although we refer to 'citizens' to align with relevant literature, we included studies that refer to the perspectives of migrants and refugees. Ultimately, 64 articles were selected by two reviewers (overview in Table 1).

As Table 1 shows, the literature reflects an increase over time with most articles published in the second decade of the period. The empirical literature represents a broad spread geographically across the Global South although with little on the MENA region. Several countries feature extensively among case studies—including China,

TABLE 1 Summary of included articles by year, region, methodology and social protection focus.

| Year | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|
| 2000–2009 | | 2010–2015 | | 2016–2021 |
| 7 | | 24 | | 33 |
| Region and country ^a | | | | |
| Africa | Asia | Latin America | Post-soviet | MENA |
| 17 | 26 | 22 | 4 | 4 |
| Methodology | | | | |
| Qualitative | Quantitative | Mixed methods | Literature review | Theoretical |
| 40 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| Social protection focus | | | | |
| Social assistance | Social insurance | Public works | Various programmes | Social welfare provision/administration |
| 34 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 14 |

^aSome articles refer to multiple countries.

South Africa, Turkey, Brazil and India. Methodologically and thematically the articles represent a very diverse range of approaches. Social assistance is by far the most common type of social protection programme considered in the literature, and qualitative methods are most frequently used.

We group our thematic analysis of citizens in relation to the state around three levels that emerge from an inductive review of the literature: activity, perceptions and expectations. *Activities* are the most visible layer of analysis and describe what citizens (and non-citizens) do in relation to the state as a result of social protection. *Perceptions* relate to how citizens and non-citizens see themselves in relation to the state and in turn feel seen by others and the state. *Expectations* describe perceived rights and responsibilities from and towards the state.

2 | ACTIVITY

In this section, we investigate the substantial research that focuses on the observable activities fostered by social protection. We explore two questions: Does social protection cause increased citizen activity? Does social protection empower citizens to interact with the state? While we find indications to the affirmative, there are similarly examples that citizen activity is an unreliable proxy for strengthened state-citizen relations. In addition, the balance of power in engagements with the state is often asymmetrical thereby constraining opportunities for increased agency.

2.1 | Does social protection cause increased citizen activity?

Empirical studies confirm a broad assumption that social protection leads to increased levels of citizen activity and engagement with the state. A descriptive review of the literature highlights the types and nature of engagements that are linked to social protection programmes, producing a long and varied list of activities including: attending or leading information sessions, meetings with officials (for selection of beneficiaries, issue of identification documents, application procedures or benefit collection), assisting at paydays, coaching other participants to meet conditions, writing or signing letters, monitoring of programmes by participants, programme-related appeals or grievance mechanisms, activities within participants' local communities (such as membership of programme committees), inputs into the design of social protection programmes, participation in local political meetings, activities linked to the claiming of social rights (e.g., protest, or appeals to courts), voting behaviour and payment of taxes (Adato et al., 2016; Baghdasaryan, 2017; Chandler, 2014; de Milliano et al., 2021; Dygert, 2017; Fischer, 2020; Garmany, 2016; Hickey & King, 2016; Jones et al., 2016; Kruks-Wisner, 2018; Layton & Smith, 2015; Oduro, 2015; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020; Ulriksen, 2013; Zhang, 2017).

Greater levels of activity may occur within the same programme for some participants but not for others. Some studies describe how greater levels of state-citizen activity occur for a sub-set of social protection programme participants endowed with more responsibilities for the functioning of the programme, such as the participant representatives in the LEAP programme in Ghana, or the promotoras (unpaid voluntary workers) in the PROGRESA/Oportunidades in Mexico (Molyneux, 2007; Oduro, 2015). The remuneration of these workers (or lack of it) can also contribute to their level of activity (Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020).

Gender is often a key differentiator in terms of levels of state-citizen activity associated with a programme, either by design or because of institutional and cultural factors (Kruks-Wisner, 2018; Molyneux, 2006, 2007). Women and girls tend to be targeted as primary beneficiaries, because they are at a greater disadvantage in terms of socio-economic status within their communities. However, particularly in the case of conditional programmes, the potentially competing demands of a social protection programme for greater levels of activity within both the private and the public sphere can reduce their capacity for participation in the public sphere (Camfield, 2014; Corboz, 2013; Molyneux, 2006, 2007).

Furthermore, social protection may be associated with strengthened state-citizen relations, without leading to greater state-citizen activity. In the case of the Brazilian Bolsa Familia programme, Sabates-Wheeler et al. (2020) find that the limited use of citizen-driven policy control mechanisms did not equate to a passive citizenry. It could instead be considered evidence of citizens' satisfaction with a well-functioning and responsive state-led administrative mechanisms, and their ability to hold government accountable through the local and federal electoral process.

Importantly, in some cases, it was the withdrawal (rather than introduction) of social protection that stimulated greater levels of citizen activity, for example through appeals to courts or efforts to expand coverage in some post-communist societies (Chandler, 2014). In South Africa, a study concluded that the inadequacy of social welfare provisions, characterised as a 'slice of bread', helped to galvanise protests and demands for 'the whole loaf', understood as democratic inclusion and full citizenship (Goebel, 2011).

The need to examine systemic state-citizen outcomes beyond the programmatic level also emerged from several studies. A case study in Mexico demonstrated how the interaction and collaboration between female participants of the Oportunidades programme and local municipal authorities emerged as women sought to superimpose the communitarian design of a more expansive public health programme onto the restrictive boundaries of the cash transfer programme (which limited their opportunities for public engagement) (Dygert, 2017). In Lesotho, Ulriksen (2013) observed that since pension recipients were not direct taxpayers on account of their low incomes, the social contract within which they operated was limited. Consequently the extent of influence and mobilisation of pension recipients related to the continued existence of benefits rather than to their expansion.

