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Abstract: The goal of this special issue is to highlight the importance of unconventional social policies, theorize their development in comparison with traditional welfare state accounts and outline a new research agenda. In this introduction to the special issue, the editors present the concept of social policy by other means as encompassing two kinds of unconventional social policy (from the point of view of mainstream comparative research): First, functional equivalents to formal systems of social protection and, second, non-state provision of benefits. The concept builds upon a sizeable, but fragmented literature in comparative welfare state research. While numerous examples demonstrate that social policy by other means is more pervasive in both OECD and non-OECD countries than often acknowledged, a brief survey of the top 20 articles in the field reveals that this fact is not sufficiently reflected in the academic literature. With reference to both existing studies and the contributions to this special issue, the editors go on to explore 1) the different forms of social policy by other means, 2) explanatory theories and 3) their effectiveness in terms of social outcomes. They close by outlining a research agenda.
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Introduction to Social Policy by Other Means

Life can be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short” (Hobbes 1660, ch. xiii). To protect their citizens from the hardships of life, Western European governments have since the nineteenth century introduced social policies such as health insurance or old age pensions that constitute the core of what we now understand as the modern welfare state. Most countries worldwide have followed that path in one way or another (Schmitt et al. 2015). The strong focus on public social insurance and state-provided social services has served comparative welfare state research well in analyzing the reduction of life risks in advanced Western economies over the last century. Yet, increasingly, this focus is too narrow. There is a strong need to discuss new
policies within and outside developed democracies, as well as historical and contemporary forms of what we call social policy by other means. The goal of this special issue is to highlight the importance of unconventional social policies, theorize their development in comparison with traditional welfare state accounts and outline a new research agenda. In this introduction we first specify our understanding of social policy and integrate existing strands of literature on social policy by other means. We then illustrate how underrated the topic is through a brief survey of the most cited articles in the field. A second part theorizes the typical drivers and outcomes of social policy by other means. The final part briefly sketches a research agenda.

Social Policy by Other Means: Conceptualization and Precursors in the Literature

Reformulating Asa Brigg’s famous definition of a welfare state slightly, we conceive of social policy as *the deliberate use of organized power (through politics and administration) in an effort to shape market processes and modify outcomes of market forces to (a) guarantee a minimum income, to (b) provide an insurance against life contingencies such as unemployment or illness for (c) all citizens without distinction of status* (Briggs 1961: 228). Secondary ‘macro goals’ of social policy typically include the stabilization of the economy, a stable supply of labor and political stability. While classical welfare state schemes such as a national health service and unemployment insurance support these goals, they are by far not the only policies governments around the world have at their disposal.¹ States also rely on a vast array of social policies by other means to decommodify, regulate, and stabilize their economies. We are of course not the first ones to make such a claim. Richard Titmuss (1958), already in the 1950s wrote about the underappreciated areas of ‘occupational’ and ‘fiscal welfare’. The term ‘social protection by other means’ was coined by Francis Castles in the 1980s (Castles 1985, 1989).²

---

¹ We exclude social policies that are exclusively provided and regulated by non-state actors. For an overview of private, welfare state substituting arrangements see for instance Cammett and MacLean (2014).

² We use the term ‘social policy’ instead of ‘social protection’ as it tends to have a wider definition which, for example, often includes education and social assistance.
He aimed to explain the puzzling absence of a large welfare state in Australia and New Zealand, despite a relatively strong working class movement and egalitarian political cultures. His historical explanation centered on a range of policy measures and structural characteristics of the two Antipodes, including high levels of labor market regulation with a strong legal norm of a ‘family wage’, trade protectionism and strict regulation of immigration, which dampened the need for formal welfare state schemes. As a result, what at first sight might look like a welfare state laggard, turns out to be a highly regulated system of protective and compensatory policies, leading, for many years, to strongly egalitarian social outcomes. Just not through European-style social welfare. Similar arguments can be made for other countries. Consider Japan, where for a long time generous company welfare made up for less comprehensive welfare benefits (Peng 2000). Or take Switzerland, which combined trade protectionism and a tolerance for producer cartels with a relatively lean welfare state (Bonoli and Mach 2000). In short, there are many kinds of welfare state ‘exceptionalism’ that rely strongly on various ‘functional equivalents’ to formal public provision, aiming at broadly the same social policy aims mentioned above, but using very different means, including subsidies, skills investment, ‘business’ regulation, or the direct supply of goods. Some empirical examples of social policy by other means are widely acknowledged, such as tax benefits and mandatory private pensions (Adema and Ladaique 2009, Ebbinghaus 2011, Morel et al. 2016). In many rich countries, these instruments have become quite significant in size: The United States spends over 134 billion dollars annually on tax breaks towards current private spending arrangements like employer health insurance (Adema et al. 2011). Education and training is a massively important policy area that is currently making the transition from unconventional to core social policy as part of the social investment agenda (Busemeyer 2014, Morel et al. 2012). More broadly, a number of

