In the past 12 years or so, international welfare state research has witnessed a revival of *ideal-typical welfare state theory and methodology* in comparative welfare state analysis (Gough et al., 2004; Wood and Gough, 2004, 2006; Aspalter, 2005, 2006a, 2011, 2017; Aspalter et al., 2009; cf. Arts and Gelissen, 2002; Meier Jæger, 2005; Ferragina and Seeleib-Kaiser, 2011), while at the same time the growing number of real-typical welfare state studies (e.g. Ramesh, 2004; Kwon, 2005a, 2005b; Lee and Ku, 2007; Kammer et al., 2012) has continued to leave its mark on the development of international comparative welfare state research.

In 2004, Ian Gough, Geof Wood and their colleagues (Gough et al., 2004; Wood and Gough, 2004, 2006) substantiated a new approach of how to classify different welfare state systems according to their degree of institutionalization, covering the entire world. A year later, Aspalter (2005) classified East Asian welfare state systems (Japan, South Korea, China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore) according to the ideal-typical method, a methodology introduced by Esping-Andersen (1987, 1990); cf. Titmuss, 1974. Following this path, in 2009 Aspalter, Kim and Park paid particular attention to the case of certain Eastern Central Europe welfare state systems, focusing on Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia, classifying them as members of the continental group of welfare state systems after demonstrating their reorientation towards the Corporatist/Christian Democratic Model over one and a half decades prior to that, due to the historical, political and cultural affinity of their closest neighbors Germany and Austria. In 2011, Aspalter identified the ideal-typical nature of key welfare state systems in Latin America, particularly Brazil, Chile, Argentina and Uruguay, determining their own regime-specific ideal-typical characteristics.

The new dichotomy between real-typical and ideal-typical welfare state research was touched upon and found first considerations early on by Esping-Andersen (1987), Arts and Gelissen (1999, 2002), Meier Jæger (2005) and Arcanjo (2006), even though the difference and relationship between ideal- and real-types was understood differently (even the definitions of what is an ideal-type or a real-type) more or less in each case, and these two (incomparable) types were more often than not compared to one another on a one-to-one basis (cf. also Bambra, 2007a; Ferragina and Seeleib-Kaiser, 2011).

Starting in 2005, Aspalter has for the first time considered real-types as a different method and theory separate from the ideal-typical method, by simply defining ideal-types strictly along
the lines of Max Weber and, with it, by defining real-types by the absence of any ideal-type method or perspective (as envisioned and propagated by Max Weber).

Starting with the new ideal-typical classification of the East Asian welfare state systems (Aspalter, 2005, 2006a), the discussion about what are real-types and ideal-types has been clarified (cf. Aspalter et al., 2009; Aspalter, 2011, 2017, 2018b, forthcoming), which should have helped avoid any further lingering confusion of exactly what is what and how to apply and employ these two separate methodologies and theories.

There were earlier works, though, that silently implied and/or applied the nature of ideal types (e.g. Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1958; Titmuss, 1974; Korpi and Palme, 1998; Aspalter, 2001a; Wood and Gough, 2004, 2006; and especially Esping-Andersen, 1990).

This chapter will show why we should not confuse (or compare on a one-to-one basis) real-typical welfare state theory and methodology with ideal-typical welfare state theory and methodology. In fact, comparing real-typical studies with ideal-typical studies is like comparing apples with pears, or chickens with ducks. Both, real-typical and ideal-typical studies, are a different breed of study, designed for different purposes, each using a different methodological approach. Contrary to real-typical studies, ideal-typical studies go back to the methodology of identifying “ideal-types” as invented and developed by German sociologist Max Weber (which, note, runs counter to the idea of any kind of “perfect” state of affairs). In the Weberian sense, ideal-types are types with characteristics that are by and large shared by most members of a common group of research objects, societies, or in our case welfare state systems.

