

Appendix II: Secondary Factors Specific to Each Income Security Innovation, Created by GoS 1971-82

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
I. Ideology										
(101) The creation of these innovations by a social democratic government during the 1970s was likely. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree or agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(102) The abolition of these innovations by a Neoliberal government during the 1980s was likely. Very likely=5, Likely=4, Somewhat likely=3, A little likely=2, Not likely=1. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree or agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(103) The ideology of the NDP government supported these innovations at the time they were created. Very well=5, Well=4, Somewhat=3, A little=2, Not well =1 Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree or agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(104) The ideology of the Tory government did not support these innovations. Very opposed=5, Opposed=4, Fairly neutral=3, A little in Favour=2, Very much in favour =1 Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(105) The NDP government strictly followed its ideology in introducing these income security innovations. ³ Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(106) The Tory government strictly followed its ideology in deciding the fate of these innovations. ⁴ Very strongly=5, Strongly=4, So-so=3, Weakly=2, Very weakly =1. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(107) The ideologies of the federal and provincial governments were very similar at the time of the creation/abolition/retention of the innovation. The same=5, similar=4, somewhat similar=3, somewhat different=2, very different=1. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(108) The NDP government that introduced the innovation was highly left wing ideological on the subject of the innovation. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(109) The Tory government that abolished/retained the innovation was highly right wing ideological on the subject of the decision. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										

¹ Small then medium (small=\$2 million or less, medium=\$2 M -\$4M); large=>\$4M).

² **Abbreviations:** Mort/Sv: Mort=Mortality, Sv=Survival

³ Berry, Ringquist, Fording and Harrison (1998) studied ideology in American states using public opinion polls and comparisons of party status in the Congress and the Presidency. Because Sask is a unified system (one legislature, Premier responsible to the Legislature), this approach is not available. Sask changes government regularly but tends to elect Tories to the federal Parliament.

⁴ See footnote 3.

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
Total App. II										
+ Total App. I	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
How Important a Factor was Ideology? Sum App II + I										
2. Politics										
(110) There was a change of provincial government soon after time of action on innovation. Soon is 1 year=5 points or 2 years=4 points. Strongly Disagree=1 ⁵ , Disagree=2, Neither disagree or agree=3 (no changes), Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(111) The government was in office a long time (3 years or more) after taking action. Strongly Disagree=1 ⁶ , Disagree=2, Neither disagree or agree=3 (no changes), Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(112) There was federal funding for this innovation at the time of creation/abolition. Strongly Disagree=1 ⁷ , Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3 (no changes), Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(113) There was federal funding for this innovation at the time of the election after that. Strongly Disagree=1 ⁸ , Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3 (no changes), Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(114) There was federal funding for this innovation at the time the Conservative government was elected (1982). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(115) There was federal funding for this innovation at the time the Conservative government was re-elected (1986). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(116) The politics of the federal and provincial governments were the same when the innovation was created/abolished/retained. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree or agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(117) This situation strengthened the Sask government's position. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(118) Federal funding, if made available, did not continue to be available under the same conditions. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										

⁵ 1=One year before election won by NDP in 1975; 1=Tories made major cut-backs in 1986, just after an election they won in which planned cut-backs were not acknowledged.

⁶ 1=One year before election won by NDP in 1975; 1=Tories made major cut-backs in 1986, just after an election they won in which planned cut-backs were not acknowledged.

⁷ 1=One year before election won by NDP in 1975; 1=Tories made major cut-backs in 1986, just after an election they won in which planned cut-backs were not acknowledged.

⁸ 1=One year before election won by NDP in 1975; 1=Tories made major cut-backs in 1986, just after an election they won in which planned cut-backs were not acknowledged.

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
(119) There was federal funding for this innovation at the time of the next provincial election after the innovation was created. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
Total App. II										
From Appendix I:										
How Important a Factor was Politics?										
3. External Support										
(120) The innovation was supported by the NDP/Tories. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(121) The innovation had been introduced by another government. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(122) The innovation had been abolished by another government. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(123) The issue/abolition was listed in the governing party's election platform Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(124) The innovation was proposed in an official report. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
Total External Support App. II										
From Appendix I:										
How Important a Factor was External Support? Mean										
4. The Economy										
(125) The economy was growing well (over 3% per year) when the innovation was created/abolished. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(126) The government was not in substantial non-self financing debt when the innovation was created/abolished. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(127) The government's fiscal situation was good (close to balanced budget) when the innovation was created/abolished (manageable or no provincial debt). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
Total App. II Economy										

