What Happens to Innovations and Their Organizations? Piloting an Approach to Research

Eleanor D. Glor

Adjunct Professor

York University

Toronto, Canada

and

Garry A. Ewart

Ph.D. Student

University of Regina,

Saskatchewan, Canada

What Happens to Innovations and Their Organizations?[1] Piloting an Approach

Eleanor D. Glor and Garry A. Ewart

ABSTRACT

In the private, non-profit and public sectors innovation is promoted and considered adaptive, but little evaluation of its impacts or fate has been done. Using Glor's (2014) framework, this paper pilot tests Glor's approach by examining five case studies of innovations and their organizations by identifying key success factors, the effects of the innovations on the organization's people, and the demography of the innovations and their organizations. If innovations are adaptive, they and their organizational populations should survive longer than normal programs and their organizations. Do they? To answer this question, the five income security innovations and their implementing organizations of the Government of Saskatchewan (GoS), Canada, 1971-82, 45 to 36 years after innovations and organizations were created, are studied. Three innovations were initiated by the government, one by departmental personnel and one by a statutory review committee. For the five innovations and their three existing and two new organizations, key supportive factors were social democratic politics and ideology, full innovation implementation, an efficacious program model, adequate funding, and management support. Key negative factors were shared: election of a neoconservative government, a change in ideology, a large budgetary deficit, and lack of support of some personnel for new principles. For the four innovations that increased equality, the mean survival period was 12.75 years, until the subsequent neoconservative government introduced an austerity program and abolished them. The fifth, pro-business *and* pro-worker innovation still exists. The mean survival period was 17.6 years for five innovations.

The complex longitudinal relationship between the innovations and the mortality of their organizations was identified. Only the four departmental organizations could be studied—at four vertical levels; organizational information was not available on the administrative tribunal. The organizations administering the four Department of Social Services (SS) innovations survived a mean of 11.5 years, a short-term survival period (Glor, 2013). The paper identifies factors influencing innovation and organizational fate and establishes the demographics of the five innovations and of four organizations. This methodology could potentially be used to study the remaining 154 GoS population's innovations and organizations and other populations.

Key words: Public sector innovation, innovating organization, innovating organizational population, organizational demography, adaptiveness of innovation

[1] An earlier version of this paper "Is Innovation Good for Public Sector Organizational Survival?" was presented to the Annual Conference of the Prairie Political Science Association (PPSA), September 12-14, 2014, Banff, Canada.

Introduction[2]

Managers and personnel in all organizations have been strongly encouraged to innovate since the 1980s (e.g. Peters and Waterman, 1982; Drucker, 1985), but what happens to innovations and their organizations that innovate and why? Is innovation adaptive? Does it enhance survival? In order for innovations to fulfill their program or process objectives, they must first be fully implemented. Are they? They must identify and use efficacious models. Do they? Then they must survive. Do they? How does their survival compare to that of normal[3] programs and organizations? Normal survival for organizations was established by Glor (2013). Is developing or implementing innovations[4] good for the survival of organizations or is it a detriment? The answers to these questions are relevant for both researchers and practitioners.

The next subsections identify what we know about factors contributing to and survival of innovations and organizations. They draw on the published literature for help understanding: (1) the factors correlating with organizational fates for normal and changed organizational populations, (2) the demography of normal and changed organizational populations, and (3) the demography of innovations and their organizations.

Factors influencing fate of programs and organizations. Only one study was found on a *population of programs*—Corder (2004) examined USA programs run by Cabinet departments and independent agencies listed in the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA). Including programs in existence both in the starting year (1974) and ones created after that date, he found a 56 per cent program mortality rate in 26 years, a mean mortality rate of 2.2 per cent per year. Studies of normal and changed *organizational populations* identified independent (not dependent on the organizations) factors correlating significantly with reduced survival included: young organizational age (Freeman, Carroll and Hannan, 1983), low endowment (Carroll and Hannan, 2000), small size (Brüderl and Schüssler, 1990; Carroll and Huo, 1988; Fichman and Levinthal, 1991), fewer resources (Brüderl and Schüssler, 1990; Singh, House and Tucker, 1986), high competition (Lewis, 2002), Republican politics (Lewis, 2002), narrow niche width and high population density (Carroll and Huo, 1988). In *governments*, factors positively correlated with innovation survival included environmental health (deprivation negatively) (de Lancer Jules and Holzer, 2001), higher urbanization, more resources, and large size of full-time employee group. Being rural or small had negative associations. Damanpour (1987) nuanced the factors in 75 non-profit libraries in the USA. Survival analysis (e.g. time series, survivor function, hazard rate) was often used to identify differences in the fate of organizations. These same factors are potentially also affecting the fate of innovations and organizations.

The ***demography of normal and some abnormal organizational populations*** have been

[2] The following abbreviations are used in the paper: GoS=Government of Saskatchewan; GoC=Government of Canada; Saskatchewan=Sask.; SS=Department of Social Services; FTE=full time equivalentss; CAP=Canada Assistance Plan, SAP=Sask. Assistance Plan; FIP=Family Income Plan; SIP=Sask. Income Plan; ESP=Employment Support Program; WCB=Workers Compensation Board; SSAR=Dpt. of Social Services Annual Report.

[3] Normal refers to the survival rates for programs and organizations that do not exhibit extreme characteristics, studied correctly. Based on 21 normal (unbiased) organizational population studies, Glor identified the period definitions for normal PSE organizations: short-term <16 years old; medium-term 16 – 30; long-term > 30 years (Glor, 2013: 28).

[4] Innovation refers to "the conception and implementation of significant new services, ideas or ways of doing things as government policy in order to improve or reform them, and involves taking risks" (Rogers, 1995; Glor, 1997: 4).

published (summarized Baum, 1996; Glor, 2013).[5] Abnormal is defined as biased or outlier studies. Once biased and outlier studies were removed, Glor calculated a baseline mortality rate for the 21 normal organizational *populations*[6]: the mortality rates for all 21 organizational population studies were less than 1.3 per cent per year. The baseline mortality rate in non-profit sector and private sector populations was lower than for the public (government) sector (Glor, 2015: Figure 9.1). The mortality rate for the ten public sector populations was under 1.3 per cent. These rates could be compared to the mortality rates of innovative public sector populations, should such research be done.

The mortality rates of two ***changed organizational populations*** have also been studied. In a first study, Singh, House, and Tucker (1986) studied all 389 voluntary (non-profit) sector day care centres coming into existence from 1970 to 1980 in Toronto, Canada. They studied six types of changes: in goals, sponsorship, chief executive, service areas, location, and structure (e.g. grouping of work units, reporting relationships, number of hierarchical levels). They found that "some changes are disruptive, some have no impact on organizational mortality, and others are adaptive" (1986: 587). In a second study, Amburgey, Kelly and Barnett (1993) researched Finnish newspapers, considering changes in key characteristics—e.g. name, geographic location, breadth of coverage, language of publication. Change was correlated with an increase in the likelihood of further changes and an immediate increase in the hazard rate of failure, independent of the effects of the changed characteristics. Does innovation disrupt, have no impact or help organizations adapt?

The ***demography of innovations*** is not known because only a few studies have addressed the survival of innovations. Glor (2015: 134-8) studied nine Canadian innovations and reviewed data bases of three innovation awards, finding inconsistent mortality rates. Among the nine innovations, there were four mortalities (Glor, 2015: Table 9.5).[7] Among the 18 (of 400) Innovations in American Government Award nominees for which innovation fate was reported, there were three mortalities. These two small studies were not of populations, so population mortality rates could not be calculated. The largest study on the fate of innovation award nominees was of 140 Brazilian award nominees from sub-national governments: 16 of 140 disappeared over seven years (Farah and Spink, 2008). The Brazilian study reports on a population of award nominees. Innovation award nominees are not a good source of information on the mortality of innovations, however, as nominees can be expected to have lower mortality rates than populations of innovations generally (Hartley, 2008). They have higher levels of management support and legitimacy than normal innovations, having been nominated by employees and approved for nomination by management and sometimes even departmental ministers. A synthesis (meta-analysis) of the mortality data of the studies described above found a short-term mortality of 66 of 232 innovations, a 28 per cent mortality rate. A mean mortality rate per year could not be calculated (Glor, 2015: Table 9.5) as the survival period was not always identified.

[5] According to Glor, normal populations are "ones that include a full population (preferably) or close to it or are representative of a full population and are therefore suitable for establishing a standard" (Glor, 2013).

[6] Private, non-profit & public sectors. A normal government organizational mortality rate was developed from ten populations: one each German and Norwegian studies, two each Irish and Canadian studies, and four USA studies (Glor, 2013: App. 4).

[7] Although Sandra Hale (1991) described three of 60 innovations in the Government of Minnesota starting in 1983, she did not describe their fate.

