

# Value orientations of social welfare policy structures

Garlington S.B. Value orientations of social welfare policy structures

Substantial literature exists around the variation of welfare policy development in liberal democracies. The contrast of the American welfare state to those in Europe has sparked significant analytical literature about which factors are most significant in the variation. The literature extensively examines many of these factors but has neglected the significance of social values. This article discusses values and policy development as a foundation for further studies linking specific values to policy and institutional development. First, I discuss theorists who have identified value orientation as significant to welfare state variation; second, I review the major comparative welfare state literature. Finally, I discuss the major variation categories through the lens of social values by identifying the significant value orientation of sample policy structures. Comparative welfare state literature benefits from elucidating the values orientation of welfare policies that define the welfare state typological categories. Including the role of social values in welfare state comparisons promotes greater understanding of the origins and trajectory of current policy.

*Key Practitioner Message:* • *Increase understanding of welfare state variation factors;* • *Frame questions about social values reflected in social policy.*

**Sarah B. Garlington**

School of Social Work, Boston University, Boston, MA, USA

*Key words:* welfare state, values orientation, national variation, comparative, individualism

Sarah B. Garlington, School of Social Work, Boston University, 264 Bay State Road, Boston, MA 02215, USA  
E-mail: sgarling@bu.edu

Accepted for publication June 24, 2013

## Introduction

Welfare policy development has been dissected in multiple ways emphasizing a range of factors including economic changes, class struggle, and social values. The contrast of the American welfare state to those in Europe has sparked significant analytical literature about which factors are most significant in the variation between national cases. While welfare activities have frequently been discussed in concert with church organizational activities, the lens of religion as a defining factor has only recently been incorporated into research about welfare policy development (Morgan, 2002, 2006; van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009). Public education as a welfare state structure has also been brought into the discussion (Garfinkel, Rainwater, & Smeeding, 2010). In discussing the “welfare state,” we must understand that this concept refers to a web of policies unique to each national context designed to address social problems. In some countries, these policies that constitute the welfare state are explicitly identified as such. In Scandinavian countries, for example, policies were instituted as a comprehensive effort to create a national welfare structure. Other countries, for

example, the USA, have extensive welfare-related policies that constitute the welfare state but are not necessarily clearly identified as such. For example, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a policy that redistributes wealth, but the EITC is rarely viewed as such by the general population or referred to in political rhetoric as welfare policy. In this article, I use “welfare state” as an umbrella term for the range of policies in a country that is used to address social problems, including the distribution of wealth. More in-depth discussions are needed to problematize how the literature understands what policies constitute the welfare state, as Garfinkel et al. (2010) did regarding the issue of public education. This will also facilitate future discussions of the value orientation of policy.

Welfare policy literature extensively examines many of these factors but has neglected the significance of social values. A further exploration of the contribution the value orientation of policy structures makes to welfare policy development adds depth to the understanding of policy variation. This article discusses social values and welfare policy development as a foundation for further studies linking specific values to policy and institutional development. First, I discuss

those theorists who have identified social values as significant to welfare state variation; second, I review the major comparative welfare state literature. Lastly, I discuss the major variation categories through the lens of social values by identifying the significant value orientation of sample policy structures.

### Values perspective on welfare policy development

Most welfare policy analyses recognize a multitude of factors that shape policy development. However, different schools of thought place the emphasis on different factors. This first section of the article focuses on literature that emphasizes the value orientation of policy. As the most recognized theorist of values and policy, Lipset's (1996) discussion of American exceptionalism provides the foundation for discussing the value of individualism in welfare policy in the USA. The following discussion uses the example of individualism to examine the values perspective on welfare policy development.

Classic arguments about American exceptionalism posit that the USA has a unique welfare state development because of a national emphasis on individualism (Walzer, 1990), self-sufficiency, and a limited role for government (Heidenheimer, Hecl, & Adams, 1983; Hyde & Dixon, 2002; Ladd, 1994; Lipset, 1996; Weir, Orloff, & Skocpol, 1988). Lipset (1996) argued that the specific values of the "American Creed" (liberty, egalitarianism, individualism, populism, and laissez-faire economics) are especially significant in the USA because of the origins of the nation: "It [the U.S.] has defined its *raison d'être* ideologically" (p. 18). Weir et al. (1988, p. 44) also emphasized the significance of the USA as "the world's first mass democracy" in the development of welfare policy. The formation of the USA through a revolutionary separation from a colonizer sets up these values to be the foundation of national identity, as opposed to other countries with longer shared histories and common features. As such, Lipset argued, welfare policy in the USA developed differently than in other welfare states. This difference results from both the emphasis on ideology and the actual values of the "American Creed," including individualism.