In sum, there are clear connections between social protection and levels of citizen activity, but this relationship is not linear. Levels of activity may remain within the scope of a programme or may spill over into other areas of public life. In some cases, increased levels of citizen activity are related to the reduction of benefits rather than their expansion. Levels of state-citizen activity associated with social protection also interact with citizens' pre-existing public and private activities, potentially exacerbating gendered patterns of division of labour. Consequently levels of activity may not be a good indicator of the strength of state-citizen relations and need to be considered in conjunction with empowerment effects, as the next section discusses.

2.2 | Does social protection empower citizens to interact in with the state?

A second broad assumption in the literature is that social protection increases citizen agency. Hickey and King identified a 'growing pressure for social protection interventions to be delivered in ways that enable recipients to exercise agency in holding providers to account for delivering social protection as a right rather than as a hand-out' (p. 1225). This is particularly the case in contexts where marginalised people have previously been unable to assert their citizenship and make claims on the state (Jones et al., 2016; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020).

While there is significant evidence to this effect (e.g., Adato et al., 2016; Hunter & Sugiyama, 2014), there are several caveats. First, different types of interaction carry different opportunities for agency. Within social protection programmes, interactions may be one-way, two-way, or mediated by a third party, with varying effects on levels of citizen empowerment. One-way interfaces were mentioned particularly in studies concerned with conditional cash programmes, which invited or required participants to attend information or training meetings (Adato et al., 2016; Dygert, 2017; Molyneux, 2006, 2007). While offering exposure to state representatives in different capacities, these engagements offer little in the way of increased agency and may simply reflect social hierarchies.

Two-way interactions are spaces in which both parties play an active role and may be primarily characterised as relational (focused on the relationship between actors, e.g., social protection recipient and public official) or procedural (e.g., the administrative processes involved in accessing social protection). The distinction between relational and procedural interactions is not mutually exclusive. However, descriptions of state-citizen engagements may focus on the relational dynamics (e.g., power dynamics or obligational hierarchies) which are entailed by face-to-face encounters, while others may (also) consider the implications for state-citizen relations of participant engagements in

institutional processes (such as application procedures), whether or not these involve direct relational engagement (Chudnovsky & Peeters, 2021; Mataradze, 2011; Oduro, 2015; Plageron et al., 2012; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020). Procedurally, access to identity documents can increase the space for citizen agency (Oduro, 2015). However, administrative failings can also leave citizens feeling disempowered (Mataradze, 2011).

Relational interactions may be direct encounters between recipients and public officials or they may be mediated by nonstate brokers and institutions, such as 'fixers' or civil society actors, affecting the scope for citizen agency (Auerbach & Kruks-Wisner, 2020; Devereux, 2013; Henninger & Romer, 2021; Hickey & King, 2016; Kruks-Wisner, 2018). For instance, in Moldova lack of civil society involvement limited the scope for state-citizen activities (Ratzmann, 2014). Other actors such as philanthropists or violent groups can also play a role in facilitating or undermining social protection related spaces for states and citizens to engage (Dillon, 2011; Grynkeiwich, 2008; Morvaridi, 2013).

The analysis of the interpersonal nature of state-citizen encounters highlights significant variation in the scope for agency—on one hand social accountability may increase, while on the other power differentials between state representatives and recipients may be reproduced. Juxtaposed dynamics may occur synchronously. In a case study of young people receiving disability benefits and anti-retroviral treatment in South Africa (Vale et al., 2017), relational descriptions of encounters with welfare officials are described as 'ambiguous', and 'at once subordinating and enabling' (p. 1287), whereby recipients direct their limited forms of agency towards navigating the state's dual roles as carer and enforcer of medical regime adherence. Ethnic minorities may have different experiences when interacting with state representatives compared to members of privileged or dominant groups (Alik-Lagrange et al., 2021). Stigma and prejudice may also (pre-)determine the experience of encounters with public state officials for some categories of recipients including non-citizens (as Congolese refugees in South Africa or Syrian refugees in Turkey) (Celik & White, 2022; Masuku & Rama, 2020). As a result of these different relational dynamics, state-citizen engagements may be empowering or punitive, transforming or entrenching existing relational hierarchies.

Second, points of contact at different stages within a social protection policy cycle can signify different levels of agency. Indeed, the type of citizen activity and involvement may be limited to areas of implementation rather than oversight. In the case of Progresia/Oportunidades, Molyneux observed while participants were very active in the programme's implementation, they were not 'given an active role in the design, management and evaluation of the programme'. Similarly, despite programme commitments to fostering citizenship among participants, the Comundades Solidarias Rurales in El Salvador did better at including recipients in operational assistance than governance activities (Adato et al., 2016).

Third, most studies refer to interactions within the ambit of a particular programme. Arguably, however, citizen-state interactions which transcend the confines of a programme's design offer a more robust test of sustainable effects for agency. These cases are not systematically documented. An example is provided by Kruks-Wisner who describes how MGNREGA has opened opportunities in Rajasthan, India for informal citizen-state engagement with politicians and state officials visiting work sites during electoral campaigns due to the congregation of large and diverse groups of people. Kruks-Wisner also cites research which finds that women who travel more regularly outside their village (as they regularly would for MGNREGA work) are more likely to hold public officials accountable.