Some studies have identified innovations and then asked governments (Damanpour and Schneider, 2009; reviewed by Walker, 2013) or government departments (Lorsuwannarat, 2011) if they adopted the innovations. Lorsuwannarat developed theories about innovation mortality studying 292 public organizations that introduced one of two innovations in the Thai government. Neither of these studies reported mortality rate. Only one study of a population of innovations was found, identifying all 159 innovations of the Government of Saskatchewan (Sask) GoS), 1971-82 (Glor, 1997, 2002). The studies reported above used different definitions of innovation and many did not report fate. Study of the demography (foundings and mortality) of innovations is in its infancy.

Study of the ***demography of innovating organizations*** is also in its infancy. Only one study was found: Among 65 innovations—European Quality Award nominees—45 of their organizations disappeared (could not be reached at their previous telephone numbers) within two years of nomination (Pollitt, Bouckaert and Löffler, 2006). The factors influencing and mortality rates[8] of innovating organizations and populations have not been tracked or measured, leaving a gap in data and understanding of the relationship between being an innovating organization and survival. Studies are needed reporting on populations of innovations and their organizations, which could be, e.g. all innovations of a whole government; all governments of a type, e.g. sub-national governments; or all innovations of a type (e.g. income security innovations).

Neither the key factors influencing nor the demography of innovations, their organizations nor their populations have been identified. This paper makes a start by conducting a pilot study applying the Glor methodology to a sub-population of five public sector innovations and their organizations. The paper (1) identifies a framework for studying the issues; (2) detects key independent factors influencing the fate of the five innovations and their organizations; (3) ascertains the demographics of the dependent variables, identified as the fate of the innovations and their organizations; (4) reports and discusses the results; and (5) establishes whether this approach could be used in larger studies.

Research Framework

Most research frameworks employ one theoretical paradigm, such as institutionalism. Knill and Lenschow (2001) argued that scope of change studied, the theoretical schools chosen, and whether the conceptual schools are structure or agency-based create key differences in studying change. They suggested that false disagreements arose in the literature because authors used only one approach and scope and did not relate their work appropriately to that of other schools studying other levels. Glor (2014 a, b; 2015), likewise, suggested expanding the scope of theoretical schools referenced because study of the fate of innovations and their organizations is so new.

Based on Burrell and Morgan (1979), Glor recommended using elements from four theoretical approaches—interpretive, humanist, functional and structural. Glor's research framework (2014a, b) is employed. An *interpretive approach* considers case studies where there is a plausible link between an organization innovating and surviving/disappearing, preferably

[8] Mortality is the opposite of survival. It is usually the measure used because information on it is easier to find.

matched with case studies of normal programs and organizations. A *humanist approach* focuses on employees, e.g. managers, employees of the organizations that implemented the innovations, focusing on how the innovations and organizations affected employees and how they affected the innovations and organizations. A *functionalist* approach, the most developed, explores the factors correlating significantly with increased innovation and organizational mortality. A *structural* approach (Glor, 2014b) focuses on the fate of structures—including innovations and innovating organizations—and their demography, measured by founding and mortality rates. This approach permits consideration of case studies and effects on people, functions, and structures. Most studies have looked only at one or two of these issues but considering more issues allows for better understanding of complex issues.

Understanding the factors and demographics of numerous populations of innovations and innovating organizations would permit their comparison to the demographics of normal program and administrative populations and organizational populations. Glor (2013) made a start by synthesizing existing organizational population demography literature and identifying the mean organizational population mortality rates by sector—private, non-profit and government.[9] There is sufficient government population data (ten studies) to set a standard for organizational mortality rates and compare the results to that for innovating government organizational populations, should such studies be done. Glor's approach has not been tested previously, but it is tested in this pilot study. This current study considers five case studies (interpretive approach), the influence of and on employees (humanist approach), the independent factors influencing the dependent variables of innovation and organizational fate (functional approach); and the fate of structures—innovative programs and innovating organizations (structural approach).

Questions considered. The paper addresses: How can the factors affecting fate of innovations and their organizations and the effect of innovations on their organizations be determined? How can the fate of the five innovations and their organizations be tracked? What were the important independent factors affecting their fates? Specifically, what happened to the government's income security innovations and their organizations? Did the innovations act as independent variables for the organizations? How were employees affected?

Methodology

From functionalist (e.g. Gopalakrishnan and Damanpour, 1997) and evolutionary adaptation (e.g. Carroll and Hannan, 2000) perspectives, innovative organizations and populations should survive longer than normal ones, because they have adapted. Yet some demographic organizational population *change* literature (structural approach) suggests organizational change, an aspect of innovation, creates an increased risk of disappearance of the organizations. The two studies of the mortality of changed organizational populations reported earlier had contradictory findings: The full population of Toronto day care centres that changed, studied over 11 years (Singh, House, and Tucker, 1986), had a higher mortality rate than normal organizations. The full population of Finnish newspapers that changed, studied over 192 years (Amburgey, Kelly and Barnett, 1993), had a lower mean mortality rate than normal organizations

[9] Ideally, a normal mortality rate is calculated from the mean mortality rate of the full population over its full lifespan (Glor, 2013: 5).

(Glor, 2013, Appendix 1). Although interesting, these contradictory results could be due to other factors: the difference could be due to the differences in the study periods, a factor known to be related to survival rates (Glor, 2013: 18), rather than to the fact that they changed.

Demographics of innovative organizations and populations have not been systematically recorded and so the empirical question "do populations of innovations and their organizations have higher or lower mortality rates than normal programs and organizations?" is unanswered. Glor (2014b) suggested the best approach to whether innovation good for the survival of public sector organizations is a combination of the approaches outlined above. It is crucial to study populations of innovations and organizations. The only population (government) for which all the innovations have been identified is the GoS. Glor and colleagues (1997, 2002) identified 159 policy, program and administrative innovations in the GoS 1971-82, the Pemier Blakeney government (Glor, 1997: Table 1 and 2002:142-3). They defined innovation as the first, second or third time an innovation had been introduced in the GoS (a population) *and* in Sask's community (the Canadian provinces, the Government of Canada (GoC) and American state governments). This research did not, however, systematically identify the factors influencing the fate of the innovations or organizations, when the innovations were implemented, which organizations implemented them, nor what happened to the innovations and the organizations. Such information is required to do a demographic (structural) analysis. To develop a data base of demographic information for the 159 innovations and their organizations would require considerable research. Can the information be found to do such a study? This study tests the approach on a sub-population of all the income security innovations.

A *structural* research approach (Glor, 2014b) focuses on structures—in this study on the fate of *innovations and innovating organizations*. Fate is measured by founding and mortality. Determination of the demographics of numerous populations of innovations and innovating organizations would permit comparison with the demographics of numerous normal programs and organizational populations. Glor's (2013) synthesis has identified enough government demographic data (ten population studies) to be able to allow comparison with innovating organizational populations. A normal mortality rate is calculated by the mean mortality rate of a full population over its full lifespan (Glor, 2013: 5). Can this information be collected for the five innovations and their organizations?

The ***five innovations*** include: (1) A subsidy for day care services for low and middle income parents, for which federal cost-sharing was secured. This allowed a major expansion of day care. Previously only very low income parents on welfare were subsidized. (2) Family Income Plan (FIP), Canada's first subsidy for the working poor with children; (3) Seniors Income Support Program (SIP), Canada's first provincial subsidy for very low income seniors (two federal subsidies for seniors' income already existed, GIS and OAS); (4) Employment Support Program (ESP), the first provincial program providing long-term unemployed and "unemployables" with short-term work, thus reintroducing them to the workforce and making them eligible for federal Unemployment Insurance; and (5) the first conversion of an employer-sponsored WCB from a pure insurance scheme providing lump-sum payments for loss of life and limb (debilitating injuries to specific body parts) into a combined insurance and long-term income replacement scheme (WCB) which was then adopted by all ten provinces and many USA states (Sask WCB, 1980; 1997). The injured workers' income security element qualified for Sask

Assistance Plan (SAP), was paid by SS, and was cost-sharable with the federal government.[10] Day care, FIP, SIP and WCB were preceded by formal investigations and reports on the issues and federal signals of willingness to cost-share, usually followed by provincial legislation. Key independent factors and the demography of innovations were studied.