Comparing real-typical and ideal-typical methodology

One needs to pay attention to the definition of “real-typical” and “ideal-typical” in the context of comparative research. “Real” here does not mean real, and “ideal” here does not mean ideal either, hence one must not confuse common language with scientific terminology. “Real” here stands for “in depth, in detail.” “Ideal” here stands for “average, by and large”; in other words, “matching a certain yardstick or, actually, matching a set of yardsticks.”

The use of both methods is bound to the purpose of each individual study. Those studies that look at a larger number of case studies may use the ideal-typical approach, while others with only a limited number of case studies may prefer to apply the real-typical method. Ideal-typical research analyses deliver the larger picture (on the level of wood/woods, not on the level of trees) – they are “ideal” in the Weberian sense; that is, they are matching certain yardsticks (cf. e.g. Hekman, 1983, and esp. Aspalter, 2018a). Real-typical research on the other hand is detail-oriented, and hence subject to relatively frequent changes.

Using different methodologies means looking at different levels of research. The view of a bird flying high in the sky will always deliver a larger – less sharp, but a more comprehensive and a longer lasting – picture. A bird sitting on top of a tree will look at the world differently, arriving at different conclusions. Both, however, are part of the reality of the world in which we live, and hence necessary to better understand the very same world.

Table 28.1 highlights the fast growth in the area of real-typical welfare state studies shortly after the publication of Esping-Andersen’s 1990 book The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. It is interesting to note (cf Meier Jæger, 2005; Arts and Gelissen, 2002) that the bulk of research did not focus on the ideal-typical nature of Esping-Andersen’s study (Esping-Andersen, 1990; cf. also Esping-Andersen, 1987). Relatively quiet, but nevertheless ideal-typical research methodology found its way into mainstream welfare state comparison (cf. Korpi and Palme, 1998; Gough, 1999; Abrahamson, 2003, 2008; Wood and Gough, 2004, 2006; Gough et al., 2004; Aspalter, 2005, 2006a).
| **Table 28.1 Advantages and disadvantages of ideal-typical and real-typical methodology compared** |
| --- | --- |
| **Real-typical method** | **Ideal-typical method** |
| **Purpose** | Focusing on the reality of welfare state institutions, their similarities and differences across nations; hereby researchers focus on the detail, on institutional differences rather than their similarities, for better clarity on “micro cross-national” level. | Focusing on average features of each regime cluster, it is used as a “yardstick” to facilitate broad cross-national comparisons; as a consequence, minor and some major differences are omitted for the sake of better clarity on the “macro cross-national” level. |
| **Theoretical basis** | Researchers’ own method of distinguishing system features | The theory of Max Weber on “ideal types”* |
| **Major advantages and disadvantages** | **Advantages:**<br>1 delivers the detailed picture;<br>2 focuses on particular administrative and regulative set-up, as well as legal and administrative technicalities, i.e. this methodology is more sensitive to program-level and short-term developments;<br>3 enables further analysis of welfare state institutions, also when building on knowledge derived from ideal-typical theories and models;<br>4 enables greater clarity on national and policy level in welfare state comparison.<br><br>**Disadvantages:**<br>1 the grand picture at international level may be unclear or contradictory;<br>2 some important similarities on international level, especially with regard to policy outcomes and strategies, may be omitted (cf. e.g. the importance of the principle of functional equivalence);<br>3 the models set up change quickly over time, and often lack substance, i.e. a strong theoretical fundament. | **Advantages:**<br>1 delivers the greater picture;<br>2 focuses on functional equivalences (different systems or system structures deliver the same outcome, for example, housing ownership is functionally equivalent to pension income);<br>3 provides a perfect starting point for further real-typical welfare state regime analysis;<br>4 enables greater clarity on international and global level of welfare state, comparison, i.e. it is very helpful when comparing a larger number of welfare state systems.<br><br>**Disadvantages:**<br>1 details at national level may not appear, especially with regard to the institutional set-up of systems as well as administrative technicalities and legal provisions;<br>2 some important policy levels and areas may not appear;<br>3 one or another country may not fit, or may not easily fit into an ideal-typical model (not every welfare state system has to be part of an ideal-typical welfare regime, some are atypical or simply drifting in between different welfare regimes, or changing from one to another). |
The distinction between real-typical and ideal-typical welfare state analyses is vital, since ideal types enable a greater degree of clarity on a global or regional scale, and especially also when evaluating comparative studies. It is of little use to oppose ideal-typical studies based on the findings of real-typical studies and the other way around. It is very useful, on the other hand, to apply both methodologies when engaging in comparative analysis, since perspectives and insights from either methodology may strengthen and support findings of the other. It is paramount to understand that when using the ideal-typical method one is measuring completely different things, on a different level of observation, with a different analytical and theoretical purpose.

