

On Theoretical Possibility of East Asian Welfare Regime: from the Point of Comparative Politics¹⁾

Masatoshi Kato *

Abstract

Since the publication of Esping-Andersen's *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (1990), scholars of comparative political economy and social policy have paid attention to welfare regimes in East Asia. In this context, East Asia mainly consists of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. The focus of these scholar's arguments is whether welfare regimes in East Asia appropriately fit Esping-Andersen's typology. Esping-Andersen insisted that welfare regime in Japan was "hybrid", possessing attributes of both liberal and conservative regimes. However, specialists in East Asia claim that the welfare regime in it comprise a peculiar regime. For example, some scholars assert that because welfare regime in East Asia has strong family values, they are called "confucian welfare states". In addition, other scholars pay attention to the subordination of social policy to economic policy for the purpose of economic growth. They characterize welfare regimes in East Asia as "developmental (or productivist) welfare states". Some specialists focus on the relationship between the late industrialization in Asia and its welfare states. They call welfare regimes in East Asia "late coming welfare states". While these arguments emphasized the peculiarity of East Asian welfare regimes, others tried to place it on comparative framework. Some insists that because welfare regime in East Asia

* Associate Professor, the Faculty of Social Sciences, Ritsumeikan University

(and South Europe) depended on family welfare, they should be categorized as “familialistic” regimes, which would constitute a fourth regime in Esping-Andersen’s typology.

In this paper, I consider the academic significance and limitations of these works and clarify the implication for future research from the point of political science. For example, the theory of “confucian welfare states” shows the importance of cultural base of welfare states. However, this tends to fall into cultural reductionism. In addition, the theory of “developmental welfare states” demonstrates the importance of combining social policy with economic policy in order to understand welfare state. However, it may underplay the fact that welfare states in Europe emphasize economic value of social policy. Moreover, the theory of “late coming welfare states” points the importance of time in the development of welfare states. However, this can fall into “the international situations matter”. The theory of “familialistic regimes” emphasizes the comparability of East Asia. However, this does not show that how and/or why East Asian welfare regime looks like it. Finally, I return to the Esping-Andersen’s contribution to theory of comparative welfare states, and clarify the implication of the examined theories of East Asian welfare regimes. I provide a new typology of welfare states and suggest a new theoretical framework for comparative analysis of welfare states development.

1 Introduction

Since the publication of Esping-Andersen’s *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (1990), scholars of comparative political economy and social policy have paid attention to welfare regimes in East Asia. In this context, East

Asia mainly consists of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. The focus of these scholar's arguments is whether welfare regimes in East Asia appropriately fit Esping-Andersen's typology. There are many views about the utility of his typology in analyzing East Asia. For example, Esping-Andersen (EA) believed that welfare regime in Japan was "hybrid", possessing attributes of both liberal and conservative regimes (Esping-Andersen 1997)²⁾. However, specialists in East Asia claim that welfare regime in it comprise a peculiar regime. In other words, they think that EA's typology is does not accurately apply to East Asia. For example, some scholars assert that because welfare regimes in East Asia have strong family values, they should be termed "confucian welfare states" (Jones 1990, 1993). In addition, other scholars pay attention to the subordination of social policy to economic policy for the purpose of economic growth. They characterize welfare regimes in East Asia as "developmental (or productivist) welfare states" (Holliday and Wilding 2003, Holliday 2000, Wilding 2000, Kwon 2005, 2009). Moreover, some specialists focus on the relationship between late industrialization in Asia and its welfare states. They call welfare regimes in East Asia "Late Coming Welfare States" (Kim 2008, 2017, Li 2011, Takekawa 2007). While these arguments emphasized the peculiarity of East Asian welfare regimes, others tried to place it on comparative framework. Some insists that because welfare regime in East Asia (and South Europe) depended on family welfare, they are categorized as "familialistic" regimes, which would constitute a fourth regime in EA's typology (Shinkawa 2005, Ahn et al. 2015, Estevez-Abe et al. 2016).

Although there are many discussions on the utility of EA's typology and the features of East Asian welfare regimes, scholars cannot consider their contributions to theory of comparative welfare states. This is because these

discussions are mainly interested in understanding the characteristics of welfare states, and do not sufficiently analyze the relationship between the various views on welfare state. While some views clarify certain features of welfare states, they do not provide a through overview. Moreover, if those views are complementary, their implications should be jointly incorporated to facilitate an effective understanding of welfare states. Therefore, scholars should learn from each other's work and synthesize their implications to improve their theory. In short, my aims are to consider the significance and limits of the theories regarding East Asian welfare regimes, to clarify their contributions to the theory of comparative welfare states, and to construct new theoretical frameworks based on their implications. The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. First, to show the significance and limits of EA's welfare regime theory, I critically analyze his main discussion. I indicate two main points and some limits of his theory. Second, I show the theories of East Asian Welfare Regimes (confucian welfare states, developmental or productivist welfare state, late coming welfare states and familialistic regime). In addition, I investigate the significance and limits of those theories. Third, I provide a new theoretical framework to understand comparative welfare states based on their implications. To do so, I link the two points of EA's theory with the implications of theories regarding East Asian welfare regimes. Finally, I demonstrate the significance of my contributions and suggest avenues further issues.

