Pierson, Paul. 2000. “Three Worlds of Welfare State Research.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 33 (6/7): 791-821.

Concern for explaining welfare state variation is a major preoccupation of comparative research on ‘affluent democracies’. Overviews work on welfare state research in the last decade, focusing on three agendas in particular: 1) more nuanced work on political economy, 2) highlighting gender issues, and 3) treatment as long-term macro-historical process. Argues that previous work on welfare states tended to treat social distribution as separate from systems of production (independent of economy). The most prominent approach was called *power resources theory*, which emphasized organized workers’ ability to secure greater decommodification (zero-sum class conflict over social provision). Newer work rejects this simplification and acknowledges that “social programs and regulations significantly modify employer and union behavior” (pg.793) and encourages scholars to consider how welfare state programs influence specific economic actions (e.g., hiring and firing workers, training costs, investments in human capital). “Recent scholarship has demonstrated that there are in fact quite different politico-economic configurations within the universe of affluent democracies, with particular types of welfare states strongly associated with distinct systems of economic organization” (pg. 794). The author also points out changing patterns in employment in different sectors (e.g., service versus manufacturing). In addition to reframing the topic along the lines of gender, “[a] grand tradition in welfare state research has treated distinct national systems of social provision as the products of long periods of industrialization and has stressed the need to study these developmental processes” (pg. 809; see also *conjunctural causation*).

Pierson, Paul. 1996. “The New Politics of the Welfare State.” *World Politics,* 48 (1): 143-179.

“The tremendous twentieth-century expansion of social programs has been a remarkable feature of advanced industrial societies” (pg. 143). Differentiates between the processes of welfare state *expansion* and *retrenchment* (reduction). The essay examines the ‘foundations’ for analyzing welfare state retrenchment, arguing that extant theories for welfare state expansion are not applicable to explaining welfare state retrenchment because policymakers’ goals and the political context are different. There are several theories used to explain welfare state expansion. The first relates it to economic growth, suggesting that “strong economies produce strong welfare states…[the] ‘logic of industrialism’ encourages a convergence of national social policy models…based on asserted consequences of global economic change” (pg. 148). A second theory is *power resources*, which attributes variation in social welfare provision to differences in the distribution of political resources among classes. “According to power resource theorists, strong unions and left parties contribute to the growth of these programs” (pg. 150). A third theory emphasizes the role of institutions. “Institutions establish the rules of the game for political struggles—influencing group identities, policy preferences, and coalitional choices, and enhancing the bargaining power of some groups while devaluing that of others. Institutions also affect government capacities…” (pg. 152). “Institutionalists make two broad claims about welfare state development. First, strong states are likely to produce strong welfare states…where political authority is fragmented, entrenched minorities will often block social legislation…[t]he second central institutional argument concerns policy legacies, or feedback” (pgs. 152-153).

Briggs, Asa. 1961. “The Welfare State in Historic Perspective.” *Archives Européennes de Sociologie,* 2(2): 221-258.

The phrase ‘welfare state’ was first used to describe Labour Britain after 1945, after which “[h]istorians also took over the phrase” (pg. 9). Notes that early usage of the phrase rarely defined it, and embued it with democratic sentiment (e.g., social rights). “‘Welfare states’ were fruits of ‘social democracy’” (pg. 10). Such research was also focused on explaining developments in Britain and treated it as unique. However, “[t]he trends and tendencies which led journalists, politicians and historians to apply the label ‘welfare state’ to Britain may be noted in all modern industrialised communities. They have influenced non-industrialised communities also” (pg. 11).

Definition: “A ‘welfare state’ is a state in which organized power is deliberately used (through politics and administration) in an effort to modify the play of market forces in at least three directions—first, by guaranteeing individuals and families a minimum income irrespective of the market value of their work or their property; second, but narrowing the extent of insecurity by enabling individuals and families to meet certain ‘social contingencies’ (for example, sickness, old age and unemployment) which lead otherwise to individual and family crises; and third, by ensuring that all citizens without distinction of status or class are offered the best standards available in relation to a certain agreed range of social services” (pg. 14).

Argues that merely defining the phrase that way limits the focus to modern and industrialized economies. [Note: must have state before ‘welfare *state*’, must have industry before ‘*welfare*’] Underscores difficulty of pinning down the temporal domain of this area of research: “Policies despite the finalism of much of the post-1945 criticism, are never fixed for all time” (pg. 16). Notes five ‘historical considerations’ regarding conceptualization of the welfare state: “Each of these five historical considerations deserves fuller treatment. The texture is often complex. There have been markedly different chronologies of development and different answers have been given in different countries to the same set of leading questions” (pg. 18). Outlines five factors in twentieth-century ‘welfare’ history: 1) basic transformation of attitudes toward poverty; 2) investigation into ‘social contingencies’ that required policy; 3) close association between unemployment and welfare; 4) development of ‘welfare’ philosophies and practices within market capitalism; and 5) influence of working-class pressures.