The review suggests that participants' levels of agency in relation to the state may be restricted, maintained or expanded as a result of social protection. Sabates-Wheeler et al. (2020) description of 'closed', 'invited' and 'claimed' spaces offers a useful framework to explore different levels of agency among participants from citizens being recipients (in closed spaces), to being users and choosers (in invited spaces) to having a higher level of active citizenship as makers and shapers (in claimed spaces). There is scope for greater theorization of 'empowerment' at the systemic level, rather than just at the programmatic level. Empirically, we need to have more knowledge of when and how citizens move from closed and invited spaces to the claimed spaces within and beyond social protection programmes. Additionally, particularly in the light of increasing digitisation of social protection processes, there is scope for an integrated analysis of the effects of both relational and procedural dynamics on state-citizen relations.

3 | PERCEPTIONS

A second layer of analysis of the social protection and state-citizen nexus concerns perceptions. Insights from the studies reviewed relate to how programme participants, and citizens more broadly, view themselves, the state and each other. Alik-Lagrange et al. (2021) refer to these perceptual findings as reconstitutive effects which 'capture the ways in which myriad aspects of social protection programming, including cursory or incidental features of programme design and implementation, reconfigure both states and citizens, independently and in relation to one another' (p. 156). We discuss the literature on perceptions under two themes: What kind of perceptions of the state result from social protection programmes? How are perceptions of citizenship affected by social protection? The findings suggest that social protection can contribute to a more granular view of the state, though not necessarily to improved assessments. Perceptions of self and others as citizens promoted via social protection may reflect moral values of 'good' citizenship based on what is seen as acceptable behaviour, rather than legal or symbolic expressions of inclusive citizenship based on human rights.

3.1 | A more visible state, a better state or an inconsistent state?

There is some consensus in the empirical literature that social protection programmes make the state more visible. The provision of social protection, and the exchanges that it facilitates, can serve to make the state's presence more tangible, sometimes for the first time (Alik-Lagrange et al., 2021). Some studies show that increased visibility can lead to enhanced perceptions of the state as benevolent and/or competent (Oduro, 2015; Plageron et al., 2012; Zhang, 2017). However, overall, the research confirms that social protection can be associated with both positive, negative or no changes in perceptions of the character and competence of the state. In the area of implementation, if the state delivers well on a social protection programme it is more likely to lead to a positive perception of the state. Conversely if the state delivers poorly, this can affect a negative view of the state (Garmany, 2016; Mataradze, 2011; Oduro, 2015; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020; Scheel et al., 2020).

Thus, increased visibility of the state cannot necessarily be equated with perceptions of a better state, but it does mean that claimants (and citizens more generally) may acquire a more detailed view of the state. The comparative assessment of studies highlights that citizen perceptions of the state, refracted through the lens of social protection, can contribute to a multifaceted view of the state which may not be unitary or consistent (Akerkar et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2008). At the local level, encounters with public officials and social workers may dominate perceptions of the state in relation to social protection, leading to complex characterisations of the state's emissaries as compassionate, powerful, paternalistic, clientelistic, suspicious, discretionary, discriminatory, accountable, impervious, self-interested and/or acquisitive (Eiro, 2019; Garmany, 2016; Hickey & King, 2016; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020; Yoltar, 2009, 2020). Ethnographic research in Turkey highlighted how the provision of health insurance in a marginalised community created perceptions of the state as present yet discretionary and unpredictable, and contrasted deeply with their desire for a developmentalist state that could provide jobs, confirming a sense of abandonment by the state (Yoltar, 2020). In Peru, a study observed that voters were attuned to both corrupt and competent behaviour of politicians responsible for a public works programme (Vera, 2020). In a South African study, Plageron et al. (2012) find that social assistance recipients view state officials as having their own agenda, not just as state representatives.

Perceptions may also differ by sector of the state. In post-communist Russia, positive perceptions of social welfare bureaucracies contrasted with general assessments of state governance as corrupt and ineffective (Berenson, 2010). In Uruguay, female participants in the PANES programme, including the ingreso ciudadano ('citizenship income') cash transfer, felt this was insufficient to meet their needs and characterised the state primarily based on its inability to provide protection from crime and to address the concerns of its citizens (Corboz, 2013).

Differing perceptions of the state can also result from within the same social welfare programme (Auerbach & Kruks-Wisner, 2020). In China, positive assessments of local government performance in social assistance and insurance programmes were reported by rural citizens', in contrast with their urban and migrant peers (Huang & Gao, 2018).

In sum, social protection can affect perceptions of the state, but typically this occurs via an additive rather than transformative mechanism, resulting in multi-layered and fragmented views. Perceptions of local social protection officials may dominate participants' views of the state.

3.2 | 'Good' citizens or holders of human rights?

A normative assumption that social protection can strengthen perceptions of recipients as citizens with equal rights informs a large body of the literature, and there is indeed evidence to this effect (Leisering & Barrientos, 2013). Through the pathways of economic independence and social inclusion, social protection may strengthen perceptions of self in relation to fellow citizens and towards the state among marginalised populations (Alik-Lagrange et al., 2021; Hunter & Sugiyama, 2014; Oduro, 2015).

However, empirical evidence also brings nuances to this assumption. Three lines of argument can be extracted from the examination of the literature. First, social protection programmes may reinforce or promote strong assumptions about 'good' citizenship rather than citizenship itself. In their study on the Bolsa Família's effects on recipient perceptions of belonging and agency, Hunter and Sugiyama (2014) note how powerful messages about how the state views poor people is conveyed into recipients and non-recipients perceptions of themselves and others. Recipients' perceptions of self as a citizen may become less connected to the meaningful experience of political, civil, and social rights, and more connected to behavioural adherence to predominant and moral values. A study conducted in Peru illustrates how gendered and racially encoded discourses of 'good citizenship' around savings behaviour and personal hygiene, which accompany the delivery of social protection, are internalised by recipients (Meltzer, 2013).

