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There is a need to change the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 because it brought inequality instead of promoting equal distribution of national resources. Some of the underlying problems of the law were that it promoted laziness among the poor because they were guaranteed pay. Also, the inequality gap increased among the middle-class income earners since they were not considered as beneficiaries of the poverty reduction package (Maks‐Solomon & Stoker, 2019). As a roadmap for correcting some of these policies, the report identified that a Department of Social Services should be established to repeal the law. However, such a move cannot be successful without engaging all relevant stakeholders to help in pushing for reform. In this discussion, the focus will be on effective strategies that can be used to fully engage stakeholders and ensure the success of the reform. The proposal will suggest that the top-bottom approach for implementing reforms will be the best strategy to repeal the welfare act since the legislation process will not be affected by the political conflict of interests.

**Who is responsible?**

Although the Department of Social Services will lead in advocating the change of the law, there will be a need for influential advocacy organizations to steer-head the reform process. Such stakeholders include law advocacy organizations that have a powerful influence on the legislative process. An example of such an organization that can be sought out for help is the National Welfare Right Organization because it has a great interest in the law since it has progressively dealt with welfare rights of people since the law was made (Maks‐Solomon & Stoker, 2019). To ensure the success of the reform, the policy development process will involve passing the bill into motion, allowing House of Representatives to debate for the reform, and after which the bill will be reformed based on the majority vote count.

**Beneficiaries’ Positions**

One of the beneficiaries includes the National Welfare Rights Organization which has taken a position in the matter because it aims to bring justice to marginalized populations, which in this case include middle-class income earners. Recently, this organization has been making frontline campaigns to support social welfare laws that protect adequate income, justice, and democratic participation across United States citizens of all social-class backgrounds (Wilson et al. 2018). This organization may give the Department of Social Services full support by influencing the legislature to reform the Act of 1996. Also, taxpayers have taken a great interest in the matter since the money that was allocated to supplement incomes of the poor was deducted from their salaries. Their argument follows that they have lost their hard-earned money to feed a population of lazy urban dwellers.

**Other Groups Interested In the Legislation**

Other groups that have gained interest in the reform include the Democrats and Republicans. However, the arguments that have been presented by the two groups fall into divided debates as Democrats support the welfare law while Republicans reject it (Muennig et al. 2015). Democrats argue that in 2016, over 70 million Americans needed help from the relief program and thus the welfare act should be enforced through the Medicaid Program (Wilson et al. 2018). In contrast, Republicans argue that the most annoying aspect of the law is that it does not accomplish the very mission it was created for in the first place, to reduce poverty (Wilson et al. 2018). Instead, Americans have been overtaxed to support the relief program while the United States economy risks to slump into bankruptcy.

**Strategies for Building Support**

Two strategies can be used to support the reform: the bottom up and the top-down approaches. The bottom-up involves mobilizing affected communities from the grassroots level join public rallies that will support the repeal of the law and thus force the government to make reforms. This will include politicians who will support or reject the reform. The second strategy is the top-down approach where only top influential leaders from advocacy organizations for legal reforms will influence the legislative arm of the government to reform the law. The best approach will be the top-bottom strategy because it will eliminate the politicization of the reform that can be costly to the reform process in terms of wasted time and public resources in campaign processes. When using the top-down approach, only the relevant stakeholders will discuss the matter and involve legislative teams to make the amendments needed.
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