The innovations were identified by Glor (1997) as *Innovations that strengthened the social fabric*. They were highly innovative and subsequently became staples of the Welfare State in Canada, before it began to be dismantled the 1980s in Sask and elsewhere. While Sask is known for being the birthplace of Medicare in Canada, it was also the first government in North America to establish innovations of the type of FIP, ESP and the income subsidy under the Workers Compensation Board (WCB). It was tied for first with Manitoba for introduction of generously-subsidized day care and it was the second government to establish programs of the type of the SIP (after the Canadian government).[11] Besides being highly innovative, these five innovations, the innovations studied, are the full population of income security innovations introduced. Organizationally, four were located in SS and the fifth in an administrative tribunal, the WCB. Because abolition of the four SS innovations during the 1980s by the subsequent Progressive Conservative government was controversial, it had an incentive to mask what it was doing. If fates for these five innovations and organizations could be traced, it would suggest that other departmental innovations could be followed as well.

Using accessible documents,[12] personal knowledge, and creating descriptive statistics, this retrospective (historical) study attempted to identify factors and to do a demographic analysis of the five income security innovations and their organizations. These innovations and their organizations were ***chosen*** from among the 159 Blakeney government innovations ***because*** (1) they were highly innovative; (2) they encompassed all of the government's income security innovations (a sub-population); (3) the Department of SS innovations were controversial in the eyes of the next, Devine government, so it could be determined whether or not information remained transparent (the Devine government passed legislation that made reorganizations more opaque, and refused to answer most questions in the Legislature or by media about reorganizations); (4) the Blakeney government and two of its successor governments were well documented in published works; (5) the lead author was familiar with these innovations;[13] and (6) the population of innovations (159) had been identified for this government (Glor, 1997, 2002): the others could also be studied if the methodology was appropriate and the information available. The research examined the efficacy of the framework by exploring these issues.[14]

[10] The structural history of these innovations was collected by Mary Gianoli (1995: 441-471).

[11] Glor (1997) reported Sask. as first for day care cost-sharing: In fact, Sask was tied with Manitoba, with Manitoba establishing a similar program two to three months before Sask. Source: Ron Hikel.

[12] Only recent documents are available online. Earlier documents are rarely available outside Regina.
As of 21/1/2016, budget estimates are available for 2000-01 at:
http://www.publications.gov.sk.ca/prdtermlist.cfm?t=972&p=7802 and from 1999-2000 at:
http://skdocs.legassembly.sk.ca/serial/109321/109321.htm SSAR are available starting in 2004-05 at:
http://www.publications.gov.sk.ca/deplist.cfm?d=17&c=1957 and http://skdocs.legassembly.sk.ca/serial/69454/69454.A.htm

[13] Having worked as SS Budget Analyst in the Department of Finance; done a special project on the WCB while there; and having worked on the WCB conversion while employed in Executive Council.

[14] There were difficulties, e.g. the first author tried to track the original information on the Internet and through Library and Archives Canada. Saskatchewan Estimates from the 1970s and 1980s were not available through interlibrary loan, the National Archives in Ottawa, whose electronic catalogue listed one or two Estimates from the period. Neither the Sask Legislative Library nor the Provincial Archives of Sask loan the Estimates or annual reports. The first author lives about 2500 kilometers from Regina, the second author lives in Regina.

After 40 years, there were ***challenges*** assessing the founding and mortality of government innovations and organizations, such as: (1) finding and limited access (only in-person) to key documents; (2) identifying changes to innovations and their organizations, and (3) determining their significance and distinguishing small from significant changes: often programs maintained very similar names yet changed fundamentally, including their objectives. In such situations, though, they usually changed name or department or legislation. The definition of founding used was appearance in the record and of mortality disappearance from the record. Other indicators of innovation and organization mortality were change of name, important modifications to legislation, and substantial reductions in funding; they are consistent with definitions used in other organizational demography studies (Glor, 2013).

Measures. The analysis required data on factors and the fate of innovations and organizations. SS innovations were well ***documented*** and organizational information was found in government budget estimates, SS annual reports, and elsewhere. Innovations and organizations were researched individually, mostly in Regina, by the second author. ***Primary independent variables*** were defined as ones that affected the fate of all innovations and organizations. They were measured by whether: (1) Innovations were initiated by the New Democratic Party (NDP) government (a social democratic party) (sources: election platform, other NDP governments), a pressure group, a statutory report and well-informed departmental personnel; (2) Implementation was measured by whether the innovation was fully implemented and funded, whether the program model was efficacious, the length of time the government was in power, and whether the innovation had the support of personnel (management/working level). All five innovations were publicly announced. ***Secondary independent variables*** were defined as ones that applied to some innovations and did not apply to others and, possibly, applied differently across innovations (Downs & Mohr, 1976: 703).

Tracing survival. Using a combination of experiential and retrospective methodology, Glor (1997, 2002) had already developed a comprehensive list of the 159 innovations of the GoS, 1971-82, including the five new income security programs. None of the innovations was created for a limited term (sunset); ESP was initially a pilot project, but quickly became a permanent program; all were fully funded. Demography of the innovations and organizations was studied by creating an event history data record of the timing of birth, mortality and significant changes in the innovations and their organizations. Organizational founding was traced by appearance in official documents, mortality by name change, change in location in the hierarchy,[15] departmental change, or severely reduced funding. The innovations' and organizations' communities were officials in other (especially NDP) provinces, small Sask non-profit organizations supplying services, academic supporters and critics, Cabinet and members of the legislative assembly, and other English-speaking social democratic country officials (e.g. U.K., New Zealand). The government's community for these innovations was members of the NDP and its supporters, elected officials in some other Canadian provinces and the federal government, and a few progressive American governments—New Jersey; Gary, Iowa; and Seattle-Denver had guaranteed income experiments at the time (Osborne, 1985: 12) and the Province of Manitoba introduced one in Dauphin as well.

[15] A challenge was deciding whether an organization's promotion to a higher level but with the same employees was truly mortality. The decision was that it was. Demotion of status was more clearly an organization's mortality.

Results

Sufficient information was found and the analyses could be done to explain and identify the fate of five innovations and four of five organizations.

Factors. Fate of innovations and of their organizations was a function of primary independent (did not depend on the innovations) and secondary variables. Five ***variables*** affected all five innovations and their organizations: (1) Politics, supported by pressure groups, NDP ideology, a majority long-term government (11 years) and NDP belief in greater equality, dignity and support for low income people. (2) Public administration: innovations were fully implemented, achieved their objectives and senior management supported them. (3) Funding: the innovations were fully funded and government finances were supported by a strong economy, small tax increases and changes to taxes on resource companies. (4) Primary variables. (5) Interactions. The innovations appeared to function as independent variables for the dependent variable, the fate of organizations, but results were not identical and government policies also played key roles in the fate of organizations (see later). Some independent variables worked against the innovations: (1) Election of Canada's first neoconservative government in Sask in 1982; and (2) The Official Opposition and some managers and personnel in SS were not supportive of the new principle, expanded income security for the poor, preferring the former "deserving destitute" policy; others (some were active in the NDP) thought the government should have been even more generous. The WCB had established a statutory review of its program that recommended the innovation—introducing a new income security element to workers' compensation. Low income injured workers received welfare, paid by SS and cost-shared with the federal government. WCB continued to pay the insurance costs with employer contributions. No voices of criticism emerged publicly from the employees of SS or WCB. Another important factor in survival of the innovations was their full funding from the beginning (one program was initially over-budgeted), but based on expected federal government cost sharing[16] (Table 1).

The GoS's income security programs were progressive compared to most provinces and the GoC during the 1970s. When the Sask NDP was elected in 1971, there were NDP governments in two other provinces, British Columbia (B.C.) and Manitoba. They had laid the groundwork for SS changes and could be relied upon for support in dealing with the federal government. The B.C. Government was defeated shortly afterwards. All five programs supported incomes and were ***expensive***, especially FIP and SIP. Sask was a poor province, receiving federal equalization payments until the late 1970s. It therefore ***needed the federal government to subsidize*** its income security programs. As part of joint official federal-provincial income security and SS reviews (late 1960s and early 1970s), federal offers were made to cost share these types of programs under the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) (Coward, 2000) with no ceilings or under a new SS Act (Hum, 1985a), but neither materialized.[17] Just as Sask introduced its new income security programs, the federal Department of Finance grew concerned with increasing expenditures under CAP—$450 million in 1969-70, $727M in 1971-2 and $825M in 1973-4 (Osborne, 1985: 12). The federal government pulled back then passed the Established

[16] To secure federal funding, provinces were required to establish their new programs, and then apply for cost-sharing. The federal government then decided whether it would providce cost-sharing.

[17] A federal offer to cost-share with the provinces a pilot guaranteed income experiment was taken up by Dauphin, Manitoba.