Lipset (1996) broke his discussion of values and public policy into three categories: state structures, Protestantism, and economic dynamics. The following discussion uses these categories to better understand the values perspective on welfare policy development.

#### State structures

In the USA, many parts of society reflect the value of individualism. In discussing welfare policy, the constitutional provisions in the USA that express

individualism are the most relevant. These provisions include the division of federal powers and the structure of election cycles. First, the weak centralization of federal power purposely limits the government's ability to regulate the lives of individuals, which is in contrast to the parliamentary structure found in other liberal democracies (Axtmann, 2004; Evans, Rueschemeyer, & Skocpol, 1985; Huber, Ragin, & Stephens, 1993; Huber & Stephens, 2001; Immergut, 1992): "The chronic antagonism to the state derived from the American Revolution has been institutionalized in the unique division of powers . . . a deliberate decision by the country's founders to create a weak and internally conflicted political system" (Lipset, 1996, p. 39). Nettl (1968) argued that this state structure in the USA makes law the utmost tool for social change: "The weakness of the state, the emphasis on individual rights and a constitutionally mandated division of powers . . . [means that] only law is sovereign" (as cited in Lipset, 1996, p. 40). The primacy of law and the division of powers are both expressions of individualism and reinforcement of it as a value as only certain rights (civil, political vs. social, and economic) are incorporated into the state structure and consequent policy (Glendon, 1992; Marshall, 1987).

The structure of elections, both local and national, also emphasizes individual rights. Elected officials fill more offices in the USA than in other liberal democracies, and the USA also holds elections more frequently. This allows individuals to hold representatives directly accountable for policy decisions. The value is placed on the right of the individual over other values such as efficiency of government or trust in government decision making (Lipset, 1996). The individualistic structure of elections reinforces each citizen's access to the democratic process – for better or worse. This reinforcement becomes iterative as elected officials must respond immediately to voter influence because of short election cycles and so are less able to create long-term policy change that might undermine the current social values – individualism, for example (Huber & Stephens, 2001; Immergut, 1992).

#### Protestantism

Religion can influence welfare policy in several ways. One way is through the relationship between religion and society; a second way is through the content of religion. For example, the specific brand of Protestantism in the USA has contributed directly to the emphasis on individualism (Lipset, 1996; Parsons, 1964; Weber, 1946). From the beginning, Protestant church formation has been unique in the USA (Ammerman, 2005; Warner, 1993, 2005). Churches in the USA are voluntary, sect based, and nonhierarchical, in contrast to Protestant churches in Europe that are more

“birthright” oriented and hierarchical (Lipset, 1996; Morgan, 2006; van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009). This congregational element of religion in the USA promotes egalitarianism and individualism as primary values in both political and religious life by investing the individual with moral responsibility (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985).

Lipset (1996) addressed the contribution of Protestant sectarianism to individualistic US welfare policy structures specifically: “American Protestant sectarianism has both reinforced and been strengthened by social and political individualism. The sectarian is expected to follow a moral code, as determined by his/her own sense of rectitude . . .” (p. 19). The particular congregational structure of religion in the USA represents individualism because it is antihierarchical and antielitist. Beyond Protestantism, this congregational structure influences the ways that other religious traditions are structured in the USA as well – oriented around values such as individualism (Warner, 1993). Social welfare policy in the USA then reflects this investment in individual moral responsibility in ways such as temporary, crisis-oriented assistance and services geared toward the “deserving poor” (Schneider & Ingram, 1993).

The unique constitutional structure of the church–state relationship also represents the individualistic value orientation of American Protestantism (Manow, 2004; Morgan, 2006; van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009). Protecting the state and the churches from undue influence on each other reinforces the founding ideology of the USA by protecting individuals’ freedom and autonomy. Ladd (1994) argued that Americans see religion’s contribution to democracy as positive:

Outside the U.S., the historic association of churches with non-democratic forces, especially the aristocracy, meant that proponents of a newer, freer, more egalitarian and democratic order often had good reason to consider religious institutions . . . to be their enemies. The U.S., however, has historically seen religious experience contributing to the strength and vitality of democracy. (p. 15)

The separation of church and state in the USA enables this positive contribution because the separation reinforces individualistic values by prioritizing individual freedom (both from the state and from the church) at the institutional level.

