

Mehmet Atilla Güler

ORCID: 0000-0001-6910-2134
Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University¹

The concept of the welfare state and typologies of welfare regimes: A review

Summary

The welfare state expresses an institutionalized structure after World War II. Among the studies on the welfare state, the classification-centered ones have a special place. The studies on the classification of the welfare state have improved in the period of institutionalization. The first studies on this subject mainly focused on the level of social spending, the scope of social security systems, and the provision of welfare services. In spite of the precursor works, the generally accepted approach to the classification of welfare states is based on the work carried out by Esping-Andersen in 1990. Esping-Andersen updated his views in 1999 with a new study. This study aims to expose the studies on the classification of welfare states. Accordingly, first of all, precursor studies have been explained, and then the modeling of Esping-Andersen has been laid out. In the last part of the study, criticism has been put about the modeling of Esping-Andersen.

Key words: the welfare state, welfare regimes, Gøsta Esping-Andersen

¹ Correspondence: Mehmet Atilla Güler, Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Faculty of Economics of Administrative Sciences No: 328, Karaman-Turkey; author's email address: atillaguler@kmu.edu.tr

Introduction

The welfare state is one of the most important concepts of advanced capitalism. It can be said that there are three main views that come to the fore in the literature for the historical development and definition of the welfare state. According to the first view, the welfare state is a structure that emerged after a series of historical events based on the re-sharing of power and wealth as a result of a comprehensive change in the balance of power between labor and capital in Western Europe. This view considers the welfare state as a structure that provides a significant advance in people's living and working conditions and thus has received great support from the society (Wahl, 2011, pp. 4–5). The second view treats the welfare state as a subsidiary of the market mechanism. The regulatory nature of the welfare state situates at the center of this approach. In this context, the welfare state arranges the rules of the market mechanism, ensures its survival and assumes the task of redistributing the income which obtains by capital accumulation (Walker, Wong, 2004, p. 120). The third and final view explains the welfare state for the historical process based on the expansion of citizenship rights. This approach considers the development of civil, political, and social rights as the basis of modern society by referring to Marshall. The welfare state plays a central role in the creation of these rights (Boje, 1996, p. 24).

The Concept of Welfare State

There are many definitions in the literature explaining the welfare state. Evaluation of all of these definitions exceeds the limits of this study. For this reason, it is useful to emphasize the points that are most emphasized in the conceptualization of the welfare state. The authors who develop a definition of the welfare state can move from very different points. The most common starting points in the related definitions are as follows:

The welfare state has been considered as a response to the understanding of individualism that has left individuals and societies unprotected from the beginning of the 19th century (Castel, 2017, p. 38).

The welfare state can be explained as the product of an organized and powerful class struggle. This approach explains the welfare state through class struggle. The division of social surplus between classes and democratic representation is centered on this view. The representation of labor at the parliamentary level and the social democratic parties representing labor are also important here (Baldwin, 1992, p. 702).

Some approaches evaluate the welfare state as complementary to the market economy. The point highlighted in this approach is the corrective nature of the welfare state against market failures. In this regard, on the one hand, the welfare state ensures that the rules of the market mechanism are rearranged and on the other hand, it provides the redistribution of the income obtained by capital accumulation (Walker, Wong, 2004, p. 120). Redistribution of income is one of the most commonly used points in the definition

of the welfare state. At this point, vertical redistribution, horizontal redistribution based on needs, redistribution among different groups, insurance, the rationale of activity, life cycle distribution, compensation of family needs and external benefits are emphasized (Hills, 2012, pp. 191–192).

Some writers consider the welfare state as a historical process based on the constant expansion of citizenship rights. According to Marshall (1950), the development of civil, political and social rights forms the basis of modern society and the existence and institutions of the welfare state play an important role in creating these rights.

In some of the approaches explaining the welfare state, socio-economic practices are taken to the center. Accordingly, the welfare state aims to overcome the economic, social and political inequalities caused by capitalism. At this point, unifying and egalitarian practices will be stronger in the countries where the working class is strong (Therborn, 1986, p. 150).

In some definitions in the literature, the welfare state is identified with social security. According to these approaches, it is embodied by the public administration of welfare and social risks.

Some of the definitions of the welfare state that corresponded in the literature by following per under the above explanations are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Different Welfare State Conceptualizations

Author	Concept	The main topic mentioned
Beveridge, 1942	With a social security system based on the principle of universality, it is a structure that aims to eliminate the problem of poverty which defined as “the disgrace of the contemporary society” and deepening after World War II.	Fight against poverty and universality
Briggs, 1961	The welfare state is a state which organizes power is used consciously to change market forces in at least three directions (minimum income security, narrowing the scope of social uncertainties, social services).	State intervention
Titmuss, 1974¹	The welfare state is a clear declaration of willpower for the survival of some people through the control of risks, and democracy is the instrument that makes it possible to express this declaration of will.	Control of social risks
Gough, 1979	The welfare state is based on balancing the asymmetric power relationship between labor and capital through the struggle of the working class and expanding the scope of social policies, regulating rights and private sector activities such as social security, health, education and housing provided to individuals and their families.	Class struggle and regulation

Table 1. Cont.