Table 1: Variables: Factors Influencing Fate of Five Innovations and Their Organizations

Independent Variables		**Dependent Variable 1: Innovation's Fate**	**Dependent Variable 2: Organization's Fate**
Innovation Initiation	**Innovation Implementation**	**Intervening Factors (More Specific Independent Factors)**	**Intervening Factors.**
FIP, SIP, Day Care: -By NDP -By govt: in election platform; -Day care by 2 other NDP governments	-Fully implement-ted & efficacious -Fully funded -Senior mgmt support -NDP govt in power 3 terms (11 yrs) -Some personnel doubtful about new principles	1/FIP & SIP pressure groups remained in favour; day care support was divided (slow uptake; pressure group that demanded universal not income-tested day care not satisfied). 2/Existing mgmt remained responsible, in the same orgs; then all transferred to newly created, larger, upgraded Branch, salaries increased. 3/Sufficient funding to have an effect but limited impact on bigger issue of poverty; quick to show results. NDP constrained budgets late 1970s. Cons. govt cut budgets, positions, salaries. 4/Targets: Official Opposition found seniors deserving but not poor families (FIP & day care); did not support women working outside home. 5/ 1982 New ideology with Cons. govt: SS innovns abolished within four years; names retained.	1, 2/NDP govt created new orgs for FIP, SIP. Existing org used to admin day care. 3/ Cons. amalgamated orgs, downgraded Branch to Division, reduced salaries. 4/All 4 SS innovns affected fate of orgs (acted as independent variable for the organizations' fates. WCB unknown.
ESP: -By front line staff -Initially temporary money	-Fully implemented, successful -Fully funded -NDP support -Good enthusias-tic leaders but not senior mgmt	1/Pressure & target group were concerns of govt & mgmt: unemployables on welfare deserving of help. 2/ Quick, measured results; model efficacious 3/Eventually sufficient funding to have an effect 4/Implementing mgmt remained in place 5/Govt picked up on model & expanded it 6/ Neocons govt: initially became an employment program & subsidy to employers, then abolished.	1/Initially org responsible for innovn also responsible for other programs 2/Small unit created to mg ESP; then new division created to admin permanent program. 3-5 see Column 3. 6/Org abolished by Cons.
WCB: -By businesses -Statutory review* recom-mended; sponsored by Minister -NDP platform favoured small business	-Fully implemented & successful in reducing new costs to employers -Fully funded by taxpayers, widows/ widowers -Innovn not in NDP platform - Mgmt & Minis-ter supported	1/NDP govt supported small business 3/Existing managers responsible 4/NDP govt remained in place 11 years 5/WCB continued to have sufficient funding with better benefits but limited increase in WCB financial liabilities; positive effect on workers' health 6/Efficacious model to create funds for prevention & reduce worker injuries 7/Quick to show results 8/Targets: injured workers deserving ; employers continued to pool legal responsibility for accidents. 9/ 1982 Cons. govt retained innovation.	Branches eventually renamed and senior managers' salaries increased, but no obvious link found in reports indicating creation of a new org to manage the innovn. Innovn was about funding sources & new eligibility criteria, not org.

Abbreviations: org=organization; mgmt=management; innovn=innovation; Cons=Conservative Party
* *Report of the Workers' Compensation Act Review Committee,* chair Mr. Justice A. J. Muir, 12/1978

Programs Financing Act (EPF) in 1977. It attempted—unsuccessfully due to provincial opposition—to block fund (cap) SS funding (Osborne, 1985), then reduced funding unilaterally and substantially during the late 1980s and early 1990s, then introduced full block funding during the early 1990s. The ***secondary variables*** were independent variables but ones more specific to the individual innovations and organizations; for example, divisions regarding scope of day care funding (Table 1). The ***innovations*** acted as independent variables for the fate of the organizations, as discussed later.

Demographic analyses required detailed information on when important events occurred.

Table 2 identifies the years innovations were created and disappeared, and information on any similar (if any) successor programs. Founding occurred when innovations were first funded (appeared in the Budgetary or Supplementary Estimates or an annual report) and mortality occurred when they disappeared from these records, fundamentally changed their mandates, as indicated by a new name, new legislation or a change of department, and therefore objectives, or received a major cut in resources. Most organizational demography research uses name change as the marker of organizational mortality (Glor, 2013). The first four innovations appeared under SS in the Budget Estimates; the WCB innovation was mentioned only in WCB reports (administrative tribunals do not appear in the Estimates).

Table 2: Innovation Event History and Resources

Innova-tion	**Innovation Period**	**Innovation's Fate & Year**	**Initial Resources**	**Recent $ Resources * & Successor**
Day care subsidy with federal cost-sharing	1/3/1974** announced 1974-5 im-plemented to 1986 mortality: 13 yrs	1983-84: Cons. govt reviewed day care program. Exclusively parent-run, non-profit day care program abolished 1986. 1986-87: Day Care Services introduced subsidization of private spaces. 8/1989 new Child Care Act: Day care subsidy abolished, replaced with less generous "child care" subsidy.	*1975-6:* FTE: 13 Subsidy: $4,792,189 Institutions: $1,710,623	1986-7: Subsidy $16,580,896 1992-93: Child Care Division created (Child Care Act). 2013-14: $16,175,000 child care parent subsidy
Family Income Plan FIP	1/10/1974-5 to 1986-7: 12 yrs	1986-7: Objective of getting people off welfare deleted. June 30, 1998: FIP name changed. July 1, 1998: New program created as Building Independence Initiative.	*1974-75*: FTE: NA Subsidy: $12,334,428 to 23,513 families. *1975-6*: $21,188,468 *1976-77*: $14,316,239	1986-7 resources: $19,338,000
SIP	1/10/1975-6 to 1986: 12 yrs	1986: Program dismantled. ***i.*** New *Sask. Income Plan Act, 1986.* Benefits portion of Senior Citizens' Benefits Program (SIP) abolished (mortality). Seniors' Income Plan (SIP) created.	*1975-76:* Actual: $4,095,589 to 37,292 seniors	1996: Seniors' Income Plan, SIP, created. 2013-14: $27,401.000
ESP	1973 pilot; 1974-5 in Estimates; 1977 perm-anent. 1974-5 to 1987-88: 14 yrs	1986-7 SS still admins ESP. 1987-8 transferred to new Employment Development Agency. ***ii.***	*1974-5*: FTE: NA $1,439,108 *1975-6*: $1,600,000 Maximum *1979-80*: 10 FTE, $4,040,000	1986-7: $2,122,390 2013-14: Did not exist
Total years 4 SS innovations survived			***51 years***	
WCB (Non-budge-tary)	New legislation 1979. 1979 to 2016: 37 yrs	*The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979* Remained until *The Workers' Compensation Act, 2013*.	1979 WCB FTE: 198 Admin Expenses: $3,503,877 Assets: $747,674,000 *1997:* Admin Expenses: $29,340,000	***2013:*** Admin Expenses: $41,874,000 Assets: $1,939,404,000 Liabilities: $1.3 billion
Total years 5 innovations survived (including WCB innovation)			**88 years**	
Mean Survival Period			4 SS: 12.75 years 5 with WCB: 17.6 years	

Sources: SS annual reports and Sask Estimates (the government's budgetary estimates for the year)=full time equivalent
* FTE staff were no longer reported. Collected August 2, 2014 at: http://www.wcbsask.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Annual-Report-2013_FINAL_web.pdf ** Day/month/year is the Canadian date format, used here.
i. Transferred Senior's Bureau and Grants for Senior Citizens' Services to Dpt. of Human Resources, Labour & Employment.
ii. After this transfer, the character of ESP changed substantially: funding declined & was provided to industry positions & transitional placements. In 1989-90 EDA program was replaced by Sask Works, seen by some as a work-for-welfare scheme. ESP shrank then was abolished 1989. *1985-6 Employment Development Agency Annual Report:* 14; Potter-MacKinnon, 2003.

Identifying founding and mortality. Three programs today give the appearance of being similar to the Blakeney innovations and target related groups of people (FIP, SIP, ESP). They came to this situation in two phases. Under the next, neoconservative Devine government they were abolished by being given new objectives, new legislation, major changes to eligibility criteria and in one case a new department—they received new mandates (Table 2). Their funding was cut in real terms (Table 3), especially given that Sask Housing, previously a crown (government owned) corporation, was added to the SS budget (the base) and major inflation occurred during the early 1980s. The principles and eligibility criteria driving the programs were changed. The Blakeney principle was that there should be no distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor—that anyone could need help with income at some point in their lives and that therefore income security programs should not require recipients to be paupers (almost no assets) before they could receive any government assistance. Income security should apply first and welfare, requiring asset tests, last. Income security programs were only income tested, a distinction of particular importance for farm and home (or mortgage) owners required to sell their assets before they were eligible under asset tested programs. This approach was meant to help people get off the stigmatized social assistance and also reduce health care costs: social status is a major determinant of health (Marmot et. al., 1991; Wilkinson, 1986). This principle disappeared during the subsequent neoconservative government. When the NDP was again elected during the 1990s and 2000s, additional money was put into these programs. Today's programs with similar names, under the right wing Sask Party, are both income and asset tested.

