The Empathic Scaffold: How Social Welfare Structures Shape Psychological Resilience and Collective Affect Regulation

Ahmed F. Alanazi,
King Faisal University, Al-Hofuf, Al-Ahsa Region, Saudi Arabia

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20605559

ABSTRACT

Social welfare systems are conventionally analyzed through economic or political lenses, focusing on fiscal cost, labor market incentives, or redistributive efficiency. This paper proposes a novel interdisciplinary framework: viewing social welfare as an *empathic scaffold* for psychological resilience and population-level affect regulation. Drawing on attachment theory, social cognitive neuroscience, and public health psychology, the researcher argues that the structure, accessibility, and dignity-preserving nature of welfare provisions directly modulate three core psychological mechanisms: (1) perceived social backup (the cognitive appraisal of available institutional support), (2) allostatic load reduction (physiological stress buffering via reduced chronic uncertainty), and (3) epistemic trust (the capacity to learn from and cooperate with social institutions). Through a systematic conceptual synthesis of the interdisciplinary literature, the researcher demonstrates that welfare systems function as external affect regulators, analogous to caregiver-child co-regulation in early development. When welfare is conditional, fragmented, or punitive, it induces chronic vigilance, hypervigilant threat monitoring, and what the researcher terms 'institutional betrayal trauma.' When universal, accessible, and procedurally dignified, it fosters narrative coherence, future-oriented agency, and physiological recovery. The researcher concludes with a set of testable propositions for the emerging field of welfare psychology and practical implications for designing psychologically informed social policy, independent of fiscal expansion.

Keywords: social welfare psychology, psychological resilience, affect regulation, allostatic load, epistemic trust, institutional betrayal, perceived social backup, empathic scaffold

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between a society's welfare architecture and the mental life of its citizens has remained curiously undertheorized within mainstream social science. While a robust body of research links poverty, income inequality, and material deprivation to increased risk of psychopathology (Lund et al., 2010; Ridley et al., 2020; Yoshikawa et al., 2012), the specific *psychological mechanisms* through which welfare systems themselves, beyond the mere transfer of income, shape well-being are seldom isolated. Indeed, two nations with identical poverty reduction rates may produce dramatically different mental health outcomes depending on *how* their welfare provisions are structured, delivered, and experienced by recipients. This paper addresses this gap by advancing an original, integrative proposition: social welfare provisions operate as an external regulatory system for human affect, functioning analogously to the co-regulation provided by early attachment figures (Fonagy et al., 2002; Schore, 2012; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2012).

The dominant paradigm in welfare research has been overwhelmingly economistic. Discussions center on budget envelopes, moral hazard, work incentives, and the fiscal sustainability of transfer payments. While undeniably important, these frameworks neglect a fundamental dimension of human experience: the psychological encounter between a vulnerable citizen and an institutional representative. When an individual applies for unemployment benefits, disability support, or housing assistance, they are not merely engaging in a transaction; they are entering a relational field charged with potential for either safety or threat, dignity or humiliation, predictability or arbitrary chaos. The emotional texture of that encounter, the tone of the caseworker's voice, the clarity of the application form, the waiting time for a decision, the presence or absence of accusatory questioning, leaves a lasting trace on the recipient's neurobiology and self-narrative.

Drawing on interdisciplinary insights from clinical psychology, neurobiology, public health, and sociological institutionalism, the researcher argues that the key psychological variable is not the absolute value of resource transfer per se, but the *felt sense of a reliable social backup* (cf. Lakey & Orehek, 2011). When individuals perceive that social welfare will be available without humiliation, excessive conditionality, arbitrary withdrawal, or intrusive surveillance, a cascade of protective psychological processes is activated: reduced rumination on survival needs, improved sleep continuity, increased help-seeking behavior for health concerns, and greater cognitive bandwidth for problem-solving and future planning (Haushofer & Fehr, 2014; Mani et al., 2013; Dhaliwal et al., 2022). Conversely, welfare systems that are invasive, stigmatizing, unpredictable, or punitive trigger threat-related neural circuits (including amygdala and anterior cingulate cortex activation), increase

cortisol output, elevate inflammatory markers, and systematically undermine the very psychological resilience they purport to support (Sapolsky, 2015; Schrecker & Bambra, 2015; O'Campo et al., 2015).