Although he did not speak specifically to the value of individualism, Casanova (2009) did tie less comprehensive welfare policy in the USA to the specific configuration of religious denominations: “Americans have defeated so far every attempt to institutionalize the welfare state because of the model of a self-organized and privately regulated civil society which is so intrinsically related with their model of religion

denominationalism” (p. 1). This denominationalism is the congregational structure that directly contributes to the individualism in US policy – the nonhierarchical, voluntary organizational structure and the separation of church and state authority. Parsons (1964) also emphasized the influence of Protestantism on American values, such as individualism and pluralism, through the orientation of Protestantism toward individual religious engagement. An evolutionary theory of the incorporation of Protestant values into secular society and social policy is problematic if it assumes that Protestantism is the root from which all else grows. Protestantism is a contributing factor in the historical development of social values (specifically individualism) in the context of the USA but not to the exclusion of other factors.

### Economic dynamics

In the USA, the value on individualism is also represented in economic relationships that shape welfare policy development (Weber, 1946). Lipset (1996) wrote that the Protestant sectarian history of the USA promoted hard work and economic ambition in individuals as moral behavior. As morally oriented, an individual’s ability to work hard and resist laziness directly leads to economic success. This individualistic explanation for economic success shaped the USA’s relationship with industrialization as well as the trajectory of workers’ organizations – both contributions to the development of welfare policy (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Weber, 1946).

As discussed above, American individualism foments resistance to government intervention in many sectors of society, especially the economy. This laissez-faire orientation reflects the value on individualism in the assumption that industrialization brought increased economic opportunities for individuals. Government intervention was thought to only hinder the egalitarian nature of economic opportunity for success and class mobility (Ladd, 1994). The emphasis on the free market and the equality of opportunity placed primary value on the individual as the engine for all activity. In this, Ladd wrote: “Americans declare themselves prepared to countenance very substantial economic inequalities, while insisting on the importance of the ideal of equal opportunity” (1994, p. 35).

In their analysis of market-based social security policy, Hyde and Dixon (2002) used the language of “welfare ideology” to discuss how values along an individualism–collectivism spectrum link to policy that is more or less reliant on the free market to address social issues. By using values to understand the role that the market plays in policy reform, Hyde and Dixon described how an emphasis on individualism (or collectivism) manifests specific policy solutions to social welfare issues (social security in this case). US policy

falls on the individualist end of the spectrum because of its emphasis on market-based means to address social security reforms.

Historically, the USA also exhibits individualism as a social value in its lack of strong unions and other workers' organizations (Lipset, 1996). The national history of revolution against hierarchical, statist structures and values discourages workers' organizations. Americans see these organizations as compromising the individual's right to self-determination (Forbath, 1991; Ladd, 1994; Lipset, 1996). Lipset (1996) made a strong argument for the uniqueness of the egalitarian class structure in the USA and the value on individualism that this reflects: "Where workers are led by the social structure to think in fixed class terms, as they are in postfeudal societies, they have been more likely to support socialist or labor parties or join unions" (p. 23). In other liberal democracies, these workers' organizations have driven the development of social insurance programs, programs significantly different in nature to those in the USA (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The history of organizing workers in the USA is complex and clearly not shaped by a single factor.

The individualistic value orientation of various US social structures (political, religious, and economic) demonstrates the significance of values in understanding policy development. Theoretical discussions of welfare policy often mention values, but only a few authors dissect and emphasize the role of values as significant. This section has presented the arguments of those value-oriented theories. The following section presents major nonvalues-focused arguments for welfare policy development variation.

### **Major nonvalues-oriented theories on welfare policy development**

This section reviews three of the most significant theoretical categories regarding welfare policy development variation that are oriented around nonvalues factors. Using the categorical language of Huber and Stephens (2001), the three theoretical approaches reviewed are the "logic of industrialism," "state-centered," and "political class struggle" (p. 14). These three categories provide a framework for understanding how theorists emphasize the role of economic, social, and political factors in welfare policy development. Other theoretical discussions regarding cross-national differences in welfare policy development exist as well, but the scope of this article addresses only the major categorical schema.

#### **Logic of industrialism**

The logic of the industrialism framework for understanding cross-national welfare policy development variation focuses on the economic transition to a more

industrialized society. Several theorists have argued that welfare policy has been a direct consequence of industrialization (Ebbinghaus & Manow, 2001; Hall & Soskice, 2001; Polanyi, 2002; Wilensky, 1975). The shape welfare policy takes is determined by the structure and experience of economic changes within a nation-state, "by-products of economic development and its demographic and social organizational consequences" (Huber & Stephens, 2001, p. 15). Most theorists have recognized industrialization as a key feature of welfare state development, but some emphasize this as the prime factor (Pampel & Williamson, 1989; Wilensky, 1975).