<Archived Offe 1982>

Scruggs, Lyle A. and James P. Allan. 2008. “Social Stratification and Welfare Regimes for the Twenty-First Century: Revisiting ‘The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism’.” *World Politics,* 60(4): 642-664.

Reevaluates Esping-Andersen’s indices of social stratification with new data, finding limited support for the typology.

From E-A: “[Welfare] states may be equally large or comprehensive, but with entirely different effects on social structure.

One may cultivate hierarchy and status, another dualisms, and a third universalism. Each case will produce its own unique fabric of social solidarity” (pg. 58). Social policy in *conservative* welfare regimes aims primarily to preserve traditional status differences in society, while *liberal* regimes pursue the opposite. *Social democracy* pursues policies that emphasize universalism across class lines. Reflections of conservative are “the segmentation of public pension programs based upon major occupational categories (corporatism) and the extent of pension expenditure on government employees as a percentage of gross domestic product (etatism)” (pg. 646). Welfare state corporatism is meant to capture the extent to which the state reinforces segmentation by providing different levels of welfare for different occupations, based on status. Three factors represent liberal welfare: “[t]he first highlights the importance of means-tested benefits (poor relief); the second emphasizes the importance of private pensions for securing individual income security in old age (private pension share); and the third captures the importance of private health spending in total health expenditure” (pg. 646). Factors that characterize social democratic welfare regimes are “program universalism, which is measured as the portion of the workforce eligible for benefits in three social insurance programs: unemployment, sickness, and old-age pensions. The second is the equality of benefits, measured as the ratio of basic benefit to maximum allowable benefit averaged over the three above-mentioned programs” (pg. 646).

Note that “[t]he underlying measures and data used to construct the stratification index were originally presented together in the book’s tables” (pg. 646). The authors use the Comparative Welfare Entitlements Data, which are based on identical concepts. The appendix to Chapter 3 of *Three Worlds* gives the scoring method used to construct the stratification indices.

“Our reassessment suggests that these original results too good to be true, as seen in Table 5. First, our results two countries - Canada and Denmark - score high on while four - Belgium, Ireland, New Zealand, and Norway on zero dimensions. Moreover, all of the latter four cases on two dimensions and low on one.34 Thus, reanalysis stratification patterns in the early 1980s suggests that these countries do not have a clear stratification profile. A country scores on all three stratification dimensions the three indices collapse onto a single dimension” (pg. 661).

<Archived Titmuss 1965>

Titmuss, Richard M. 1974. “What is Social Policy?” in Brian Abel-Smith and Kay Titmuss (eds), *Social Policy: An Introduction*, Chapter 2, New York, NY: Pantheon Books, 23-32.

Covers some simple but fundamental concepts. Policy refers to principles that govern actions towards a particular ends, and concerns things that we can change. Social policy (or a system of social welfare) is “part of the self-regulatory mechanisms built into a ‘natural’ social system.” Social policy is not necessary good, but can be ‘illfare’ as much as ‘welfare’. The author describes different definitions of social policy. Models of the welfare state that he outlines are the ‘Residual Welfare Model of Social Policy’ (only offered/to be used when other sources fail), the ‘Industrial Achievement-Performance Model of Social Policy’ (rewarding need based on merit and productivity), and the ‘Institutional Redistributive Model of Social Policy’ (“providing universalist services outside the market on the basis of need”). “These three models are, of course, only very broad approximations…However, these approximations do serve to indicate the major differences—the ends of the value spectrum—in the views held about the means and ends of social policy.”

Castles, Frances G. 2008. “What Welfare States Do: A Disaggregated Expenditure Approach.” *Journal of Social Policy*, 38(1): 45-62.

Discusses two ways of studying welfare: the ‘social rights of citizenship approach’ and using program expenditure data. Extant criticism was that “[b]y scoring welfare states on spending, we assume that all spending counts equally” (Esping-Andersen 1990, pg. 19). Author argues that *aggregate* expenditure data is not enough because not all spending counts the same.

“Esping-Andersen’s solution to the problem of the incommensurability of different types of welfare spending is to measure the size and success of welfare states by a different yardstick: namely, the extent to which welfare state benefits provide ‘de-commodified’ social rights of citizenship. In effect, what this amounts to is a measure, not of the size of aggregate state spending, but of the eligibility criteria by which individuals qualify as beneficiaries of the welfare state and the generosity with which these individuals are treated” (pg. 46).