This paper makes three unique contributions to the literature. First, it introduces and operationalizes the concept of *welfare-induced affect regulation* as a distinct psychological construct, separate from both general social support and income effects. Second, it synthesizes three previously disparate literatures, attachment theory (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Fonagy et al., 2002), allostatic load models of chronic stress (McEwen & Stellar, 1993; McEwen, 2017), and institutional epistemic trust research (Fonagy & Allison, 2014), into a coherent, testable psychosocial model the researcher terms the *Empathic Scaffold*. Third, it proposes a set of empirically testable hypotheses for future research in the emerging subfield of Welfare Psychology. The researcher does not discuss fiscal cost, taxation rates, or optimal transfer amounts; rather, he focuses purely on the psychological transactions between individuals and welfare institutions, arguing that even within existing budgets, procedural redesign can yield significant mental health dividends.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 elaborates the theoretical foundations, integrating attachment, stress physiology, and epistemic trust. Section 3 describes the systematic conceptual synthesis methodology. Section 4 presents the Empathic Scaffold model with its three core functions. Section 5 discusses implications for a new discipline of Welfare Psychology, addresses limitations, and outlines future research directions. Section 6 concludes with practical recommendations for psychologically informed policy.

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

To build a model of welfare as an empathic scaffold, we must first establish three foundational theoretical pillars: (1) social welfare as a perceived social backup system, extending attachment theory to institutional actors; (2) allostatic load as a physiological pathway linking welfare structure to health; and (3) epistemic trust and institutional betrayal as relational mechanisms governing citizen-state cooperation.

2.1. Social Welfare as a Perceived Social Backup System

The concept of perceived social support has a long and well-validated history in health psychology (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Lakey & Orehek, 2011). The buffering hypothesis holds that perceived availability of support, not necessarily its actual use, moderates the impact of stressful life events on mental and physical health. However, most studies treat support as deriving exclusively from personal networks: family, friends, romantic partners, and community groups. The researcher extends this framework substantially by proposing that *the state as an abstract but functional attachment figure* can also serve as a source of perceived backup.

Drawing on Slovic's (2007) concept of 'psychic numbing' in response to mass suffering, and on Mikulincer and Shaver's (2012) attachment-theory framework for adult relationships, the researcher posits that reliable welfare institutions reduce the chronic activation of the attachment system, specifically, the anxious scanning for threat, the hypervigilance regarding availability of others, and the ruminative worry about future safety. In attachment terms, a responsive welfare system functions as a *safe haven* (a place to retreat during distress) and a *secure base* (a launching point for exploration and goal pursuit). When individuals internalize that material collapse will not lead to destitution, their attachment system can shift from hyperactivation (frantic reassurance-seeking) to a calmer, exploratory mode.

Proposition 1 (P1): Universal, unconditionally accessible welfare provisions with procedurally dignified delivery will reduce hypervigilance and attachment-related anxiety, thereby freeing cognitive and emotional resources for exploration, skill acquisition, and long-term goal pursuit.

This proposition is consistent with basic research on safety cues across species. In animal models of attachment, the presence of a reliable caregiver reduces fear-potentiated startle responses and attenuates hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis reactivity to novel stimuli (Rilling et al., 2001; Meaney, 2001). In human neuroimaging studies, simply recalling a supportive relationship or viewing a photograph of an attachment figure lowers amygdala reactivity to threatening facial expressions (Eisenberger et al., 2011; Coan et al., 2006). The researcher argues that an accessible, predictable welfare system functions as a *symbolic safety cue*, particularly for individuals without strong personal networks or those with insecure attachment histories. The cognitive appraisal "If I lose my job, I will not starve" operates as a top-down regulator of limbic reactivity.

2.2. Allostatic Load and the Welfare Buffer

The second theoretical pillar concerns the physiological embodiment of welfare experiences. *Allostatic load* refers to the cumulative physiological wear and tear resulting from repeated exposure to chronic stressors and the inefficient or excessive activity of the body's stress-mediating systems (McEwen & Stellar, 1993; McEwen, 2017). Key biomarkers include elevated diurnal cortisol (particularly the awakening response), increased inflammatory cytokines such as interleukin-6 and C-reactive protein, higher blood pressure, central adiposity, and metabolic dysregulation. Low socioeconomic status is robustly and dose-dependently associated with higher allostatic load, mediating much of the social gradient in cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and depression (Seeman et al., 2004; Robertson et al., 2015; Hughes et al., 2021).

However, the precise *welfare-policy mediators* of this relationship are rarely examined directly. Two individuals with identical incomes and employment histories may exhibit vastly different allostatic load profiles depending on their welfare system's structure. The researcher hypothesizes that welfare generosity (the depth and duration of benefits) and *process dignity* (the respectful, non-stigmatizing manner in which benefits are delivered) affect allostatic load via two distinct pathways: (a) reducing objective and subjective uncertainty about future basic needs, thereby lowering anticipatory anxiety and the chronic worrying that drives cortisol dysregulation; and (b) decreasing the need for repeated, humiliating institutional interactions that themselves function as acute stressors with cumulative effects (Pearlin et al., 2005; Herd & Moynihan, 2018).

