

Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 449

Stability of Gosta Esping-Andersen's
"The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism"

Andreas Tiemann

September 2006



Universität Konstanz
Politik- und Verwaltungswissenschaften

Stability of Gøsta Esping-Andersen's "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism"

The Politics of Welfare State Reforms – Germany Compared

Summer Semester 2006

Supervision by Dr. Sven Jochem

Andreas Tiemann
Rheingutstr. 40
78462 Konstanz

Matrikelnummer 01/612764
Second Semester

Due date: 15. September 2006

For professional advice as well as providing publications and statistical data,
I would like to thank

Dr. James P. Allan,
Department of Political Science, Wittenberg University

Dr. Clare Bamba,
Centre for Public Policy and Health, Durham University

Christina Behrendt,
Social Security Department, International Labour Organisation, Genf

Prof. Christopher Pierson,
School of Politics and International Relations, University of Nottingham

Prof. Lyle A. Scruggs,
Department of Political Science, University of Connecticut

Edward Whitehouse,
Social Policy Division, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris

Contents

I. ABSTRACT 1
II. INTRODUCTION..... 1
III. STABILITY ANALYSIS 3
 A) STRATIFICATION 4
 B) DE-COMMODIFICATION..... 7
IV. CONCLUSION 9
V. APPENDIX 11
VI. REFERENCES 19

I. Abstract

Since its first publication in 1990, Esping-Andersen's typology of "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" has loomed incomparably large over the area of comparative social politics. This paper uses the concept of stability, researching comprehensively whether the construct "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" has been valid for over 20 years despite the varying outcomes of the 18 countries' social policy. By using recent data, a nearly complete replication of Esping-Andersen's original indices was accomplished. The results of the research at hand explicitly reveal that Esping-Andersen's fundamental logic now shows stark discrepancies. Subsequently, in order to search for an appropriate typology to subsume various kinds of social policy, turning away from the alleged "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" seems indispensable.

II. Introduction

Typologies enjoy great popularity all over the different areas of political and social sciences. By using typologies, the standard of knowledge about a research object as well as the state of ongoing research projects are tried to be made structured and comprehensible. The goal of grouping diverse profiles of welfare politics was first approached by Wilensky and Lebeaux in the year 1958 and later addressed by several other scientists (Alber 1982; Amenta 1993; Castles 1982; Flora/Heidenheimer 1981; Schmidt 1982; Titmuss 1963, 1968).

By publishing his book "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" in 1990, the Danish scholar Gøsta Esping-Andersen took up the discussion regarding a typology for social politics. In doing so he strongly criticized the *modi operandi*, which had been in use until this point of time: "existing theoretical systems of the welfare state are inadequate" (1990: 2) especially since they mainly focus on comparing governments' aggregated social spending. According to the author, this fact conceals the manifold manners in which the topic of social policy is approached since "even if the lion's share of expenditures or personnel serves welfare aims, the kind of welfare provided will be qualitatively different, as well as its prioritization relative to competing activities, be they warfare, law and order, or the promotion of profits and trade" (1990: 1). Furthermore, he adds that "the existence of a social program and the amount of money spent on it may be less important than it what it does" (1990: 2). With this reasoning Esping-Andersen does not only give consideration to

the complexity of the issue, but he implicitly incorporates both developments of implementation research (cf. Sabatier, 1986) as well as the differentiation of a political system's input, output and outcome referring to Almond and Powell (1978). Consequentially, in order to create his typology, Esping-Andersen makes use of two dimensions which focus on the outcome of social policy: "De-commodification" (cf. Lat.: *commoditas*) describes the extent to which an individual is protected from her treatment as commodity, is able to legally demand certain benefits, and „maintain a livelihood without reliance on the market“ (1990: 22). "Stratification" (cf. Lat.: *stratificatio*), on the other hand, specifies the extent to which welfare regimes act as "key institutions in the structuring of class and the social order" (1990: 55).

After measuring de-commodification and stratification for 18 OECD-countries on the basis of 1980 data, three worlds of welfare capitalism were identified and later described with the terms "conservative", "liberal" and "social-democratic" (1990: 26 et sqq). These types can be understood – although not referred to as such by the author – as ideal types¹ (Kohl 1993, Obinger/Wagschal 1998, Schmidt 2005), whereas "the empiric real types rather show to be hybrid, combining elements of various different ideal types" (Obinger/Wagschal 1998: 111; editor's translation). The conservative regime is characterized by the intensification of social classes, class-dependent services, minimal financial redistribution, as well as the subsidiarity principle, which is founded in a strengthened responsibility of families. This type is also referred to as "corporatist", since "the state edifice [is] perfectly ready to display the market as a provider of healthcare" and "private insurance and occupational fringe benefits play a truly marginal role" (Esping-Andersen 1990: 27). The liberal regime is represented by a negligible role of the government, comparably immaterial social services, which often require means tests and a strong market-orientation. Finally, in the "social-democratic world" major features like governmental interventions and high financial redistribution promote the goals of equality, full employment, and universal and ample services (Esping-Andersen 1990).