Welfare policy origins link directly to the timeline of industrialization in Western liberal democracies. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the USA and Europe experienced significant changes in the economic and social landscapes (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Huber & Stephens, 2001). Increased mechanization of industry led to the accumulation of wealth by the owners. The success of this system of industry relied on increased amounts of workers as well as stability in the rule of law to guarantee contractual obligations. With industrialization came migration from rural areas to urban areas and increasingly institutionalized government structures in nation-state form (Axtmann, 2004). Community and family structures changed as well because of mobility and employment market changes (Morgan, 2006). As individuals and families migrated from rural areas to larger cities for employment opportunities, the support of extended family networks was disrupted. With this came an increasing need to address the negative consequences of industrialization-focused migration such as social dislocation and income disparity (Piven & Cloward, 1993).

Discussion of welfare state variation often focuses on how industrialization happened differently in different countries. The combination of increased economic resources (the accumulation of wealth by some) and the increased social dislocation was managed by nation-states in a variety of ways. Some proponents of the "logic of industrialism" theory link the birth of the welfare state directly to economic growth (Cameron, 1978; Wilensky, 1975). While empirically this parallel growth can be disputed (Skocpol, 1991), the welfare policies that states developed (and continue to develop) are a key part of how they managed this economic growth. Tax structures for wealth redistribution, the services provided by the tax funds, and the populations who benefit from the services vary from country to country. In the USA, for example, the early 1900s saw the development of policy targeting the aging population: "performing something of a regulatory function by instituting programs to provide for those necessarily (and appropriately) forced from the productive economy" (Hudson, 2008, p. 533). In contrast, welfare policy in countries such as The Netherlands originated

with family-oriented policies intended to protect family structures from economic changes (Morgan, 2006). Other theorists have discussed additional elements of economic change during industrialization that shaped welfare policy. Ebbinghaus and Manow (2001) wrote that intersections between social welfare policy and political economy (industrial relations, the production system and employment regime, and the financial and corporate finance system) help explicate how states addressed these needs in varying ways. Orloff (1993) discussed the expansion of welfare policy in countries, such as Sweden, in which policy is shaped by women entering the workforce. Economic growth due to industrialization put nation-states in a position to address the rising social welfare needs (Huber et al., 1993; Wilensky, 1975). However, other factors within countries also contributed to how social welfare needs were understood and how these economic resources were used to address the needs.

### State centered

State-centered explanations for welfare policy variation among countries look at factors beyond economic changes and stability. State structures and past policy shape how current and future policy decisions are made regarding social welfare needs (Evans et al., 1985; Hecló, 1976; Hicks & Swank, 1992; Lowi, 1964). Examining these factors beyond the economic context begins to incorporate other political and social elements that shape policy as well.

Skocpol (1985) emphasized the influence of “autonomous state action” on political culture and social policy, as well as on the centralization (or lack) of state power. Features such as federalism and government autonomy (Huber et al., 1993; Immergut, 1992) influence the way the state can create and implement welfare policy, as well as how the need for policy is determined. Robertson’s (1993) discussion of the “new institutionalism” emphasized two intersecting elements: political capacity and political coherence. By outlining what he called “limiting conditions” for public policy creation by the state, Robertson explained how characteristics of the state structure shape policy. He defined political capacity in this way: “first, the formal boundaries of legitimate government intervention . . . ; second, government’s fiscal ability . . . ; and third, the professionalism and expertise of legislators and public administrators” (Robertson, 1993, p. 24).

Also, Hudson (2008) pointed out the unique structure between the civil service and the government in the USA in which the lack of autonomy interferes with the ability to create an administrative bureaucracy (Orloff & Skocpol, 1984; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991). In his comparative analysis of Sweden and the UK, Hecló (1976) identified this bureaucracy and the administrators in it as

a significant variable because of the decision-making position: “Policy-making is a form of collective puzzlement on society’s behalf; it entails both deciding and knowing” (p. 304).

Robertson’s (1993) political coherence is then just that: how centralized the state is and how autonomous are its various parts. For example, the structure of the US federal government with its checks and balances requires continual compromise and incorporation of varying interests regarding policy decision making. Similarly, Huber and Stephens (2001) argued that state structure is a political variable as defined by “the concentration or dispersion of political power resulting from constitutional provisions” (p. 4) or veto points (see also Immergut, 1992). The USA has more veto points than countries that, like Sweden, have more expansive welfare states. Huber and Stephens (2001) argued that these points at which policy can be thwarted in the decision-making process slow the development of a comprehensive policy. These theories highlight the significance of structure in government’s ability to appropriate an issue as a public policy one, as well as its ability to address that issue. The differences in state autonomy, capacity, coherence, and dispersion of power all contribute to the variation in welfare policy cross-nationally.