2 Esping-Andersen's theory of welfare regime revisited

In this session, I explore EA's welfare regime theory. In addition, I highlight its various contributions and limitations in greater detail.

The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism (1990) is a seminal work in the field of comparative political economy. Although two decades have passed since its publication, it remains a catalyst of prolonged academic discussion³). A major concern of these discussion is the validity of EA's typology in the face of neoliberal globalization and post-industrialization (Armingeon and Bonoli 2005, Morel et al. 2012, P. Pierson 2001). Another concern is the usefulness in analyzing welfare state reform (Beland 2005, Korpi 2001, P. Pierson 1994, Mares 2003, Swank 2002, Rothstein 1998, Schmidt 2002). Moreover, as mentioned earlier, scholars of East Asia and other areas also focus on whether certain welfare states are characterized by his typology well (cf. for Australia, Castles 1997. for South Europe, Ferrera 1996).

To understand the significance and limitations of the theory of East Asian welfare regimes, we must first understand EA's welfare regime theory which greatly influenced it. EA criticized previous studies such as industrialization theory (Wilensky 1974), and offered a new concept "welfare (state) regime" (Esping-Andersen 1990, 1999)⁴). This concept focuses on the relationship between state, market and family in providing social protection. He utilized "welfare regime" to capture the diversity in welfare states. In other words, previous studies presupposed that economic growth and social change (such as ageing) made welfare state convergence. Thus, previous studies saw the difference in welfare states as solely quantitative. Contrary, EA explored the qualitative difference in welfare states.

In 1990, EA made new typology based on two indexes; namely, "de-commodification" and "social stratification" (Esping-Andersen 1990, chapter 1). In 1999, "de-familiarization" was added as a new index to cope with critics

from gender studies (Esping-Andersen 1999, chapter 4). According to his typology⁵⁾, welfare states were categorized into three types; namely social democratic regimes, conservative regimes, and liberal regimes. Social democratic regimes possess a high level of equality and the strong role of state. Conservative regimes primarily concern themselves with the maintenance of social status, and have the strong role of family. Liberal regimes possess a high level of inequality and the strong role of market.

As each type's name implies, EA emphasized the importance of political coalitions which were driving force for welfare state development. He mentioned three political factors namely, "mobilization of labor class", "political coalitions of classes", and "historical legacy about institutionalized regime" (Esping-Andersen 1990, ch.1). In contrast to both industrialization theory (Wilkensky 1974) - which emphasized the economic growth and social change -, and power resource theory (Korpi 1983, 1985) - which focused on the importance of class mobilization -, EA paid attention to political factors. In other words, while previous studies attached importance to the social and economic factors of welfare state development, EA explored comparative welfare states from the point of political science.

Thus, EA offered two primary contributions to the theory of comparative welfare states. First, EA shed light on the qualitative difference and diversity in welfare states. Second, EA illustrated the importance of political coalitions when analyzing welfare states development.

However, there are many criticisms to EA. Some scholars insisted that he overlooked gender inequality (cf. Lewis 1992, Orloff 1993). Others contended

that there are the fourth type of welfare states (cf. Ferrera 1996, Castles 1985, 1988, 1997). More importantly, because of focus on social policy, he did not appropriately capture the diversity of welfare states, despite that being one of his main contributions. For instance, some countries such as Australia provided “social protection by other means” (Castles 1989). Castles showed that in spite of underdevelopment of social policy, citizen of Australia enjoyed a high level of social protection through protective measures such as tariffs and immigration control. However, EA categorized Australia as liberal regime, which implied a low level of social protection. Additionally, he overlooked the importance of time in social science research (cf. Gersenkron 1962, Pierson 2004). By focusing on diversity at that time, he dismisses commonalities between advanced societies and emphasizes the continuity of welfare regimes. Finally, because of the declining power of labor class in the age of neoliberal globalization, the focus should not only be on political coalition, but also on other political factors such as political institutions and political idea (cf. Hall 1997, Blyth 2002, Schmidt 2002) in analyzing welfare state development. These limitations of EA render it difficult to extend the focus of analysis geographically and chronically. As will be elucidated the following sections, East Asian countries mainly depend on family welfare and give importance to economic growth, which provided some form of social protection. Moreover, globalization and post-industrialization have increased the uncertainty and made political competition more complex. Therefore, to devise the theory of comparative welfare state, we should acknowledge EA’s contributions and attempt to correct the limitation of it.

In this section, I demonstrated significance and limits of EA’s welfare regime theory. In next section, I critically analyze the theory of East Asian welfare

regime.

3 Values and problems of the theory of East Asian Welfare Regimes

In this section, I explore the theory of East Asian welfare regimes⁶⁾. Especially, I focus on four theories, considering the significance and limitations of those theories.

As mentioned above, one of the main criticism to EA's theory is whether his typology is applicable to other regions and developing countries. Compared to Europe and North America, countries in East Asia were late bloomers as welfare states. Moreover, they have different cultures and customs. Therefore, some scholars insist that welfare regimes in East Asia constitute a peculiar regime. However, others suggest that East Asian states are indeed comparable to those in the West. Thus, I focus on three theories aligned with the former notion and one theory aligned with the latter. I will briefly discuss each of these four theories, exploring both their significance and limitations.