Since its first publication, Esping-Andersen's work has loomed incomparably large over the area of comparative social politics. However, it has also met severe stricture. Main points of

¹ Max Weber describes the ideal type as follows: „It is gained by the one-sided accentuation of one or more aspects and by the synthesis of a great number of individually existing phenomena, which are here more, there less, in places not at all, diffuse and discrete, paying deference to these partially emphasized aspects, thus creating one uniform theoretical construct. In reality, this construct can nowhere be found empirically in its conceptual pureness; it is an utopia and for the historic work this creates the task of deciding for each case how close or how far reality reaches the ideal.“ (Weber 1904: 191; editor's translation).

which criticism is based are, inter alia, the methodological approach (Kohl 1993; Obinger/Wagschal 1998), „gender-blindness“ (Daly 2000; Sainsbury 1994), the possible existence of further regimes (Ferrera 1996; Lessenich 1994), „institutional-blindness“ (Schmidt 2005), and a political comprehension which is too narrowly related to rationalism (Offe 1993). However, examination of this scientific discussion obviously shows that research on stability and repeated measurements, which would allow panel studies, has been almost neglected so far. On this account, this work analyses, by the use of Esping-Andersen’s dimensions stratification and de-comodification, whether the „Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism“ found for the year 1980 are still identifiable for the same group of 18 OECD-countries. In addition to presenting new research results, publications by Clare Bambra (2004) as well as James Allan and Lyle Scruggs (2003, 2006) are especially taken into account. To ensure comparability the procedures and operationalizations developed by Esping-Andersen are thereby strictly followed and, where feasible, the same sources are used (1990).

III. Stability Analysis

Although largely negative, the importance of criticism surrounding “The Three Worlds of Welfare” should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, it is striking that attempts to put the ‘Three Worlds’ theory to the test have not entirely followed with success. This is particularly surprising considering that the author himself pointed to possible weaknesses in the theory in one of his later publications. In Esping-Andersen’s estimation, “typologies are problematic because parsimony is bought at the expense of nuance, but especially because they are inherently static. They provide a snapshot of the world at one point in time and do not easily capture mutations or the birth of new species. Any typology of welfare regimes remains valid as long as history stands still” (1999: 73). Thus the perpetuation of the ‘Three Worlds’ theory after more than 25 years is most unlikely. It is to be researched whether the theory proves stable if up-to-date indices for stratification and de-commodification are deployed. Such research has been carried out in publications by Allan and Scruggs (2003) and Clare Bambra (2004) into de-commodification. Replications of the stratification index, on the other hand, have only been partially completed (Allan/Scruggs 2006).

While Bambra carried out research into the “robustness” of Esping-Andersen’s typology, this term will be deliberately avoided for the following reasons. Firstly, the concept of robustness has become a loaded term due to its multiple, and hence disuniform, usage in

scientific discourse (Santa Fe Institute 2001). Secondly, and more importantly, one ought to differentiate clearly between the terms “stability” and “robustness” as defined by Erica Jen of the Santa Fe Institute Robustness program. Here, robustness is defined as a weakened term for the description of persistence which is lacking of mathematic and methodological tools (Jen 2001). In order to use the most precise terminology possible, and since this work is methodologically grounded, the talk should instead be of stability analysis.

Stability analysis is defined as “the methodologically-grounded investigation of the level to which a construct proves validity although the used constituents are varying.” The typology would thus remain stable if, in spite of variance in the social policies of the countries taken up in Esping-Andersen’s study (Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Great Britain, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the USA), though a renewed measurement the indices for de-commodification and stratification could furthermore allow for the division into the three worlds of liberal, conservative and social-democratic systems.

Thus defined, one should also distinguish stability from “reliability”, a term arising from discourse within measurement theory. Reliability can be described as “the extent to which the repeated measurement of an object with a measuring instrument achieves the same result” (Schnell/Hill/Esser 2005). Nevertheless, reliability refers to a quality factor regarding the measurement of an unvaried object and thus reliability differs from the present examination on whether a construct, based on several varying parts proves revalidation. Nevertheless, the reliability of the used measuring instruments are not called in question but taken for granted.

A) Stratification

Esping-Andersen presents three indices which are designed to identify the typical stratification type within liberal, conservative and social-democratic regimes respectively. Thus, the author expects that a country holding a socio-political outcome suitable for one of the ‘Three Worlds’ will display a high result on this world’s particular index and correspondingly low results on the other two indices. The state encouraged retention of social classes and the omnipresence of the state as characteristic attributes of the conservative system are measured by two indicators. Firstly, in a conservative nation one would expect a greater number of state-run, employment-specific pension programmes

(corporatism); in addition a relatively large proportion of the gross domestic product is typically allotted as annuity payment to civil servants (etatism). Market influence and the reduction of state-presence to a 'Night-watchman' basis as characteristic attributes of the liberal system are now identified through three indicators. Firstly the sum of state expenditure on poverty relief is measured against the total sum of state expenditure. Then the sum of private retirement provisions are measure against total retirement expenditure and the sum of private expenditure on health is measured against the total expenditure in this area. State provisions for pensions, health insurance and unemployment benefits are observed under the investigation of equality and universalism as characteristic attributes of the socio-democratic system. The indicators used in this case are the ratio of minimal, guaranteed benefits and maximal, possible benefits (equality) and the percentage of 16-25 year-olds who are eligible to receive benefits (universalism). As shown in Table 1.1, these figures are then established for the 18 countries and then schematically coded with the figures zero, two or four. The results for the three indices are then cumulated.