Author	Concept	The main topic mentioned
Flora & Heidenheimer, 1981	It is embodied by the welfare state, industrial society, capitalism, international system, nation-state, mass democracy, family and society. In this sense, the welfare state is a form of state that provides minimum income guarantee to individuals and their families, protects them against social dangers, develops social security opportunities and sets standards guaranteed by legislation, in particular for education, health, and housing.	Historical context and comprehensive approach
Parry, 1984	The structure, which is organized on a collective level to alleviate the effects of various social problems, especially health, poverty, unemployment and old age, is called the welfare state.	Management of social problems
Berger, 1990	The welfare state includes the expansion of social management, the expansion of the social security system, the mass consumption and the institutionalization of the class struggle through the trade union's legitimacy in the public sphere.	Transformation of the relation between market and state
Castel, 1995²	The welfare state is a security state that has historically been based on the idea of "Social Europe", which is formed around the rights created by social insurance and constitutes the new property regime.	Social security-based understanding
Méda, 1995³	The welfare state is a structure that guarantees all members of the society to reach a certain level in social life in a way that identifies with employment and aims to provide more prosperity to the working class in this regard.	Employment and welfare-based on employment
Amoroso, 1996	The welfare state is a structure formed by the articulation of social policies, education, financial health policy, and labor market policy.	Articulation of different intervention areas
Esping-Andersen, 1999⁴	The welfare state is one of the three sources that control social risks together with the family and the market and is explained in different models.	Management of social risks
Fujimura, 2000	It is a structure based on the realization of state intervention in the economic field to provide full employment based on the existence of human rights and social rights that support the establishment of the system under the administration center of the nation-state on an ideological level and broadens the scope of social security.	Emphasis on the role of the nation-state, ideological foundations of the system and state intervention

Author	Concept	The main topic mentioned
Lindbeck, 2006	It is the state model that focuses on the cash assistance and various care services to be provided to households in a narrow sense, and price arrangements, housing policy, working life regulation and environmental policies in the broad sense.	Reference to historical and actual problems of social policy

¹ Tittmuss' description is cited from Offe, 1987: 508–509.

² This description was originally taken from Castel's book which entitled *Les métamorphoses de la question sociale: Une chronique du salariat* and published in 1995. In this study, the work translated into Turkish in 2017 was used.

³ This description was originally taken from Méda's book which entitled *Le Travail, une Valeur en Voie de Disparition* and published in 1995. In this study, the work translated into Turkish in 2012 was used.

⁴ Esping-Andersen treats the welfare state as one of three sources controlling social risks, together with family and market. Esping-Andersen chose to use the welfare state concept in his first study (1990) and then use the notion of welfare regime in second (1999). Despite the differentiation in naming, the equivalent of two concepts in literature is the same. Esping-Andersen argues that the basic principles of the welfare state are not distributed linearly around a common denominator. There are three different welfare state regimes clustered according to different organizational logics and stratification (social democrat, conservative-corporatist, liberal). Esping-Andersen also points out that his approach deals with the welfare state with a broader perspective on the economic-political context. Concordantly, Esping-Andersen asserts that he re-conceptualizes the welfare state by highlighting social rights, social stratification, and the public-private mix.

Source: own elaboration.

While the welfare state can be defined in different ways, the historical development of this structure can also be examined in the context of different periodizations. It is stated that the term welfare state was first used in France during the Second Empire period (1852–1870). On the other hand, in Germany, the concept of the welfare state was used for the first time by the “Kathedersozialisten-socialists of the chair” in the 1870s, and from the 1880s it was associated with the social security measures of the Bismarck period. Finally, in the United Kingdom, the use of the concept of “welfare policy” took place until the 19th century, but the use of the welfare state as a concept took place after the Second World War (Rosanvallon, 2004, p. 119). The exposition of the historical development of the welfare state on the axis of different periods also exceeds the limits of this study. Nevertheless, concerning Therbörn, at least the idea of periodisation can be expressed. Therbörn (1984, p. 31) lists the stages of the welfare state as experience (1870–1920), integration (1930–1940), expansion (1950–1960), and reformulation (after 1970). Almost all of the studies on the welfare state are based on this classification or a similar approach is adopted.

Studies on the Classification of Welfare States

The approach adopted in the literature on the welfare state models was developed by Esping-Andersen. The classification of Esping-Andersen is even based upon by social democrats, liberals, conservatives, and even Marxists. While some of these groups accept the classification as valid, some of them criticise it for theoretical or empirical reasons. On the other hand, there are some precursor studies about classification before Esping-Andersen. Therefore, it is useful to mention these studies briefly before analysing Esping-Andersen's classification.

Precursor Studies

The beginning of the studies on the classification of the welfare state started in the expansion period. Historically, it can be seen that the mentioned studies have emerged in the post-World War II. The first aim of modeling the welfare states was to reveal the difference between the United States and European countries during the institutionalization phase of the welfare state (Petersen, 2013, p. 232).