---

3 Castles explicitly contrasted the Australasian strategy of ‘domestic defence’ with ‘domestic compensation’ found, for example, in some small, corporatist European countries such as Austria, the Netherlands and Sweden (Katzenstein 1985).
Scholars have advocated for the use of ‘predistribution’ in the fight against rising income inequality by way of minimum wages, stronger labor market regulation, skills investment etc. (Chwalisz and Diamond 2015, Morgan and Kelly 2013). Other examples are much less well known, even though they have played a massive role in certain places and at certain times. Consumer and producer subsidies in developing and middle-income countries are a case in point. Countries like Egypt and Jordan, for example, funnel more than eight per cent of GDP to consumers in the form of food and fuel subsidies (IMF 2012) – thereby matching what many rich countries spend on public health care. A second important form of social policy by other means relates to the provision of transfers and services. Sometimes protection to individuals and households is either publicly mandated or strongly supported, but not directly provided by the state. Instead provision is left to private actors, either individuals or collective nonprofit or for-profit organizations. When it comes to non-state actors in the ‘delegated welfare state’ (Morgan and Campbell 2011), we find that over 90 per cent of public eldercare services in Germany, England and the Netherlands are delegated to private (non-profit as well as for-profit) providers (Riedel et al. 2016). The Ghent system of voluntary, trade union-administered unemployment insurance still found in Belgium and Scandinavia must also be seen in this light. Such arrangements are typically historical power-sharing compromises made between nation state-building elites and powerful economic, regional or religious opponents to centralization. In sum, there are many ways in which governments can protect their citizens from long-term or cyclical negative effects of market forces – either by regulating private service provision or using a variety of social policies by other means. As we have seen, some of these have been picked up and discussed by the literature in comparative welfare state. Yet even though such studies exist, they are fragmented by policy field or region, and – as the next section will show – are still seen as the exception rather than the social policy rule.

The Conventional Picture
The mainstream welfare state literature of the last 30 years or so has focused on a relatively narrow set of policies and actors, with important consequences. This becomes evident if we look at the list of the 20 most highly cited works that mention ‘welfare state’ or ‘social policy’ in their title or abstract. A number of observations can be made: First, most articles focus on the core OECD world of the 1980s and 1990s, some even more narrowly on EU countries or the United States. Second, there is a dominance of social spending analysis, almost invariably based on the OECD social expenditure database (SOCX) with its nine functional branches and, more recently, replacement rates of core formal social security programs such as statutory old age pensions, unemployment insurance or sickness benefits. Third, 14 out of these 20 influential social policy or welfare state analyses are quantitative (or mixed) studies. Fourth, and most importantly, only 5 out of 20 analyses include social policies by other means - sometimes almost “by accident”, for example, by taking total government consumption as a dependent variable. Iversen and Cusack (2000), for instance, briefly discuss public employment as an alternative to social transfers. Fifth, when such unconventional policies are included in these top articles, they tend to be analyses of certain polities, such as the United States (Hacker 2004), East Asia (Holliday 2000) or the social policy of the European Union (Pierson 1996), and filed under various kinds of exceptionalisms to the allegedly ‘typical’ Western pattern of nation state development. As Daniel Béland (2019) points out in the conclusion to this special issue, while the specialization and institutionalization of welfare state research was a necessary step to expand the field, it can also lead to inertia.

What is Missing?

4 See Online Appendix. Our literature review is based on a SSCI search from the 16th of February 2018 for the terms “Social Policy” or “Welfare State” in Political Science. We excluded review or method articles, primarily normative articles, articles that were obviously not on social policy-related themes as well as introductions to special issues.