Creating the index of stratification, the goal of using most recent data, had to be given up both by Esping-Andersen and in the case of this replication. Though, while the author chose a very long time distance in order to obtain a cross-section analysis for the year 1980, for the present calculations the most recent data available was used. However, in the process of updating the figures it was only possible to a limited degree to refer to the same sources as those used by the author. In the "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" the author used sources obtained by the Swedish Institute for Social Research within the Social Citizenship Program (SCIP). The replication of the index proved particularly difficult since the public has hitherto been denied access to databank of this project, led by Walter Korpi at the University of Stockholm and is therefore forced to refer to alternative sources². For this reason data from the Comparative Welfare Entitlement Dataset (Allan/Scruggs 2006: 33) from the University of Connecticut has been used. It also proved impossible to refer to the original sources in the case of further individual figures. It was particularly difficult to receive access to the figures for private retirement provisions. In this case it was difficult to ascertain the source from which the author obtained the figures and similar figures were obtained from the Luxembourg Income Study, although only for a limited number of the countries in question. The figures for seven of the 18 countries were available, while the others had to be taken from Esping-Andersen's data. Table 1.2 displays an overview of the

² In an email on the 21st of August, 2006, Walter Korpi announced the dataset would be published on the 1st of November, 2007.

results, in which the temporal relationships of figures and sources used in this study are compared to the data used by Esping-Andersen.

Table 1.2 compares the updated results of the stratification indices with those published in „The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism”. The author’s proposed approach to identify the existence of regime-clusters is the use of an intercorrelation matrix. It is expected that “for regimes to exist there must be a strong relationship among the particular characteristics that supposedly identify the regime; and in converse, these must be negatively correlated, or uncorrelated, with attributes of alternative regimes”. With the help of the figures obtained back in 1980, Esping-Adersen felt entirely justified regarding the indicators for the conservative and liberal index and limitedly justified regarding the socialist regime. Table 1.3 displays the correlation matrix for the updated figures. While the conservative regime can be still identified due to a high correlation of the indicators corporatism and etatism and a low or negative correlation of these indicators with the others, this cannot be said for the other two worlds. For allegedly liberal regimes, the indicators for poverty relief and health-related payouts as well as for poverty relief and pension programmes correlate negatively. The other supposedly correlating indicators only relate weakly. Likewise, in allegedly socio-democratic systems the indicators for universalism and equality correlate negatively. Finally, for both political systems there was weak to intermediate correlation in unexpected places such as between the indicators for poverty relief and equality or corporatism and universalism. Therefore on the basis of the bivariate correlation matrix, the theory of three socio-political worlds cannot be proven effective.

As a concluding observation on the three stratification indices table 1.4 displays the countries in a ranking order which is contrasted with the original ranking of Esping-Andersen’s documentation (1990: 74). This led the author to arrive at the following conclusion: “We cannot but conclude that clusters do exist. The nations which score high on our summary index of conservatism (Italy, Germany, Austria, France, and Belgium) all score low, or at best, medium on our indices of liberalism and socialism. In turn, the countries characterized by strong liberalism (Austria, Canada, Japan, Switzerland, and the United States) score low or medium on conservatism and socialism. Finally, the socialism cluster includes the nations of Scandinavia, and the Netherlands, all countries which score low (or medium) on the two other regime-clusters” (1990: 76). It is again striking that even for the figures obtained from 1980 the author makes no further mention in the cases of Great Britain, Ireland and New Zealand, which do not achieve high values in any of the

three indicators and which therefore cannot be allotted into any of the three clusters. This is also a problem in the case of Belgium, which only achieves a high value on the scale of conservatism as a result of an incorrect coding, and which should have been rated with “intermediate” status (Obinger/Waschal 1998). In addition it is questionable whether Germany and the Netherlands, and, had it been correctly coded, France, have been ranked appropriately since they do indeed rank highly on one scale, yet only display intermediate results with the other clusters.

The observations on the existing replicated data have been blatantly exaggerated (Table 2). Firstly, three of the countries, namely Italy, Japan and New Zealand, have not been organised into any of the three clusters since they exhibit no high values whatsoever. Furthermore, the declaration that certain countries are typical examples of a specific political system has now become questionable for five of those countries. Indeed, Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany and Great Britain only show high results and no low ones, and can therefore only be allocated to a particular group on a conditional basis. Even more problematic is that Ireland and Canada are recognised as being typically socio-democratic as well as liberal. If Esping-Andersen’s ‘Three Worlds’ theory is to be justifiable, then it would be absolutely impossible to exhibit this characteristic, since a country would singularly pursue either a social, liberal or conservative social policy.

In light of the preceding criticism, in particular the observations upon the bivariate correlation matrix and the ranking order of the countries, it must be concluded that on the basis of the stratification indices, the ‘Three Worlds’ theory has been proven instable.

B) De-Commodification

The de-commodification scale is created through the use of a series of indicators, which serve to highlight the relationship between an individual’s welfare and market activity. Thereby three indices concerning pensions, unemployment benefit and health insurance payouts are constructed, each with five indicators respectively (Table 3.2.)³. The values based on financial benefits are duplicated (R1, R2, K1, A1; in the Table) and then the results for the indicators one through to four are added together and assessed against the results of the fifth indicator. Finally, the de-commodification values for the pensions and

³ Regarding Bambra’s documentation, it is notable that the coding was displayed in an incorrect manner (2004: 13). However, Bambra’s calculations were carried out in the correct way.

benefits paid out in the case of unemployment and/or illness are culminated in a comprehensive index.