Real-typical studies are employed best when the number of welfare state systems included in the analyses is kept low. Ideal-typical studies, however, may be applied when, for example, comparing half a dozen or dozens of countries. It may also be the case that the research study would like to check group membership of one or two countries or welfare state systems with an existing ideal-typical welfare regime.

### Ideal-typical welfare models

At this point, it is certainly most useful to look once again at the current state of ideal-typical welfare regime models. Before, however, we turn our attention to the world of Esping-Andersen and his three initial welfare regimes and further regimes identified in the process along the way, we will focus on the most prominent, outstanding and/or useful alternatives in classifying ideal-types in

### Table 28.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real-typical method</th>
<th>Ideal-typical method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes**

** Demonstrative, not exhaustive list.
welfare state comparison. One is the classification put forward by Korpi and Palme in 1998. Both Walter Korpi and Joakim Palme follow explicitly the method of constructing ideal-types, which is also apparent in the lack of any welfare state system that would be attributed to the fifth model identified: the Voluntary State-Subsidized Model.

The Basic Security Model, according to Korpi and Palme (1998), is exemplified by the welfare state systems of Canada, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States. In all these countries, entitlements are based on citizenship or contributions (see the role of functional equivalence), and a flat rate benefit principle is applied. On the other hand, Sweden, Norway and Finland match the yardsticks of the Encompassing Model; that is, entitlements are based on citizenship or labor force participation, while flat rate and earnings-related benefits principles are dominant. Germany and France, in contrast, belong to the Corporatist Model, as entitlements are based on occupational category and labor force participation while implementing the earnings-related principle. Another ideal-typical welfare regime was identified by Korpi and Palme: the Targeted Model. This is exemplified in the case of the Australian welfare state, where eligibility derives from proven need, and the minimum benefit principle is vigorously applied. The fifth model introduced by Korpi and Palme, the Voluntary State-Subsidized Model, is marked by eligibility based on membership or contributions, as well as the flat rate or earnings-related benefit principle.

In 2004, Ian Gough, Geof Wood and their colleagues developed another ideal-typical classification covering all countries on earth by looking at welfare state systems around the globe from a satellite perspective (see Gough et al., 2004; Wood and Gough, 2004, 2006) (cf. Table 28.2). The new classification is the broadest and the least detail-oriented of all comparative classifications so far, which carries in it its advantages and disadvantages. As Wood and Gough (2004) state:

> [T]he reality is more complicated than such a classification […] in the sense that regions and countries within them can combine elements of all three “families” within a single social formation. Thus different categories of a country’s population can experience different primary regimes: some might be successfully incorporated into state protection; others reliant upon community and family arrangements; and others more excluded from formal or informal mainstream arrangements and reliant upon highly personalized politico-militia patrons, in which a sense of “in/security” is prevalent. But within that complexity of hybrids, we are certainly clustering different countries of the world into a primary association with one of these three regime groups.

Since this particular classification is based on extremely broad ideal-types, which in total include all countries of all development stages on earth, the actual purpose is to describe worldwide developments in social policy, including showing the relative absence thereof in the least developed parts of the world. This classification — due to its catch-all strategy — is, however, not useful in describing or evaluating different kinds of social insurance programs or different kinds of modern welfare state systems, or in comparing them to each another.