First, I focus on the theory of confucian welfare states (Jones 1990, 1993)⁷⁾. This theory emphasizes the cultural base of East Asian welfare regime. According to this theory, countries in East Asia have a common cultural background which is called Confucianism. This factor makes the welfare regime in East Asia peculiar. For example, East Asian welfare regimes are characterized by their focus on the investment in education, importance of family and relatives in providing social protection based on patriarchy, and subordination to authority.

The theory of confucian welfare states clarifies the importance of exploring political culture when researching welfare states. It is an important contribution to the theory of comparative welfare states. However, there are some problems. For example, this theory tends to fall into cultural reductionism. Therefore, this theory is unfit to analyze the diversity in East Asian welfare regimes. In addition, due to its black-boxing of decision making, this approach does not adequately explain why East Asian welfare regimes look the way they do. Moreover, the importance of family is also common to other countries and regimes. For example, welfare regime in South Europe depended on family welfare (Ferrera 1996). In other words, the importance of family is relevant, but not comprehensive when characterizing the welfare states in East Asia.

Second, I focus on theory of developmental (or productivist) welfare states (Holliday and Wilding 2003, Holliday 2000, Wilding 2000, Kwon 2005, 2009, Kim 2015, Choi 2012)⁸⁾. This theory emphasizes the relationship between social policy and employment policy. According to this theory, countries in East Asia subordinate social policy to economic policy for the purpose of economic growth. Thus, they insist that East Asian welfare regimes form a peculiar regime with characteristics such as emphasis on political aims, a presupposition of economic growth and full employment, a focus on productive welfare, a dependence on family welfare, and the regulatory role of state (Holliday and Wilding 2003, chapter 7). Recently, some scholars introduce new concept such as “functional equivalents” (Estevez-Abe 2008) or “surrogate policy”(Kim 2010) to understand the relationship between social policy and employment policy. These new concepts mean that employment policy such as subsidy, regulation, and public services allowed East Asian

countries to accomplish full employment and economic growth. This consequently limited the need for social policy.

The theory of developmental (or productivist) welfare states shows that we should focus not only on social policy, but also employment policy to understand the whole pictures of social protection provided by welfare states. It is thus important contribution to the research on comparative welfare states. However, it has also its limitations. For example, although this theory mentions to hard economic situation and political needs, it does not explain why countries in East Asia adopt this specific combination of policies. In other words, this theory ignores political process that govern the formulation of public policy. Moreover, the focus on economic aspect of social policy is solely characteristic of East Asian welfare states. For example, North Europe such as Sweden always focus on the same (C. Pierson 2008, Gough 1996).

Third, I focus on late coming welfare states, which comes from the scholars who are prominent in Japan (Takekawa 2007, Kim 2008, 2017, Kim ed. 2010, Li 2011)⁹⁾. This theory emphasizes the relationship between late industrialization and welfare state development. According to this theory, international economic structures constrain the government's policy options. As result, late industrializer such as East Asia must adopt "functional equivalents" or "surrogate policy" to survive in international economic competition. In other words, this theory explains why East Asia adopts this peculiar mix of policies.

The theory of late coming welfare states insists the importance of timing in welfare state development. The features of the welfare states depend on the

time in which welfare states are formed. It is an important contribution to the research on comparative welfare states. However, there are some problems. For example, this theory tends to fall in structural reductionism. In other words, this overlooked the agency of welfare state development. Moreover, All late industrializers may not adopt same policy mix. For example, there are qualitative difference between East Asia and South America, both of whom are newly industrialized economies. As EA clarified, there is also a qualitative diversity in European countries, who experienced the industrialization at the same time. Thus, this theory ignores also political process too.

In spite of the differences in aforementioned theories which imply the different significance and limitation, they have common problems. To emphasize the differences between East Asia and developed welfare states, they tend to overlook the diversity within East Asia¹⁰. Moreover, they tend to ignore the commonality between East Asia and developed welfare states. In addition, they tend to overlook recent welfare states reforms in East Asia.

Finally, in contrast to above three theories which emphasize the peculiarity of East Asia, the theory of familialistic regimes paid attention to the comparability of it (Shinkawa 2005, An et al. 2015, Estevez-Abe et al. 2016). The dependence on family welfare in East Asia and South Europe produced a welfare regime which was distinguished from EA's typology. Shinkawa characterized it as low level of "de-commodification" and "de-familiarization" which were terms originally used by EA originally (Shinkawa 2005, An et al. 2015).

The theory of familialistic regimes illustrated that the welfare regimes in

East Asia are comparable to Europe and North America. In other words, while the aforementioned studies try to elucidate the peculiarity of East Asian welfare regimes, this instead offers a “comparative” glimpse at welfare states at the first time. Moreover, it uses the same concept such as de-commodification and de-familiarization for its categorization. This revises EA’s theory to extend the target of its analysis outside Europe and North America. However, there are some problems. While this focuses on clarifying the features of welfare regimes, it does not explain why the familialistic regimes looks like it. Additionally, the theory of familialistic regimes is hindered by the same limitation as EA’s theory. By focusing on social policy in narrow sense this overlooked the “social protections by other means” (Castles 1989).

In short, all of the aforementioned theories are both distinctly theoretical significances and own limitations. The theories regarding East Asian welfare regimes cannot replace the EA’s welfare regime theory. Nevertheless, we should utilize their implications to overcome EA’s theory and revise the theory of comparative welfare states. This is attempted in next section.