As in the case of the socio-democratic index for stratification, Esping-Andersen used invariable data acquired from the Social Citizenship Indicator Program for the de-commodification index. This proved problematic for Allan and Scruggs as they attempted to create a comparison using material acquired from the “Comparative Welfare State Entitlements Data Set, 1960- 2000). In order to justify that these values were comparable to those calculated by Esping-Andersen, figures from 1980 were compared to those in the original work (Allan/Scruggs 2003). It can only be proven to a limited degree that the same dimensions were being measured by both instruments. It may also be noted that Clare Bamba makes no mention of this problem in her calculations for the period 1998-1999 and singularly assures that, “where possible, the same data sources as those used by Esping-Andersen were consulted.” (Bamba 2004:11)

Unlike in the stratification index, in the de-commodification index countries are not divided into three different types but instead a ranking order is created. A conclusion is then reached by the creation of clusters within the ranking order, that is, if three results from the countries in question conglomerate. However, in “The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism”, the possibility of cluster analysis is not entertained; the index is merely used in order to confirm a previously postulated organisation of countries into liberal, socio-democratic or conservative systems.

If one subscribes to Esping-Andersen’s theory, then one must expect the results for stratification to be akin to those for de-commodification. According to this, this thesis aims to investigate whether, at least in the case of the 13 countries in which a faultless allocation into one of the three political systems is possible, the types in which these countries are allocated into these types is replicated in actuality. Tables 3.3 and 3.4 set up a comparison between updated de-commodification indices and those of Esping-Andersen. The final two columns display whether Bamba’s and my own calculations correspond with the classifications as determined by the stratification index. From my own data nine countries corresponded with the index and from Bamba’s only five. These results lead to the conclusion that Esping-Andersen’s “Three Worlds” thesis based on the de-commodification construct is no longer justifiable.

IV. Conclusion

The hitherto existing discussion about Esping-Andersen's work may be well described with Clare Bambra's metaphor of a storm which is weathered by "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" (2004). Indeed, the "Three-World-Theory" has met a lot of criticism which adverts in diverse ways its highly limited validity. (Daly 2000; Ferrera 1996; Kohl 1993; Lessenich 1994; Obinger/Wagschal 1998; Sainsbury 1994; Offe 1993).

After first steps undertaken by Bambra (2004) as well as Allan and Scruggs (2003, 2006), in this paper a surprisingly neglected aspect was taken into consideration. By creating a nearly complete replication of the original indices, a comprehensive research on stability was accomplished. Thereby, the research question, whether the construct "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" has been valid over 20 years in spite of the varying outcomes of the 18 countries' social policy, had to be answered in the negative. So far, the author has been able to invalidate most criticism by pointing at the typology's need of simplicity. Discussing a possibly existing fourth regime for example, the author states that the acceptance of "slippery or ambiguous cases" is advisable since otherwise the "desired explanatory parsimony would be sacrificed" (1999: 88). However, Esping-Andersen later concedes that this rationale is based on a "distinct overall logic" (1999: 92). Yet the results of the research at hand explicitly reveal that this very fundamental logic from 1980 now shows stark discrepancies when analyzed with recent data. Subsequently, in order to search for an appropriate typology to subsume various kinds of social policy, turning away from the alleged "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" is indispensable.

Nevertheless, it must be considered that the presented standard of knowledge only marks the beginning of research on the "Three-Worlds-Typology's" present relevance. A more profound knowledge will be possible once data, which allows statements on private pensions and revisions for a shorter period of time, is available. Moreover, it is desirable and necessary for further research that Esping-Andersen publish the exact sources used for the creation of the 1980 index. Additionally, Walter Korpi's announcement that the data collected within the Social Citizenship Indicator Program (SCIP) (and later exploited by Esping-Andersen) would be publicly available by November 2007, seems very promising. Finally, it would be interesting to extend the range of research by further incorporating countries such as Korea or Mexico. Klaus Armingeon, at the University of Bern, is currently starting a research project to provide data that allows reconstructing the

stratification indices for the European Union. Not only might newly integrated countries allude to the existence of additional types, but also could the mean and standard deviation based indices of the newly contemplated group lead to different performance results of the previously included countries.

V. Appendix

Table 1.1: Composition of Stratification Index

	Abbreviation	Title	Measurement	Coding
Conservative	(Corp)	Corporatism	Number of major occupationally distinct public pension schemes	$x \leq 2 = 0$ $2 < x \leq 5 = 2$ $x > 5 = 4$
	(Etat)	Etatism	Expenditure on pensions to government employees as percentage of GDP.	$x \leq 1\% = 0$ $1\% < x \leq 2,1\% = 2$ $x > 2,1\% = 4$
Liberal	(Pov)	Means-tested poor relief	Percentage of total public social expenditure	$x \leq 3\% = 0$ $3\% < x \leq 8\% = 2$ $x > 8\% = 4$
	(Pen)	Private Pensions	Private-sector share of total pension spending	$x \leq 10\% = 0$ $10\% < x \leq 15\% = 2$ $x > 16\% = 4$
	(Health)	Private Health Expenditure	Private-sector share of total health spending	$x \leq 10\% = 0$ $10\% < x \leq 20\% = 2$ $x > 21\% = 4$
Socialist	(Univ)	Average Universalism	Averaged percentage of population, 16-64, eligible for sickness, unemployment, and pension benefits	$x \leq 60\% = 0$ $61\% < x \leq 85\% = 2$ $x > 86\% = 4$
	(Equal)	Average Benefit Equality	Average differential between basic and maximum social benefits for sickness, unemployment, and pension (based on net, after-tax, benefits)	$x < 55\% = 0$ $55\% \leq x \leq 85\% = 2$ $x > 80\% = 4$

Source: According to Esping-Andersen (1990)