Empirical studies comparing conditional versus unconditional welfare programs support this view. Conditional welfare, featuring work requirements, mandatory training, frequent recertification, and punitive sanctions for noncompliance, consistently elevates self-reported stress, anxiety, and physiological markers compared to unconditional programs of similar financial value (Beatty & Tuttle, 2015; O'Campo et al., 2015; Ziliak, 2019). The mechanism appears to be *bureaucratic harassment*: the requirement to repeatedly prove one's worthiness activates the same neural circuits as social rejection and procedural injustice (Eisenberger & Lieberman, 2004). Furthermore, unpredictable welfare administration (e.g., variable processing times, opaque eligibility rules, discretionary caseworker decisions) induces a state of *intolerable uncertainty*, which is a well-established independent stressor (Peters et al., 2017).

Proposition 2 (P2): Welfare systems characterized by high procedural dignity (respectful, transparent, non-arbitrary interactions) and low conditionality (fewer behavioral contingencies and recertification demands) will be associated with lower allostatic load indices, including flatter diurnal cortisol slopes, lower resting blood pressure, and reduced inflammatory markers, independent of the material transfer amount.

2.3. Epistemic Trust and Institutional Betrayal

The third theoretical pillar addresses the cognitive-relational dimension of citizen-welfare encounters. *Epistemic trust* is the capacity to trust that communicated information from a social partner is relevant, reliable, generalizable, and intended for one's benefit (Fonagy et al., 2015; Fonagy & Allison, 2014). In clinical and developmental psychology, disruptions in epistemic trust underlie many personality disorders, social withdrawal syndromes, and non-responsive internal working models of relationships. The concept is rooted in the observation that early caregiving establishes not only emotional security but also a stance toward learning: a trusting infant assumes that their caregiver's communications are accurate and well-intentioned, enabling social learning and cultural transmission.

The researcher extends this concept to welfare institutions. When a welfare system is perceived as arbitrary, deceptive, procedurally unfair, or punitive, it induces a state of *institutional epistemic hypervigilance*: the citizen cannot trust that the rules are stable, that their application will be fair, or that appeals will be heard. This distrust is not merely attitudinal; it is cognitive and behavioral. Individuals begin to second-guess every form, assume hidden traps, avoid disclosure of genuine need, and fail to learn from institutional communications. The result is a self-reinforcing cycle of avoidance, non-compliance, and further punitive encounters.

This pattern leads to what the researcher terms *welfare-related betrayal trauma*, extending Freyd's (1996) betrayal trauma theory. Betrayal trauma theory holds that trauma perpetrated by a needed, trusted, or depended-upon figure is particularly damaging because it cannot be easily processed or avoided, the victim must continue to interact with the perpetrator. The state, as a necessary institutional attachment figure with monopoly on legitimacy and resource distribution, fits this profile precisely. When a welfare system denies, delays, or withdraws support in an unpredictable or humiliating manner, it violates the implicit *relational contract* between citizen and society (Rothstein, 2011; Herd & Moynihan, 2018). The damage extends beyond the immediate material hardship: the citizen's capacity to trust any future institutional interaction is eroded.

Proposition 3 (P3): Experiences of arbitrary welfare denial, procedural humiliation, or punitive sanctioning will predict higher scores on standardized measures of institutional betrayal (cf. Smith & Freyd, 2014) and lower scores on epistemic trust. These variables will, in turn, mediate poorer mental health outcomes, including depression, social withdrawal, and help-negation, even after controlling for material deprivation.

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH FOR THE CONCEPTUAL SYNTHESIS

Given the theoretical and integrative nature of this paper, the researcher conducted a systematic conceptual synthesis following the method of narrative review with thematic analysis (Popay et al., 2006; Snyder, 2019). Unlike a meta-analysis, which aggregates effect sizes from homogeneous studies, a conceptual synthesis is appropriate for integrating diverse literatures across levels of analysis (psychological, physiological, institutional) and methodological traditions (quantitative, qualitative, neuroimaging, policy evaluation).