Wilensky and Lebeaux's work in 1958 is highlighted as a starting point for the studies of the classification of the welfare state. After this study, the main problem of the classifications was the historical differences between systems and regimes and the economic, social, and political changes shaped according to these differences. Wilensky and Lebeaux analyzed the welfare states under two headings as "residual" and "institutional". In residual regimes, welfare-seeking units are primarily family and market. The state only comes into play when these two units are in observance. On the other hand, in the institutional welfare regime, the function of providing welfare belongs directly to the state. Wilensky later argued that countries with different social conditions and lifestyles differed in terms of welfare states because of the development of industrialisation and production growth. The parameters which used in the classification by the Wilensky are the share of social expenditure in the national income, the proportion of the elderly to the total population and the maturity level of the social security system. Wilensky is considered the principal representative of the traditional welfare state sociology. This approach relates to the welfare state in the increase in social spending in the GDP. Accordingly, the increase in social spending affects the level of representation of the political parties in the parliament and the share of the population from the economic development (Gough, 1979, pp. 7–9; Esping-Andersen, 1999, p. 47; Mingione, 2001, p. 1044).

Titmuss sees the welfare state as evidence of the human desire to survive as an organic whole. Also, the welfare state means that the public declares a clear spine to help some people to survive. As to him, political democracy is the manifestation of this spine. In his first work, Titmuss (1958) made a dual distinction between "residual" and "institutional". Titmuss states that in the residual regime the state takes responsibility only in case of failure caused by the family or the market. On the other hand, the institutional regime adopts a universalist approach. The second model aims to fulfill all

the promises made about welfare. Titmuss (1974) classified welfare states in a new way as “residual,” “industrial achievement-performance,” and “institutional redistributive” by triple separation. In the residual model, the state only intervenes to help the poor. In the industrial achievement-performance model, welfare services such as education, health, and social security are provided by the state. And in the institutional redistributive model, the state provides services that correspond to the needs of all citizens within the framework of the principle of universality (Offe, 1987, pp. 508–509). Esping-Andersen (1990, p. 20) argues that Titmuss’ approach paves the way for new studies in comparative welfare state research.

Esping-Andersen’s Welfare State Classification

Esping-Andersen is considered as one of the names who use the historian approach in social policy. He is also among the founders of the social democratic theory of the welfare state. Esping-Andersen and his followers, who are examining all nations experiencing the of industrialisation and modernisation process with a functionalist approach on the axis of welfare state models, stated that although industrialized countries had different kinds of social policies, there was much benevolence among them. In this context, generous and wide-ranging social policies could be implemented in the structures where the working class and the parties representing the class were strong and well organized, whereas, in those places where these conditions were not provided, social programs could not be implemented to the same extent (Baldwin, 1992, p. 701).

As regard to Esping-Andersen (1999, pp. 33–34), it is possible to find the roots of the welfare state in the 19th-century reformism. Nevertheless, essentially, the welfare state can be characterized as a specific historical structure that emerged between the 1930s and 1970s. The promise of the welfare state is the restructuring of the social contract between the state and the citizen, as well as reducing the social diseases and redistributing the main risks. According to Esping-Andersen, stratification is an important part of the welfare state. On the one hand, social policy handles the problems of stratification, but on the other hand, it reproduces them. The main reason for this problem is the uncertainty of the goal of equality of the welfare state. Esping-Andersen’s modeling refers to the works of Weber in explaining the stratification. Weber proposes to develop a bird’s-eye approach to the characteristics of any social or historical situation/process and recommends that simplification and detail should be avoided. Weber was interested in the ideal type, individual, and holistic. Similarly, the ideal welfare regimes of Esping-Andersen are also holistic. When this approach is considered for the modeling of Esping-Andersen, it can be said that the basic tools required for comparison and measurement are used in this way (Arts, Gelissen, 2002, p. 139; Baranowski, 2013, p. 143).

Esping-Andersen’s classification is based on two different studies published in 1990 and 1999 in an evolutionist manner. One of his works, published in 1990 and titled “Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism” put social classes in center. As regards Esping-Andersen, a theory examining the development of the welfare state should focus on the nature of

class mobilization, the class-political coalition structures, and the historical accumulation of the institutionalization of the regime. Esping-Andersen argues that class coalitions of the welfare state do not only explain their past evolution, but also their future expectations. The emergence of alternative class coalitions is determined by the formation of classes. In the early stages of industrialisation, as the rural classes constituted the majority of the electorate, the social democrats had to form alliances to obtain the majority. Under these circumstances, paradoxically, rural classes have been decisive for the future of socialism. Since the rural economy has a significant role in the management of the families holding the capital density in a narrow area, the production potential is high, and the potential of the alliance has been wide. In such cases, strong political agreements have been achieved, as in the Nordic countries (Esping-Andersen, 1999, pp. 30, 33).

In respect to this work, the most important source of the success of the welfare state is seen as the existence of a strong labour movement in alliance with the social democratic parties. This approach argues that the welfare reform is supported by the working class and left politics, but it is opposed by the middle classes and the right politics. However, the fact that the democratically powerful units have the power of governance in politics has led to the realization of these reforms. This approach is called the power resource theory of welfare state and social democracy (Baldwin, 1996, pp. 35–36).