Table 1.2: Updated Index of Stratification

Country	Conservative				Liberalism				Socialist						
	Corp	Score	Etat	Score	Pov	Score	Pen	Score	Health	Score	Univ	Score		Equal	Score
Australia	1	0	1,3	2	49,0	4	k.A.	4	31,1	4	0,22	0	1,00	4	Australia
Belgium	5	2	3,5	4	3,0	2	k.A.	0	24,2	4	0,89	2	0,94	4	Belgium
Austria	7	4	3,5	4	6,0	2	k.A.	0	30,1	4	0,79	2	0,70	2	Austria
Canada	1	0	0,8	0	16,5	4	k.A.	4	29,7	4	0,85	2	0,98	4	Canada
Denmark	1	0	1,2	2	2,9	0	56,3	4	17,6	2	0,94	4	1,00	4	Denmark
Finland	7	4	2,8	4	14,0	4	56,1	0	24,9	4	0,91	4	0,00	0	Finland
France	9	4	3,2	4	11,6	4	k.A.	0	24,2	4	0,85	2	0,57	0	France
Germany	5	2	1,9	2	9,4	4	22,1	4	21,4	4	0,86	2	0,75	2	Germany
Great Britain	1	0	2,3	4	17,3	4	k.A.	2	19,1	2	0,90	2	0,94	4	Great Britain
Ireland	1	0	0,8	2	29,0	4	k.A.	2	26,7	4	0,99	4	1,00	4	Ireland
Italy	3	2	k.A.	4	4,1	2	4,3	0	26,5	4	0,71	2	0,26	0	Italy
Japan	3	2	1,2	2	7,2	2	k.A.	4	18,7	2	0,69	2	0,63	0	Japan
Netherlands	1	0	1,2	2	12,1	4	k.A.	2	36,9	4	0,98	4	0,84	0	Netherlands
New Zealand	1	0	k.A.	0	27,9	4	k.A.	0	22,0	4	0,33	0	1,00	4	New Zealand
Norway	6	4	k.A.	2	3,9	2	k.A.	0	17,5	2	0,95	4	0,86	2	Norway
Sweden	1	0	k.A.	2	5,1	2	48,0	4	15,1	2	0,93	4	0,87	2	Sweden
Switzerland	1	0	k.A.	0	7,2	2	k.A.	4	44,4	4	0,70	2	0,51	0	Switzerland
USA	3	2	2,1	2	19,7	4	53,6	4	56,0	4	0,60	0	0,58	0	USA
Mean		3,2		2,0		13,7			27,0		0,78		0,75		Mean
S.D.		2,7		1,0		11,9			10,3		0,22		0,28		S.D.

k.A.: no data available.

Score: Score, according to Esping-Andersen's procedure described in "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" (1990).

If no recent data available, Esping-Andersen's original scoring was deployed

	Data for:	Original Sources:	Sources:
(Corp)	2002	US Social Security Administration	US Social Security Administration; in: Allan/Scruggs (2006)
(Etat)	1996; Finland 2006	International Labor Organization	International Labor Organization, Finland: OECD; in: Allan/Scruggs (2006)
(Pov)	1999; Austria 2003; Australia 2001; Canada, New Zealand, USA 2000; Japan 1990	International Labor Organization	EUROSTAT (2006); Austria, Australien, Canada, Japan, New Zealand (2000), USA: International Labor Organization; in: Allan/Scruggs (2006)
(Pen)	1980; Finland, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Great Britain, USA 2000; Denmark 1992	Not specified	Esping-Andersen (1990); Denmark, Finland, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Great Britain, USA: Luxembourg Income Study (2006) ⁴
(Health)	2000	OECD	OECD (2006)
(Univ)	2002	Social Citizenship Indicator Program	Comparative Welfare Entitlement Dataset; in: Allan/Scruggs (2006)
(Equal)	2002	Social Citizenship Indicator Program	Comparative Welfare Entitlement Dataset; in: Allan/Scruggs (2006)

⁴ On August, 21th 2006, the used data was provided by courtesy of Lyle Scruggs.

Table 1.3: Bi-variate Correlation Matrix of Stratification Indicators

	Korp	Etat	Pov	Pen	Health	Univ	Equal
Korp	1	0,733	-0,351	-0,072	-0,123	0,228	-0,497
Etat	0,733	1	-0,270	-0,029	0,047	0,142	-0,416
Pov	-0,351	-0,270	1	-0,025	0,233	-0,651	0,301
Pen	-0,072	-0,029	-0,025	1	0,177	0,055	-0,188
Health	-0,123	0,047	0,233	0,177	1	-0,287	-0,235
Univ	0,228	0,142	-0,651	0,055	-0,287	1	-0,059
Equal	-0,497	-0,416	0,301	-0,188	-0,235	-0,059	1

- Highest intercorrelation expected because of postulated conservative regime
- Highest intercorrelation expected because of postulated liberal regime
- Highest intercorrelation expected because of postulated socialist regime

Tabelle 1.4: Compared Indices of Stratification

Conservative		Liberalism		Socialist	
EA	T	EA	T	EA	T
Austria	8	Austria	8	Denmark	8
France	8	Finland	8	Sweden	8
Germany	8	France	8	Finland	6
Italy	8	Belgium	6	Netherlands	6
<i>Belgium</i>	6	Italy	6	<i>Norway</i>	6
Finland	6	Norway	6	Australia	4
Ireland	4	Germany	4	Belgium	4
Japan	4	Great Britain	4	Canada	4
Netherlands	4	Japan	4	Germany	4
		USA	4	Great Britain	4
Denmark	2	Australia	2	<i>France</i>	4
<i>Great Britain</i>	2	Denmark	2	New Zealand	4
<i>New Zealand</i>	2	Ireland	2	Switzerland	4
<i>Norway</i>	2	Netherlands	2	Austria	2
USA	2	Sweden	2	Ireland	2
Australia	0	<i>Canada</i>	0	Japan	2
Canada	0	New Zealand	0	Italy	0
Sweden	0	Switzerland	0	USA	0
Switzerland	0				
Sum	66	Sum	68	Sum	72

The colors in use show the strength of the parameter value:



During the coding procedure, Esping-Andersen made 10 (!) mistakes. (Obinger/Wagschal 1998:119). Country names in italics show that the values have been corrected. Country names printed in bold letters show that in correcting the values the strength of the parameter was changed.