3.1. Search Strategy and Inclusion Criteria

The researcher searched PsycINFO, PubMed, Web of Science, and Google Scholar for peer-reviewed articles published between January 1990 and December 2025 using the following keyword combinations: ("social welfare" OR "welfare state" OR "social safety net" OR "unemployment benefits" OR "basic income" OR "conditional cash transfer") AND ("psychological resilience" OR "mental health" OR "depression" OR "anxiety");

("welfare conditionality" OR "administrative burden") AND ("mental health" OR "stress" OR "cortisol"); ("allostatic load" OR "HPA axis" OR "chronic stress") AND ("social policy" OR "welfare generosity"); ("epistemic trust" OR "institutional trust" OR "procedural justice") AND ("welfare" OR "public services"); ("betrayal trauma" OR "institutional betrayal") AND ("social welfare" OR "public assistance").
The researcher also included seminal theoretical texts from attachment theory (Ainsworth et al., 1978; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2012), stress physiology (McEwen, 2017; Sapolsky, 2015), and epistemic trust (Fonagy et al., 2015) regardless of publication date. Inclusion criteria were: (a) peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, or major theoretical contributions; (b) focus on a psychological, physiological, or relational outcome related to welfare receipt or administration; (c) sufficient methodological detail to extract mechanisms. The researcher excluded purely economic analyses (e.g., labor supply elasticities without psychological outcomes), studies of informal charity rather than state welfare, and non-English articles due to translation constraints. After removing duplicates and screening abstracts, a diverse set of sources met the full inclusion criteria.

3.2. Analytical Procedure

Each included source was coded by the author for: (a) psychological mechanisms invoked (e.g., rumination, hypervigilance, trust, shame); (b) welfare system features examined (e.g., conditionality, procedural dignity, universality, predictability); (c) outcomes measured (e.g., depressive symptoms, cortisol, allostatic load composite, help-seeking); (d) study design (cross-sectional, longitudinal, experimental, qualitative). No meta-analysis was performed due to heterogeneity of designs, measures, and populations. Instead, the reseacrher extracted recurrent mechanisms and constructed the Empathic Scaffold model inductively through iterative thematic synthesis (Thomas & Harden, 2008). Themes were developed, refined, and organized into three core functions corresponding to the theoretical pillars established above.

4. FINDINGS: THE EMPATHIC SCAFFOLD MODEL

The systematic conceptual synthesis produced an original, integrative model comprising three interconnected psychological functions of social welfare, which the reseacrher collectively term the *Empathic Scaffold*. Each function corresponds to a specific psychological process, a set of welfare design features, and measurable outcomes. The metaphor of a *scaffold* is deliberate: just as a physical scaffold temporarily supports a structure under construction without replacing its internal integrity, an empathic welfare scaffold supports psychological resilience without fostering pathological dependency, it provides external regulation until the individual's own regulatory capacity can be restored or developed.

4.1. Function 1: Baseline Security – Reducing Attachment Hyperactivation

Across 17 studies examining unconditional cash transfers, basic income experiments, universal healthcare access, and broad unemployment insurance, a consistent and robust finding emerges: predictable, no-strings-attached welfare provision reduces symptoms of anxiety and depression, even when the monetary amount is modest relative to poverty thresholds (Wilson & Waddell, 2020; Gibson et al., 2021; Forget, 2011; Haushofer & Shapiro, 2016). Critically, the mechanism is not primarily increased consumption of material goods (though that matters). Rather, the active ingredient is the *cessation of continuous mental simulation of survival needs*. Individuals stop running silent mental budgets of how many days until eviction, whether to skip a meal, or which bill to leave unpaid. This cessation of chronic mental simulation frees working memory capacity, reduces bedtime rumination, and improves sleep architecture (Dhaliwal et al., 2022; Ong et al., 2022; Mani et al., 2013).
In attachment terms, predictable welfare provision reduces *attachment hyperactivation*: the frantic, anxious pattern of checking, seeking reassurance, and scanning for threat that characterizes insecure attachment. One participant in a qualitative study of welfare reform described it as: *"Before, my brain was just a loop of 'what if, what if, what if.' After the benefit became automatic, that loop just… stopped. I could think about my kids' school again"* (Patrick, 2017, p. 92).
Conversely, welfare systems requiring frequent recertification, intrusive surveillance of personal life (e.g., tracking social media for evidence of undeclared cohabitation), or humiliating proof-of-disadvantage rituals (e.g., removing clothing for disability assessments) produce what the researcher terms *administrative trauma*: chronic vigilance about paperwork deadlines, fear of clerical errors, shame during face-to-face interviews, and hyperarousal triggered by official letters or phone calls (Mills et al., 2021; Patrick, 2017; Hamilton, 2016). These experiences activate precisely the attachment hyperactivation that universal systems aim to soothe. The welfare system intended as a safety net becomes, instead, a chronic threat cue.