Esping-Andersen's welfare state modeling focuses on the experience of class struggle in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden (1990, p. 34).² According to him, after the First World War, the alliance of rural, middle classes and the working class was influential in the institutionalization of the welfare state through social democratic parties. Also, Esping-Andersen argued that the political tendencies of the middle classes which formed after the Second World War was decisive for the integration of the welfare state. From this point of view, Esping-Andersen states that the political tendencies of the middle class are clear about its role in shaping the welfare state model. However, it should be noted that this statement of Esping-Andersen applies only to the social-democratic welfare state. Esping-Andersen does not provide an explanatory argument on the role of the class for the other models. Esping-Andersen, on the other hand, goes to a more complete account of loyalty to the welfare state. Accordingly, the social democrat and conservative models maintain the loyalty of the middle classes towards the welfare state. In the liberal

² Sweden is the most prominent example of the social-democratic welfare state. The main reason for this is the fact that the Social Democratic Party (SDP) has been in power since 1932, alone or almost uninterruptedly as part of the coalition. Social democrats have pursued the search for egalitarian society through a broad coalition of support. The elimination of class inequalities, the realization of industrial democracy and the creation of universal social services are the main objectives of SDP. Social democrats also believed that capitalism could be reformed through cooperation with capital and they acted accordingly. This intellection was materialized in 1938 with the "Saltjobaden Spirit." The consensus is based on the simultaneous realization of economic productivity and worker's welfare, signed by the Swedish Trade Union Confederation (LO) and the Swedish Employers Association (SAF). In the Swedish case, the realization of full employment, the procure of high-quality welfare services and the provision of justice in income distribution are largely associated with this compromise (Page, 2012, p. 72).

model, the level of social loyalty to the welfare state is relatively low due to the weakness of the working class. Welfare regimes were supported by the middle classes for historical reasons. The fact that these classes have become a political power through social insurance programs has enabled them to demonstrate loyalty towards their welfare regimes. The political power which these groups acquired over time has made them determinative for the consolidation of the welfare state.

In Esping-Andersen's first classification, the main components of the welfare state models were the division of social protection between the public sector and the private sector, thereby identifying the structural composition of decommodification and explaining the level of stratification of the models. In his welfare regime classification, Esping-Andersen established a decommodification index that highlights cash retirement, sickness and unemployment benefits, and their renewal rates and eligibility conditions. Esping-Andersen classified the countries according to this. In the words of Esping-Andersen (1990, p. 36; 2011, p. 43), decommodification is a concept that permuted from Polanyi and was later developed by Offe. This concept is used to express the rules of the weakening of the material relations tended by the state independently of the market. Esping-Andersen considers the concept of decommodification as a way to define citizenship rights. In his study, Esping-Andersen produced results on decommodification using cluster analysis.

In his 1990 publication, Esping-Andersen mentioned three different models, p. social democrat, conservative-corporatist and liberal. He updated this in his work which published in 1999 and titled "Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economics." In his first study, Esping-Andersen explained the welfare state models with structural factors. But in the second, he focused on the triangle of state, family, and market.

In the 1999 work, social risks have particular importance in Esping-Andersen's classification of. Social risks are defined as the probability-weighted ambiguities encountered in the changing and dynamic world in which people live. In this sense, social risks are also called as "social problem" in social policy. The main types of social risks are listed as class risks, risks arising in the course of life, and intergenerational risks. Esping-Andersen states that these risks can be internalised, distributed to the market, or met by the state. According to him, especially class risks and inter-generational risks should be solved directly by the welfare state. When the state eliminates these risks, the responsibility of both the family and the market will be reduced, and the decommodification of the mentioned risks will be limited (Esping-Andersen, 1999, p. 40; Manning, 2012, p. 21).

The concept of welfare regime in Esping-Andersen's classification is a systematic critique of the complex legal and institutional features involved in the relationship between the state and the economy. From this point of view, Esping-Andersen goes beyond the narrow perspective, which sees the welfare state as the area of "social recovery" and reassesses the welfare state from areas of decommodification, social stratification, and employment.

Esping-Andersen (1999, pp. 33–36) defines the welfare regime as "the method of production and distribution of prosperity in the interdependence between the state, the market, and the family." When an in-depth analysis is applied, it is seen that the definition

of a welfare regime is made concerning the sharing of risks. Within this framework, welfare regimes are largely classified concerning the level of the state role in the poorest, minimalist, inclusive, or institutional.

The importance of social risks and the role assigned to the family has a vital role in the change of Esping-Andersen's attitude between 1990–1999. In 1990, Esping-Andersen, who did not care about these issues, took them to the center in 1999. This change makes his social policy definition meaningful. According to him, social policy means the public administration of social risks. Some of these risks are fixed, and some appear in the course of history and disappear. In his 1999 study, he considered the family the third tool for managing social risks together with the market and the state, and claimed that this tripartite structure constituted a “welfare mix.” (Powell, Barrientos, 2004, p. 86). Esping-Andersen (2009, p. 35) emphasizes the necessity of making the political economy more sociological due to the risk of forgetting the family from a comparative political economy perspective.