A recent development in this area of welfare policy theory is the emphasis on the structural relationship between church and state (Manow, 2004; Morgan, 2006; van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009). While incorporating some of the elements discussed above, this theoretical piece focuses on the transition of social welfare provision to the state from the church as a significant structural factor in policy development. This transition depends strongly on the unique power dynamic between church and state in a national context. In discussing the origins of family policy specific to mothers, Morgan (2006) wrote: “Patterns of church–state relations and religious conflict had an enduring impact on early family and educational policies, as well as the way religion would be incorporated into politics” (p. 3). The variation in ways that nation-states developed in relation to the established church shaped the balance of who provides welfare services. Regarding Sweden, Morgan (2006) wrote: “This pattern of church–state fusion, weak religious cleavage, and advanced secularization facilitated the expansion of state responsibility for children and families” (p. 46). The USA, in contrast, has a unique separation of church and state that has shaped the “decentralization of matters of family morality and children’s education to states, local communities, and the voluntary sector” (Morgan, 2006, p. 53).

The work of van Kersbergen and Manow (2009) took the theoretical explanations of welfare state variation a further step back to examine a state’s ability to assume responsibility for social welfare:

This cleavage [of church and state] has been the result of state–church conflicts in the wake of the national revolution when state-building elites challenged the position of the church in domains perceived crucial for the creation of modern nation-states, particularly education but also social protection. (p. 10)

Using the USA as an example, the unique constitutional structure of church and state stems from the religious diversity of the population and has contributed to the exponential growth of pluralism (Morgan, 2002, 2006). This constitutional structure and the religious diversity slowed the state’s assumption of social welfare provision in the USA. In contrast, the religious homogeneity in Sweden, for example, meant that the primary religious organizations could be subsumed under the national government structure, and the government could easily assume responsibility for social welfare provision that had previously been the purview of the church (Morgan, 2006; van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009).

The effects of past policy, or path dependency, demonstrate another entry point for policy’s influence on state structures (Hecló, 1976; Huber et al., 1993). Welfare policy arguably creates certain constituencies (whether beneficiaries, proponents, or adversaries) who contribute to shaping state and policy structures in new and consequential ways: “As each policy is put into place it transforms the distribution of preferences; as the regime increasingly entrenches itself, it transforms the universe of actors” (Huber & Stephens, 2001, p. 32). The participation of citizens and the form that participation takes (whether interest group based, identity based, etc.) is impacted by welfare policy specifically, as Mettler (2007) argued, but also then reflects back on to shaping future policy. Schneider and Ingram (1993) wrote about the ways in which policy either motivates individuals to participate in the political process or actually distances them from the political system. For example, Mettler (2007) discussed how the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act of 1944 (popularly known as the GI Bill) in the USA created a constituency of politically engaged citizens because beneficiaries saw the government as working in their favor. Hudson (2008) and Campbell (2011) also discussed this phenomenon regarding older adults and Social Security’s inception and continual strength:

Thus, at ‘time 1,’ public policy may have been critical in the creation and institutionalization of the organized aging, but at ‘time 2,’ the groups become critical in efforts to expand – or more recently – to defend the policies against outside encroachment, (Hudson, 2008, pp. 548–549)

Esping-Andersen (1990) wrote: “The welfare state is not just a mechanism that intervenes in, and possibly corrects, the structure of inequality; it is, in its own

right, a system of stratification. It is an active force in the ordering of social relations” (p. 23).

Two constitutive elements of the nation-state contribute to the development of the welfare state and its variation among countries: state structure and state policy. State structure and policy also add to the discussion of how industrialization and economic changes facilitate welfare policy and cross-national variation. While some theorists emphasize one set of factors over the other, all of the arguments discussed thus far provide insight into the cross-national variation.