5 Old age, survivors, incapacity-related, health, family, active labor market programs, unemployment, housing, other (mostly social assistance).
What is missing from the literature is a systematic integration of the two forms of social policy by other means (functional equivalents and non-state provision) into thinking about the welfare state. Given the ubiquity of at least some form of this in virtually all countries, we need to think more about how to integrate them into our descriptions and measurements of what social policy is and finding explanations for why policy development across countries and time has taken these routes. The contributions to this special issue focus on several important instances of social policy by other means. When it comes to functional equivalents, Alexandre Afonso (2018) highlights the functional role of migration policy in the postwar years as a means to regulate labor supply in Switzerland in order to avoid having to support rising female employment via state intervention. The long-term consequences of this policy for the demographic make-up and labor market position of different groups in Switzerland and Sweden are still visible today. Tim Dorlach (2018), by contrast, focuses more on the aim of social policy in stabilizing household incomes and shows that the solution to this problem in Turkey for a long time has been agricultural subsidies and housing policy. The former kind of policy involves transfers by the state to rural households that can be found in similar ways in the United States and the European Union at certain points in time (Rieger 1995, Sheingate 2003). In contrast to the active agricultural welfare state, in the housing area the Turkish state has supported low-income households through strategic inaction or what Alisha C. Holland (2017) has called ‘forbearance’ or deliberate non-enforcement of laws. In a similar vein, Santiago López-Cariboni (2018) demonstrates how low-income inhabitants of Montevideo have informal access to electricity due to strategic forbearance. Electricity theft helps to close the gap for the poor in a formal welfare state heavily targeted towards the middle-class. Moreover, during economic downturns, policymakers become more tolerant of electricity theft, thereby helping to smooth consumption in an otherwise highly pro-cyclical fiscal setting. While this form of indirect redistribution arguably helps to perform an important macro-economic function, it also deepens the dualism between formal and informal sector workers, many Latin
American welfare states are famous for. Hendrik Moeys (2018) addresses the second face of social policy by other means, the provision by non-state actors. Going back much further than most studies of the Belgian welfare state – or one should say, most studies of the welfare state tout court – namely, the beginning of the nineteenth century, he demonstrates the central role of religious and philanthropic organizations in providing social services in very specific arrangements one might be tempted to call public-private partnerships. The dominance of these arrangements throughout the pre and early history of the Belgian welfare state also explains the importance of non-state providers in Belgium today. Such historical compromises in the initial phases of nation-state building in the nineteenth century are typical for many Continental European countries, marked by religious (and sometimes cultural and linguistic) divisions (Salamon and Anheier 1998). The specific ‘welfare mixes’ resulting from these long-term processes shape the kind of reforms initiated and the kind of politics that are relevant in different welfare states to this day (Ascoli and Ranci 2002). How these processes compare with welfare state building in similarly fragmented non-OECD countries is still seriously under-researched. The contribution of social policy by other means in balancing integration and autonomy is a plausible hypothesis to be applied in other settings. Taken together, the studies included in this special issue significantly advance our understanding of what social policy is and how countries manage to reach some traditional welfare state goals without recourse to traditional welfare state means. For the most part, what we see is a trade-off between conventional and unconventional social policy, in the sense that well-developed social policy by other means seems to slow down the growth of conventional forms of protection and the retrenchment of the former is accompanied by an expansion of the latter (see e.g. Dorlach). Yet given the enormous difficulty of standardizing measurements across time, space and policy area, it comes as no surprise that outside of areas like, say, tax expenditures (Morel et al. 2018) and land reform (Albertus 2015) most studies of social policy by other means are single-country studies (including quantitative analyses like López-Cariboni’s) or small-N comparisons (like
Afonso’s). A first step in making these more broadly comparable would be to acknowledge that they are all part of the same phenomenon with a view to developing measures and typologies of these policies. Another route towards integrating the literature is via common *explanations* which is what we will address in the following section.

**Explaining Social Policy by Other Means**

What leads states to adopt social policy by other means rather than just conventional forms of welfare provision? Do the same forces drive both kinds of social policy? One way of looking at these questions is that these are two completely different strategies. Social policy by other means is determined by low state capacity and levels of low to intermediate economic development and is mostly superfluous in advanced economies. This would call for different theories than those we know from welfare state research. The opposite way is to argue that social policy by other means is no different than traditional social policy and driven by the same factors, alleviating the same needs. As our special issue shows, the truth lies somewhere in between. Social policy by other means occurs mostly in non-advanced settings⁶, but is often influenced by the same proximate causes than conventional social policy. Need in form of poverty (Dorlach 2018), poverty and poor health (Moeys 2018), but also labor shortages (Afonso 2018) or macro-economic shocks (López-Cariboni 2018) drive social policy answers. Moreover, such proximate explanations can be supplemented by more abstract ones, as responses to need are invariably embedded in institutions, influenced by cultural scripts and policy ideas and exacerbated or diluted by party politics. All are heavily path-dependent. A useful heuristic, informed by existing welfare state research, categorizes explanations as either functional or political, with the latter further divided into explanations centering on interests, institutions and ideas. *Functional* explanations see policy as a response to structural, mostly