Powell and Barrientos (2004, p. 86) think that what is important in the change of position of Esping-Andersen is the emphasis of social risks and welfare mix. Social risks and their management were not included in the 1990 index, but they played a central role in the latter. Besides, the role of the welfare mix which incorporated the family, market, and state triangle in the management of social risks is also important. He made it clear that the welfare mix played a more central role by putting social risks on the foundation of the organization underlying the production of welfare.

Critics to Esping-Andersen's Welfare State Classification

The criticisms brought to Esping-Andersen's classification can be divided into two as theoretical and empirical.³ Arts and Gelissen (2002, p. 138) argue that criticism in the first group is more important at this point. It is possible to examine the theoretical criticism brought to the classification of Esping-Andersen within five dimensions.

The first criticism is the lack of numerical models. This criticism also engenders the most studied topic on it. Various authors criticised this deficiency by proposing new models of welfare regime. The second point of criticism is the disregard of different aspects of welfare services. There is an empirical aspect of this criticism. Different authors emphasised the inadequacy of the indicators used by Esping-Andersen and performed new studies. The third criticism is that the out-of-class stratification resources are ignored. This criticism is also associated with the crisis of the welfare state. The lack of gender-based perspective is another theoretical criticism of Esping-Andersen's modeling. Finally, it is

³ In addition to the theoretical studies put forward in this paper, it should be noted that there are many empirical studies on the classification of welfare states. The most prominent studies on this subject are Kangas's study which based on clustering analysis, Ragin's BOOLEAN comparative analysis (1994), Shalev's factor analysis (1996), cluster analysis by Obinger and Wagschal (1998) and principal component analysis by Wildeboer Schut et al. (2001) (Arts, Gelissen, 2002, p. 142).

another issue of criticism that the modeling of class coalitions historically did not address current issues in this area (Arts, Gelissen, 2002, p. 137; Gough, 2004, pp. 241–242).

In addition to the models identified by Esping-Andersen, the first topic in the works of the authors who propose new models is those defining the countries of Southern Europe as a separate and new welfare regime. Leibfried, Ferrera and Bonoli have carried out the most important studies which have classified Southern European welfare states as a separate regime.⁴

Leibfried (1992, pp. 126–128) argues that the poverty regimes of European countries should be analyzed. Leibfried focuses on poverty, social insurance, and anti-poverty policies, and deals with welfare states based on social citizenship. As a result, Leibfried lists the welfare states as Scandinavian, Bismarckian, Anglo-Saxon, and the Latin Rim (including Southern European countries). Although the Latin Rim model resembles the Anglo-Saxon model with its residual structure but the entrance of the labor market, it represents a unique model. The areas where the Latin Rim regime differs are the fact that the tradition of full employment has never been valid, the sectoral distribution of employment, the lack of an institutionalized social security model, and the weak position of women in the labor market.

On the other hand, in his work on access to welfare services, welfare benefits, financial arrangements, and organizational-managerial agreements, Ferrera (1996, pp. 18–20) treated southern European countries like Leibfried as a separate model. Describing the Southern European model as a “particularist-clientelist,” Ferrera argues that the particular distribution of prosperity has evolved in Southern Europe in all areas of social policy, especially in the health. Fundamental indicators of this model are the income guarantee system linked to the working status, the minimum level of social protection, the association of health services with citizenship, the transience and contributions and the financial incomes. In addition, Bonoli (1997, pp. 357–358) arrives at a classification based on the amount of welfare state spending based on Bismarckian and Beveridgean social security models. The models in this classification are shaped as British, Continental, Nordic, and Southern European. The Southern model is financed by contributions from the Bismarckian, which is characterized by high-level social spending and the low share of social spending in the GDP.

It can be said that the additional classification studies have developed depending on the increase in the number of member countries of the European Union. At this point, it was discussed whether Central and Eastern European countries, which accelerated the process of integration with the capitalist system after the dissolution of the Soviet Union,

⁴ Although not included in the literature reviews, Amoroso (1996, p. 50–51) offers a quadratic classification of Southern European countries. Amoroso brings forward the Scandinavian, German, French and Southern European models. As regard to Amoroso, the decisive characteristics of the Southern European model are the divergence between economy and politics, the universality and the mixed system based on the principle of insurance, the low level of service categorisation, the dual structure between the traditional and advanced sectors, the low level unionism, and the hegemony of capital in the state and economy.

could be included in a new classification. The Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Hungary, Croatia, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia could be examples of this approach. Although there are some studies in the literature to classify these countries as for the Eastern European models, the studies in this direction are not strong compared to those on the Southern European countries (Fenger, 2007, p. 22).

The classification of Esping-Andersen is also criticized by studies linking Australia and New Zealand to a separate welfare regime, which is considered to belong to the liberal welfare regime. The scope of the approach to the means-tested based social protection, wage control methods, and employment security are the main rationale for disaggregation. This welfare regime is called the “Antipodean” in the literature (Arts, Gelissen, 2002, p. 146).