Table 3: Comparison of Resources for Innovations* at Founding to Recent Versions

Organi-zation	SS Total Resources 1975-76***	SS Total *** Resources for Four Innovns 1975-76	SS Total Resources in Estimates 2013-14	2013-14 Mean Salaries & Benefits	WCB 1979	WCB 2013
FTEs	2078 FTEs	40 FTEs	1,748 FTES		198	628 +
Admin $ estimate	$13,728/FTE	Mean $/FTE** = $30,789 x 40 = $1,231,560	$11,882,000		5,898,824	Salaries & employee benefits $40,216,000
Total $	$138,486,720	32,594,718	$224,241,000	$64,006 / FTE	5,898,824	Not identified
Ratio innovns to total SS	FTEs $ % SS	FTEs 40/1748 = 2% $32,594,718/ 138,486,720 = 23.54%	$59,142,000/ 224, 241,000= 26.4%	Not Identified	Not identified	Not identified

Abbreviations: SS=Department of Social Services; FTE=full time equivalent; max=maximum; innovn=innovation

* WCB was not a budgetary item (did not appear in the Estimates). It was a cost-recovery administrative tribunal. The innovation was a change in eligibility criterion which moved some of the costs onto welfare, a budgetary item.

**Community Services was used as the standard, thinking their $/FTE costs were similar to those of the four innovative programs

***Full time equivalent (FTEs) and dollar figures from Sask Estimates.

+ WCB no longer reported number of employees in its Annual Report. Estimate $64,000/employee.

Fate of Resources. Tables 2 and 3 identify *funding resources* for the innovations and the department. In 1973-4, the only income security program was day care assistance, only available under SAP, and only to people on welfare looking for work. It represented 0.01 per cent of the SS budget. By 1975-76 (Table 2), the cost of the innovations combined was $32.6 million (M)—24 per cent of SS expenditures, while the cost of SAP (welfare), the largest program, was $59.1M—43 per cent of total costs. Eligibility for SAP was income and asset tested. The GoS

had shifted costs considerably into income security programs by 1975-6, as evinced by flat spending on SAP and increased spending on income security programs, with the expectation of federal cost-sharing under a new federal SS Act. By 1986-7 the innovations cost $65.4M; by 2013-14, programs with similar target groups had declined to $59M but had increased from 24 to 26 per cent of the SS budget (Table 3). This percentage change was probably from Sask Housing being moved out of the department, and reducing the denominator. The 1980 WCB innovation kept the self-financed WCB fund in balance between assets and future commitments. It cost SS additional money but the expenditure was not reported.

Personnel. Full time equivalents (FTEs) (person years) increased by 40 per cent 1974-83 and then decreased 27 per cent by 1987 (Devine government) (Table 2). In real terms, funding had been substantially reduced. Table 3 compares the resources dedicated to four SS innovations when fully implemented in 1975-76 to the total expenditures of the department the same year: The four innovations represented 2 per cent of staffing and 24 per cent of total departmental spending. As a result, while they were not expensive programs to operate, resources for the innovations were substantial. Prior to introduction of the four innovations, the Department of Welfare, predecessor to SS, had primarily provided welfare to the destitute and institutional services to the disabled and the elderly. Now it spent 24 per cent of its resources on income security.

Post-Devine government changes. The 1990s Romanow NDP government followed the Devine government. It conducted an Income Security Redesign. Phase I included introduction of new benefit programs to help low income families care for their children and to encourage and support their decision to work. This recreated programs similar to those abolished in 1986. In 1998, as part of Sask's commitment to the National Child Benefit, other new programs were launched including the Sask Child Benefit, Sask Employment Supplement and Family Health Benefits. With an improved provincial economy and less unemployment, there was a substantial decrease in the number of families receiving these benefits and the amount they received (Sask Update, N.D.).

Discussion

This section considers factors, fate of the innovations, the governments' comparative resources, survival of the organizations, and the relationship between innovations and organizations.

Factors. Three key factors affected these five income security programs: politics, public administration and funding. The change between the Blakeney and Devine governments involved a change of ideology; this was a major factor in the fate of all five programs and organizations. Creating greater equality was a Blakeney government objective but was not an objective of the Devine government (Pitsula and Rasmussen, 1990: 201-3). Public administrators were divided in their support for some of the innovations. The public administration was more skilled under the NDP, which had recruited very widely. Fiscally, federal cost-sharing did not materialize but the NDP nonetheless always balanced its budget. The expensive neoconservative tax cuts, new, unfunded programs and a poor economy moved the budget balance into deep deficit and the province into deep debt.

Comparative resources. By 2012-13, under a right-wing Sask Party government, three programs existed with similar names to those of the 1970s programs, though with different mandates. The not-adjusted for inflation funding had been reduced substantially. FTEs had increased by 40 per cent under the Blakeney government then decreased 27 per cent by 1987. In real terms, funding of programs with similar names had been reduced substantially but the not-adjusted for inflation resources dedicated to the four innovations represented 24 per cent of the department's resources in 1975-6 and 26 per cent in 2013-14 (Table 3). The innovations had a substantial resource impact on SS. Low-income groups were not priorities during the 1980s but returned as priorities during the 1990s under an NDP government; nonetheless the four programs were not returned to their 1970s versions. Today there is a program called SIP, but the initials stand for something else; there are programs with similar objectives to those of FIP and SIP, but they are asset tested. Expenditures on SAP were almost identical in 1973-4 and 2013-14, despite major inflation during the 40 year interval and once again a booming economy. The number of SS employees was lower in 2013-14 than in 1975-6 but only 40 full time equivalentss were dedicated to the innovations in 1975-6 and computers have reduced the need for staff.

Survival Period—Innovations. The *four SS innovations* survived a mean of 12.75 years, a median of 12.5 years and a mode of 12 years. The dispersion was a range of two years, a variance of 0.9167 and a standard deviation of 0.9574. All SS innovations—day care subsidy, FIP, SIP and ESP—were abolished by the next, Devine government. While FIP retained its name and SIP its abbreviation, the Devine government's introduction of assets as a consideration for eligibility, not just income, represented a major change.[18] The Devine government of 1982-91 abolished the SS innovations. The *five innovations* survived a total of 88 years; their mean survival period is 17.6 years and growing[19] (Table 1). Only the WCB innovation survived the whole period, creating a skewed, bimodal distribution between 12 and 37 years with a high lot of homogeneity (Table 2). The median was 13 years and the mode was 12 years. Dispersion was 25 years, with a variance of 118.3 and a standard deviation of 10.88. This skewed result suggests the need for research on additional GoS innovations.

Survival Period—Innovations' Organizations. The survival period of the organizations internal to the WCB could not be calculated because the information was not reported. The four SS innovations each had its own organization. All required legislation, except ESP, a new grant program serving the "unemployable," already legally served under existing SAP legislation. CAP did not cost-share grants and so did not cost-share it. Initially ESP was managed by Community Affairs Branch then in 1975-6 a new Employment Support Division was created to manage it, located in a new Community Affairs Branch (branches were one level higher than divisions). Following the change of government in 1982, ESP was moved in 1985 to a new Sask. Employment Development Agency. ESP was expanded to be made available to Sask businesses. This iteration of ESP eligibility and transfer of ESP's organization outside SS entailed the demise of both the program and its organization.

[18] Farmers owning land or families owning a home but having extremely low incomes, for example, were no longer eligible. Two Blakeney government programs were recreated by the Romanow government of the 1990s that performed similar functions to those performed by the Blakeney government innovations—the Building Independence Initiative replacing FIP and the Senior's Income Plan replacing the Sask. Income Plan. Provincial politics, changes in federal cost-sharing and objectives, and political ideology were driving forces in these abolitions and re-creations.

[19] In public sector population studies, Glor (2013) defined medium-term populations as between 16 and 30 years old (mean survival period in the medium-term population studies was 22, 26, 27, and 28 years).

Table 4 outlines the ***event history of the organizations***. WCB is equivalent to a department. Four SS organizations managing innovations were eventually consolidated into one organization in 1983-84 by the Devine government which shortly abolished it. The SS organizations (unit, divisions, branches) survived a mean of 11.5 years, a short-term survival period (Glor, 2013). The median and mode was nine years and dispersion was a range of four years, a variance of 0.9167 and a standard deviation of 3.3166. The innovations' and organizations' mortality rates were 100 per cent, the organizations' per year 6.7 per cent (a normal government organization mortality rate is under 1.3 per cent per year [Glor, 2013]). Because of the small number of cases, this population of five innovations and organizations may not be normal, so no further conclusions can be drawn from this data. Several larger populations would need to be studied to establish a survival norm for public sector innovating organizations.