Second, proving one's eligibility for social protection may mean needing to prove that one is not a 'good citizen'. There is thus a potential paradox whereby the route to inclusion in a programme requires being (and remaining) excluded by proving one's inadequate credentials as a good citizen. For example, a qualitative study in Mexico observes that since social protection is aligned with the implicit correspondence between being a good citizen and being a (male) breadwinner, the extension of social assistance to women is based on their inadequate citizenship (Medrano, 2016). In Turkey, a system reinforced by state officials emphasised a beneficiary-benefactor relationship between poor citizens and the state. Receipt of social benefits was viewed by local bureaucrats as a sign of recipients' moral and political inadequacy and their status as deficient citizens. Further, state officials held a strong view that if members of an ethnic minority exercised any claims on the state, this disqualified their status as credible beneficiaries (Yoltar, 2009). Thus, the very basis for accessing social protection in this context denies the right to social assistance.

Third, social protection may reinforce social hierarchies or may generate new processes of social stratification, in ways that differentiate citizens into categories thereby shifting the basis for inclusion and/or undermining the collective and inclusionary nature of citizenship. A social protection programme may simply leave social hierarchies by gender and class unchallenged, limiting opportunities for transformed perceptions of self (Breitkreuz et al., 2017; Goebel, 2011; Phiri, 2017). Alik-Lagrange et al. (2021, p. 161) cite studies from Latin America which observed that programmes contributed to negative attitudes towards recipients, 'entrenching a belief that welfare makes people "work less" than they otherwise would'. Particularly in contexts of equivocal social welfare reform and practice, supercilious public officials and social workers could intensify a priori distinctions between deserving and undeserving recipients, contributing to negative discourses around poverty assessments (Eiro, 2019; Ratzmann, 2014; Yoltar, 2009). The tension between equality and equity-based rationales for social protection is raised in a Turkish study, in which Kilic (2008) argues that a policy shift in social welfare from a 'gender-differentiated' citizenship model towards a 'gender-neutral' citizenship, was detrimental

for the achievement of an equal citizenship for women which would take into account gendered differences in capabilities. Some studies highlight a lack of clarity regarding whether claimants' basis for entitlement to social protection is tied to their identities as workers or as citizens (Agarwala, 2008; Breitzkreuz et al., 2017; Camfield, 2014).

Beyond citizenship, migrants' access (or lack of it) to social protection is associated with their characterisation within different contexts and host/sending states may be perceived as hostile or as peripheral (Celik & White, 2022; Rao et al., 2021; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020). Social assistance offered to refugees and other forced migrants can be associated with a range of positive and negative empowerment and dignity outcomes (Celik & White, 2022; Sabates-Wheeler et al., 2020). Views of migrants as holders of human rights or as deserving economic contributors were promoted by civil society organisations in Argentina and Malaysia respectively, within the parameters generated by different political regimes (democratic in Argentina and electoral-authoritarian in Malaysia) (Henninger & Romer, 2021).

This review of perceptions highlights the differentiated nature of citizenship following receipt of social protection. Rather than inclusive citizenship, attention to behavioural adherence can predominate leaving social stratification unchallenged.

4 | EXPECTATIONS

In this section, we explore whether and how social protection shapes citizens' expectations of the state, themselves, and others in terms of actors' rights and responsibilities. Compared to the other two levels, there are much fewer analyses covering these more hidden dynamics of state-citizen relationships. Based on common assumptions in the literature we ask whether social protection elicits citizens' expectations regarding their social rights, whether citizens see themselves and others as equal duty-bearers and whether rights and responsibilities are shared evenly across citizen groups. While there are some indications of such positive trends, some studies show the opposite: participants in social protection programmes do not always claim their social rights but rather exchange them for other rights; citizens may naturally take on a range of duties, but particularly conditional cash transfers pose obligations on recipients in demeaning ways; and there may be a tendency that 'responsible' contributors to social protection also have stronger rights claims than social protection programme participants.

4.1 | Are social rights claimed or exchanged?

It is often assumed that social protection stimulates an expectation among *claimants* that they can lay demands on the state (Chopra & Lintelo, 2011). Case studies indicate that while recipients make material demands (i.e., receiving the transfers regularly), social protection recipients also call for greater involvement in the implementation and oversight of programmes. The desired involvement can vary from merely having more access to information, to insisting on channels for regular communication and respectful relationships between service providers and recipients (Jones, Abu-Hamad, et al., 2016). Hence, social protection can affect citizens' sense of dignity as well as their expectation to be treated in a dignifying manner (Jones et al., 2016; Oduro, 2015). Receipt of social protection can also foster expectations of programme continuation among citizens, as in the previous Soviet states of Moldova and Georgia where many citizens hold a nostalgia for the socialist past resulting in claims for universalistic entitlements to continue despite fundamental transitions and regime change (Mataradze, 2011; Ratzmann, 2014).

Nevertheless, the literature also identifies a range of barriers that dampen expectations of the state and consequently cause citizens to refrain from making claims. These barriers may reinforce existing inequalities. Negative experiences with the state, anticipation of being treated unfairly, and inability to get access can explain reasons for non-participation in programmes by otherwise eligible recipients (Chudnovsky & Peeters, 2021). Citizens struggling on low incomes may also experience the state as not prioritising them and consequently opt for private solutions

(Birdsall et al., 2014). On an individual level there is also an unevenness in who accesses benefits. Citizens with higher levels of social capital—those that ‘move around the most within and beyond their local communities’—have better knowledge of social protection, are more likely to make claims and have better opportunity to do so (Kruks-Wisner, 2018). Conversely, the most vulnerable—those with less human capital and scarcity of time—are less likely to make claims (Chudnovsky & Peeters, 2021).