Rather, it is useful for the study of social development and developmental social policies (cf. Wood and Gough, 2004, 2006). Hence, every method, and every classification itself, may serve a different purpose — all of which help bring forth new insights and developments in comparative analysis and theory-making.

A third alternative model derives from perhaps the oldest of any ideal-typical models in comparative welfare state analysis, that of Harold Wilensky and Charles Lebeaux’s monumental work Industrial Society and Social Welfare, first published in 1958. Wilensky and Lebeaux also
Table 28.2 Welfare regimes following Wood and Gough (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected regime-specific characteristics</th>
<th>The insecurity regime</th>
<th>The informal security regime</th>
<th>The welfare state regime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant mode of production</td>
<td>Predatory capitalism</td>
<td>Peasant economies with peripheral capitalism, with uneven development</td>
<td>Capitalism, with technological progress plus exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant social relationship</td>
<td>Different forms of oppression</td>
<td>Different forms of exploitation, exclusion and domination</td>
<td>Exploitation and market inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant source of livelihood</td>
<td>Various forms of livelihoods with extensive conflict</td>
<td>Various forms of livelihoods</td>
<td>Access to formal labor market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant form of political mobilization</td>
<td>Diffuse and fluid</td>
<td>Diffuse and particularistic (with patron-clientelism)</td>
<td>Class coalitions, issue-based political parties and political settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State form</td>
<td>Shadow, collapsed and criminal states with porous contended borders</td>
<td>State weakly differentiated from other power systems</td>
<td>Relatively autonomous state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional landscape</td>
<td>Extreme negative permeability and fluidity</td>
<td>Broader institutional responsibility matrix with powerful external influences and extensive negative permeability</td>
<td>Welfare mix of market, state and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare outcomes</td>
<td>Intermittently extreme forms of insecurity</td>
<td>Insecurity modified by informal rights and adverse incorporation</td>
<td>Different degrees of decommodification plus health and human investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of social policy</td>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td>Less distinct policy due to permeability, contamination, as well as foreign actors</td>
<td>Countervailing power based on institutional differentiation and positive permeability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

created ideal-typical classifications (i.e. the *Residual Model* and the *Institutional Model*), for which the United States and Sweden served as key examples. That is, the rudimentary welfare state model, with low levels of coverage and benefits and high levels of commodification on the one side, and the comprehensive welfare state model, with universal coverage of all people in all fields of social security, high benefits and highest levels of decommodification on the other.

There have been a number of classifications of social welfare models in the past that also followed the notion of ideal-types, though not explicitly but implicitly (e.g. Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1985; Titmuss, 1974; Estes, 1993). Thomas Watts, to take one particular illustrative example, puts forward four models of social welfare, two of which are the original models as described by Wilensky and Lebeaux (1958), plus two additional models identified by Watts. Whereas Wilensky and Lebeaux classified welfare state systems (i.e. ideal-types in the Weberian sense) of welfare states, Watts identified ideal-types of social policies and welfare provision. Apart from the *Residual* and the *Institutional Model*, which Watts has taken over from Wilensky and Lebeaux (1958), Watts described the main characteristics of the *Neoconservative Model* (which exemplifies what in Europe is called the neoliberal welfare model). The *Neoconservative Model* follows the principles of privatization of social policy and all of its welfare state institutions, market principles in delivering social services, and obligations emphasized instead of social rights of the individual or the welfare recipients.

Another major ideal-typical model of social welfare put forward by Watts is the *Developmental Model* (Midgley, 1993, 1995, 2008; Estes, 1990, 1993; Elliott, 1993), which also shares the proactive approach of the *Institutional Model*, as well as a positive outlook on society, with the aim of creating a better society, by increasing public welfare wherever possible through social intervention, and employing a strategy of planned prevention and development. The *Developmental Model* also shares the importance of social justice, equality and empowerment with the *Institutional Model*. A new feature of the *Developmental Model* is the emphasis on the positive outcomes of investment in human resources (i.e. social investment) to ensure the enablement of people and the development of their full potential. The government and social welfare professionals act further as agents of change and advocates for more social welfare (Falk, 1984; Midgley, 1993, 1995, 2008; also Wood and Gough, 2004).