Table 4: Organizational Event History and Fate

Period of Survival	**Organization (Org) 1**	**Org 2**	**Org 3**	**Org 4**	**Org 5**	**Org 6**
Day care 1974-5 to 1989 16 yrs	Administered by Community Grants & Standards Division, CAB	New Day Care Division, SS, 1974-5. ***i.***	Name of Dpt. of SS changed to Community Resources & Employment 5/9/1983	Mortality 1989. New Child Care Act 1989-90. New Child Day Care Branch, SS administered all.	1992-93 Romanow Govt created Child Care Division in SS & a subsidy recreated.	
FIP 1/10/1974 to 6/1988 12 yrs	ISD established late FY 1973-4 to manage financial aspects of all programs, develop FIP	ISD upgraded to Income Security Branch (ISB) early FY 1974-5	ISB downgraded to ISD 1983-4 ***ii.***	FIP listed under Income Security, 1988-89 in *Estimates* & *SSAR, 1988-89.*	In 1990-91, FIP still administered by ISD, SS	Abolished 6/1988; name abolished 30/6/1998.
SIP 1975-6 to 1988 14 yrs	ISD upgraded to ISB early 1975-6 (new org).	SIP administered by ISB.	ISB downgraded to ISD 1983-4	Administration of SIP to Dpt. of Human Re-sources, Labour & Employment 1/1988. Morta-lity 1988, by *Statutes of Sask 1988-89, c.42; 1996 c.20; 2000.*	April 2, 1988, Seniors' Bureau renamed Seniors' Directorate & includes new Sask Income Plan which continued 6/2015.	
ESP 1974-5 to 1985-6 12 yrs	Pilot April 1973	Unit in Community Affairs Branch, SS (existing org)	1975-6 ESP in Employment Support Services Division, CAB	1985-6 ESP org & funding to new Employment Development Agency (EDA) (like dpt). SS remnant to RSD	1/2/1987, EDA to new Dpt. of Human Resources, Labour & Employment.	ESP shrank, then abolished 1989. EDA to Sask. Works.
WCB 1/1929 to 1/2016; 87 yrs	WCB created Jan. 1929 with no-fault legislation (existing org)	The Workers' Compensation Act, 1979	2007: 3 divisions: Operations; HR & Team Support; Prevention, Finance & IT.	No program change until The Workers' Compensation Act, 2013*. Innovation & WCB continued 1/2016		

Abbreviations: ISD=Income Security Division; ISB=Income Security Branch; RSD=Rehabilitation Services Division; org=organization; CAB=Community Affairs Branch; FY=Fiscal Year.
Sources: Sask. Social Services annual reports; Estimates; WCB Fact Sheet, 2007.
Notes: ***i.*** Income Security Branch, grants & subsidies to day care, 1975-76 *SSAR:* 24. ***ii.*** 1983-4 *SSAR:* 2. Senior's Bureau
*Collected 26/1/2016 at: http://www.wcbsask.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/Annual-Report-2013_FINAL_web.pdf

In 1974-5 there was a Day Care Branch but by 1975-76 it became a lower-level division in the new Community Affairs Branch, which managed the Senior Citizens' Division and the Day Care Division. By 1975-76, Income Security Division was upgraded to Income Security Branch, to manage financial aspects of day care, FIP and SIP grants and subsidies associated with senior citizens, day care, and SAP. The Income Security Branch thus managed three of the four innovations, but managed other financial programs as well. A new *Saskatchewan Income Plan Act* was introduced by the Devine government in 1986 and the exclusively parent-run day care program was abolished. A program that permitted subsidizing private child care was introduced in 1989-90. A new Child Day Care Branch was created to license the 95 day cares providing 5994 spaces in 1990-91, monitor family care and manage the subsidy to day cares and parents. A more generous subsidy to parents was reintroduced by the Romanow government, elected 1991 and administered by Child Day Care Branch. As of 2016, only cost-sharable low income parents are subsidized. According to the 1986-8 SS Annual Report, changes clarified the intent of the program and eligibility requirements. At the same time, however, the Sask. Income Plan was dismantled: the Senior's Bureau and Grants for Senior Citizens' Services were moved to the Dept. of Human Resources, Labour & Employment (*Supplementary Estimates* 1988: 89; 1986-87 SSAR: 11); the benefits portion remained in SS.

In 1975-6, the expanded SS had four branches: Income Security, Community Affairs, SS, and Corrections. By 1985-6, SS no longer had branches, only four lower-level divisions: Family Support, Young Offender Services, Day Care and Rehabilitation Services divisions (SSAR, 1975-6, 1985-6). This reorganization allowed the government to demote and reduce the salaries of the managers in the branches (lower-level staff had collective agreements). The WCB continued to be self-managed as an administrative tribunal, preparing several reports each year. The WCB innovation and the highest level WCB organization both survived, avoided a major unfunded liability, a confrontation with employers, and further calls to abolish the WCB.[20] If there were structural changes in the WCB, they were not reported publicly. While the names of organizations one level down in the WCB changed over 37 years, it was not possible to find out when nor whether the innovation was a factor. During the more transparent Blakeney years, FTEs were reported for all five programs but this practice ended under the next government.

Innovations as independent variables for their organizations. Most of the SS innovations were sufficiently large that organizations were set up immediately to manage them. While Lewis (2002: 102) argued that public policy outputs and organizational structure are inextricably linked, this examination of the linkages between innovations and organizations found a more complex relationship. They were linked, but timing was not identical—other factors were also at work, such as the Conservatives' political decision to consolidate the income security innovations, to reduce the status of their organizations and thus salaries, then finally to abolish all the innovations and eventually all of organizations. While part of the same department, the four SS programs and organizations were closely linked—by principles, objectives, funding sources (SS + CAP), target groups, stakeholders, and management. When ESP was split between two departments, the relationship between program and organization delinked and these commonalities disappeared. The program lost its own organization and soon disappeared. For the four SS organizations, implementing innovations appears (there is nothing

[20] The government had also introduced strong workplace health and safety legislation, which contributed to the prevention of accidents (Snyder, 2002: 118).

to compare them to) not to have been good for the long-term survival of the organizations, as all disappeared in the short-term except day care, which disappeared a year later. Innovation may also not have been good for the branches to which the divisions reported–all also disappeared, usually after even less time (Table 5). SS was created in 1972 to replace the Dpt. of Welfare. It was renamed in 2003 and then recreated as SS in 2007. It still exists but not ISD, ISB, Day Care Branch nor Community Affairs Branch. The innovations were independent variables for their immediate organizations (divisions) and perhaps for one level higher (branches) but abolishing the branches (all abolished, later dates) also reduced personnel costs. Abolishing the department cannot be attributed to the innovations or branches, as the departmental name change occurred later. The way the innovations were managed and their success was not the link with the organizations—the policy decision to consolidate then abolish the four innovations and their organizations was.

Table 5: Comparison of Survival Period of Five Sask Income Security Innovations (Programs) and Organizations *i.*

Innovation	**Innovation Survival Period (years)**	**Organization (Division) Survival Period (years)**	**Difference (years)**
Day Care parent subsidy	13	16	+3
FIP	12	9	-3
SIP	12	9	-3
ESP	14	12	-2
Total Years Survived & Mean	***51; Mean 12.75***	***46; Mean 11.5***	***-5 yrs; mean -1.25***
WCB	36	NA	

i. Sources: Stewart and Flynn, 1997: 189; *SSAR, 1974-1975;* Hum, 1985b; Sask Department of Finance, 1976.

Conclusion

This was a study of the factors influencing and the fates of innovations and organizations of all five income security innovations of the GoS 1971-82. It adopted a framework, employed a retrospective methodology and found it is likely possible to secure most of the information needed for a comprehensive study of departmental innovations in the GoS. This would be useful for future policy and innovation planning. It is not clear that the necessary information is accessible for innovations delivered by non-budgetary organizations (e.g. administrative tribunals) Whether crown corporations can be studied is unknown. The four SS innovations and organizations were studied with no censoring (from when they were created until they were abolished), and the WCB innovation using right censoring (mortality data missing). No censoring is ideal for population studies.

Results. Over 40 years, the five GoS income security *innovations* survived a mean of 17.6 years and counting, while the four SS innovations survived a mean of 12.75 years. The *organizations* (divisions) administering the SS innovations survived a mean of 11.75 years, a short-term survival period. The branches administering the divisions survived a mean of 11.5 years; the department 31 years. WCB, surviving 87 years as of 2016, could only be studied at the tribunal (department-equivalent) level—other information was not available. The four SS innovations and organizations were all abolished—100 per cent mortality—around the same time

but they were not abolished at the same time. All five income security innovations of the Blakeney government were studied, but they were a small population. Each SS innovation had a major impact on the fate of its purpose-built organization; the four innovations were probably primarily abolished for political and financial reasons, the organizations for pragmatic (no longer needed) and cost-saving reasons. Their implementing organizations and the organizations one level higher were abolished around but not at the time the innovations were abolished. The four SS innovations were not good for their organizations or their employees—innovating organizations disappeared and staff lost their positions.