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
<i>From App. I Economy:</i>										
<i>How Important a Factor was the Economy?</i>										
5. Resources										
<i>a) Financial Resources</i>										
(128) Funding for the innovation kept up with the cost of living. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(129) The budget was near balance. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(130) The government was not in significant non-self financing debt when the innovation was introduced. [is this the right term??] Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(131) The government was not in significant non-self -financing debt when the innovation was abolished. [is this the right term??] Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(132) When the innovation was created, the government did not have other major priorities that were absorbing much of the marginal resources. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(133) When the innovation was created, the government had windfall revenues (one year, 1974-5). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(134) When the innovation was abolished, the government had windfall revenues. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(135) The innovation was fully funded under the NDP. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(136) The innovation was fully funded under the Tories. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(137) The Innovation retained its resources after 5 years. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(138) The Innovation retained its resources after 10 years. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(139) The Innovation retained its resources after 15 years. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(140) The Innovation was recreated in part after 20 years. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
(141) Sufficient information was available to track the innovation. ⁹ Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
Total App. II Financial										
Total App. I										
How Important a Factor Financial Resources										
b. Administrative Support										
(142) When created/abolished, the innovation was large. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(143) When the innovations were created, the needed infrastructure was funded/ provided. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(144) When the innovations were created, the innovations were funded for new positions to deliver the innovations. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(145a) The organization had not changed recently (within two? Years) (change in name, mandate, department or budget cut 25% or more) prior to introduction of the innovation. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(145b) Administrative support was an important resource in the successful implementation of the innovation. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
Total App. II From Appendix I:										
How Important a Factor was Administrative Support?										
c. Was the innovation fully implemented?										
(146) The innovation was fully and quickly staffed (less than 1.5 yrs). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(147) The innovation was fully and quickly funded. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(148) The innovation retained its funding. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(149) The government was in power after approval long enough for it to gain legitimacy with the public (>4 years). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither										

⁹ Social Services innovations were well documented; organizational information was found in government budget estimates and Social Services annual reports. The WCB innovation was not well documented.

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(150) The innovative program was fully and quickly implemented by personnel (within three years). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
Total Implementation App. II										
Total Implementation from Appendix I:										
How Important a Factor was Full Implementation?										
d. Employee Support										
(151) SS personnel supported the innovations. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(152) Personnel were well treated, respected and received salary increases. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5										
(153) Employees perceived that they were not competing for funding with other programs/ administrative areas. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5										
(154) Personnel were well treated, respected and received salary increases. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5										
Total Employee Support App. II										
Total from Appendix I:										
How Important a Factor was Employee Support?										
Resources App II										
App. I										
Total Resources Mean										
5) Effects										
a. Efficacious										
Appendix I										
Total efficacious										

Secondary Factor	Day Care		FIP		SIP		ESP ¹		WCB	
	Create	Mort/ Sv ²	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv	Create	Mort/Sv	Create	Mort/ Sv
b. Did it reduce poverty?										
<i>Appendix I</i>										
<i>Total reduced poverty</i>										
c. Did it fulfill its goals?										
(155) The innovation's creation succeeded in redistributing income by subsidizing the poor through increased payments/subsidies. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(156) The innovation's abolition/retention succeeded in redistributing income by subsidizing the poor through expanded eligibility. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
<i>Goals App. II</i>										
<i>App. I</i>										
<i>Total Goals</i>										
d. Were the innovations respectful of clients?										
<i>App. I</i>										
<i>Grand total respectful</i>										
e. Unwanted side effects										
(157) The innovations were not a magnet for the poor in other provinces (Berry, Fording, Hanson, 2003 ¹⁰). Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(158) The innovations did not act as a disincentive to work. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
(159) The innovation reduced work disincentives. Strongly Disagree=1, Disagree=2, Neither disagree nor agree=3, Agree=4, Strongly Agree=5.										
<i>Total App II</i>										
<i>Total unwanted side effects</i>										
<i>Total Effects App. II</i>										
<i>Total Effects Appendix I:</i>										
<i>How Important a Factor was Effects?</i>										

Source: Eleanor D. Glor

N/A= Not applicable, Cr=create; recipients were seniors (>65 years old).

Note: This questionnaire was completed by the Author, who worked in central agencies and line departments for the GoS during the Blakeney government and has conducted research on this government since then.

¹⁰ Data for all the measures used by these authors could not be found for Sask.

* Neither seniors nor severely injured workers are expected to work. The WCB assesses injured workers' capacity to work and supports them to do so. This process is completed before an injured workers' pension is approved.

References:

Berry, William D., Evan J. Ringquist, Richard C. Fording, & Russell L. Hanson. 1998. Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States, 1960-93. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(1): 327-48.