In the development context, the imperative of the eradication of illfare (i.e. diswelfare, oppression, dehumanization), precedes the imperative of the development of welfare (cf Aspalter, 2006b). Only when we rescue people who would otherwise die of thirst, starvation, disease, accidents, crime, terrorism, abuse and neglect – and try to prevent such incidences in the first place – can they effectively enjoy higher forms of social welfare/well-being, by way of social insurance, legal protection, personal and group empowerment, social justice, and so forth (cf e.g. Aspalter et al., 2008; Singh and Aspalter, 2008; Wood and Gough, 2004).

We now turn to Richard Titmuss (1974) and his ideal-typical classification of types of social policy: the *institutional type*, the *industrial-achievement type* and the *residual type*. Again, one may note the importance of the institutional and residual type as developed by Wilensky and Lebeaux (1958). The industrial-achievement type is heavily dependent on social insurance and a near all-inclusive (i.e. quasi-universal) coverage of the population with all major forms of social insurance systems, pensions, accident insurance, health insurance, unemployment insurance, as well as long-term care insurance, which has only relatively recently joined the rim of traditional areas of social insurance. Contrary to Watts), Titmuss (1974) did identify so-called model countries (i.e. Sweden, Germany and the United Kingdom) for the *Institutional*, the *Industrial-Achievement* and the *Residual Model*.

Born out of this intellectual development, the tripartite classification of Gøsta Esping-Andersen (1987, 1990) conquered the stage of international comparative welfare analysis. The
models, which have filled countless theoretical and empirical studies to date, are astonishingly identical to that of Richard Titmuss (1974). However, Esping-Andersen went a step further and not only classified (Weberian) ideal-types of social policies but also ideal-types of welfare state systems. Furthermore, and this is also a critical point of distinction between the two, Esping-Andersen went on to bring in the history of those welfare regimes, and with it, and central to his theory, the political economy that caused and drove the development of welfare state regimes in the first place (cf. also e.g. Baldwin, 1990; Moore, 1969). Political and social class alliances, the size and timing of those alliances in particular, played a pivotal role in the development of the three welfare regimes, as identified by Esping-Andersen (1987, 1989, 1990), namely: the Social Democratic Model (which he called the Socialist Model on several occasions throughout his 1990 book), the Conservative Corporatist Model and the Liberal Model. Sweden, Germany and the United States now served as model countries for these three ideal-types of welfare regime.

A number of studies, such as Huber et al. (1993), Huber and Stephens (1999); Van Kersbergen (1994, 1995); Moller et al. (2003); Bradley et al. (2003); Ebbinghaus and Manow (2001); Aspalter (2001c, 2006a, 2011); and Aspalter et al. (2009), identify the continental European model as the Christian Democratic Model, since it was the Catholic social teachings of the 1850s (which preceded the establishment and the rise of the German social democratic workers’ movement) that have shaped continental European social policy to date (Aspalter, 2001c), particularly with (1) the pivotal role of NGOs in service provision (healthcare, social work, education, etc.), (2) the self-governing role of social insurance bodies with the integration of labor unions, (3) the federal structure (focusing on state-level powers and diversity) of social policy and hence that of welfare state institutions, as well as (4) the occupational division of social insurance programs, which is central to the strategy of the original Catholic social teachings (to create a better society while providing a strong alternative to pure Marxism or pure neoliberalism on the far corners of the political spectrum; cf. Aspalter, 2001c).