Implications for further research. It was possible to track the changes made to the SS organizations as departments were required to report planned and approved expenditures in the Estimates and actual expenditures in its annual reports. ***Innovation mortality*** was more difficult to track than that of organizations: Estimates and annual reports did not always identify changes to programs nor whether changes constituted death of an innovation. The study tracked program name and substantive changes; fate of delivering organization, branch and department; new legislation; and transfers to other departments (parts of day care and ESP). Innovation name change and new legislation were confirmed to be the easiest ways to define ***innovation mortality*** but eligibility criteria (reflecting objectives) were also important. Abolition of delivering organization and transfer to another department were confirmed to be the best way to define ***organizational mortality***,[21] as in other research (Glor, 2013: Appendix 4). Although it was possible to track funding for the social security programs, it was not for the WCB innovation or for the numbers of personnel. In Estimates and annual reports, the Blakeney government made public the numbers of staff in branches, divisions and the WCB, in part as a defence against attacks by the Opposition but the next government, with a large majority, did not. Should the survival rates of innovations and their organizations in the full GoS population be studied, comparisons could be made among sectors of the Sask government and with ten normal government organizational populations (Glor, 2013: Appendix 3). The normal populations had annual mortality rates lower than those of the GoS's four income security organizations (under 1.3% versus 6.7%/year).

The study determined the amount of time required to conduct the research[22] and where information could be found, thus establishing that further research could be undertaken and how. Broader research could be done, but would require a larger research project. Preliminary work accomplished the following: (1) researched and calculated the mean mortality rate of GoC departments (a population) (Glor, 2011); (2) synthesized the literature and calculated the mean mortality rates of 21 normal organizational populations including ten government populations in five countries (Glor; 2013); (3) created a framework for studying the impact of innovations on the survival of their organizations (Glor, 2014a); (4) identified an agenda for research on the impact of innovation on organizations (Glor, 2015); (5) identified theories and hypotheses for examination (Glor, 2015; Glor and Rivera, 2015, 2016); and (6) demonstrated in this paper, that the data needed can be collected for GoS innovations and their organizations 1971-82. Future research should determine whether information can be secured for crown corporations. As many as possible of the remaining 154 innovations should be studied. Such a study would be the first

[21] With considerable hunting, the information sought was found. However, the meaning of statements in reports was not always clear. We had to teach ourselves the best way to track the innovations and organizations.

[22] Between the authors, we estimate we spent 180 hours researching the template data for the innovations and their organizations.

on the fate of innovations and organizations of an entire population (a government). The study would be labour intensive but the demographics of innovating populations and their organizations can only be addressed if full innovation populations are studied. The next stages should be more efficient.[23] Further research may need to be restricted to programs and their organizations that appear in budget estimates, annual and performance reports but this research could help to answer "what happens to innovations and their organizations"? To attribute organizational mortality to specific factors required: (1) Understanding the factors; (2) Study of innovations substantial enough to affect their organizations; and (3) Understanding the motivations of elected officials and public servants. Motivation is not easy to determine but the Blakeney and Devine governments are well documented (e.g. Gruending, 1990; Martin, 1995; Ternowetsky, 1995; Harding, 1995; Glor, 1997, 2002; Pitsula & Rasmussen, 1990; Baron and Jackson, 1991; Biggs and Stobbe, 1991).

Lessons learned included: (1) Researchers should collect longitudinal information on an ongoing basis. Even when the innovations and their organizations can be found later, it is more difficult to research them. (2) Systematic collection of information would help identify the factors important to survival and mortality of innovations and organizations. (3) This would be easiest if an organization was responsible for tracking the impact of innovations, as opposed to researchers doing so post-hoc: young researchers, governments or a professional association could be funded to develop accessible data bases on factors, legislation, implementation, resources, impacts, personnel, and demographics of *innovations*, innovating *organizations*, organizational *communities* and *populations*. This was done for other studies of organizational populations, which usually secured information from membership-based organizations or ones requiring legal registration. Currently, data is only kept on innovation award nominees and surveyed organizational members that do not usually identify fates. Records are not kept on innovations that fail nor innovations that do not fit tightly with the ideology of the government. These databases are not normal innovation populations as they are the most successful innovations, are usually small and therefore do not appear in estimates or annual reports—and small innovations may not affect the fate of the organizations. Creation of such databases would allow study of: (1) demographics of innovations and innovating organizations; (2) whether innovation is adaptive for organizations, organizational communities and populations; (3) whether innovation was good or bad for survival; (4) how their results compare to the mortality of normal government populations; and whether any innovations are introduced that do not fit the ideology of the government.

About the Authors:

Eleanor D. Glor spent her working life as a public servant in the Canadian public sector at four levels and has written about public sector innovation for publication since the 1980s. She is the publisher and founding editor of The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal. She can be reached at glor@magma.ca. Most recently she published *Building Theory of Organizational Innovation, Change, Fitness and Survival* and Assessing the Relationship between Innovation and Survival in Organizations: An Empirical Review, Research Synthesis, and Analytical Case Study (with Mario Rivera).

[23] The authors discovered that the estimates and annual reports of the Blakeney government contain most of the information required. Those of the Devine government lack the information on human resources that the research framework required.

Garry A. Ewart is currently conducting research for his PhD Dissertation at the University of Regina. His PhD is in Canadian Plains Studies with an emphasis on historical public policy. He received his Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and Sociology and his Master's in Social Studies. His Master's Thesis was on the Saskatchewan Children's Dental Plan, one of the innovations of the Government of Saskatchewan, 1971-82.

References:

Amburgey, T. L., D. Kelly & W. P. Barnett. 1993. Resetting the Clock: The Dynamics of Organizational Change and Failure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(1): 51-73.

Baron, Don & Paul Jackson. 1991. *Battleground: The Socialist Assault on Grant Devine's Canadian Dream.* Toronto, Canada: Bedford House Publishing

Baum, J. A. C. 1996. Chapter 1.3: "Organizational Ecology." Pp. 77-114 in Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy & Walter R. Nord (Eds.), Handbook of Organization Studies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Biggs, Lesley & Mark Stobbe (Ed.). *Devine Rule in Saskatchewan: A Decade of Hope and Hardship.* Saskatoon, Canada: Fifth House Publishers

Brüderl, J. & R. Schüssler. 1990. Organizational Mortality: The Liabilities of Newness and Adolescence. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 35 (September): 530-47.

Burrell, G. & G. Morgan. 1979. *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis.* London, UK: Heinemann

Carroll, G. R. & M. T. Hannan, 2000. *The Demography of Corporations and Industries.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Carroll, G. R. & Y. P. Huo. 1988. "Organizational and electoral paradoxes of the Knights of Labor," pp. 175-93 in G.R. Carroll (Ed.), *Ecological Models of Organizations.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Coward, K. 2000. *A History of the Canada Assistance Plan*. Hanover, Canada: Skyway Printing.

Corder, J. K. 2004. Are Federal Programs Immortal? Estimating the Hazard of Program Termination. *American Politics Research*, 32(1): 3-25.

Damanpour, F. 1987. The Adoption of Technological, Administrative and Ancillary Innovations: Impact of Organizational Factors. *Journal of Management,* 13(4), 675-688.

Damanpour, F. & M. Schneider. 2008. Characteristics of Innovation and Innovation Adoption in Public Organizations: Assessing the Role of Managers. *JPART,* 19: 495-522.

de Lancer Julnes, P. & M. Holzer. 2001. Promoting the utilization of performance measures in public organizations: An empirical study of factors affecting adoption and implementation. *Public Administration Review,* 61(6): 693–708.

Downs, George W. Jr. & Lawrence B. Mohr. 1976. Conceptual Issues in the Study of Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(December): 700-14.

Drucker, Peter. 1985: *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York, NY: Harper & Row

Farah, Marta Ferreira Santos & Peter Spink. 2008. Subnational government innovation in a comparative perspective: Brazil. Pp. 71-92 in Sandford F. Borins (Ed.) *Innovations in Government: research, recognition and replication*. Ash institute for democratic governance and innovation, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Boston, Mass. and Brookings institution press, Washington, D.C.

Fichman, M. & D. A. Levinthal. 1991. Honeymoons and the Liability of Adolescence: A New Perspective on Duration Dependence in Social and Organizational Relationships. *Academy of Management Review,* 16: 442-68.

Freeman, J., G. R. Carroll & M. T. Hannan. 1983. The Liability of Newness: Age dependence in organizational death rates. *American Sociological Review,* 48: 692-710.