---

⁶ Note that this is almost true by definition given that the conventional welfare state literature focuses on policies in advanced democracies.
socio-economic conditions. Functionalism implicitly addresses social policy by other means by arguing that with rising levels of economic development, countries will converge on the conventional welfare state model, and crowd out ‘pre-modern’ community-based alternatives (Wilensky 1975). Marxist analyses, despite their more critical outlook, share this overall perspective on the dominance of state solutions. Neo-functionalist explanations often analyze the impact of economic globalization or deindustrialization. Mishra, for example, in one of the few more general contributions about the phenomenon of social policy by other means, argues that these policies ‘developed in conditions in which nation-states could remain relatively insulated from the global economy. The opening up of national economies to market forces and international competition […] has tended to weaken, if not undermine, the foundations of these types of [social protection by other means]’ (Mishra 2004: 69). An important reinforcing factor of this, according to Mishra, is the influence of international institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank (see also below). Another functionalist explanation would focus on the impact of sectoral economic shifts – including the role of decreasing agricultural employment and deindustrialization – on the (demise of) social policy by other means. In his contribution on the Turkish case, Dorlach discusses and ultimately dismisses such a functionalist explanation, however. Relatedly, an issue that is particularly salient in the Global South is the high share of employment in the informal sector (Barrientos 2009). This alone often impedes formal social protection – at least when it comes to social insurance-type schemes – and therefore may give rise to functionally equivalent forms of protection, as witnessed in Uruguay. Formalization may then prompt shifts in social protection. More political, interest-based explanations include those that focus on narrow electoral interests as well as political parties. The literature on ‘distributive politics’ (Golden and Min 2013) dovetails with social policy by other means to the extent that the goods and services analyzed by distributive politics scholars very often amount to material transfers to households quite different from formal welfare state programs, but similar in their material effects. A large part of the distributive politics literature finds that the motivation for
such policies can often be found in the targeting of either core constituencies or swing voters. Following this logic, Holland claims that forbearance is not a sign of lacking state capacities, but of electoral politics. Social policy by other means, however, may also be influenced by the partisan orientation of a government. Santiago López-Cariboni (2018) for example shows that countercyclical forbearance is pursued by left-wing governments in particular. Alexandre Afonso (2018) argues that a strong left power led to what we could nowadays call the first development of a social investment state in Sweden and an increased female workforce. This fits with the conclusion of comparative welfare state research that left-wing parties tend to expand social policy. The decision to expand social policy and the choice of the instrument to do this – conventional or unconventional – must be distinguished, however. Here, perhaps the clearest pattern is not about left-vs.-right, but about the role of Christian Democracy. After all, Christian Democratic parties have historically tried to expand the welfare state without necessarily expanding the state apparatus (Huber and Stephens 2001, van Kersbergen 1995). The Catholic doctrine of ‘subsidiarity’ implies that community-based solutions should be supported (e.g. subsidized) by the state, but not replaced by state bureaucracy. This is why we find a prevalence of non-state social provision in Continental Europe to this day. As Hendrik Moeys (2018) shows for Belgium, Christian democratic parties were the carriers of these ideas and for the most part resisted centralization and direct state provision. Yet they did not limit social policy expansion per se. When faced with socialist opposition from subnational politics, Catholic parties were eager to centralize decision-making on welfare state matters, which is how the peculiar compromise between state intervention (in funding) and non-intervention (in provision) became enshrined. Similar pragmatic moves can be found under other Christian democratic governments in Europe. More recently, private provision was introduced under the
headline of the neoliberal choice agenda. The marketization of social provision via contracting-out should therefore be strongest under market-liberal governments. Research on social services reforms has shown, however, that partisan differences exist not so much in the extent, but the form of marketization of social services (Gingrich 2011, Zehavi 2012). Institutional explanations come in many forms. The two most relevant institutionalist arguments for social policy by other means are institutions as state capacities and institutional path dependency. One of the key reasons for social policy by other means might be the lack of state capacities to introduce traditional state-centered transfer systems or services (Orloff and Skocpol 1984). The lack of means to extract resources – tax revenue, in particular – and administer large public schemes has led governments to look for alternative ways to reach equitable social outcomes, either by using regulatory policies or by altogether bypassing the nation state. What is more, social policy by other means is also remarkably resistant to reform and retrenchment. Jacob Hacker’s study of the public-private interplay in pensions and health care in the United State is a case in point (Hacker 2002). The path dependency of employer-funded health care and private pensions is key in explaining the relatively underdeveloped formal welfare state. The sources of path dependency can, in turn, be found in the political support of groups not commonly counted among the defenders of social policy: employers and conservative politicians. Path dependency looms large in Moey’s (2018) account of the Belgian welfare state. He effectively shows the very deep roots of today’s policies, reaching as far back as the first half of the nineteenth century. The ideational literature on the development of the welfare state is more fragmented than the other approaches (Gofas and Hay 2010). Cultural factors have been used to explain certain features of welfare arrangements (e.g. family policy, anti-poverty programs), but they are often relatively specific to the policy or even to the country analyzed (van Oorschot