This is also supported by the very clear findings of Woldendorp and colleagues (1998). In 1998, Woldendorp and colleagues found hard empirical evidence for the fact that long-term public social expenditures, and hence extensions of welfare state systems and institutions, are caused by the rule of a particular government party or parties (in the case of coalition governments). They proved that the longer a party rules, the stronger its influence on social policy, the formation and the development of welfare state systems. Social Democratic parties in government have been found to be correlated most with the highest degrees of welfare state extension. Not far behind (i.e. very close behind in second place) were Christian Democratic parties when participating in government formation. Further behind we find social liberal parties, and then in last place (pure) conservative parties. Christian Democratic parties support in general a large welfare state, though in recent years both Christian Democratic and Social Democratic parties have set out jointly to slash government expenditure and with it a large number of welfare programs and entitlements, largely by reducing benefits, but also by tightening eligibility rules across the board.

Aspalter (2005, 2006a) added a fourth ideal-type of welfare state system, comprised of welfare state systems in East Asia, particularly Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, as well as Mainland China (cf. also Aspalter, 2001a). There is an array of characteristics that may be ascribed to the East Asian welfare regime, or the Pro-Welfare Conservative Welfare Regime. These include: (1) the principle of universal benefits coexists with the principle of benefits based on performance and achievements; (2) a strong focus on the principle of social investment in areas of education, healthcare and housing; (3) a concurrent extension of welfare state columns and institutions; (4) generally medium benefit levels; (5) the dominance of employment-based
social security and welfare benefits; (6) the growing importance of mandatory individual savings accounts; (7) dominance of social service provision by NGOs and families, as well as, for example, (8) a growing focus on active labor market policies and programs.

In 2011, Aspalter integrated the case of Latin America into the existing stream of ideal-typical comparative studies in welfare state analysis, by identifying major characteristics of an ideal-type of welfare state system in Latin America, with Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Uruguay as core members of this group of welfare state systems (Aspalter, 2011).

Among the major characteristics of the Latin American Anti-Welfare Conservative Welfare Regime, we find, for example, that (1) welfare states in Latin America regulate social inequality and have as a result been marked by “regulated citizenship”; (2) even though in some cases social spending is significant (as in the case of Brazil), social programs are poorly focused or ineffective; (3) a dual legacy of Bismarckian social insurance systems and neoliberal privatization policies; (4) partially universal elements of social welfare provision have been introduced (first implemented by autocratic regimes, recently by democratic governments), such as the recently implemented targeted cash transfer programs; (5) social security is a political instrument (of who controls social insurance institutions) rather than an instrument of social policy; (6) in Latin America social security systems and schemes work in favor of the rich, as they are to some extent regressive in nature and effect, (7) the highest levels of inequality among all welfare regimes identified thus far, as well as (8) a dominance of social service provision by NGOs (particularly church organizations) and families.

Recently, Aspalter (2017) has carried on the quest of identifying ideal-typical welfare regimes beyond Old Europe and has consequently arrived at “ten” worlds of welfare regimes (or welfare capitalism). Why not more? Other researchers are invited to carry on the work and look for and find more welfare regimes out there, either in small island nations in the Pacific or elsewhere.

In 2017, Aspalter identified an additional welfare regime for each: countries in Africa (covering only the non-British former colonies there); the rich countries in the Middle East, plus Israel; most countries of the former Soviet Union, especially Russia and Kazakhstan; countries in South Asia (particularly India and Sri Lanka); and, last but not least, Cuba, the last of a number of countries belonging to the Communist/Socialist Welfare Regime (the last one was even considered by Esping-Andersen in 1987 to represent a possible fourth ideal-typical welfare regime at that time; cf. Esping-Andersen, 1987) (cf. Table 28.3; also Chapter 27, this volume).

Indeed, there may be more ideal-typical welfare regimes out there which are yet to be identified by researchers; of particular interest may be the case of the Middle East, the African continent, Central Asia, South Asia and the many island states, especially in the Caribbean and the Pacific Ocean, with the possibility of arriving at one or more welfare regime clusters/groups here and there.