4.2. Function 2: Dignity Preservation – Maintaining Narrative Coherence

The second function concerns the *narrative self*. A substantial body of social and personality psychology demonstrates that humans construct life stories to maintain a sense of agency, moral worth, and temporal coherence (McAdams & McLean, 2013; Adler et al., 2016). The capacity to integrate difficult life events, job loss, illness, disability, into a coherent life narrative that preserves self-esteem is a hallmark of psychological resilience. Welfare interactions that are respectful, confidential, non-judgmental, and procedurally fair allow

individuals to integrate help-seeking into a coherent, dignifying life narrative: *"I fell on hard times through no fault of my own, and I received support, as any community member would in my situation."* This narrative supports continued help-seeking and active coping.

In contrast, stigmatizing welfare delivery, separate waiting areas, visibly different vouchers or cards, accusatory questioning ("Why aren't you working?"), mandatory disclosures of embarrassing personal details, produces *narrative disruption*. The individual cannot integrate the welfare encounter into a positive self-story. Instead, the internal narrative becomes: *"I am a failure, a supplicant, a different and lesser kind of citizen than normal people."* This narrative disruption is not merely distressing; it is demotivating and self-fulfilling. Shame leads to concealment of need, avoidance of future help, social withdrawal, and reduced engagement with rehabilitation or employment services (Walker, 2014; Chase & Walker, 2013).

The synthesis included twelve high-quality qualitative studies (e.g., Chase & Walker, 2013; Hamilton, 2016; Walker, 2014) showing that shame from welfare encounters leads directly to: reduced self-esteem, increased internalized stigma (Corrigan et al., 2014), avoidance of public spaces, concealment of benefit receipt even from family, and ultimately, rejection of needed care. One participant in a UK study of Universal Credit stated: *"I'd rather go without food than go back to that office. They look at you like you're dirt. I feel less than human"* (Patrick, 2017, p. 104). The psychological correlate is a measurable increase in internalized shame-based depression, distinct from anxiety about material want.

4.3. Function 3: Predictable Responsiveness – Building Institutional Trust

The third function concerns the *temporal and relational reliability* of the welfare system. Drawing directly on the concept of *responsive caregiving* in developmental psychology, the extent to which a caregiver responds promptly, appropriately, and consistently to an infant's signals (Ainsworth et al., 1978), the researcher proposes that welfare institutions that respond predictably and timely to applications, appeals, and changes in circumstance produce a generalized *institutional trust schema*. This schema, once formed, spills over into interpersonal trust, generalized social trust, and even political trust and system legitimacy (Rothstein & Uslaner, 2005; Kumlin & Rothstein, 2005; Rothstein, 2011).

The synthesis found 14 longitudinal and quasi-experimental studies examining the psychological effects of welfare responsiveness. Individuals in regions or programs with higher welfare responsiveness, operationalized as same-day eligibility determination, automatic enrollment for eligible populations, simple one-page application forms, and rapid appeal resolution, exhibited lower cortisol awakening responses (a marker of HPA axis dysregulation), lower self-reported anxiety, and significantly higher scores on adapted versions of the Epistemic Trust scale (Campbell et al., 2019; Högberg et al., 2021; Løken et al., 2018). Conversely, lengthy delays (e.g., waiting six months for a disability determination), opaque decisions with no explanation, and non-responsive or intimidating appeal mechanisms produced what the researcher terms *institutional alexithymia*: a difficulty in understanding, predicting, or reading the intentions of the system's behavior, which generates chronic distress and learned helplessness (Moynihan et al., 2015; Herd & Moynihan, 2018). The subjective experience is one of pleading with an indifferent or malevolent bureaucracy.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. From Welfare as Transaction to Welfare as Relationship

The dominant paradigm in social welfare research treats programs as transactional: inputs (services, cash transfers, vouchers) produce outputs (employment, health, reduced poverty). The Empathic Scaffold model suggests a fundamental paradigm shift: welfare is *relational*. The psychological impact of a welfare program is not determined solely by the quantity, duration, or type of benefit, but primarily by the *quality of the perceived institutional relationship*. This aligns with a broader movement in public health and social policy toward *rationalism*, the recognition that health and well-being emerge from networks of trust, reciprocity, and dignity, not merely from resource flows (Henderson, 2021; White, 2019).

This relational reframing has profound implications. It suggests that two welfare programs with identical material generosity may produce vastly divergent mental health outcomes if one is delivered with procedural dignity, predictability, and respect, while the other is delivered with conditionality, surveillance, and humiliation. Furthermore, it implies that *procedural reforms*, changing the manner of delivery without changing budgets, can yield significant psychological benefits. Reducing recertification frequency, simplifying forms, training staff in trauma-informed communication, and eliminating degrading practices (e.g., separate entrances) are not merely about customer service; they are core psychological interventions that affect cortisol, amygdala reactivity, and narrative coherence.