While we find several examples in the literature of claims making without the expectation of giving something in return, we also find examples where an *exchange* logic is prominent. On one level, exchanges may entail an active bargaining between state and citizens. According to one study (Agarwala, 2008), informal workers in India have been able to claim welfare benefits from the state in return for the acceptance of an unregulated labour market and their political support. Through the welfare benefit the informal workers get an official identity card from the government which ‘proves state recognition of their work, even in the absence of employer recognition’ (Agarwala, 2008: 399).

On another level, however, exchanges can be defined by people in positions of power with social protection recipients passively accepting receipt of transfers in return for loyalty and political support. A salient feature of social protection in Turkey, for instance, ‘is that people with access to patronage and state power are more likely to be the beneficiaries of social policy than those who do not’ (Morvaridi, 2013). As for India, Akerkar et al. (2016) argues that norms of patronage trump formal rights. Although citizens can claim formal social protection entitlements, the entitlement claims are defined by a ‘a moral contract with the elite patrons’ at the local level. In Armenia, citizens exchange benefits for limitations in their political rights where they are pushed to join and/or vote for specific parties (Baghdasaryan, 2017). While political support often is the currency of exchange, a study on Kurds in Turkey shows how exchanges can take many forms ‘ranging from accepting one’s destiny, to not asking too much of the state, to performing shame, to not engaging in oppositional political activities’ (Yoltar, 2020). Social protection may thus in its implementation reinforce existing local power structures and entrench existing inequalities. For instance, in another study on Turkey, Yoltar (2009) argues that those with good contacts to state officials can ask for special favours and maintain better knowledge of and influence on programme implementation that makes the programme exclusionary for those who do not have these contacts.

Rights can be regarded as interdependent, but rights may not necessarily be mutually reinforcing as illustrated above where political rights may be undermined by the promotion of social rights (Tessitore, 2011). We need to understand better how citizens navigate contexts where social and political rights may either be regarded as separated (benefits provided by local public servants, political rights related to local politicians), or be convoluted as indicated above. Das et al. (2021) provide a nuanced understanding of local state-citizen relations through the study of political settings that foreground how transactions are provided through a multitude of incentives and relations that go beyond merely assuming all relations to be defined by patronage. Such a framework to study local political dynamics around social protection may allow us to get a firmer understanding of the exchange logics and whether and how they more either transform or entrench existing hierarchies and inequalities.

4.2 | Are obligations taken or given?

The other side of the coin to citizens as rights-holders is citizens as duty-bearers, where we can ask whether citizens recognise their own contributions, or whether obligations are placed upon them by social protection providers. In our pool of articles, we find little focus on whether and how citizen see themselves as responsible citizens that take it upon themselves to perform obligations towards the state, others, and themselves. In one way this is surprising as citizens perform all kinds of duties throughout their lives; although often unconsciously (Ulriksen & Plageron, 2014). While there has been limited attention to claimants’ (and local state officials’) self-perceived obligations towards the state, there are some disparate references to the potential contrast between responsibilities towards the state and existing notions and practices of obligation towards kin and community (Akerkar et al., 2016; Alik-Lagrange et al., 2021; Plageron et al., 2012; Yoltar, 2009). The often-implicit nature of duty-bearing may be the exact reason

why there is little academic focus on this in the social protection literature. One interesting exception is a study on China (Jensen, 2019) where it is argued that rural elders (unlike urban elders) perceive their well-being to be their own responsibility rather than the obligations of others or the state. As rural elders are at a greater risk of poverty in retirement compared to their urban counterparts, existing inequalities are reproduced.

One section of the social protection literature is, however, by no means silent on obligations, namely studies on conditional cash transfer (CCT) programmes. We find several studies that highlight how social protection programmes are used by state officials, and accepted by citizens, to place obligations on recipients in ways that are patronising and degrading. For instance, two different studies from Peru show how both service providers and participants see it as necessary to apply pressure on recipients to ensure compliance with conditions. The one study, highlights how conditions go beyond the requirements of sending children to school, to maintain standards of hygiene and cleanliness that are couched in narratives of poor citizens as idle and dirty (Meltzer, 2013). The other study shows that recipients themselves express the conditions as ‘tasks to be completed due to instructions from authorities rather than about a balance between citizens’ rights and responsibilities’ (Jones et al., 2008). In Ghana, state officials regard it important to educate participants about how to use the cash efficiently and to comply with conditions. In this study, it is argued that the state fails to treat recipients with respect and the participants ‘indicated that the conditions made them feel “less a person” in that they were told what to do’ (Oduro, 2015).

There are also scholarly contributions suggesting that states can use social protection to transfer obligations to citizens; that CCTs represent ‘a dilution of the state’s responsibility for its citizens’ (Scheel et al., 2020). In a study on Turkey, it is argued that the state is transferring responsibility for well-being to private mechanisms as many vulnerable groups are left to rely on informal measures of social protection (Morvaridi, 2013). In Peru, participants in a savings promotion programme are expected to manage their own risks given their participation in the program (Meltzer, 2013). And in Mexico, a CCT programme for poor women is used by other villagers and officials to ‘transfer previously communal responsibilities to the “poor women” designated as program beneficiaries’ (Dyert, 2017).