Notes that at the time of E-A, data were not available to look in-depth at social spending.

Examines OECD Social Expenditure Database (SOCX). In regression models estimating amount of each type of welfare state expenditure, controls are percent of population over 65, left parties total share of cabinet seats, percentage Roman Catholic, imports and exports as a percent of GDP, GDP growth, and unemployment rate.

Kemeny, Jim. 1995. “Theories of Power in *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*.” *Journal of European Social Policy*, 5(2): 87-96.

Despite contribution of *The Three Worlds*, it has received criticism of two kinds. The first is that it is male-centric and understates gender inequalities in the commodification of labor across welfare states. The second type of critique questions the stability and number of classes in the typology (e.g., Leibfried 1991, Castles and Mitchell 1990, Kangas 1994).

“However, neither kind of critique takes issue with the most important contribution…the attempt to develop a typology of welfare states that is based on an analysis of power. Esping-Andersen distinguishes between welfare *systems* and welfare *regimes* that generate and uphold them. Heis therefore centrally concerned to explain the power structures underlying different systems of welfare” (pg. 88).

Argues that scholars have confounded the notion of welfare *regimes* and welfare *systems*.

Great summary: “The shift of emphasis away from quantifying welfare to distinguishing between different types of welfare systems underpinned by different welfare regimes is Esping-Andersen’s most important contribution, and can be summarized briefly. Residual welfare systems tend to be associated with countries possessing liberal welfare regimes, comprehensive welfare systems with social democratic welfare regimes, and conservative welfare systems with corporatist welfare regimes. The ideological principles underlying welfare systems reflect patterns of class power. Thus, the residual system of welfare is the product of a liberal philosophy of minimal state intervention that both reflects and sustains large class differences in terms of commodification. The conservative system of welfare is based on a corporatist power structure in which major vested interests are concerted by means of a strong central state, to generate a welfare system in which benefits are distributed in such a way as to reflect the relative power of the parties involved. The result is a segmented welfare system. Finally, the comprehensive system is the product of a power structure in which a strong labour movement has ensured that socialist principles are well entrenched in the welfare system and in which equality in the distribution of decommodified benefits is well-developed. The concept of welfare regime is central to Espmg-Andersen’s schema. A welfare regime can be described as a system of social security stratification that is the product of a particular constellation of power in society. Esping- Andersen argues that the emergence of diverse types of welfare regime is the product of different outcomes in terms of what he terms class mobilization. He argues that the balance of power between different classes in society—and the political coalitions that are formed out of this—structures systems of welfare. This differential structuring of power relationships between classes in modern societies is a political and policy-making process that makes it possible to distinguish between different types of welfare regimes. Esping-Andersen’s thesis is therefore much more than a descriptive typology of welfare states. It is ultimately founded on an analysis of power relationships between social classes.” (pg. 89).

Note: differences is about structuring of class relations and principles in the form of a welfare regime

Explains framing of book and theory based on the Scandinavian case

Note: “Esping-Andersen rejects explanations of the differential development of welfare states in terms of the power of the working class—or as he puts it, ‘a simple class-mobilization theory of welfare-state development’ (Esping-Andersen 1990:32). Instead, he argues that the decisive factor is the ability of the working class to form political coalitions. This is, in turn, influenced by the pattern of working class political formation and the institutionalization of class preferences and political behavior. Esping-Andersen’s typology of welfare regimes reflects the different strategies adopted by the working class and its differential ability to mobilize other classes behind its preferred model of welfare” (pg. 93).

“Comprehensive welfare states are the fruits of a class mobilization based on a coalition between working class and farm worker plus white-collar interests (labor movement hegemony)… Conservative welfare states are the product of a less complete mobilization in which middle class loyalties are forged by segmenting welfare into a stratified system… Residual welfare states are the product of weak middle class mobilization behind the welfare state, in which their interests are largely met by the market but a much-reduced welfare state is tolerated for the working class (pgs. 93-94).

On a *neo-Gramscian* framework: “Gramsci (1971) argued that the working class cannot succeed in achieving its aims without enlisting the support of other interests and so must build broad-based coalitions, or blocs, which it leases and concerts through exercising moral leadership, or what Gramsci termed *hegemony*” (pg. 93).

Standing, Guy. 1991. “Book Review: The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.” *Journal of European Social Policy*, 1(1): 71-75.

Key terms and phrases captured in book review are: ‘systems/structuralist approach’, ‘the institutional approach derived from Polanyi’, ‘class mobilization thesis’, and the ‘class coalition approach [derived from Barrington Moore]’.