Gough (2004, pp. 241–242) approached the classification studies differently from the contributions described so far. Using the notion of social policy regimes instead of welfare regimes, Gough has made an alternative mapping by highlighting five new regimes. These are; Latin America (from conservative-informal regimes to liberal-informal), East Asia (economic miracle and productive social policy), Bangladesh and South Asia (aid and informal security), and Sub-Saharan Africa (regional mistrust) regimes.

Esping-Andersen (1996, pp. 20–21) does not accept the idea that countries in Southern Europe Eastern Europe, Central Europe, Antipodean or Latin America follow new routes in terms of quantity compared to the Western model and therefore they should not be explained under different models. According to him, there is no other cluster to be considered within the context of the welfare state. As emphasized earlier, another criticism of Esping-Andersen’s classification is that different welfare services are not included in the analysis. Numerous different indicators such as poverty, social insurance, welfare expenditures, tax policies, promotion of women’s work, widening the scope of family benefits paid to women, access to social rights, financing methods, organizational-managerial regulations and the quantitative dimension of the welfare state expenditures have been used in alternative studies to exceed the boundaries of Esping-Andersen’s classification based on decommodification and stratification (Arts, Gelissen, 2002, pp. 143–144). Similarly, in another study, based on the concept of Esping-Andersen’s welfare mix, a new classification was made by placing active labor market policies at the center of this concept. Accordingly, active labor market policies are important in terms of establishing the link between the production of welfare and work (Powell, Barrientos, 2004, p. 84).

The criticism that Esping-Andersen does not take into account the different stratification dimensions is associated with the subjects and demands of the new social movements that have been rising since the 1968 movement. Different stratification dimensions from different fronts, such as the feminist movement, civil rights movements, sexual revolution movement, the environmentalist movement, which have important effects on current economic policy, were completely excluded from Esping-Andersen’s classification. By the 1970s, the welfare state was based on a certain limit in economic, social and political terms. The welfare state has been criticised for the stagnation experienced in the accumulation

of capital from the economic point of view and the impact of social spending on this stasis. The social problem on the issue put pressure on the social state with the increasing militancy of the working class and the new social movements, which increased after 1968. The reflection of these two situations on the political field has emerged by questioning the social democratic parties in power, and all these developments have been explained by the crisis of the welfare state (Jessop, 2005, p. 54).

The work of Orloff, Lewis, and Bambra comes to the fore in the gender-based critiques of Esping-Andersen's classification. Orloff developed a multidimensional critique. On this axis, the social services provided by the state affect women's financial situations, shape the gender roles, constitute the political conflict and participation, contribute to the formation and mobility of identities and interests. Gender was neglected in the mainstream comparative studies and the feminist studies on welfare state were not systematically compared. Therefore, a conceptual framework that integrates the feminist approach with mainstream studies has been developed. In this context, starting from the theory of power supplies, it has established three main starting points. Firstly, how social services provided to families are organised in different countries within the context of state-market relations is examined. Secondly, an assessment of these services in terms of gender relations, particularly in terms of improving the conditions of paid and unpaid labor, was conducted. Third, the gender impact of the decomposition of social rights was highlighted. In addition, two new dimensions have been proposed to embody the impact of social services on gender relations, access to paid work and capacity to form and maintain an autonomous household (Orloff, 1993, pp. 303–304).

The institutionalised welfare state represents an understanding of the livelihoods of households based on the work of men and women taking care of children, the sick or the elderly. Lewis explains this model as "the male breadwinner model." On the other hand, the increase in women's participation in labor markets since the second half of the 1970s has transformed both the labor markets and the family structure. The employment contract relationship established after the Second World War is based on this model. In this sense, gender rules are based on the marginal evaluation of women's work. The role of women is embodied in the child and elderly care. However, the economic, social and political developments experienced over time have transformed this structure by accelerating the entry of women's labour into the labour market. Therefore, welfare typology should be considered on the gender basis. Accordingly, the male breadwinner model in the Esping-Andersen work was replaced by a new model: an adult-worker model (Lewis, 2001, pp. 153–154).

Esping-Andersen deserved the criticisms which directed to him about this argument. As previously emphasized, in his analysis, which he updated in 1999, put a special role to the family, and used the concept of defamilization (familialization of welfare liabilities). But this approach of Esping-Andersen was also criticised for decommunitarianizing family life. Bambra (2007, pp. 329–330) has developed a defamilialization index that includes 18 OECD countries. Indicators included in the index are women's labor force participation rate, pregnancy leave fee, paid maternity leave, and average family wage. Bambra focuses

on how the indicators she identified affect the dependence of women on the welfare state. Defamilisation explains the degree to which individuals can live an acceptable life, regardless of family relationships, through paid work or with the guarantees provided by the social security system. In this context, a comparison was made with Esping-Andersen's typology within the analysis framework (Bambra, 2007, pp. 326–327).