The critical reflections on social protection as imposing citizens with (demeaning) obligations relates to conditional programmes. As unconditional programmes obviously do not entail the fulfilment of specific obligations, it is also less straightforward to study the relationship between a social right and some diffuse set of responsibilities. There are, nevertheless, some studies that explicitly relate rights and responsibilities as we discuss in the next section.

4.3 | Are rights and responsibilities placed evenly or asymmetrically?

In our review, we have identified few studies focusing on both rights and responsibilities related to social protection. An interesting theme emerging from our reading is how the focus on both rights and responsibilities can place different groups of citizens in contrast to others in ways that may either address existing inequalities or further entrench dualities and experiences of unfairness.

A study conducted in Georgia highlights how citizens may hold balanced expectations between rights and responsibilities. Given a past system where citizens show their dedication to the socialist state through work, ‘pensioners think that the current state is obliged to pay them back for their devotion’ (Mataradze, 2011). However, there are also examples of social protection placing rights and responsibilities unevenly across different groups. In a study of India and Ethiopia, Camfield (2014) probes what happens to girl’s roles and responsibilities when the household participates in a social protection program and finds that girls’ workloads increase and time for study and leisure decrease due to the ‘invisibility’ of girls’ (and women’s) work. Molyneux (2007) argue that the CCT in Brazil constitutes ‘inequality of responsibility’ in that recipients are obliged to meet conditions while other stakeholders, such as teachers, do not meet the same strict obligations of not missing class. This causes resistance towards the programme and a feeling that it is not based on genuine co-responsibility. The contrast between the responsibilities of social protection recipients and the rights/lack of explicit responsibility of others is particularly stark in a study on Guatemala in which it is argued that there are ‘dual classes of citizens: taxpayers who have the right and responsibility to audit

social programs, and recipients of state benefits who are viewed as legitimate objects of public scrutiny' (Dotson, 2014).

Thus, there may be a risk that claimants of social protection are placed in inferior positions vis-à-vis other groups in society: recipients are bestowed duties not necessarily placed on others. However, the connections between rights and responsibilities are curiously understudied. As mentioned in a new contribution: 'Despite centuries of "duties talk", the question of who bears the duties for social rights has never been definitely answered' (Jensen & Walton, 2022: 16). We observe from the social protection literature a split between the contributions focusing on rights-based social protection, which generally only mentions duties when referring to state's obligations, and the contributions studying conditional cash transfers where obligations of social protection recipients is at the centre.

The difficulty of connecting rights and duties may also be because obligations can be rather 'diffuse' (Kabeer, 2014) and difficult to connect meaningfully to specific social rights. In an earlier contribution, we proposed a theoretical framework for understanding the relationship between rights and responsibilities based on the concept of 'generalised exchange', within which citizens are rights-holders and duty-bearers in a variety of ways that may shift across space and times during ones' lifetime (Ulriksen & Plageron, 2014). Particularly, we theorised how there may be specific barriers for poor to be duty-bearers, which are typically not recognised. Being cognizant of the hierarchies of rights-holding and duty-bearing may help us better understand the above noted uneven placement of obligations on social assistance recipients in ways not experienced by other groups.

5 | CONCLUSION

In our literature review of how social protection shapes state-citizen relations, we identified three overall levels of analysis going from the visible and most studied 'activities', through 'perceptions' to the less visible and least studied 'expectations'. Based on this framework, we both highlighted the strong assumptions that inform the social protection scholarship and illuminated the nuances and contradictions in the findings.

A common thread through the levels of analysis is the bifurcated and hierarchical nature of relationships between social protection recipients on the one side and the state and non-recipients on the other. (1) Social protection may increase citizen *activity* and engagement with the state, but activity is not necessarily a good indicator of the strength of state-citizen relations and citizen engagements may be limited to less fundamental roles such as in programme implementation, rather than in the design and oversight elements. (2) Social protection receipt makes states more visible and can improve participants' *perceptions* of self. However, a nuanced eye on the relational dynamics reveals state and other citizens to be concerned with recipients' behavioural adherence to moral values rather than seeing them as citizens on an equal footing. (3) Social protection may raise the *expectations* and claims-making of programme participants but may also, particularly in the case of conditional cash transfers, pose specific obligations on them not experienced by others.

Thus, the cross-section of evidence included in this review does not conclusively support the oft-assumed transformative potentials that bring a priori identified vulnerable groups (as is generally the characteristic of recipients of non-contributory social protection) on par with other citizen groups. Groups are differentiated based on widely held perceptions of differentiated rights and responsibilities that are stronger than possible inclusive intentions in some social protection programmes. Citizen-centred studies of activities, perceptions and expectations can contribute to nuanced theoretical frameworks of citizenship which shy away from optimistic assumptions to instead openly and systematically explore webs of differentiated relationships and uneven identifications of who has the right to what, and who should make what contribution.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated. All studies that are part of the literature review are included in the list of references.

ORCID

Marianne S. Ulriksen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2567-1615>

Sophie Plageron  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8018-2080>

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Key words: Social protection, social assistance, social security, cash transfer, public works, in-kind transfer, social insurance, community-based insurance, welfare provision, social welfare, non-contributory scheme, contributory scheme, social transfer, social grant; state-citizen, social contract, social compact, citizen-state, state-society, society-state, citizen, political settlement, right, reciproc*, duties, responsibilities.
- ² Social protection includes benefits for children and families, maternity, unemployment, employment injury, sickness, old age, disability, survivors, as well as health protection. Social protection systems address all these policy areas by a mix of contributory schemes (social insurance) and non-contributory tax-financed benefits, including social assistance (ILO, 2017).