Gianoli, Mary. 1995. "Chapter 15: Historical Synopsis: NDP Party and Government Policy, 1971-82." Pp. 441-471 in Jim Harding (Ed.), *Social Policy and Social Justice: The NDP Government in Saskatchewan during the Blakeney Years.* Waterloo, CA: Wilfred Laurier University Press

Glor, Eleanor D. (Ed.). 1997. *Policy Innovation in the Saskatchewan Public Sector, 1971-82.* Toronto, CA: Captus Press

Glor, Eleanor D. (Ed.). 2002. *Is Innovation a Question of Will or Circumstance? An Exploration of the Innovation Process through the Lens of the Blakeney Government in Saskatchewan, 1971-82*, 2nd edition. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal.* Collected August 26, 2014 at: http://www.innovation.cc under Books.

Glor, Eleanor D. 2011. Patterns of Canadian Departmental Survival. *Canadian Public Administration,* 54(4): December: 551-566.

Glor, Eleanor D. 2013. Do innovative organisations survive longer than non-innovative organisations? Initial evidence from an empirical study of normal organizations. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal,* 18(3), article 1. Collected December 20, 2013 at: http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol18-no3.htm

Glor, Eleanor D. 2014a. Proposal for Comparative Research on the Fate of Innovative Public Sector Organizations, a paper presented to the International Research Society for Public Management, April 9-11, 2014, Ottawa, Canada.

Glor, Eleanor D. 2014b. Studying the Impact of Innovation on Organizations, Organizational Populations and Organizational Communities: A Framework for Research. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 19(3): article 1.

Glor, Eleanor D. 2015a. *Building Theory of Organizational Innovation, Change, Fitness and Survival*. Ottawa, CA: The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 20(2): article 1. Accessed May 23, 2015 at: http://www.innovation.cc/books.htm

Glor, Eleanor D. & Mario Rivera. 2015. Proposal for Research on the Fate of Innovative Public Sector Organizations, Populations and Communities: A Research Synthesis and Prospectus. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 20(2): article 3. Collected October 30, 2015 at: http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol20-no2.htm

Glor, Eleanor D. & Mario Rivera. 2017 in press. "Innovation and Organizational Survival Research," chapter in Ward, James (Ed.), *Leadership and Change in Public Sector Organizations: Beyond Reform*. Abingdon-on-Thames, UK: Routledge

Gopalakrishnan, S. & F. Damanpour. 1997. A Review of Innovation Research in Economics, Sociology and Technology Management. *Omega, International Journal of Management Science*, 25(1): 15-28.

Gruending, Dennis. 1990. *Promises to Keep: A Political Biography of Allan Blakeney.* Saskatoon, CA: Western Producer Prairie Books

Harding, Jim (Ed.) 1995. *Social Policy and Social Justice: The NDP Government in Saskatchewan during the Blakeney Years.* Waterloo, CA: Wilfred Laurier University Press

Hale, Sandra J. 1991. Reinventing Government the Minnesota Way. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 15(2): 123-131.

Hartley, Jean. 2008. Does Innovation Lead to Improvement in Public Services: Lessons from the Beacon Scheme in the United Kingdom. Pp. 159-87, Chapter 9 in Sanford Borins (Ed.), *Innovations in Government: Research, Recognition, and Replication*. Washington, DC: Ash Institute for Democratic Governance and Innovation, Harvard University and Brookings Institution.

Hum, D. P. J. 1985a. "Social Security Reform during the 1970s." Pp. 29-47, Chapter 3 in Jacqueline S. Ismael (Ed.), *Canadian Social Welfare Policy: Federal and Provincial Dimensions*. Toronto, CA: The Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Hum, D. P. J. 1985b. "Chapter Seven: The Working Poor, the Canada Assistance Plan, and Provincial Responses in Income Supplementation." Pp. 120-138 in Jacqueline S. Ismael (Ed.), *Canadian Social Welfare Policy: Federal and Provincial Dimensions*. Toronto, CA: The Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Lewis, David. 2002. The Politics of Agency Termination: Confronting the Myth of Agency

Immortality. *The Journal of Politics*, 64(1) (February): 89-107.

Lorsuwannarat, Tippawan. 2013. Innovation discontinuation in public organizations: From the institutional and ecological perspectives. *Thai Journal of Public Administration,* 11(1): 59-83. Collected April 15, 2015 at: http://gspajournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/PA-11-1-4.pdf

Marmot, M. G., Davey Smith, G., Stansfeld, S., Patel, C., North, F., Head, J., White, I., Brunner, E. & Feeney, A. 1991. Health inequalities among British civil servants: the Whitehall I1 Study. *Lancet,* 337(8754): 1387-1393.

Martin, Judith. 1995. "Chapter 2: The Continuing Struggle for Universal Day Care," pp. 17-51 in Jim Harding (Ed.). 1995. *Social Policy and Social Justice: The NDP Government in Saskatchewan during the Blakeney Years.* Waterloo, CA: Wilfred Laurier University Press

Osborne, John E. 1985. The Evolution of the Canada Assistance Plan. Appendix to the Nielsen Task Force report on the Canada Assistance Plan. Collected August 1, 2014 at: http://www.canadiansocialresearch.net/capjack.htm

Peters, T. J. & R. H. Waterman. 1982. *In Search of Excellenc*e. New York, NY: Warner Books.

Pitsula, James & Ken Rasmussen. 1990. *Privatizing a Province: The New Right in Saskatchewan.* Vancouver, CA: New Star Books

Potter-MacKinnon, Janice. 2003. *Minding the Public Purse: The Fiscal Crisis, Political trade-offs, and Canada's Future*. Montreal and Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Rogers, Everett M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations. Fourth Edition.* New York, NY: The Free Press

Saskatchewan Department of Finance. *Estimates for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31: 1974, 1975, 1976; 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 2013*. Regina, CA: Queen's Printer.

Saskatchewan Department of Finance. *Supplementary Estimates: 1988.* Regina, CA: Department of Finance.

Saskatchewan Update. No Date. "Welfare to Work Phase 2: Provincial and Territorial Updates." Collected August 4, 2014 at: http://publish.uwo.ca/~pomfret/wtw/html/provsum/sk2.html.

Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board. 1980. *Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board: Annual Report for the Calendar Year: 1980.* Regina, CA: Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board.

Saskatchewan Workers' Compensation Board. 1997. *The Story of Workers' Compensation in Saskatchewan*. Regina, CA: Workers' Compensation Board

Singh, J., R. House & D. Tucker. 1986. Organizational Change and Organizational Mortality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(4) (December): 587-611.

Snyder, Gordon T. 2002. Social Justice through Legislation: Saskatchewan Labour, Chapter 7 in Eleanor D. Glor (Ed.), *Is Innovation a Question of Will or Circumstance: An Exploration of the Innovation Process Through the Lens of the Blakeney Government in Saskatchewan, 1971-82*, 3rd edition. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal.* Collected February 2, 2016 at: http://www.innovation.cc under Books.

Social Services Annual Reports (SSAR) 1973-74 to 1975-76; 1980-81; 1983-84; 1986-87 to 1986-87-88; 1987-88; 1992-93; 1995-96; 1998-99, 2012-13. Regina, CA: Queen's Printer.

Stewart, R. N. (Toby) & Larry Flynn. 1997. Chapter 11: Getting People Off Welfare: The Employment Support Program—Innovative Grassroots Community Economic and Social Development." Pp. 189-203 in Eleanor D. Glor, *Policy Innovation in the Saskatchewan Public Sector, 1071-82*. Toronto, CA: Captus Press.

Ternowetsky, Gordon. 1995. "Chapter 6. Income Inequality, 1971-82: The Saskatchewan Case. Pp. 149-71 in Jim Harding (Ed.), *Social Policy and Social Justice: The NDP Government in Saskatchewan during the Blakeney Years.* Waterloo, CA: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Walker, R. M. 2013. Internal and External Antecedents of Process Innovation: A review and extension. *Public Management Review*, 1-25. DOI:10.1080/14719037.2013.771698. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2013.771698

Wilkinson, R. G. (Ed.). 1986. *Class and Health.* London, UK: Tavistock

Persons Consulted for this Paper: Larry Flynn, regional director and acting director, ESP 1974-84; Ron Hikel, former Assistant Deputy Minister, Social development (income security), Manitoba & Associate Deputy Minister, Social Services, Sask.; Ian Potter, formerly Planning Bureau, Executive Council & Director Social Services Planning Unit, Department of Social Services, Saskatchewan; Merran Proctor, former Director, Social Services Planning Unit (including personal email to Eleanor Glor from JustCauses dated July 28, 2014), Department of Social Services, Saskatchewan. Ms. Proctor replaced Ian Potter in this position; Toby Stewart, former head of ESP.