---

7 The idea of Big Society of the British Conservative-Liberal coalition of 2010-2015 may also be seen in this light (Smith and Jones 2015). The Big Society agenda was, however, quickly abandoned and replaced by austerity (Woodhouse 2013).
et al. 2008). Explaining welfare state reforms is an area where ideational approaches have been particularly fruitful e.g. via framing or discursive strategies (Cox 2001, Schmidt 2002). Ideas also matter greatly in understanding social policy by other means, as the contributions from this special issue make clear. Catholic ideas of subsidiarity, for instance, shaped Belgian non-state provision and different gender norms are one key factor to understand why Sweden and Switzerland reacted very differently to a common labor shortage. Conversely, the functional equivalents to formal welfare in Turkey were at odds with the neo-liberal ideas of the IMF, the WTO and the EU in the 1990s and early 2000s.

**Many ways to Rome? Social outcomes of social policy by other means**

How should we evaluate social policies by other means based on their outcomes? One view is to see them as inferior alternative to conventional social policies. They provide solutions to the same problems, but can be less efficient such as farm subsidies in Turkey (Dorlach 2018), more dangerous such as forbearance of electricity theft in Uruguay (López-Cariboni 2018), or favorable for outdated gender roles such as labor supply policies in Switzerland (Afonso 2018). Moreover, there is mounting evidence that tax expenditures and state mandated and/or subsidized private provision lead to inegalitarian outcomes (Been et al. 2017, Branco and Costa 2018, Faricy 2015). Yet in a world of second best, these are sometimes the only available solutions. The best outcome of functioning social policies by other means is hence their own substitution with conventional social policies. Another view highlights the path-dependency and layering of social policies. As the coordinated, long-term development of the Belgian welfare state shows, even core OECD countries have welfare states that developed from – what is now considered – unconventional social policy provision and are still steeped in them (Moeys 2018). This is not to say that social policy by other means cannot be innovative, which the example of the renewed interest in education (social investment) policies, via diffusion helped
by the United Nations and the OECD from the developing world into advanced democracies, illustrates (Jenson 2010).

**Future Welfare State Research**

The contributions from this special issue have made it clear (yet again) that by ignoring social policy by other means, we risk missing out on important aspects of social protection, redistribution and macroeconomic stabilization. We have conceptualized social policy by other means as coming in two forms (which may be combined): 1) functional equivalents to conventional policies and 2) non-state provision of benefits and services mandated and regulated by the state. Although, as we have tried to show in this introduction, there are already some fruitful approaches to systematically capture and explain what is going on above, below and beside the welfare state, we would like to point out three areas of research that seem particularly promising:

First, without doubt, the systematic comparison of social policy efforts across time and space faces practical difficulties when social policy by other means is taken seriously. This may be the single most important reason why the idea has not made deeper inroads into the mainstream literature. Rather than spending, which does not capture many of the phenomena, one may have to look more at legislation and regulation, on the one hand and outcomes, on the other. In fact, measuring the degree to which social problems are diminished at the individual or household level – by whatever means – may be the most realistic way forward to a comparison (Castles 1994). Second, one aspect of social policy by other means that has not received sufficient attention so far is whether its retrenchment follows similar pathways as cutbacks to conventional social policy (Pierson 1994, Nispen 2016). Dorlach explores the issue in his contribution on Turkey. Due to interest-group feedback, it seems likely that non-state provision is harder to cut back than publicly provided services. When it comes to functional equivalents, the expectations could go both ways. On the one hand, their more indirect, sometimes “hidden” character might make them preferred targets of cutbacks. On the
other hand, these policies may also be surrounded by established interest groups and a strong “policy instrument constituency” (Béland and Howlett 2016) preventing retrenchment. Third, comparing social policy by other means historically and across countries may be a way to overcome the ethnocentrism of welfare state research and better integrate research on the Global South with research on the (core) OECD. By pointing out that both historically and currently, Western countries have been much more ‘unconventional’ than often acknowledged could bridge the still existing gulf between the idealized picture of ‘modern’ welfare states in the Northwestern corner of the world map and the somehow exotic, but substandard ‘rest’.
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## Appendix

*Table 1: Social Policy in the Literature, sorted by Citations.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Country focus</th>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>SPOM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierson 1996a</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Public cash transfers (pensions, unemployment insurance), health care, housing</td>
<td>Social spending and legislative changes</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>c. 1974-94</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierson 1996b</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>EU social policy, including quite unconventional (e.g. gender equality, occupational health and safety)</td>
<td>Legislative changes, court rulings at EU level</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>c. 1980-95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacker 2004</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Social transfers and tax expenditures, subsidies for private provision in health and pensions</td>
<td>Legislative changes, trends in private provision</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Post-1970s</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korpi and Palme 2003</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Social transfers (sickness, work accident, and unemployment insurance)</td>
<td>Replacement rates</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1975-95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman and Zaller 1992</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Government provided services, guaranteed jobs; potentially quite broad (open ended)</td>
<td>Survey data (open ended questions)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>(Yes, implicit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iversen and Soskice 2001</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>(Individual support for) government spending on unemployment, health, retirement</td>
<td>Cross-national survey data</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1996/97</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scharpf 2002</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>EU social policy (social protection and employment policy)</td>
<td>Legislative changes, court rulings at EU level</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>1980s-90s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iversen and Cusack 2000</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>government transfers and civilian government consumption</td>
<td>Cross-national spending, public employment and social benefits are discussed</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1961-93</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley et al. 2003</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Income inequality and redistribution</td>
<td>Cross-national aggregate, based on LIS-microdata</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1970s-90s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Research Focus</td>
<td>Type of Analysis</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Time Period</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan and Scruggs 2004</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Average net replacement rates for unemployment insurance and sickness benefits</td>
<td>Cross-national replacement rates, based on legislation and wage/taxation statistics</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1975–99</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holliday 2000</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Social security as well as non-state provision of welfare</td>
<td>Mostly secondary literature</td>
<td>5 East Asian countries</td>
<td>c. 1950-2000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett and Mitchell 2001</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Public social spending</td>
<td>Cross-national public spending on social services and income transfers</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1961-93</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moene and Wallerstein 2001</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Government spending on insurance against loss of income</td>
<td>Social spending excluding health, pensions, family, housing, other</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1980-95</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett 1998</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Fiscal policy</td>
<td>Total government spending</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>1980s-90s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumlin and Rothstein 2005</td>
<td>Quant</td>
<td>Various state transfers and benefits: housing allowances</td>
<td>Survey asks about contact with administration for different benefits</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
social assistance, transportation allowances for disabled persons, disability pensions, disability care, active labor-market measures, and elder care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Include?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korpi 2006</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Secondary literature and entitlement data</td>
<td>OECD 20th century, mostly post-Depression</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt 2002</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Legislative change and discourse</td>
<td>Secondary literature</td>
<td>OECD 1980s-90s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton and Pontusson 1998</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Core welfare state programs, government consumption</td>
<td>Secondary literature, spending and social outcomes data</td>
<td>OECD Late 1970s to mid-1990s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierson 1998</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Core welfare state programs</td>
<td>Spending data</td>
<td>OECD 1960s-90s</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iversen and Stephens 2008</td>
<td>Mix</td>
<td>Welfare state, labor market regulation, education</td>
<td>Spending, entitlements, regulation levels and educational outcomes and secondary literature on reforms</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Late 19th century to 1990s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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