EA: Esping-Andersen's calculations for 1980 (1990)

T: Editor's calculations for recent data

Table 2: Countries' Placement According to Stratification Index

Country	Conservative	Liberal	Socialist	Classification	~ Dec B	~ Dec T
Austria	High	Middle	Middle	Conservative	No	No
Australia	Low	High	Middle	Liberal	Yes	Yes
Belgium	Middle	Middle	High	Socialist	Yes	Yes
Canada	Low	High	High	Keine	(No)	(No)
Denmark	Low	Middle	High	Socialist	No	Yes
Finland	High	Middle	Middle	Conservative	No	Yes
France	High	Middle	Niedrig	Conservative	No	Yes
Germany	Middle	High	Middle	Liberal	No	No
Great Britain	Middle	Middle	High	Socialist	No	No
Ireland	Niedrig	High	High	None		
Italy	Middle	Middle	Low	None		
Japan	Middle	Middle	Low	None		
Netherlands	Low	High	Middle	Liberal	No	No
New Zealand	Low	Middle	Middle	None		
Norway	Middle	Low	High	Socialist	Yes	Yes
Sweden	Low	Middle	High	Socialist	Yes	Yes
Switzerland	Low	High	Low	Liberal	No	Yes
USA	Middle	High	Low	Liberal	Yes	Yes

~ Dec B displays whether Bamba's de-commodification index reflects the classification
 ~ Dec T displays whether the editor's de-commodification index reflects the classification
 (No) displays that though no classification is possible, the de-commodification index alludes to the world which was ranked lowest for the stratification index.

Table 3.1: Indicators for De-Commodification

Pensions (P)	Unemployment Aid (U)	Sickness Cash Benefits (S)
1) Minimum pension benefits for a standard production worker earning average wages. Replacement rate is the ratio of the benefit to normal worker earnings in that year, both benefits and earnings net of taxes	1) Benefit replacement rates (net) for a standard worker during the first 26 weeks of unemployment. Relative comparison with normal worker earnings per year (net).	1) Benefit replacement rates (net) for a standard worker during the first 26 weeks of sickness. Relative comparison with normal worker earnings per year (net).
2) Standard pension benefits for a normal worker	2) Number of weeks of employment required prior to qualification	2) Number of weeks of employment required prior to qualification
3) Contribution period, measured as number of years of contributions (or employment) required to qualify for a standard pension*	3) Number of waiting days before benefits are paid*	3) Number of waiting days before benefits are paid*
4) Individual's share of pension financing	4) Number of weeks in which a benefit can be maintained	4) Number of weeks in which a benefit can be maintained
5) Percentage of relevant population covered by the program ("take-up rate")**	5) Percentage of relevant population covered by the program**	5) Percentage of relevant population covered by the program**

* Where benefits are based on a means-test, it is scored 0 for contribution period

** Where benefits are based on a means-test, it is scored 50% for population covered

Source: According to Esping-Andersen (1990: 54)

Table 3.2: Valuation of De-Commodification

P1, P2, U1, U4, S1, S4 < (mean-SD)	= 1
P3, P4, U2, U3, S2, S3 > (mean+SD)	= 1
(mean-SD) ≤ P1, ..., P4, U1, ..., U4, S1, ..., S4 ≤ (mean+SD)	= 2
P1, P2, U1, U4, S1, S4 > (mean+SD)	= 3
P3, P4, U2, U3, S2, S3 < (mean-SD)	= 3

Source: According to Esping-Andersen (1990: 54)