4 Towards theoretical progress of comparative welfare state¹¹⁾

In this section, I try to a construct new theoretical framework for comparative welfare states based on the implications of the aforementioned theories. In other words, I link the two points of EA’s theory with the implication of the theories regarding East Asian welfare regimes.

As mentioned above, the theory of EA’s welfare regime which is considered the mainstream in this area contributed to the progress of comparative welfare

state theory. It focusses on the qualitative difference in the welfare state and pays attention to political coalition within welfare state development. However, it has some limitations. First, because of its focus on social policy, it overlooks the whole picture of social protections provided by welfare states. Second, it ignores the importance of time in social science research. As result, it does not capture the commonality and difference between welfare states. Third, because of its focus on political coalitions, it ignores the importance of political factors that influence the formation of political coalitions.

The theory of East Asian welfare regimes has three specific implications. First, they emphasize focusing not only on social policy, but also on its functional equivalents such as employment security, family welfare and corporate welfare by public policy. In other words, we should consider “social protection by other means” to understand the overview of the welfare state. Previous theories were social policy centered. However, if we go back to the definition of the welfare state, this type of analysis seems wrong. For example, the influential texts in social science show that the welfare state include not only the social policy, but also public policies which contributed to enhance the social protection, such as industrial and employment policy, and economic governance (Garland 2016, C. Pierson 2008, Gamble 2016)¹²⁾. Therefore, the scope of analysis should be extended to adress the diverse functional equivalents of social policy. Second, these theories demonstrate the importance of timing. EA’s theory focused on the diversity of the welfare state at that time and presupposed the continuity of welfare regimes. In doing so, it overlooked the radical qualitative change which all welfare states experienced. In other words, we should construct a typology which is time sensitive. Finally, these theories emphasize the importance of political cultures in analyzing

welfare state development. Thus, it tries to capture the interaction between interest, institution, and idea.

Importantly, the theoretical implications of East Asian welfare regimes are linked to the limitations of EA's theory. Incorporating functional equivalents allows us to extend the scope of comparative welfare state research. Incorporating timing turns our attention to the qualitative change in the welfare states, and implies the need for new time-sensitive typology. Incorporating political cultures illustrates that political coalitions of welfare state development are affected not only by interests but also by institutions and ideas. In what follows, I provide a new typology of welfare states and suggest a new theoretical framework for comparative analysis of welfare states development.

Scholars of comparative political economy and social policy tried to elucidate two interrelated issues (Kato 2012). The first issue involved the features of the welfare states. The second was to explain the development welfare state. Thus, the theory of comparative welfare states consists of two parts¹³⁾.

First, I try to construct a new framework to capture the gamut of social protection provided by the welfare state. The aforementioned discussion suggested that the focus should not only be social policy, but also its functional equivalents. Moreover, to capture commonality and difference, we need a typology which is sensitive to timing. Thus, I provide new typology based on the relationship between social policy and its functional equivalents. If we use social policy and its functional equivalents as two axes, four types of social

protection emerge, as can also be seen in postwar era. 1) A high level of social security and a high level of functional equivalents (e.g. Germany): the mix of generous occupational social insurance (Esping-Andersen 1990), severe employment regulation (Hall and Soskice 2001), and sufficient family welfare (Esping-Andersen 1990) provided enough social protection. However, it had some inequalities such as gender gap and insider/outsider gap. 2) A high level of social security and a low level of functional equivalents (e.g. Sweden): because of low employment regulation, people sometime became unemployed. However, generous social policy such as public pension, unemployment benefits and active labor market policy helped them (Katzenstein 1985). Moreover, public social service emancipated women from the dependence (Lewis 1992). 3) A low level of social security and a low level of functional equivalents (e.g. USA): because of the low level of both, people tended to depend on the market to get enough social protection. However, the people with money (and capacity) had access to care service, additional pension, and health insurance. Thus, there were significant social division between the haves and the have-nots (Esping-Andersen 1990). 4) A low level of social security and a high level of employment security (e.g. Japan): although social security was underdevelopment, people protected their own employment through public policy such as subsidy, regulation, and public work (Miyamoto 2008, Miura 2012, Estevez-Abe 2008). Moreover, people who worked in large company got fringe benefits such as additional pension and housing allowance (Hall and Soskice 2001). In addition, family welfare was important in caring (Osawa 2007, 2014). Therefore, this type produced gender inequality and an insider/outsider gap.

i Before Globalization and post industrialization		i After Globalization and post industrialization	
social security high		social security high	
low	high	low	high
② Sweden	① Germany	② Sweden	① ×
③ USA	④ Japan	Germany	functional equivalents high
	low	③ USA	④ ×
		Japan	

However, some of the four types of social protection are not functional anymore. Globalization and post-industrialization have rendered some kinds of functional equivalents very difficult. For example, employment regulation through public policy seemed to be ineffective and illegitimate under neoliberal globalization (Steger and Ray 2010, Steger 2016). The growth of female labor made dependence on family welfare difficult (Bonli and Arimngeon 2005, Tayler-Goobye 2004). People who can get fringe benefits were increasingly limited. In other words, 1) and 4) does not work well. For example, Germany reformed employment policy, liberalized labor market, and introduced new family policy such as care services (Bonoli and Morel 2012, Palier 2010). Japan reduced the employment security and liberalized labor market. While new social policies such as long-term care insurance and gender equality policy were introduced, fiscal constrains made it inadequate (Miyamoto 2008, Estevez-Abe 2008). So, Germany came close to 2), and Japan came close to 4).