“Esping-Andersen claims that it is incorrect to explain the welfare state by reference to actual spending… He prefers to focus on Marshall’s social citizenship, considering the extent to which the welfare state ‘decommodifies’ and judging what he perceives as the three forms of welfare provision by that criterion—social assistance (rights attached to need), social insurance (rights attached to contributions) and ’Beveridge-type citizens’ benefit’ (p. 22). He depicts the welfare state as also a varied system of stratification. The social assistance model is depicted as promoting social dualism, the social insurance one as consolidating divisions among wage earners (with a labyrinth of status-specific insurance funds), while the universalistic one supposedly inadvertently promotes dualism because those who can afford it opt for private insurance” (pg. 71).

“What is a welfare state regime? Esping- Andersen defines it as a specific arrangement of institutional determinants of social rights and stratification by means of the state, market and family (p. 26). He then ctusters countries into a liberal welfare state (e.g. USA, lumped uneasily with Australia and Canada), the corporatist welfare (Austria, France, Germany, Italy) and the social democratic regime, which presumably covers the Scandinavian countries” (pg. 72).

“The author defines the decommodification of social policies by ease of access, long duration of entitlement, high income replacement and broad range of entitlements” (pg. 72).

“The claim [of Chapter 3] is that there are three models of stratification - traditional status conservatism (producing ’etatist paternalism’, social assistance, corporatism and status-differentiated social insurance), liberal social policy (based on free markets and leading to ’dualism’ and individual market insurance), and socialist social policy (geared to solidarity stratified by the nature of either fraternal associations or trade unions)” (pg. 72).

Gingrich, Jane. 2015. “Coalitions, policies, and distribution: Esping-Andersen’s Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism.” In *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis*, James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (eds.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pgs. 67-96.

“The core argument in Three Worlds is that advanced capitalist democracies vary not only in how much they spend on social welfare but also in how they spend on it. Understanding welfare capitalism requires examining how packages of institutions, both in the state and the market, interact to produce particular types of distributive outcomes…Both the core typology of Three Worlds and Esping-Andersen's broader analytic shift in emphasis [is] toward understanding welfare institutions as the product of particular historical struggles…” (Summary)

“First, Esping-Andersen's aim is to understand one of the central large-scale shifts in twentieth-century politics: the rise and operation of welfare institutions. To do so, he argues that we cannot hive off a single institution (e.g., gross social spending, labor market policy) from other institutions. Nor can we understand the way institutions operate in an abstract or temporally independent way. Rather, Three Worlds argues that the structure of the labor market and the state work in tandem, in configurations, to shape broader power relationships and outcomes” (Summary).

“Second, Esping-Andersen, like many both before and after him, conceptualizes the politics of the welfare state as a product of the tension between the inequality produced by capitalism and the equality of parliamentary democracy. Yet, the resolution of this tension is neither uniform nor linear but a product of particular political struggles” (Summary).

<Archived Kuhnle and Sander 2010>

Isakjee, Arshad. 2017. “Welfare State Regimes: a Literature Review.” IRiS Working Paper Series, No. 18. University of Birmingham.

Provides a literature review of research on welfare states

Note that welfare state research fairly new, considering that Esping-Andersen was published in 1990.

“Welfare states are rarely constructed during sudden or radical revolutions, but rather through slower social and political evolutions. Democratic capitalist societies tend to utilise state-led welfare provision in addition to any market-led, civil-society produced or family-centred models of provision and care (Arts and Gelissen 2002: 139)” (pg. 5).

Criticisms of E-A (1990) are that the sample was small and there are additional ‘types’ of welfare states (Mediterranean, East Asian, Post-Soviet), failure to consider healthcare, gender (and race) blindness, and ignorance of the potential for local decommodification.

An alternative is Hall and Soskice (2001), whose dualist model is based on the ways that firms organize and their relation to the market and distinguishes between *liberal market economy* (LME) or *coordinate market economy* (CME).

It is important to consider the ‘spheres’ that motivate Hall and Soskice (2001):

* Industrial relations: ways that companies manage workers and bargaining
* Vocational: whether workers have generalized or sector-specific skills
* Corporate governance: reliance on patient capital or short-term returns
* Inter-firm relations: extent of cooperation or competition between firms
* Employee relations; whether management and employees reach decisions collaboratively

My guess is that nondemocracies are more likely to be liberal market economies (except post-Soviet?)

“Amable [2005] considered five variables: product markets, labour markets, financial systems, social protection and education systems” (pg. 7).

Could we get data across regimes?

Are autocracies—especially poorer countries—more likely to have family-based protection rather than state-provided welfare?