### Political class struggle

In cross-national comparisons of welfare states, left-wing politics, and the mobilization of workers play a significant differentiating role. This explanatory factor fits well with the major variation between the USA and other liberal Western democracies. The USA lacks both an expansive welfare state and a history of left-wing/working-class political organizing (Kimeldorf & Stepan-Norris, 1992). Esping-Andersen (1990) wrote: “the history of political class coalitions is the most decisive cause of welfare-state variation” (p.1). His arguments and other theories in this category of political class struggle were much more sophisticated, however, than a simple link between labor power and welfare policy. Esping-Andersen’s (1990) major project was to categorize welfare state variation into a comprehensive typology based on how a country “de-commodifies” labor or removes an individual’s dependence on the market for survival. The explanatory factors that he emphasized in his analysis of the variation among typologies include class-political coalition structures, the history of welfare policy institutionalization, and, most of all, class mobilization. Esping-Andersen argued that the political power of workers’ organizations stemming from class mobilization enabled these organizations to have more power in political coalitions and more voice in policy development.

Similarly, Huber and Stephens (2001) discussed power resources theory as an explanation for welfare policy variation: “The struggle over welfare states is a struggle over distribution, and thus the organizational power of those standing to benefit from redistribution, the working and lower middle classes, is crucial” (p. 17). Again, looking back at the process of industrialization and the associated economic and social changes, significant variation exists among countries regarding the mobilization of new stratifications of workers. This refers to labor union organizing, working-class/leftist political party activity, and the “decommodification of labor” (Ebbinghaus & Manow, 2001; Esping-Andersen, 1990; Korpi, 1983): “We can understand 19th century developments in social legislation in terms of the creation of a self-regulating market, the social dislocation

this caused, and the counteraction in the form of social protection this provoked” (van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009, p. 9). With working-class mobilization, political power could be accessed by those who would benefit from social welfare legislation and who challenged reliance on the free market. Again, the USA stands out as a country with limited working-class mobilization as well as a less comprehensive welfare policy compared with that of countries like Sweden and Germany (Esping-Andersen, 1990).

This “distribution of organizational power” between labor/left and center/right can be examined over time as well as in different national contexts to explain the occurrence of specific welfare policies and the expansiveness of a country’s welfare state (Hicks & Swank, 1992; Korpi, 1983). Huber and Stephens (2001) found “consistent and strong effects of political incumbency of social democratic and Christian democratic parties” regarding the expansiveness of the welfare state (p. 39). While the authors include a range of variables, including the international economy, the logic of industrialism, and women’s labor force participation, the study affirms the main hypothesis that social democratic party power directly leads to progressive welfare policy. Esping-Andersen’s (1990) contribution was the link between working-class mobilization and this social democratic political power.

This section has outlined major nonvalues-oriented theories regarding welfare policy development and cross-national variation. Most explanatory discussions of welfare policy include some combination of the above, as well as other elements that do not fall into these major categorizations. Additional theoretical perspectives include Marxist and feminist critiques that highlight the intersection of the core factors discussed, such as class struggle and economic changes (Morgan, 2006; Piven & Cloward, 1993). An explication of the values orientation of the policy structures that these theoretical discussions analyze is missing.

**Discussion**

Thus far, this article has discussed many factors explaining variation in welfare policy development

among countries. Theorists emphasize different causal factors, from industrialization to political structures (Table 1). The first section discussed the value of individualism specifically and how individualism is represented through welfare policy development in the USA. The second section then moved to other arguments that do not include the significance of values in understanding the differences in welfare policy development and welfare state typologies. This final section returns to the role of shared social values in policy development and discusses how categorical theories are incomplete without discussing the role of social values in welfare policy development. Values contribute to the development of welfare state policy through the value orientation of past policies and current policy-making structures.

**Logic of industrialization**

As discussed earlier, one type of argument regarding welfare policy development variation is the logic of industrialization framework. This group of theories focuses on how a country historically made the economic transition to a more industrial society and how that country addressed the social consequences of these economic changes. Lipset (1996) argued that the state structures in the USA that managed this transition directly represented social values specific to the USA. Van Kersbergen and Manow (2009) and Morgan (2006) argued that the structure of the church–state relationship also shaped how countries addressed industrialization’s social consequences. In the USA, the unique church–state relationship is a direct representation of values such as individualism (Lipset, 1996; Morgan, 2006; van Kersbergen & Manow, 2009). The USA also relied on market forces more than on government intervention to manage the social changes stemming from industrialization (Hyde & Dixon, 2002). This preference for market forces over government intervention also reflects social values. Incorporating a values perspective in understanding economic and social changes in the relevant time period of industrialization and welfare policy development adds an important dimension of analysis.

Table 1. Theories of welfare state development.