Second, I try to construct a new framework to capture interaction between interest, institution, and idea. In political science, these factors are often considered as exclusive. However, recent studies demonstrate that they are

not (Hay 2002, Campbell 2004, Parsons 2003, Schmidt 2002, Gofas and Hay 2010, Kato 2012). According to these studies, we should divide political process into two aspects. The first is the construction of interests by political ideas under given political institutions and socio-economic situations. The second is the pursuit of interests through the strategic use of discourse under the given political institutions. In other words, political coalitions are formed by political actors using political ideas under political institutions. We should divide political process to analyze this dynamism appropriately.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, I reviewed the theories of East Asian welfare regimes and consider their significance and limitations. These theories have some important implications which are useful for revising the theory of comparative welfare states (e.g. their focus on the relationship between social policy and employment policy, the importance of timing, the focus on political culture and idea). While they cannot replace EA's welfare regime theory, they can modify the limitations and present a more temporally and spatially extended framework. I use the implications of the theory of East Asian welfare regimes to provide two theoretical frameworks. One is the time sensitive typology which considers relationship between social security and its functional equivalents. The other is one which analyzes the interaction between interests, institutions, and ideas.

While illustrating the implications of these frameworks, I have demonstrated their necessity within future empirical research. Before globalization and post-industrialization, the Japanese government emphasized employment security

by subsidies, regulations, and public work. In other words, government did not expand social policy enough. As result, the care of the elderly and children depends on family. Women engaged in care work inside house. However, because of economic and social change, this type of social protection does not work well. After the 1990s, the Japanese government liberalized the economy and gave up the provision of employment security, but also did not expand social policy well. Moreover, the number of people that can avail fringe benefits are also declining. In addition, the late of female labor was rising. As result, there were many social problems (e.g. inequality, drop in the birthrate, short of care, and aging). Why did the Japanese government choose this path? First, the political leaders in Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) have a strong affinities with neoliberalism. Second, due to the reform of political institutions, the political leader in LDP get authoritative power to implement neoliberal reform. This issue warrants further investigation in the near future.

Notes

1) An earlier version of this paper was presented in International Symposium on “East Asia and the World after Globalization” (at Chung-Ang University, Korea, 2018) and the Academic Conference of Japan Society for Evolutionary Economies (at Nagoya Institute of Technology, Japan, 2019). I appreciate the constructive and impressive comments from the participants of both conferences. Japanese version of this paper was published (Kato 2019). Thank you for accepting it for secondary publication.

This paper was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) (17K13682, 17H02480, 15H03307, 19H00571, 19H00579, 19K01464, 15K03314, 26285140).

2) For similar stance to Japanese welfare state, see also Tanaka (2017). For a general review of the Japanese welfare model and its changes, see Shinkawa (2005), Miyamoto (2008), Oshawa (2017), Estévez-Abe (2008), Miura (2012), Uzuhashi (1997).

3) For a good review of EA's welfare regimes, see Abrahamson (1997), Arts and Gellisen (2002), (2010), Ferragina and Seeleib-Kaiser (2011), van Kersbergen and Vis (2015), C. Pierson (2008), Powel and Barrientos (2004).

- 4) Esping-Andersen mainly used "welfare state regime" in 1990. However, he used "welfare regime" to emphasize the focus on the overall welfare in 1999.
- 5) "De-commodification" is a measure of people's dependence on the market. "Social Stratification" is a measure of a welfare program's ability to mitigate the inequality. "De-familiarization" is a measure of people's dependence on family. According to EA, social democratic regime has a high level of "de-commodification", a low level of "social stratification" and a high level of "de-familiarization". Conservative regime has a high level of "de-commodification", a high level of "social stratification" and a low level of "de-familiarization". Liberal regime has a low level of "de-commodification", a high level of "social stratification" and a medium level of "de-familiarization".
- 6) For good review of East Asian welfare regime, see Goodman et al. (1998), Abrahamson (2011), (2017), Aspalter (2006), Hwang (2015), Peng and Wong (2010), Yang (2017), Lee and Ku (2007), Ku and Jones (2007) and Kamimura (2015).
- 7) At first, Jones use the term "household economy" welfare state" (Jones 1990, p.462)
- 8) While Holliday, Wilding and Kim use the term "productivist" which emphasized the economic aspect of East Asian model (Holliday 2000, Wilding 2000, Holliday and Wilding 2003), Kwon use the term "developmental" which focused on the political aspect of it (Kwon 2005, 2009).
- 9) For a more general discussion of the relationship between late industrialization and welfare state, see C. Pierson (2005).
- 10) Obviously, some recognize that there exists diversity within East Asia. Kim divides them into the "inclusive" type, the "market" type and the "dualistic" type (Kim 2015). The inclusive type includes Japan, Korea, and Taiwan which make progress the risk pool in social insurance. The market type includes Hong-Kong and Singapore which focus on individual saving. The dualistic type use both strategy within one countries such as China and Thailand. Peng and Wong divide into "inclusive social insurance" model such as Japan, Korea and Taiwan, and "individualistic social protection" model such as Hong-Kong and Singapore (Peng and Wong 2010).
- 11) Further discussion, see Kato (2012)
- 12) David Garland defined the welfare state as "welfare for the poor", "social insurance, social rights, and social services" and "economic management" (Garland 2016, pp.7-8). Pierson defined the welfare state as "a particular form of state; 2) a distinctive form of polity; 3) a specific type of society" (C. Pierson 2008, p. 10). Gamble emphasized that the capitalist society needs the welfare state for its own work, but sometimes they are contradictory (Gamble 2016).
- 13) For example, EA's welfare regime theory has typology for understanding the diversity,

and focusses on political coalition for explaining welfare state development.