REFERENCES

- Adato, M., Barahona, O. M., & Roopnaraine, T. (2016). Programming for citizenship: The conditional cash transfer programme in El Salvador. *Journal of Development Studies*, 52(8), 1177–1191.
- Agarwala, R. (2008). Reshaping the social contract: Emerging relations between the state and informal labor in India. *Theory and Society*, 37(4), 375–408.
- Akerkar, S., Joshi, P. C., & Fordham, M. (2016). Cultures of entitlement and social protection: Evidence from flood prone Bahraich, Uttar Pradesh, India. *World Development*, 86, 46–58.
- Alik-Lagrange, A., Dreier, S. K., Lake, M., & Porisky, A. (2021). Social protection and state–society relations in environments of low and uneven state capacity. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 24(1), 151–174.
- Auerbach, A. M., & Kruks-Wisner, G. (2020). The geography of citizenship practice: How the poor engage the state in rural and urban India. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(4), 1118–1134.
- Baghdasaryan, M. (2017). The practice of political rights and patron-client relations: A case study of a party in Armenia. *Citizenship Studies*, 21(8), 1034–1051.
- Berenson, M. P. (2010). Serving citizens: How comparable are Polish and Russian “street-level” bureaucrats? *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(5), 578–605.
- Birdsall, N., Lustig, N., & Meyer, C. J. (2014). The strugglers: The new poor in Latin America? *World Development*, 60, 132–146.
- Breitkreuz, R., Stanton, C. J., Brady, N., Pattison-Williams, J., King, E. D., Mishra, C., & Swallow, B. (2017). The Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme: A policy solution to rural poverty in India? *Development Policy Review*, 35(3), 397–417.
- Camfield, L. (2014). Growing up in Ethiopia and Andhra Pradesh: The impact of social protection schemes on girls' roles and responsibilities. *European Journal of Development Research*, 26(1), 107–123.
- Celik, C., & White, H. (2022). Forced migration and protection: Turkey's domestic responses to the Syrian refugees. *European Review*, 30(3), 353–373.
- Chandler, A. (2014). Citizenship, social rights and judicial review in regime transition: The case of Russia. *Democratization*, 21(4), 743–766.
- Chopra, D., & Lintelo, D. T. (2011). Democratic governance for social justice: The politics of social protection. *IDS Bulletin-Institute of Development Studies*, 42(6), 10–12.
- Chudnovsky, M., & Peeters, R. (2021). The unequal distribution of administrative burden: A framework and an illustrative case study for understanding variation in people's experience of burdens. *Social Policy & Administration*, 55(4), 527–542.
- Corboz, J. (2013). Third-way neoliberalism and conditional cash transfers: The paradoxes of empowerment, participation and self-help among poor Uruguayan women. *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 24(1), 64–80.
- Das, R., Dey, S., & Neogi, R. (2021). Across the stolen ponds: The political geography of social welfare in rural eastern India. *World Development*, 146, 105544.
- de Milliano, M., Barrington, C., Angeles, G., & Gbedemah, C. (2021). Crowding-out or crowding-in? Effects of LEAP 1000 unconditional cash transfer program on household and community support among women in rural Ghana. *World Development*, 143, 105466.
- Devereux, S. (2013). Trajectories of social protection in Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 30(1), 13–23.
- Dillon, N. (2011). Middlemen in the Chinese welfare state: The role of philanthropists in refugee relief in wartime Shanghai. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 46(1), 22–45.