Table 3.3: De-Commodification Indices

1972 T	1980 T	1980 E-A	1990 T	1998/9 B	E-A-B Rank	2000 T	E-A-T Rank
NOR 35,0	NOR 38,0	SWE 39,1	NOR 36,0	SWE 34,7	-4,4 0	NOR 38,0	-0,3 +1
NED 32,9	SWE 36,9	NOR 38,3	SWE 35,6	FIN 34,6	5,4 +6	DEN 36,0	-2,1 +1
SWE 32,2	DEN 33,2	DEN 38,1	NED 34,4	NOR 34,0	-4,3 -1	NED 35,0	2,6 +1
AUT 29,0	BEL 31,0	BEL 32,4	DEN 33,8	BEL 31,9	-0,5 +1	SWE 34,4	-4,8 -3
BEL 28,8	NED 30,9	NED 32,4	BEL 32,8	FRA 31,5	4,0 +5	AUT 33,7	2,6 +1
FIN 27,5	SUI 30,2	AUT 31,1	AUT 32,0	AUT 31,1	0,0 0	BEL 31,5	-0,9 -1
DEN 27,4	AUT 29,9	SUI 29,8	FIN 30,7	SUI 29,7	-0,1 0	FIN 31,4	2,2 -1
FRA 27,4	FIN 26,7	FIN 29,2	FRA 27,6	DEN 29,0	-9,1 -5	FRA 28,3	0,8 +2
CAN 26,9	FRA 26,5	GER 27,7	SUI 27,1	NED 28,0	-4,4 -5	ITA 26,7	2,6 +3
GER 25,4	IRL 25,3	FRA 27,5	GER 26,1	CAN 27,9	5,9 +5	GER 26,2	-1,5 -1
NZL 25,0	GER 24,3	JPN 27,1	ITA 25,7	GER 27,7	0,0 -2	GBR 25,1	1,7 +2
GBR 24,3	NZL 23,6	ITA 24,1	CAN 24,8	ITA 27,6	3,5 0	CAN 25,1	3,1 +3
SUI 20,4	CAN 23,1	GBR 23,4	GBR 24,8	IRL 22,1	-1,2 +1	IRL 22,5	-0,8 +1
IRL 19,8	GBR 22,8	IRL 23,3	NZL 22,9	JPN 18,3	-8,8 -3	JPN 21,4	-5,7 -3
USA 17,9	JPN 20,1	CAN 22,0	JPN 21,4	GBR 15,4	-8,0 -2	USA 21,0	7,2 +2
ITA 17,7	USA 19,0	NZL 17,1	IRL 20,5	USA 14,0	0,2 +1	NZL 20,2	3,1 0
AUS 16,0	ITA 18,5	USA 13,8	USA 20,2	AUS 13,5	0,5 +1	SUI 19,3	-10,5 -10
JPN 15,5	AUS 16,0	AUS 13,0	AUS 16,0	NZL 11,5	-5,6 -2	AUS 16,0	3,0 0
Mean 24,9	Mean 26,4	Mean 27,2	Mean 27,4	Mean 25,7		Mean 27,3	
S. D. 5,9	S. D. 6,2	S. D. 7,7	S. D. 5,9	S. D. 7,8		S. D. 6,5	

B: Results by Bambra (2004)

E-A: Results by Esping-Andersen (1990)

T: Editor's results based on raw data provided by courtesy of Allan and Scruggs (2003: 41 et sqq)

Table 3.4: Indices of De-Commodification for Pensions, Sickness and Unemployment Cash Benefits

Country	Pensions						Unemployment						Sickness						Country
	T	T	E-A	T	B	T	T	T	E-A	T	B	T	T	T	E-A	T	B	T	
	72	80	80	90	98/9*	00	72	80	80	90	98/9*	00	72**	80**	80**	90**	98/9*,**	00**	
Australia	6,0	6,0	5,0	6,0	(6,5)	6,0	5,0	5,0	4,0	5,0	-	5,0	5,0	5,0	4,0	5,0	(2,5)	5,0	Australien
Austria	11,7	11,3	11,9	14,0	(15,1)	16,0	6,5	7,6	6,7	7,5	7,1	7,3	10,8	11,0	12,5	10,6	8,9	10,5	Österreich
Belgium	12,6	14,0	15,0	14,0	14,3	14,0	8,3	8,5	8,6	9,2	10	8,4	7,9	8,5	8,8	9,6	7,6	9,1	Belgien
Canada	11,8	9,5	7,7	11,4	10,5	11,6	8,0	7,2	8,0	7,1	(8,1)	7,1	7,1	6,4	6,3	6,3	-	6,3	Kanada
Denmark	13,4	11,7	15,0	14,3	9,1	15,0	4,9	8,5	8,1	8,5	9,1	10,0	9,1	13,0	15,0	11,0	10,8	11,0	Dänemark
Finland	10,8	11,8	14,0	12,0	(16,4)	12,0	4,7	5,0	5,2	6,7	9,1	7,4	12,0	10,0	10,0	12,0	9,1	12,0	Finnland
France	10,2	10,8	12,0	11,4	15,3	11,5	9,1	8,3	6,3	8,5	8,5	8,0	8,0	7,4	9,2	7,7	7,7	8,8	Frankreich
Germany	7,7	6,5	8,5	8,5	7,6	9,0	7,9	7,5	7,9	7,4	9,2	7,0	9,8	10,4	11,3	10,2	10,9	10,2	Deutschland
Great Britain	10,3	8,7	8,5	12,0	5,4	12,0	6,7	7,0	7,2	6,4	4,6	6,6	7,3	7,0	7,7	6,4	5,4	6,6	Großbritannien
Ireland	7,6	9,1	6,7	7,9	9,8	7,0	6,5	8,5	8,3	6,3	6,6	7,8	5,8	7,7	8,3	6,3	5,7	7,8	Irland
Italy	6,6	8,0	9,6	14,0	(10,7)	14,0	3,8	3,2	5,1	4,0	6,2	5,0	7,3	7,3	9,4	7,7	10,7	7,7	Italien
Japan	5,0	9,4	10,5	10,0	4,6	10,0	4,3	4,5	5,0	4,9	(7,6)	5,0	6,2	6,2	6,8	6,5	-	6,4	Japan
Netherlands	10,3	10,7	10,8	13,0	(10,5)	13,0	11,3	10,6	11,1	11,6	9,1	11,4	11,3	9,7	10,5	9,8	8,4	10,6	Niederlande
New Zealand	14,0	13,6	9,1	13,9	(6,5)	11,2	6,0	5,0	4,0	4,5	(2,5)	4,5	5,0	5,0	4,0	4,5	(2,5)	4,5	Neuseeland
Norway	16,0	14,0	14,9	13,0	13,4	13,0	9,0	11,0	9,4	10,0	10,3	12,0	10,0	13,0	14,0	13,0	10,3	13,0	Norwegen
Sweden	12,0	15,0	17,0	13,0	13,9	13,0	7,2	7,9	7,1	9,6	10,4	9,4	13,0	14,0	15,0	13,0	10,4	12,0	Schweden
Switzerland	8,0	10,0	9,0	8,0	(9,9)	8,0	1,4	9,2	7,2	8,8	-	8,7	11,0	11,0	12,0	10,3	-	2,6	Schweiz
USA	10,9	11,6	7,0	11,6	(7,0)	11,9	7,0	7,4	7,2	8,6	(7,0)	9,1	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	USA