Recently, studies on welfare states' classification have been reported by Powell et al. (2019). This study includes the classification by Esping-Andersen and other typologies developed from it. Powell et al. first reviewed the welfare state typologies using different concepts, variables, and methods. It was then noted that a new examination was produced through the use of new materials that were not found in the previous studies. The starting point of the study is to examine the different works done in the past and to update the thus created list, new research has been done. In this regard, the results of social, prosperity, Esping, world, regime, typology, taxonomy, cluster or class were searched through Scopus. The most striking one among the results obtained from the study is that it is less similar to its predecessors in terms of country classification. Ultimately, the authors propose to include new criteria, like inclusion, into the classifications to be made.⁵

Conclusion

The welfare state is a structure that provides for the socio-economic needs of the broader social classes based on the labor-capital consensus historically and improves their living conditions. It also made these groups a political force. The welfare state has used a large number of instruments, including social security, education, health, and shelter. The success of the welfare state has made a major contribution to the realization of social justice, which is one of the most important objectives of social policy with social peace. This process, which is summarised, has not developed in all the countries where the welfare state is institutionalised. This difference has been a source of inspiration for welfare state classifications in the same way. Precursor works on the classification of the welfare state are mostly focused on social spending and the share of these expenditures in public expenditures. Besides, these studies were mostly carried out over a short period.

In his 1990 study, Esping-Andersen brought a new dimension to the classification of the welfare states. The first of Esping-Andersen's classification is based on the idea that welfare-state models are similar in many respects, however, not in terms of class struggle. According to his classification, the political history of class coalitions in the context of class struggle differentiated their understanding of the welfare state. At this point, Esping-Andersen claims that the middle classes have special importance. While Esping-Andersen's first classification was analyzed by the market-state relationship, this situation changed in the second study in 1999. Here, Esping-Andersen makes an evaluation of the welfare regimes in terms of family, market, and state. The second classification of Esping-Andersen also attaches special importance to social risks. The change in the attitude of

⁵ I would like to thank the reviewer who attracted my attention to this work.

the author is thought to be in line with the transformation process of social policy since the last quarter of the 20th century.

Since its publication, Esping-Andersen's classification was strongly criticised at the theoretical and empirical levels. The criticism put forward by the limits of this study includes the lack of numerical models, the disregard of different aspects of welfare service, the ignorance of out-of-class stratification resources, the lack of gender-based perspective and the ignoring current trends of class coalitions. He rejected new welfare state models while accepting gender-based critics. Also, Esping-Andersen left the other critics largely unanswered. In addition to the criticisms listed in the study, Esping-Andersen's modeling should be criticised in two ways. Esping-Andersen attaches particular importance to the class struggle in the formation of welfare regimes, but does not go to a comprehensive analysis of this issue. He makes a limited assessment only through Sweden, which he says represents only the social-democratic regime. According to Esping-Andersen, the political tendencies of the middle class have a clear role in shaping the welfare regime model. However, historical experiences show that different forms and examples of class struggle have important effects in different welfare regimes.

It can be said that Esping-Andersen's modeling causes a reduction at two levels. First, he explains social policy only with social risks. In fact, social risks constitute the common point of definitions that narrowly explain the concept of social security. In this sense, Esping-Andersen reduces social policy to social security. In addition, the approach that describes social security in a narrow sense includes the condition of professional activity. Therefore, social security is predominantly related to the income security of employees. This constitutes the second reduction of the modeling. The institutionalised welfare states, which were subject to the modeling of Esping-Andersen, primarily carried out the definition of social security, social services, and social rights. Subsequently, many other new rights were secured under these social structures. Indeed, the social state and social policy have a much greater meaning than what Esping-Andersen defines. It is a clear fact that the Esping-Andersen's classification has led to a new way in the comparative social policy studies, despite the numerous criticisms made. In most of the studies carried out in this field, the Esping-Andersen's classification is accepted as valid. Also, three different regimes in modeling have been widely accepted in almost all studies. In this respect, it would not be wrong to say that the classification of the welfare regime by Esping-Andersen is at the centre of the contemporary social policy literature.

References

- Amoroso, B. (1996). Welfare State and Development Models. In: B. Greve (ed), *Comparative Welfare Systems*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Arts, W., Gelissen, H. (2002). Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art-report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(2): 137–158.

- Baldwin, P. (1992). The Welfare State for Historians: A Review Article. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34(4): 695–707.
- Baldwin, P. (1996). Can We Define a European Welfare State Model? In: B. Greve (ed), *Comparative Welfare Systems*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Bambra, C. (2007). Defamilisation and welfare state regimes: a cluster analysis. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 16(1): 326–338.
- Baranowski, M. (2013). Towards the New Welfare State Sociology. *Kultura i Edukacja*, 6(1): 135–148.
- Berger, J. (1990). Market and State in Advanced Capitalist Societies. In: A. Martinelli, N. J. Smelser (eds), *Economy and Society: Overviews in Economic Sociology*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Beveridge, W. (1942). Social Insurance and Allied Services, London: *His Majesty's Stationery*.
- Boje, T. (1996). Welfare State Models in Comparative Research: Do the Models Describe the Reality? In: B. Greve (ed), *Comparative Welfare Systems*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Bonoli, G. (1997). Classifying Welfare States: a Two-Dimension Approach. *Journal of Social Policy*, 26(3): 351–372.
- Briggs, A. (1961). The Welfare State in Historical Perspective. *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 2(1): 221–258.
- Castel, R. (2017). *Ücretli Çalışmanın Tariçesi: Sosyal Sorunun Dönüşümü*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Pluto Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1996). After the Golden Age? Welfare State Dilemmas in a Global Economy. In: G. Esping-Andersen (ed), *Welfare State in Transition*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fenger, H. J. M. (2007). Welfare Regimes in Central and Eastern Europe: Incorporating Post-communist countries in a welfare regime typology, *Contemporary Issues and Ideas in Social Sciences*. Downloaded from http://www.learneurope.eu/files/9913/7483/4204/Welfare_regimes_in_Central_and_Eastern_Europe.pdf [Last accessed: 22.05.2019].
- Ferrera, M. (1996). The 'Southern Model' of Welfare in Social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(1): 17–37.
- Flora, P., Heidenheimer, A. J. (1981). The Historical Core and Changing Boundaries of Welfare State. In: A. Flora, J. Heidenheimer (eds), *The Development of Welfare State in Europe and America*. London: Transaction Publishers.
- Fujimura, M. (2000). The Welfare State, the Middle Class, and the Welfare Society. *Review of Population and Social Policy*, 9(1): 1–23.