References

- Abrahamson, Peter 1999: "The Welfare Modelling Business" *Social Policy & Administration* 33: 394-415.
- 2011 : "The Welfare Modelling Business Revisited: the Case of East Asian Welfare Regimes" Pp.15-34 in *New Welfare Studies in East Asia*, edited by G. J. Hwang Edward Elgar.
- 2017 : "East Asian Welfare Regime: Obsolete Ideal-type or Diversified Reality" *Journal of Asian Public Policy* 10:90-103.
- An, Mi young and Ito Peng 2016 : "Diverging Path? A Comparative Look at Childcare Policies in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan" *Social Policy and Administration* 50: 540-558.
- Armingeon, Klaus and Giuliano Bonoli (eds)2005 : *The Politics of Post-industrial Welfare States*, Routledge.
- Arts, Wil and John Gelissen 2002 : "Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism or More ? A State-of-the-art Report" *Journal of European Social Policy* 12:137-58.
- 2010 : "Models of the Welfare State" Pp.569-583, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*, edited by F. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, and C. Pierson, Oxford University Press.
- Aspalter, Christan 2006 : "The East Asian Welfare Model" *International Journal of Social Welfare* 15: 290-301.
- Béland, Daniel, 2005 : *Social Security*, University Press of Kansas.
- Blyth, Mark 2002 : *Great Transformations*, Cambridge University Press.
- Bonoli, Giuliano and Natalie Morel (eds) 2012 : *The Politics of the New Welfare State*, Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, L. John 2004 : *Institutional Change and Globalization*, Princeton University Press.
- Castles, G. Francis 1985 : *The Working Class and Welfare*, Allen & Unwin.
- 1988 : *Australian Public Policy and Economic Vulnerability*, Allen & Unwin.
- 1989 : "Social Protection by Other Means: Australian's Strategy of Coping with External Vulnerability" Pp.16-55 in *The History of Comparative Public Policy*, edited by F. G. Castles, Oxford University Press.
- 1997: "The Institutional Design of the Australian Welfare State" *International Social Security Review* 50:25-41.
- 2004 : *The Future of the Welfare State*, Oxford University Press.
- Castles, G. Francis, Stephan Leibfried, Jane Lewis, Herbert Obinger, and Christopher Pierson

- (eds) 2010 : *The Oxford Handbook of Welfare State*, Oxford University Press.
- Choi, Young-Jun 2012 : "End of the Era of Productivist Welfare Capitalism" *Asian Journal of Social Science* 40:275-94.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta 1985 : *Politics against Markets*, Princeton University Press.
- 1990 : *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Polity Press.
- 1997: "Hybrid or Unique? The Japanese Welfare State between Europe and America" *Journal of European Social Policy* 7:179-89.
- 1999 : *Social Foundation of Postindustrial Economies*, Oxford University Press.
- Estevez-abe, Margarita 2008 : *Welfare and Capitalism in Postwar Japan*, Cambridge University Press.
- Estevez-abe, Jae-jin Yang and Young Jun Choi 2016 : "Beyond Familialism: Recalibrating Family, State and Market in Southern Europe and East Asia", *Journal of European Social Policy* 26: 301-313.
- Ferragina, Emanuele and Martin Seeleib-Kaiser 2011 : "Welfare Regime Debate: Past, Present, Futures?" *Policy and Politics* 39:583-611.
- Ferrera, Maurizio 1996 : "The 'Southern Model' of Welfare in Social Europe" *Journal of European Social Policy* 6:17-37.
- 2008 : "The European Welfare State: Golden Achievements, Silver Prospects" *West European Politics* 31: 82-107.
- Gamble, Andrew 2016 : *Can the Welfare State Survive?*, Polity Press.
- Garland, Davide 2016 : *The Welfare State*, Oxford University Press.
- Gofas, Andreas and Colin Hay (eds) 2010 : *The Role of Ideas in Political Analysis*, Routledge
- Gersecgnkron, Alexthander 1962 : *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspectives*, Belknap Press.
- Goodman, Roger and Ito Peng 1996 : "The East Asian Welfare States: Peripatetic Learning, Adaptative Change, and Nation-Building" Pp. 192-224 in *Welfare State in Transition*, edited by Gosta Esping-Andersen, SAGE Publications.
- Goodman, Roger, Gordon White and Huck-ju Kwon (eds) 1998 : *The East Asian Welfare Model*, Routledge.
- Gough, Ian 1996 : "Social Welfare and Competitiveness" *New Political Economy* 1:209-32.
- Hall, Peter 1997 : "The Role of Interests, Institutions, and Ideas in the Comparative Political Economy of the Industrialized Economy" Pp.174-207 in *Comparative Politics*, edited by M. I. Lichbach and A. S. Zukerman, Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Peter and David Soskice 2001 (eds) : *Varieties of Capitalism*, Oxford University Press.
- Hay, Colin 2002 : *Political Analysis*, Palgrave.