Industrialization	State centered	Political class struggle	Values
History, mechanization of industry, workforce	Autonomous state action	Mobilization of workers	Trust re: government intervention
Economics/taxation	State structure, centralization of power, political capacity, political coherence, veto points	Left-wing politics, political class coalitions, class mobilization, power resources	Individual- community orientation
Family structure, social dislocation	Church/state structure	Decommodify labor	Degree of economic market regulation
Urban migration	Path dependency, past policy		
Political economy	Construction of target populations		

### State centered

When discussing state-centered theories, the emphasis is on the structure within which policy decisions are made. Robertson (1993) argued that a federal government's coherence and capacity determine the ease of policy creation and implementation. The creation of structures that reflect coherence and capacity is influenced by the shared social values in the national context. For example, the relative lack of coherence of the US federal government structure, Lipset (1996) argued, reflects a value on individual freedom from government intervention over more communitarian social values. In the USA, the intentional decentralization and checks/balances structure of the federal government is based on a lack of trust in government and an emphasis on protecting the individual from government rather than utilizing government and policy to provide for individuals. The political consequences of past policy are also discussed by state-centered theorists (Heclo, 1976). By incorporating the discussion of social values into the creation of deserving and undeserving target populations (Schneider & Ingram, 1993) or citizen participation (Campbell, 2011; Mettler, 2007), the discussion of welfare policy development becomes more nuanced.

### Political class struggle

The emphasis on political class coalitions even more clearly reflects shared social values. Theorists have discussed the uniqueness of the USA and its lack of cohesive workers' organizations (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Lipset, 1996). Huber and Stephens (2001) specifically talked about the nature of welfare policy being inherently about the distribution of resources and that this distribution is directly impacted by how organized the beneficiaries are. The lack of workers' organizations and working-class political power in the USA, Lipset (1996) and Ladd (1994) argued, are due to an emphasis on self-determination, as one example. Understanding why political class organizing happens the way it does uniquely in each country requires analysis of social structures and values reflected in those structures. Power resources theory and decommodification both reflect social values in the national context of reliance on the free market to redistribute resources.

While the typology of theories (logic of industrialization, state-centered, and political class struggle) is useful for assessing differences in emphasis, the discussion of values reinforces the view that the three types intersect significantly. For example, many of the theories reflect on the role of state structures even when discussing industrialization and political class struggle, among other factors. Highlighting social values makes

these intersections more clear and useful by integrating a backdrop of social context.

### Conclusion

Connecting social values to policy development provides insight into both the nuances of values and the complexities of policy variation. Van Kersbergen and Manow (2009) wrote that "welfare state development was related to the problem of social disorder and disintegration that was created by the increasing structural-functional differentiation of modern societies" (p. 6). A historical analysis of welfare policy development and the value orientation of the contextual structures and past policies contribute to the understanding of how factors such as economic changes, political class struggle, or historical events resonate in specific national contexts of social order. Including the role of social values in welfare policy development comparisons strengthens the analysis and helps us to understand the origins and trajectory of current policy.

This article establishes the significance of social values as a core factor that constitutes welfare policy as a social structure. As nation-states outside of the traditional Western democracy models develop comprehensive welfare policies, incorporating social values into policy analysis facilitates nuanced and critical understandings of how nations shape redistribution policy in response to economic, state, and political/social changes.