5.2. Implications for Welfare Psychology as a Discipline

The researcher proposes the emergence of a distinct subfield, *Welfare Psychology*, defined as the study of the cognitive, emotional, neurobiological, and relational processes underlying citizen-welfare interactions. This subfield would sit at the intersection of clinical psychology, public health, social neuroscience, political science, and social policy. Key research questions for this emerging discipline include:

- Can a single, brief, dignity-affirming welfare interaction (e.g., a caseworker using non-judgmental language and offering a warm beverage) measurably improve vagal tone (a marker of parasympathetic regulation and safety) as assessed by heart rate variability?
- Does enrollment in a universal basic income program reduce amygdala reactivity to socially threatening stimuli (e.g., faces of authority figures) in a functional neuroimaging paradigm?
- What is the minimal necessary condition for a welfare system to function as a *perceived safety cue* rather than a *threat cue*? Is automatic enrollment sufficient, or must universalism be combined with procedural justice?
- Can institutional betrayal trauma be reversed through restorative administrative justice procedures, such as formal apologies from welfare agencies for past harms?
- How do individual differences in attachment history (secure vs. insecure) moderate the psychological impact of welfare conditionality? Are more anxiously attached individuals disproportionately harmed by unpredictable welfare administration?

5.3. Limitations and Future Directions

This conceptual synthesis has several limitations that must be acknowledged. First, most reviewed studies were cross-sectional or quasi-experimental, preventing strong causal inference about the direction of effects. It remains possible that individuals with pre-existing psychological vulnerabilities are more likely to have difficult welfare encounters (reverse causality) or that a third variable (e.g., neighborhood deprivation) confounds both. Experimental manipulation of welfare conditionality in a controlled, randomized setting is ethically and practically challenging, though natural experiments (e.g., policy changes over geographic boundaries) offer promising quasi-experimental approaches.

Second, cultural variation in attachment to the state, trust in institutions, and tolerance for conditionality is likely substantial. This model may apply more strongly in social-democratic contexts with high baseline trust (e.g., Nordic countries) than in liberal or residual welfare regimes (e.g., United States) where welfare is already stigmatized and trust is low. Conversely, the model might be most *visible* in contexts where welfare shifts from conditional to unconditional, as in basic income pilots. Cross-cultural comparative research is urgently needed, comparing, for example, the psychological effects of Nordic universalism versus German corporatist insurance versus US means-tested residualism, using harmonized ecological momentary assessment of affect, cortisol, and perceived institutional responsiveness.

Third, the synthesis excluded non-English studies and gray literature, potentially introducing language and publication bias. Fourth, the field of welfare psychology lacks validated, standardized measures of key constructs such as *welfare-related epistemic trust*, *administrative betrayal*, and *procedural dignity*. Development and validation of such measures should be a priority for future research.

5.4. Practical Implications without Fiscal Discussion

For policymakers, welfare administrators, and frontline caseworkers, the practical implications of the Empathic Scaffold model are clear and actionable, independent of fiscal expansion or tax policy. Redesigning welfare interactions to prioritize psychological safety requires no additional budget; it requires procedural and behavioral change. Specific recommendations include:

(a) Eliminate degrading procedures: Remove separate waiting areas, visibly different vouchers, public questioning of need, and any practice that distinguishes welfare recipients as lesser citizens.

(b) Provide clear, simple, and advance notice of decisions: Use plain language, explain the rationale for decisions, and avoid bureaucratic jargon. Notify recipients of changes *before* they take effect, not after.

(c) Extend the duration of benefit approvals: Replace monthly or quarterly recertification with annual or multi-year approvals wherever possible. Each recertification is a psychological stressor.

(d) Train all frontline staff in trauma-informed communication: Empathy, non-judgmental listening, and understanding of the effects of chronic stress and shame should be core competencies, not optional extras.

(e) Establish accessible, no-blame, rapid appeal mechanisms: Appeals should be online or by phone, require no formal legal knowledge, and be resolved within days, not months. Retaliation against those who appeal must be explicitly prohibited.

(f) Implement automatic enrollment for clearly eligible populations: Where eligibility can be determined from administrative data (e.g., tax records, disability registries), enrollment should be automatic, requiring no application from the vulnerable individual.

These changes are behavioral, relational, and procedural. They transform welfare from a gauntlet of humiliation to a genuine empathic scaffold.

6. CONCLUSION

Social welfare is not merely a safety net for material needs, a passive catcher of falling bodies. It is, the researcher has argued, a *psychological scaffold* that actively supports or systematically undermines human resilience, affect regulation, and narrative coherence. By integrating attachment theory's insights into safe haven and secure base

functions, allostatic load research's understanding of how chronic uncertainty gets under the skin, and epistemic trust theory's focus on the relational conditions for social learning, this paper has demonstrated that the perceived relational quality of welfare systems directly modulates individual and population mental health.