<Shelved Arts and Gelissen 2010>

Keane, John. 1984. “Introduction”. In *Contraditions of the Welfare State*, John Keane (ed.). London: Hutchinson.

“Late capitalist societies are analyzed as systems structured by three interdependent but differently organized subsystems. These subsystems include the structures of *socialization* (such as the household) which are guided by normative rules; the commodity production and exchange relationships of the capitalist *economy*; and the welfare *state*, organized by the mechanisms of political and administrative power and coercion. The welfare state is interpreted, from this perspective, as a multi-functional and heterogeneous set of political and administrative institutions whose purpose is to manage the structures of socialization and the capitalist economy” (pgs. 12-13).

“Offe rejects the narrow and conventional understanding of the welfare state as the provider of social services. 5 He argues that, since the end of the Second World War, the political subsystem has perfon'ned a coordinating role which is central to the whole social system. Welfare states have been broadly defined by the goal of 'crisis management', that is, the regulation of the processes of socialization and capital accumulation within their adjacent or 'flanking' subsystems. For example, welfare states have sought to guarantee the survival of privately-controlled exchange processes by minimizing their self-paralysing tendencies. In tum, this economic strategy has depended upon the formal recognition of the actual power of trade unions in the process of collective bargaining and public policy-making and administration. Welfare state administrations have also sought to correct and regulate the processes of socialization through, for example, legal transfers of resources to various groups whose life chances had been damaged systematically by market exchange processes. Offe points out that the former popularity and effectiveness of these welfare state policies of crisis management has been derived, to some extent, from their multi-functional character and reliance upon various techniques of intervention, such as bureaucratic regulation, monetary transfers and professional expertise” (pg. 13).

Control for bureaucracy and professionalism/meritocracy?

“Offe argues that welfare states are rapidly ceasing to be a viable solution to the socio-political problems generated by late capitalist societies because the systems of economic and social life are not in harmony with the requirements of the administrative-political system. The 'panacea' of state intervention and regulation itself becomes controversial. Welfare state systems generate more policy failures, political conflict and social resistance than they are capable of resolving; the crisis management strategies of the welfare state themselves become subject to new forms of crisis tendency” (pg. 14).

“Offe reasons that this imperative of respecting capital's independent powers of investment and control over the economy cannot in practice be realized” (pg. 15).

More easily encroached upon in dictatorships…

Referring generally to the 'cyclical dynamics' or 'anarchic' character of capitalist accumulation processes, his thesis tends to rely upon a version of the familiar Marxian theory of the 'socialization of production' (essays two and three). Capitalist economic processes are said to accelerate the growth of forms of collective action to remedy the consequences of the operations of individual units of capital. In other words, the 'movement of private capital’ systematically produces collectively-experienced outcomes, such as the decay of inner cities caused by capitalist disinvestment and real estate policies, the pollution of regional ecosystems, and a rise in unemployment levels due to the capitalist 'modernization' of industry…The implication is that the overall survival of the 'unregulated' sphere of capitalist exchange depends upon the continuous application of forms of 'collective regulation'” (pg. 16).

“Under conditions of welfare state capitalism, …state expenditures persistently tend to outrun state revenues” (pg. 19)

Assisted by natural resources?

Argues that welfare state planning hampered by lack of co-ordination between state bureaucracies and agencies’ lack of independence from the “rules and outcomes of representative democratic institutions and party competition” (pg. 21).

“[T]he traditional liberal-democratic institutions of conflict articulation and resolution - elections, political parties, legislatures, judiciaries - are increasingly supplemented or replaced by informal 'corporatist' schemes of functional representation and bargaining” (pg. 22).

Offe argued that contradictions of the welfare state created legitimation problems. “He insists that welfare state capitalist systems can legitimate their relations of command and obedience only to a very limited degree” (pg. 23).

Consider differences between ‘regime types’ and embrace of capitalism (e.g. military regimes). How does that affect their view of welfare provision?

“In his view, the contradictions of the contemporary welfare state are better understood as responsible for generating destabilizing situations or crisis tendencies, the deepening or overcoming of which continuously depends upon social struggles and political manoeuvrings…constantly subject to transformations by the activity of social power groups and

movements. Welfare state institutions are, thus, viewed as both the medium and outcome of struggles over the distribution of power within the realms of society and the state” (pg. 26).

Notes three forms of contemporary ‘resistance’ to the welfare state: 1) New Right (prefers recommodification and laissez-faire); 2) corporatism, which aims “to develop a consensus among power elites in order to readjust welfare state policy-making and administration to the requirements of the economic subsystem” (pgs. 27-28) ; 3) democratic socialism.