Thus far, we count ten ideal-typical welfare regimes within the original stream of ideal-typical welfare regime analysis, which began with the path-breaking works of Richard Titmuss (1974) and Esping-Andersen (1987, 1989, 1990). Table 28.3 gives a brief summary of some key regime characteristics of each ideal-typical welfare regime (that is, ideal-types of welfare state systems) that have been identified thus far. These are the Social Democratic Model, the Christian Democratic Model, the Neoliberal Model, the Pro-Welfare Conservative Model, the Anti-Welfare Conservative Model, the Slightly Universal Rudimentary Model (India, Sri Lanka, etc.), the Ultra Rudimentary Model (non-British former colonies of Africa), the Exclusion-Based Model (rich gulf states, plus Israel), the Selective Rudimentary Model (Russia and Kazakhstan, etc.) and the Socialist/Communist Universal Model (Cuba) (cf. particularly Aspalter, 2017).
Table 28.3a  A brief outline of the ten ideal-typical worlds of ideal-typical welfare regimes capitalism (identified so far)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of social rights</strong></td>
<td>Universal social rights</td>
<td>Performative social rights</td>
<td>Clientelistic social rights</td>
<td>Productive social rights</td>
<td>Regulative social rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasis on:</strong></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of decommodification</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of stratification</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Extremely high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of individualization</strong></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries/regions</strong></td>
<td>Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Iceland</td>
<td>e.g. Germany, Austria, Netherlands, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia</td>
<td>United States, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom</td>
<td>e.g. Mainland China, Hong Kong, South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia</td>
<td>e.g. Chile, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28.3b  A brief outline of the ten ideal-typical worlds of ideal-typical welfare regimes capitalism (identified so far), continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of social rights</td>
<td>The ideal-typical slightly universal rudimentary WR in South Asia</td>
<td>The ideal-typical ultra-rudimentary WR in most of Africa (in former non-British colonies)</td>
<td>The ideal-typical exclusion-based WR in oil-exporting Gulf States, plus Israel</td>
<td>The ideal-typical selective rudimentary WR in Northern/Central Asia, and the Far East of Europe</td>
<td>The ideal-typical Communist/Socialist Universal WR in Cuba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on:</td>
<td>Slightly universal rudimentary social rights</td>
<td>Extremely rudimentary social rights</td>
<td>Social rights based on ethnic origins</td>
<td>Selective rudimentary social rights</td>
<td>Full universal social rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of decommodification</td>
<td>Virtually non-existent</td>
<td>High only for a special group of the population, non-existent or only marginally existent for the rest of the residents population</td>
<td>Relatively high in certain areas (pensions, child welfare), but very low in other areas.</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of stratification</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Extremely high</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of individualization</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries/regions</td>
<td>e.g. India, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>e.g. Angola, Cameroun, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ivory Coast, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Senegal</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia, Oman, UAE, Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait, Israel</td>
<td>e.g. Russian Federation, Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: based on Aspalter (2017).

Note: WR welfare regime.
Concluding outlook

The above study has discussed and analyzed the particular advantages of both real-typical and ideal-typical methods in welfare state analysis, as well as referring to more recent developments in the study of welfare state research. In doing so, the chapter has clarified the methodological differences between identifying ideal-typical and real-typical welfare models.

Some major developments of ideal-typical welfare models that have been developed in past decades have been looked at more closely, starting from the early beginnings of Wilensky and Lebeaux in 1958 to new breakthroughs by Titmuss in 1974, Esping-Andersen in 1987, Korpi and Palme in 1998, Gough in 1999, Gough et al. and Wood and Gough in 2004, and Aspalter in 2005.

The business of comparing comparative welfare state analyses to one another is an interesting undertaking, with its own rewards and pitfalls. All major classifications and methods discussed in this chapter have been found to be of great use to the study of comparative social policy, be it in the field of social development studies, social security studies, social services in general or social work services in particular.
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