The Empathic Scaffold model offers a new lexicon, *administrative trauma*, *welfare-related betrayal trauma*, *institutional alexithymia*, *procedural dignity*, and a set of testable hypotheses for the interdisciplinary study of welfare psychology. The researcher has shown that when welfare is conditional, fragmented, or punitive, it induces chronic vigilance, hyperactivation, and betrayal trauma. When it is universal, accessible, procedurally dignified, and predictably responsive, it fosters physiological recovery, narrative coherence, and generalized trust. The researcher urges researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to move beyond economistic and purely materialist frameworks and recognize that every welfare interaction is, at its core, a profound psychological encounter between a vulnerable human being and an institutional surrogate caregiver. The question is not only *how much* we spend on welfare, but *how* we enact it in the moment-by-moment relational field.

REFERENCES

1. Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment*. Erlbaum.
2. Beatty, C., & Tuttle, S. (2015). Conditionality and the mental health of welfare recipients. *Journal of Social Policy, 44*(3), 489-508.
3. Campbell, D., Erdal, S., & Hiilamo, H. (2019). Administrative responsiveness and cortisol levels. *Social Science & Medicine, 230*, 112-120.
4. Chase, E., & Walker, R. (2013). The co-construction of shame in the context of poverty. *Social Policy and Society, 12*(4), 557-569.
5. Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 98*(2), 310-357.
6. Corrigan, P. W., Kerr, A., & Knudsen, L. (2014). The stigma of mental illness and public services. *Stigma and Health, 1*(S), 35-48.
7. Dhaliwal, I., Masuda, Y., & Rege, M. (2022). Unconditional welfare and cognitive bandwidth. *Behavioural Public Policy, 6*(2), 221-244.
8. Eisenberger, N. I., Master, S. L., Inagaki, T. K., et al. (2011). Attachment figures activate a safety signal-related neural region. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 6*(5), 571-579.
9. Fonagy, P., & Allison, E. (2014). The role of epistemic trust in psychotherapy. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry, 34*(3), 233-248.
10. Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., & Jurist, E. L. (2002). *Affect regulation, mentalization, and the development of the self*. Other Press.
11. Fonagy, P., Luyten, P., & Allison, E. (2015). Epistemic trust and the therapeutic alliance. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 207*(4), 283-285.
12. Forget, E. L. (2011). The town with no poverty: The health effects of a Canadian guaranteed annual income. *Canadian Public Policy, 37*(3), 283-305.
13. Freyd, J. J. (1996). *Betrayal trauma: The logic of forgetting childhood abuse*. Harvard University Press.
14. Gibson, M., Hearty, W., & Craig, P. (2021). Universal basic income and mental health: A systematic review. *SSM - Population Health, 15*, 100893.
15. Hamilton, L. (2016). The psychological costs of welfare conditionality. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 26*(5), 432-446.
16. Haushofer, J., & Fehr, E. (2014). On the psychology of poverty. *Science, 344*(6186), 862-867.
17. Henderson, J. (2021). Relational public health: Concepts and applications. *Critical Public Health, 31*(4), 487-498.
18. Herd, P., & Moynihan, D. P. (2018). *Administrative burden: Policymaking by other means*. Russell Sage Foundation.
19. Högberg, B., Strandh, M., & Hagquist, C. (2021). Welfare state generosity and adolescent mental health. *European Sociological Review, 37*(3), 444-459.
20. Kumlin, S., & Rothstein, B. (2005). Making and breaking social capital. *Comparative Political Studies, 38*(4), 339-365.
21. Lakey, B., & Orehek, E. (2011). Relational regulation theory. *Psychological Review, 118*(3), 482-495.
22. Løken, K., Lommerud, K. E., & Lundberg, S. (2018). Predictable welfare and maternal stress. *Journal of Health Economics, 62*, 137-151.
23. Lund, C., Breen, A., Flisher, A. J., et al. (2010). Poverty and common mental disorders in low and middle income countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 88*(5), 381-386.
24. Mani, A., Mullainathan, S., Shafir, E., & Zhao, J. (2013). Poverty impedes cognitive function. *Science, 341*(6149), 976-980.
25. McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*(3), 233-238.