### References

- Ammerman, N. (2005). *Pillars of faith: American congregations and their partners*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Axtmann, R. (2004). The state of the state: The model of the modern state and its contemporary transformation. *International Political Science Review*, 25, 259–279.
- Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Cameron, D. (1978). The expansion of the public economy: A comparative analysis. *The American Political Science Review*, 72, 1243–1261.
- Campbell, D. (2011). Reconsidering the implementation strategy in faith-based policy initiatives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(1), 130–149.
- Casanova, J. (2009). Are we still secular? Exploring the post-secular: Three meanings of "the secular" and their possible transcendence. *Workshop with Jürgen Habermas at the Institute for Public Knowledge* (presentation). NY: New York University.
- Ebbinghaus, B. & Manow, P. (Eds.) (2001). *Comparing welfare capitalism: Social policy and political economy in Europe, Japan, and the United States*. New York: Routledge.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, P., Rueschemeyer, D., & Skocpol, T. (Eds.) (1985). *Bringing the state back in*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Forbath, W. (1991). *Law and the shaping of the American labor movement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Garfinkel, I., Rainwater, L., & Smeeding, T. (2010). *Wealth and welfare states: Is America a laggard or a leader?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Glendon, M. (1992). Rights in 20th century constitutions. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 59(1), 519–538.
- Hall, P. & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hecllo, H. (1976). *Modern social politics in Britain and Sweden: From relief to income maintenance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heidenheimer, A., Hecllo, H., & Adams, C. (1983). *Comparative public policy: The politics of social choice in Europe and America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Hicks, A. & Swank, D. (1992). Politics, institutions, and welfare spending in industrialized democracies, 1960–82. *The American Political Science Review*, 86(3), 658–674.
- Huber, E., Ragin, C., & Stephens, J. (1993). Social democracy, Christian democracy, constitutional structure, and the welfare state. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 99(3), 711–749.
- Huber, E. & Stephens, J. (2001). *Development and crisis of the welfare state: Parties and policies in global markets*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hudson, R. (2008). Society, public policy, and theories of aging. In: V. Bengtson (Ed.), *Theories of aging* (pp. 531–554). New York: Springer.
- Hyde, J. & Dixon, M. (2002). Welfare ideology, the market and social security: Toward a typology of market-oriented reform. *The Review of Policy Research*, 19(3), 14–36.
- Immergut, E. (1992). *Health politics: Interests and institutions in Western Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- van Kersbergen, K. & Manow, P. (2009). *Religion, class coalitions, and welfare states*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kimeldorf, H. & Stepan-Norris, J. (1992). Historical studies of labor movements in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 495–517.
- Korpi, W. (1983). *The democratic class struggle*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ladd, E. (1994). *The American ideology: An exploration of the origins, meaning, and role of American political ideas*. Storrs, CT: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research.
- Lipset, S. (1996). *American exceptionalism: A double-edged sword*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Lowi, T. (1964). American business, public policy, case studies, and political theory. *World Politics*, 16, 677–715.
- Manow, P. (2004). *The good, the bad, and the ugly: Esping-Andersen's regime typology and the religious roots of the western welfare state*. Munich, Germany: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies.
- Marshall, T. (1987). Citizenship and social class. In: T. Marshall, T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Citizenship and social class* (pp. 8–17). London: Pluto Press.
- Mettler, S. (2007). Bringing government back into civic engagement: Considering the role of public policy. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30(6–7), 643–650.
- Morgan, K. (2002). Forging the frontiers between state, church, and family: Religious cleavages and the origins of early childhood education and care policies in France, Sweden, and Germany. *Politics & Society*, 30(1), 113–148.
- Morgan, K. (2006). *Working mothers and the welfare state: Religion and the politics of work-family in Western Europe and the United States*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Nettl, J. (1968). The state as a conceptual variable. *World Politics*, 20(4), 559–592.
- Orloff, A. (1993). *The politics of pensions: A comparative analysis of Britain, Canada and the United States, 1880s–1940*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Orloff, A. & Skocpol, T. (1984). Why not equal protection? Explaining the politics of public social spending in Britain, 1900–1911, and the United States, 1880s–1920. *American Sociological Review*, 49(6), 726–750.
- Pampel, F. & Williamson, J. (1989). *Age, class, politics, and the welfare state*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parsons, T. (1964). *Essays in sociological theory* (Rev. edn.). New York: Free Press.
- Piven, F. & Cloward, R. (1993). *Regulating the poor: The functions of public welfare*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Polanyi, K. (2002). The great transformation. In: N. Biggart (Ed.), *Readings in economic sociology* (pp. 38–62). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Powell, W. & DiMaggio, P., (Eds.). (1991). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Robertson, D. (1993). The return to history and the new institutionalism in American political science. *Social Science History*, 17, 1–36.
- Schneider, A. & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy. *The American Political Science Review*, 87(2), 334–347.
- Skocpol, T. (1985). Bringing the state back in: Strategies of analysis in current research. In: P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer, & T. Skocpol (Eds.), *Bringing the state back in* (pp. 3–43). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Skocpol, T. (1991). Targeting within universalism: Politically viable policies to combat poverty in the United States. In: C. Jencks, P. Peterson (Eds.), *The urban underclass* (pp. 411–436). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Walzer, M. (1990). The communitarian critique of liberalism. *Political Theory*, 18(1), 6–23.
- Warner, R. (1993). Work in progress toward a new paradigm for the sociological study of religion in the United States. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 98(5), 1044–1093.
- Warner, R. (2005). *A church of our own: Disestablishment and diversity in American religion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Weber, M. (1946). *Essays in sociology*. (Translated and edited by H. Gerth and C. W. Mills.), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weir, M., Orloff, A., & Skocpol, T. (1988). *The politics of social policy in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wilensky, H. (1975). *The welfare state and equality*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Copyright of International Journal of Social Welfare is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.