- Dotson, R. (2014). Citizen-auditors and visible subjects: Mi Familia Progresá and transparency politics in Guatemala. *Polar-Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 37(2), 350–370.
- Dyrgert, H. (2017). The fight against poverty and the gendered remaking of community in Mexico: New patriarchal collusions and gender solidarities. *Polar-Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 40(1), 171–187.
- Eiro, F. (2019). The vicious cycle in the Bolsa Família Program's implementation: Discretionality and the challenge of social rights consolidation in Brazil. *Qualitative Sociology*, 42(3), 385–409.
- Fischer, H. W. (2020). Policy innovations for pro-poor climate support: Social protection, small-scale infrastructure, and active citizenship under India's MGNREGA. *Climate and Development*, 12(8), 689–702.
- Garmany, J. (2016). Neoliberalism, governance, and the geographies of conditional cash transfers. *Political Geography*, 50, 61–70.
- Goebel, A. (2011). 'Our struggle is for the full loaf': Protests, social welfare and gendered citizenship in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 37(2), 369–388.
- Grynkewich, A. G. (2008). Welfare as warfare: How violent non-state groups use social services to attack the state. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 31(4), 350–370.
- Henninger, J., & Romer, F. (2021). Choose your battles how civil society organisations choose context-specific goals and activities to fight for immigrant welfare rights in Malaysia and Argentina. *Social Policy & Administration*, 55(6), 1112–1128.
- Hickey, S., & King, S. (2016). Understanding social accountability: Politics, power and building new social contracts. *Journal of Development Studies*, 52(8), 1225–1240.
- Hickey, S., Lavers, T., Niño-Zarazúa, M., & Seekings, J. (2020). *The politics of social protection in Eastern and Southern Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Huang, X., & Gao, Q. (2018). Does social insurance enrollment improve citizen assessment of local government performance? Evidence from China. *Social Science Research*, 70, 28–40.
- Hunter, W., & Sugiyama, N. B. (2014). Transforming subjects into citizens: Insights from Brazil's Bolsa Família. *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(4), 829–845.
- ILO. (2017). *World social protection report 2017-19: Universal social protection to achieve the sustainable development goals*. International Labour Organization.
- Jensen, B. (2019). 'Perceived social citizenship': A comparative study between two different hukous. *Citizenship Studies*, 23(2), 172–188.
- Jensen, B., & Walton, C. (2022). *Social rights and the politics of obligation in history*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, N., Abu-Hamad, B., Pereznieto, P., & Sylvester, K. (2016). Transforming cash transfers: Citizens' perspectives on the politics of programme implementation. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 52(8), 1207–1224.
- Jones, N., Bassam, A., Pereznieto, P., & Sylvester, K. (2016). Transforming cash transfers: Citizens' perspectives on the politics of programme implementation. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 52(8), 1207–1224.
- Jones, N., Vargas, R., & Villar, E. (2008). Cash transfers to tackle childhood poverty and vulnerability: An analysis of Peru's Juntos programme. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(1), 255–273.
- Kabeer, N. (2014). The politics and practicalities of universalism: A contribution-based perspective on social protection. *European Journal of Development Research*, 26, 338–354.
- Kilic, A. (2008). The gender dimension of social policy reform in Turkey: Towards equal citizenship? *Social Policy & Administration*, 42(5), 487–503.
- Kruks-Wisner, G. (2018). THE PURSUIT OF SOCIAL WELFARE citizen claim-making in rural India. *World Politics*, 70(1), 122–163.
- Lavers, T. (Ed.). (2022). *The politics of distributing social transfers*. Oxford University Press.
- Layton, M. L., & Smith, A. E. (2015). Incorporating marginal citizens and voters: The conditional electoral effects of targeted social assistance in Latin America. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(7), 854–881.
- Leisering, L., & Barrientos, A. (2013). Social citizenship for the global poor? The worldwide spread of social assistance. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22, S50–S67.
- Loewe, M., & Zintl, T. (2021). State fragility, social contracts and the role of social protection: Perspectives from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region. *Social Sciences*, 10(12), 447.
- Masuku, S., & Rama, S. (2020). A case study of government and civil societies' collaboration and challenges in securing the rights of Congolese refugees living in Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*, 116(3–4), 37–42, Article 6210.
- Mataradze, T. (2011). Is the state social or the computer inhuman? Claims for state support and citizenship in post-socialist Georgia. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(3–4), 471–484.
- Medrano, A. (2016). CCTs for female heads of households and market citizenship at state-level in Mexico. *Social Policy and Society*, 15(3), 495–507.
- Meltzer, J. (2013). 'Good citizenship' and the promotion of personal savings accounts in Peru. *Citizenship Studies*, 17(5), 641–652.
- Molyneux, M. (2006). Mothers at the service of the new poverty agenda: Progresá/oportunidades, Mexico's conditional transfer programme. *Social Policy & Administration*, 40(4), 425–449.

- Molyneux, M. (2007). Two cheers for CCTs. *IDS Bulletin-Institute of Development Studies*, 38(3), 69–74.
- Morvaridi, B. (2013). The politics of philanthropy and welfare governance: The case of Turkey. *European Journal of Development Research*, 25(2), 305–321.
- Oduro, R. (2015). Beyond poverty reduction: Conditional cash transfers and citizenship in Ghana. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 24(1), 27–36.
- Phiri, M. Z. (2017). Comparative perspectives on South Africa's and Brazil's institutional inequalities under progressive social policies. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 43(5), 961–978.
- Plagerson, S., Harpham, T., & Kielmann, K. (2012). Cash transfers and citizenship: Evidence from South Africa. *Journal of Development Studies*, 48(7), 969–982.
- Rao, S., Gammage, S., Arnold, J., & Anderson, E. (2021). Human mobility, COVID-19, and policy responses: The rights and claims-making of migrant domestic workers. *Feminist Economics*, 27(1–2), 254–270.
- Ratzmann, N. (2014). Reforming Moldovan social assistance: Poor laws for the European fringe? *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, 14(3), 409–429.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., Wilmink, N., Abdulai, A., de Groot, R., & Spadafora, T. (2020). Linking social rights to active citizenship for the most vulnerable: The role of rights and accountability in the 'making' and 'shaping' of social protection. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 32(1), 129–151.
- Scheel, I. B., Scheel, A. E., & Fretheim, A. (2020). The moral perils of conditional cash transfer programmes and their significance for policy: A meta-ethnography of the ethical debate. *Health Policy and Planning*, 35(6), 718–734.
- Tessitore, S. (2011). One step beyond: From social protection recipients to citizens. *IDS Bulletin-Institute of Development Studies*, 42(6), 13–20.
- Ulriksen, M. (2013). The politics of social protection expenditure and financing in southern Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 30(1), 39–53.
- Ulriksen, M. S., & Plagerson, S. (2014). Social protection: Rethinking rights and duties. *World Development*, 64, 755–765.
- Vale, B., Hodes, R., Cluver, L., & Thabeng, M. (2017). Bureaucracies of blood and belonging: Documents, HIV-positive youth and the state in South Africa. *Development and Change*, 48(6), 1287–1309.
- Vera, S. B. (2020). Accepting or resisting? Citizen responses to corruption across varying levels of competence and corruption prevalence. *Political Studies*, 68(3), 653–670, Article 0032321719868210.
- Yoltar, C. (2009). When the poor need health care: Ethnography of state and citizenship in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 45(5), 769–782.
- Yoltar, C. (2020). Making the indebted citizen: An inquiry into state benevolence in Turkey. *Polar-Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 43(1), 153–171.
- Zhang, H. M. (2017). The minimum living standard guarantee system and citizenship cultivation among the poor in China. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 45(4–5), 483–506.

How to cite this article: Ulriksen, M. S., & Plagerson, S. (2023). Social protection and state-citizen relations: A review of the literature. *Social Policy & Administration*, 57(6), 841–854. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12959>