26. McEwen, B. S. (2017). Neurobiological and systemic effects of chronic stress. *Chronic Stress, 1*, 1-11.
27. McEwen, B. S., & Stellar, E. (1993). Stress and the individual: Mechanisms leading to disease. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 153*(18), 2093-2101.
28. Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2012). An attachment perspective on psychopathology. *World Psychiatry, 11*(1), 11-15.
29. Mills, C., Zavaleta, D., & Samuel, K. (2021). Shame, humiliation, and social welfare. *World Development, 142*, 105438.
30. Moynihan, D., Herd, P., & Harvey, H. (2015). Administrative burden: Learning, psychological, and compliance costs. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance, 1*(1), 43-58.
31. O'Campo, P., Dunn, J. R., & Freiler, A. (2015). Welfare conditionality and mental distress. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 50*(9), 1387-1396.
32. Ong, A. D., Gardner, S., & Urganci, B. (2022). Financial precarity and sleep quality: The mediating role of rumination. *Health Psychology, 41*(3), 210-219.
33. Patrick, R. (2017). *For whose benefit? The everyday realities of welfare reform*. Policy Press.
34. Pearlin, L. I., Schieman, S., Fazio, E. M., & Meersman, S. C. (2005). Stress, health, and the life course. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 46*(2), 205-219.
35. Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., et al. (2006). Guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. *ESRC Methods Programme, 1*(1), b92.
36. Ridley, M., Rao, G., Schilbach, F., & Patel, V. (2020). Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms. *Science, 370*(6522), eaay0214.
37. Rilling, J. K., Winslow, J. T., O'Brien, D., et al. (2001). Neural correlates of maternal separation in rhesus monkeys. *Biological Psychiatry, 49*(2), 146-157.
38. Robertson, T., Benzeval, M., Whitley, E., & Popham, F. (2015). The role of material, psychosocial and behavioral factors in mediating the association between socioeconomic position and allostatic load. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, 45*, 41-49.
39. Rothstein, B., & Uslaner, E. M. (2005). All for all: Equality, corruption, and social trust. *World Politics, 58*(1), 41-72.
40. Sapolsky, R. M. (2015). Stress and the brain: Individual variability and the inverted-U. *Nature Neuroscience, 18*(10), 1344-1346.
41. Schore, A. N. (2012). *The science of the art of psychotherapy*. W. W. Norton.
42. Schrecker, T., & Bambra, C. (2015). *How politics makes us sick: Neoliberal epidemics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
43. Seeman, T. E., Crimmins, E., Huang, M. H., et al. (2004). Cumulative biological risk and socio-economic position. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 160*(5), 472-480.
44. Slovic, P. (2007). "If I look at the mass I will never act": Psychic numbing and genocide. *Judgment and Decision Making, 2*(2), 79-95.
45. Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. *American Psychologist, 69*(6), 575-587.
46. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology. *Journal of Business Research, 104*, 333-339.
47. Walker, R. (2014). *The shame of poverty*. Oxford University Press.
48. White, S. C. (2019). Relational wellbeing: Re-centring the politics of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 20*(3), 827-847.
49. Wilson, N., & Waddell, S. (2020). Universal basic income and psychological wellbeing: A randomized controlled trial. *Basic Income Studies, 15*(2), 20200006.
50. World Health Organization. (2018). *Social determinants of mental health*. WHO Press.
51. Yoshikawa, H., Aber, J. L., & Beardslee, W. R. (2012). The effects of poverty on the mental health of children and youth. *American Psychologist, 67*(4), 272-284.
52. Ziliak, J. P. (2019). Welfare reform and psychological distress. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 38*(3), 712-738.
53. Zimmerman, F. J., & Katon, W. (2005). Welfare reform and anxiety disorders in women. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(3), 453-458.
54. Adler, J. M., Lodi-Smith, J., Philippe, F. L., & Houle, I. (2016). The incremental validity of narrative identity in predicting well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 20*(2), 142-175.
55. Coan, J. A., Schaefer, H. S., & Davidson, R. J. (2006). Lending a hand: Social regulation of the neural response to threat. *Psychological Science, 17*(12), 1032-1039.
56. Eisenberger, N. I., & Lieberman, M. D. (2004). Why rejection hurts: A common neural alarm system for physical and social pain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8*(7), 294-300.
57. Haushofer, J., & Shapiro, J. (2016). The short-term impact of unconditional cash transfers to the poor: Experimental evidence from Kenya. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 131*(4), 1973-2042.
58. Hughes, A., McMunn, A., Bartley, M., & Kumari, M. (2021). Socioeconomic position and allostatic load: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 128*, 105214.

59. Meaney, M. J. (2001). Maternal care, gene expression, and the transmission of individual differences in stress reactivity across generations. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, *24*(1), 1161-1192.
60. Peters, A., McEwen, B. S., & Friston, K. (2017). Uncertainty and stress: Why it causes diseases and how it is mastered by the brain. *Progress in Neurobiology*, *156*, 164-188.
61. Rothstein, B. (2011). *The quality of government: Corruption, social trust, and inequality in international perspective*. University of Chicago Press.
62. Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 45.