- Holliday, Ian 2000 : "Productivist Welfare Capitalism" *Political Studies* 48:706-723.
- Holliday, Ian and Paul Wilding (eds) 2003 : *Welfare Capitalism in East Asia*, Palgrave.
- Hwang, Gyu-Jin 2012: "Explaining Welfare State Adaptation in East Asia: The Cases of Japan, Korea and Taiwan" *Asian Journal of Social Science* 40:174-202.
- 2015 : "The Welfare Modelling Business in the East Asian Welfare State Debate" *Social Policy Review* 27:225-45.
- Jones, Catherine 1990 : "Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan: Oikonomic Welfare States" *Government and Opposition* 25: 446-62.
- 1993 : "The Pacific Challenge: Confucian Welfare States" in Pp.198-217, edited by C. Jones (ed.) *New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe*, Routledge.
- Kasza, Gregory 2006 : *One World of Welfare*, Cornell University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter 1985 : *Small States in World Markets*, Cornell University Press.
- Kim, Mason 2015 : *Comparative Welfare Capitalism in East Asia*, Palgrave.
- Kim, Pil Ho 2010 : "The East Asian Welfare State and Surrogate Social Policy: an Exploratory Study on Japan and South Korea", *Socio-Economic Review*, 8:411-435.
- Korpi, Walter 1983 : *The Democratic Class Struggle*, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 1985 : "Developments in the Theory of Power and Exchange: Power Resources Approach vs. Action and Conflict: On Casual and Intentional Explanations in the Study of Power" *Sociological Review* 3:31-45.
- 2001: "Contentious Institutions: An Augmented Rational-Action Analysis of the Origins and Path Dependency of Welfare State Institutions in Western Countries" *Rationality and Society* 13:235-83.
- Ku, Yeun-wen and Catherine Jones 2007: "Developments in East Asian Welfare Studies" *Social Policy and Administration* 41, 115-131.
- Kwon, Huck-Ju 2005 : "Transforming the Developmental Welfare State in East Asia" *Development and Change* 36:477-97.
- 2009 : "The Reform of the Developmental Welfare State in East Asia" *International Journal of Social Welfare* 18:S12-S21.
- Lewis, Jane 1992 : "Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes" *Journal of European Social Policy* 2:159-73.
- Mares, Isabela 2003 : *The Politics of Social Risk*, Cambridge University Press.
- Miura, Mari 2012 : *Welfare through Work*, Cornell University Press.
- Morel, Natalie, Bruno Palier and Joakim Palme (eds.) 2012 : *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State?*, Policy Press.
- Orloff, Ann 1993 : "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare State" *American Sociological Review* 58:303-28.

- Parsons, Craig 2003 : *A Certain Idea of Europe*, Cornell University Press.
- Parler, Bruno (ed.) 2010 : *A Long Goodbye to Bismarck?*, Amsterdam University Press.
- Peng, Ito and Joseph Wong 2008 : "Institutions and Institutional Purpose: Continuity and Change in East Asian Social Policy" *Politics and Society* 36: 61-88.
- 2010 : "East Asia" Pp.656-670 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*, edited by F. Castles, S. Leibfried, J. Lewis, H. Obinger, and C. Pierson, Oxford University Press.
- Pierson, Christopher 2005 : "Late Industrializers and the Development of Welfare Regimes" *Acta Politica* 40:395-418.
- 2008 : *Beyond the Welfare State ? (3rd edn)*, Polity Press.
- Pierson, Paul 1994 : *Dismantling the Welfare State?*, Cambridge University Press.
- 2004 : *Politics in Time*, Princeton University Press.
- Pierson, Paul (ed.) 2001 : *The New Politics of Welfare States*, Oxford University Press.
- Powell, Martin and Armando Barrientos 2004 : "Welfare Regimes and the Welfare Mix" *European Journal of Political Research* 43:83-105.
- Rothstein, Bo 1998 : *Just Institutions Matter*, Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, A. Vivien 2002 : *The Futures of European Capitalism*, Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred B. 2017 : *Globalization (4th edn)*, Oxford University Press.
- Steger, Manfred B. and Ravi K. Roy 2010 : *Neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press.
- Swank, Duane 2002 : *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States*, Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter (ed.) 2004 : *New Risks, New Welfare ?*, Oxford University Press.
- van Kersbergen, Kees and Barbara Vis 2015 : "Three World's Typology: Moving beyond Normal Science?", *Journal of European Social Policy*, 25 (1): 111-123.
- Wilding, Paul 2000 : "Exploring the East Asian Welfare Model", *Public Administration and Policy* 9:71-82.
- Wilensky, Harold 1974 : *The Welfare State and Equality*, University of California Press.
- Yang, Nan 2017 : "East Asia in Transition: Re-examining the East Asian Welfare Model Using Fuzzy Sets", *Journal of Asian Public Policy* 10:104-120.
- Yih-Jiunn, Lee and Yeun-wen Ku, 2007, "East Asian Welfare Regimes: Testing the Hypothesis of the Developmental Welfare State", *Social Policy and Administration* 41: 197-212.