B: E-A: Results by Bambra(2004)

E-A: Results by Esping-Andersen (1990)

T: Editor's results based on raw data provided by courtesy of Allan and Scruggs (2003: 41 et sqq)

* Values in parentheses point out the fact that for some of the countries data could not be found. In these cases the value was derived from the averaged available data.

** If program is not existent it is scored with 0

VI. References

Alber, Jens, 1982: Vom Armenhaus zum Wohlfahrtsstaat. Frankfurt am Main [u.a.]: Campus.

Allan, James P. und *Lyle A. Scruggs*, 2003: Trends in Welfare State Decommodification in Eighteen Advanced Industrial Democracies, 1972-2000. Working Paper for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, 27. - 31. August 2003.

Allan, James P. und *Lyle A. Scruggs*, 2006: Social Stratification and Welfare Regimes for the 21st Century: Revisiting the “Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism”. Working Paper for the Annual Meeting of the American American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, 31. August - 3. September 2006.

Almond, Gabriel Abraham und *G. Bingham Powell*, 1978: Comparative Politics. Boston: Little-Brown.

Amenta, Edwin, 1993: State of the Art in Welfare State Research on Social Spending Efforts in Capitalist Democracies Since 1960. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(3): 750-763.

Bambra, Clare, 2004: Weathering the Storm: Convergence, Divergence, and the Robustness of the “Worlds of Welfare”. *The Social Policy Journal*, 3(3): 3-23.

Castles, Francis G., 1982: The Impact of Parties. London [u.a.]: Sage.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, 1990: The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Daly, Mary, 2000: The gender division of welfare. Cambridge [u.a.]: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, 1999: Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies. Oxford [u.a.]: Oxford University Press.

Ferrera, Maurizio, 1996: The ‘Southern Model’ of Welfare in Social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(1): 17-37.

Flora, Peter und *Arnold J. Heidenheimer*, 1981: The Historical Core and Changing Boundaries of the Welfare State. S.17-36 in: *Peter Flora (Hg.)*, The Development of Welfare States in Europe and America. New Brunswick [u.a.]: Transaction Books.

- Jen, Erica*, 2001: Stable or Robust? What's the Difference?
([http://discuss.santafe.edu/robustness/stories/StoryReader\\$24](http://discuss.santafe.edu/robustness/stories/StoryReader$24))
- Kohl, Jürgen*, 1993: Der Wohlfahrtsstaat in vergleichender Perspektive. Zeitschrift für Sozialreform, 39(2): 67-82.
- Lessenich, Stephan*, 1994: Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism - oder vier? Politische Vierteljahresschrift, 35(2): 224-244.
- Luxembourg Income Study*, 2006: Zugriff nur nach Registrierung unter
<http://www.lisproject.org/introduction/userform.htm>
- Obinger, Herbert* und *Uwe Wagschal*, 1997: Drei Welten des Wohlfahrtsstaates? S.109-135
in: *Stephan Lessenich* und *Ilona Ostner* (Hg.), Welten des Wohlfahrtskapitalismus.
Frankfurt/Main [u.a.]: Campus.
- OECD*, 2006: OECD Health Data 2006.
(<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/59/49/35529832.xls>)
- Offe, Claus*, 1993: Zur Typologie von sozialpolitischen Regimes. Zeitschrift für Sozialreform, 39(2): 83-86.
- Bambra, Clare*, 2004: Weathering the Storm: Convergence, Divergence, and the Robustness of the "Worlds of Welfare". The Social Policy Journal, 3(3): 3-23.
- Sabatier, Paul*, 1986: What Can We Learn from Implementation Research? S. 313-326 in:
Franz-Xaver Kaufmann (Hg.), Guidance, control, and evaluation in the public sector. Berlin [u.a.]: de Gruyter.
- Sainsbury, Diane*, 1994: Gendering welfare states. London [u.a.]: Sage.
- Santa Fe Institute*, 2001: Working Definitions of Robustness.
([http://discuss.santafe.edu/robustness/stories/storyReader\\$9](http://discuss.santafe.edu/robustness/stories/storyReader$9))
- Schmidt, Manfred G.*, 1982: Wohlfahrtsstaatliche Politik unter bürgerlichen und sozialdemokratischen Regierungen. Frankfurt/Main [u.a.]: Campus.
- Schmidt, Manfred G.*, 2005: Sozialpolitik in Deutschland. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften
- Schnell, Rainer*, *Paul B. Hill* und *Elke Esser* 2005: Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung. München [u.a.]: Oldenbourg.

Titmuss, Richard M., 1963: *Essays on 'The Welfare State'*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Titmuss, Richard M., 1968: *Commitment to Welfare*. London: Allen und Unwin.

Weber, Max, 1904: Die "Objektivität" sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnisse. S. 146-214 in: Johannes Winckelmann (Hg.), *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Wilensky, Harold L. und Charles N. Lebeaux, 1958: *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*. New York: Free Press