- Gough, I. (1979). *The Political Economy of The Welfare State*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Gough, I. (2004). Social policy regimes in the developing world. In: P. Kennett (ed), *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*. Cornwall: Edward Elgar Publications.
- Hills, J. (2012). The Distribution of Welfare. In: T. Ridge et al., *The Students Companion to Social Policy*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Jessop, B. (2005). *Hegemony, Post-Fordizm ve Küreselleşme Ekseninde Kapitalist Devlet*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Leibfried, S. (1992). Towards a European Welfare State. In: C. Jones (ed), *New Perspectives on European Welfare State in Europe*. London: Routledge.
- Lewis, J. (2001). The Decline of the Male Breadwinner Model: Implications for Work and Care. *Social Politics*, 8(2): 152–169.
- Lindbeck, A. (2006). *The Welfare State—Background, Achievements, Problems*. IFN Working Paper No. 662, Stockholm.
- Manning, N. (2012). Social Needs, Social Problems, and Social Welfare and Well-Being In: T. Ridge et al., *The Students Companion to Social Policy*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Méda, D. (2012). *Emek Kaybolma Yolunda Bir Değer Mi?* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mingione, E. (2001). The Southern European Welfare Model and Fight Against Poverty and Social Exclusion. In: M. Tolba (ed), *Our Fragile World: Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable Development*, EOLSS Publications.
- Offe, C. (1987). Democracy against the Welfare State? Structural Foundations of Neo-conservative Political Opportunities. *Political Theory*, 15(4): 501–537.
- Orloff, A. S. (1993). Gender and The Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States. *American Sociological Review*, 59(1): 303–328.
- Page, R. M. (2012). Social Democracy. In: P. Alcock, M. May, S. Wright (eds), *The Students Companion to Social Policy*. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing.
- Parry, G. (1984). Welfare State and Welfare Society. *Government and Opposition*, 20(3): 287–296.
- Petersen, K. (2013). The early Cold War and the Western welfare state. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 29(3): 226–240
- Powell, M., Barrientos, A. (2004). Welfare regimes and welfare mix. *European Journal of Political Research*, 43(1): 83–105.
- Powell, M., Yörük, E., Bargu, A. (2019). Thirty years of the Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism: A review of reviews. *Social Policy Administration*, 54(1): 1–28.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2004). *Refah Devletinın Krizi*. Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Therborn, G. (1984). Class and States: Welfare State Developments, 1881–1981. *Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review*, 14(1): 7–41.

- Therborn, G. (1986). Karl Marx Returning: The Welfare State and Neo-Marxist, Corporatist and Statist Theories, *International Political Science Review*, 7(2): 131–164.
- Wahl, A. (2011). *The Rise and Fall of the Welfare State*. London: Pluto Press.
- Walker, A., Wong, C. (2004). The ethnocentric construction of the welfare state. In: P. Kennett (ed), *A Handbook of Comparative Social Policy*, Cornwall: Edward Elgar Publications.

Streszczenie

Państwo opiekuńcze opisuje strukturę, która w pełni zinstytucjonalizowała się po II wojnie światowej. Wśród badań dotyczących państwa opiekuńczego szczególne miejsce zajmują analizy skoncentrowane na klasyfikacji. Pierwsze badania na ten temat koncentrowały się głównie na poziomie wydatków socjalnych, zakresie systemów zabezpieczenia społecznego i świadczeniu usług opieki społecznej w różnych krajach. Ogólnie przyjęte podejście do klasyfikacji państw opiekuńczych czerpie z prac przeprowadzonych przez Esping-Andersena w 1990 r., a następnie—podejścia zaktualizowanego przez autora w 1999 r. Niniejszy artykuł przeglądowy ma na celu usystematyzowanie badań nad klasyfikacją państw opiekuńczych. Prezentuje badania prekursorskie z tego zakresu, a następnie—podejście rozwinięte przez Esping-Andersena. W ostatniej części artykułu zaprezentowana jest krytyka modeli Esping-Andersena.

Słowa kluczowe: państwo opiekuńcze, modele państwa opiekuńczego, Gøsta Esping-Andersen