【日本語文献】

- 安周永、林成蔚、新川敏光 2015 「日韓台の家族主義レジームの多様性」、新川敏光編『福祉レジーム』ミネルヴァ書房 (AN Juyoung, LIN Chenweil and SHINKAWA Toshimitsu, 2015, "The Diversity of Familialistic Regimes in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan", Edited by SHINKAWA Toshimitsu, *Welfare Regime*, Minerva Shobo.)

- 埋橋孝文 1997『現代福祉国家の国際比較』法律文化社 (UZUHASHI Takahumi, 1997, *The Comparative Study on Modern Welfare States*, Nihon Hyouron Sha)。
- 大沢真理 2007『現代日本の生活保障システム』岩波書店 (OSAWA Mari, 2007, *The System of Social Security in Modern Japan*, Iwanami Shoten)。
- 大沢真理 2014『生活保障のガバナンス』有斐閣 (OSAWA Mari 2014, *Governance of Livelihood Security*, Yuhikaku)。
- 加藤雅俊 2012『福祉国家再編の政治学的分析』御茶の水書房 (KATO Masatoshi, 2012, *Political Analysis of Welfare State Realigningment*, Otyanomizu Shobo)。
- 加藤雅俊 2013『福祉政治の理論』鎮目真人・近藤正基編『比較福祉国家』ミネルヴァ書房 (KATO Masatoshi, 2013, "Theory of Welfare Politics" in *Comparative Welfare State*, edited by SHIZUME Masato and KONDO Masaki, Minerva Shobo)。
- 加藤雅俊 2017「現代政治学におけるメタ理論の必要性」『横浜法学』26巻2号 (KATO Masatoshi, 2017, "The Necessity of Meta-theory in Political Science", *Yokohama Law Review*, 26 (2))。
- 加藤雅俊 2019「『東アジア福祉国家論』から『東アジア発の福祉国家論』へー福祉国家論の理論的刷新に向けてー」『立命館産業社会論集』55巻1号 (KATO Masatoshi, 2019, "From "the Theory of East Asian Welfare States" to "the Theory of Welfare states fromu East Asia", *Ristumeikan Social Science Review*, 55 (1))
- 上村泰裕 2015『福祉のアジア』名古屋大学出版会 (KAMIMURA Yasuhiro, 2015, *Welfare in Asia*, Nagoyadaigaku Shuppankai)
- 金成垣 2008『後発福祉国家論』東京大学出版会 (KIM Sung-won, 2008, *Late-coming Welfare States*, Tokyodaigaku Shuppankai)。
- 金成垣 2017『福祉国家の日韓比較』明石書店 (KIM Sung-won, 2017, *Comparative Analysis of Welfare State in Japan and Korea*, Akashi Shoten)。
- 金成垣編 2010『現代の比較福祉国家論』ミネルヴァ書房 (KIM Sung-won ed. 2010, *Comtemporary Comparative Welfare States*, Minerva Shobo.)
- 鎮目真人・近藤正基編 2014『比較福祉国家論』ミネルヴァ書房 (SHIZUME Masato and KONDO Masaki eds. 2013, *Comparative Welfare States*, Minerva Shobo)。
- 新川敏光 2005『日本型福祉レジームの発展と変容』ミネルヴァ書房 (SHINKAWA Toshimitsu, 2005, *The Development and Transformation of Welfare Regime in Japan*, Minerva Shobo)。
- 新川敏光編 2015『福祉レジーム』ミネルヴァ書房 (SHINKAWA Toshimitsu ed. 2015, *Welfare Regime*, Minerva Shobo)。
- 新川敏光・井戸正伸・宮本太郎・真柄秀子 2004『比較政治経済学』有斐閣 (SHINKAWA, Toshimitsu, IDO Masanobu, MIYAMOTO, Taro and MAGARA, Hideko 2004, *Comparative Political Economy*, Yuhikaku)。

- 末廣昭編 2010『東アジア福祉システムの展望』ミネルヴァ書房 (SUEHIRO Akira ed. 2010, *The Prospect of Welfare System in East Asia*, Minerva Shobo)。
- 武川正吾 2007『連帯と承認』東京大学出版会 (TAKEKAWA Shogo 2007, *Solidarity and Recognition*, Tokyodaigaku Shuppankai)。
- 田中拓道 2017『福祉政治史』勁草書房 (TANAKA, Takuji 2017, *The Political History of Welfare*, Keiso Shobo)。
- 広井良典・駒村康平編 2003『アジアの社会保障』東京大学出版会 (HIROI Yoshinori and KOMAMURA Kohei eds, 2003, *Social Security in Asia*, Tokyodaigaku Shuppankai)。
- 宮本太郎 2008『福祉政治』有斐閣 (Taro Miyamoto 2008, *Welfare Politics*, Yuhikaku)。
- 宮本太郎編 2012『福祉政治』ミネルヴァ書房 (Taro Miyamoto ed. 2012, *Welfare Politics*, Minerva Shobo)。
- 李蓮花 2011『東アジアの後発近代化と社会政策』ミネルヴァ書房 (LI Lianhua 2011, *Rate modernization and social policy in East Asia*, Minerva Shobo)。

