



Kent Academic Repository

Taylor-Gooby, Peter and Leruth, Benjamin, eds. (2018) *Attitudes, Aspirations and Welfare: Social Policy Directions in Uncertain Times*. Macmillan Palgrave, Basingstoke UK, 317 pp. ISBN 978-3-319-75782-7.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/67682/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75783-4>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Attitudes, Aspirations and Welfare

Palgrave 2018

<https://www.palgrave.com/gb/book/9783319757827>

Peter Taylor-Gooby/ Benjamin Leruth.

A Summary of the Main Points

This review of the findings from our research demonstrates that democratic forums can contribute to improved methodology in attitude research, to generating new knowledge about how people think about major social issues and to policy debate. It supports seven points:

1. Democratic forums offer a new way to explore popular understanding of welfare. Extended discussion of the issues with limited moderation generates results that parallel the main findings from structured surveys, but go beyond them to provide an account of how ordinary people understand the issues and why they come to the conclusions they do in very different economic, social and institutional contexts. Despite limitations, forums are a valuable asset in research on public policy attitudes.
2. The regime approach provides a useful typology of European welfare states. The democratic forum material helps understand why the different national patterns of attitudes fit loosely into the general regime categories.
3. The UK differs from other European welfare states in its extreme emphasis on individual responsibility and the work-ethic (influencing the perception that the most important social division lies between working and non-working groups, highlighting paid work as the main justification for childcare and valuing social investment solely because it promotes fairer opportunities in work), its exclusionary and defensive approach, as if existing services were the private property of those who enjoy them, and in its presumption that the state is incapable of sustaining the major services as pressures grow more intense.
4. People in other countries tend to understand their social world in more collective terms. Individual and family interests are to be advanced by contribution and allocation and the economy is a dynamic and collaborative enterprise requiring management and regulation to achieve the most good, and government is capable of delivering this. State welfare is part of this and not an optional luxury.
5. Immigration emerges as a major issue in most countries, but not one which leads to an overt exclusionary approach, except in the UK. There are indications that the issues are more to do with social and cultural integration in most countries and that policies to promote this are seen as essential. Immigration is a potential area of conflict between old and new Europe as anti-immigrant parties enter parliament in a number of countries at the same time as other countries export workers north and west. The forum discussions point to an integrative approach to manage the issue.
6. The intergenerational contract remains remarkably resilient in most countries, and older people in particular are willing to support provision for younger age groups and (especially in richer countries) make sacrifices in their own entitlements to pay for it

7. Social investment is seen as the way forward across European welfare states, but for different reasons. This reflects the policy emphasis of *Europe 2020*. It fits with a general shift of emphasis in public policy attitudes away from older groups and towards the needs of younger groups and the belief that the primary role of welfare is to help people meet the challenges of a new more globalised and competitive world.

In short, democratic forums build on structured survey research to enrich our understanding of welfare state attitudes in Europe. They show that in most countries the intergenerational contract is secure, but the emphasis is shifting in social policy debate from old to young, from consumption to social contribution and investment, and that public debate in different countries can endorse similar opportunity-centred policies for different reasons, appropriate to national context. The European commitment to state welfare is tested by population ageing, recession, rapid labour market change and the conflicts over immigration. Our work shows that in most countries ordinary people see the welfare state as continuing into the future and as capable of developing new services to meet the new challenges.

References:

W. Arts and J. Gelissen (2001) 'Welfare states, solidarity and justice principles: Does the type really matter?' *Acta Sociologica*, 44(4), 283-299

H.-J. Andreß and T. Heien (2001) 'Four Worlds of Welfare State Attitudes? A Comparison of Germany, Norway, and the United States', *European Sociological Review* 17(4): 337-356.

M. Blekesaune, and J. Quadagno (2003) 'Public attitudes toward welfare state policies a comparative analysis of 24 nations', *European Sociological Review*, 19(5), 415-427

S. Dahlberg, J. Linde and S. Holmberg (2014) 'Democratic Discontent in Old and New Democracies: Assessing the Importance of Democratic Input and Governmental Output', *Political Studies* 63(1): 18-37.

EC (2010) *Towards a strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*, COM (2010) 2020 <http://ec.europa.eu/eu2020/pdf/COMPLET%20EN%20BARROSO%20%20%20007%20-%20Europe%202020%20-%20EN%20version.pdf> accessed 27.11.2017

EC (2013) *Towards social investment for growth and cohesion-including implementing the European Social Fund 2014–2020*. COM (2013) 83 final (Brussels: European Commission).

EC (2014) *Third Public Health Initiative*, https://ec.europa.eu/health/sites/health/files/programme/docs/factsheet_healthprogramme2014_2020_en.pdf accessed 27.11.2017

G. Esping-Andersen (1999) *Social Foundations of Post-Industrial Welfare States*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ESS (European Social Survey) 2017 *ESS Round 8*, available at <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/> accessed 21.11.2017.

Eurostat (2017) *Inequality of Income Distribution*, <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tsdsc260&plugin=1>, accessed 17.11.2017.

- W. Jennings, N. Clarke, J. Moss and G. Stoker (2017) 'The decline in diffuse support for national politics: the long view on political discontent in Britain', *Political Quarterly* 81(3): 748-758.
- Z. Kolarič, A. Kopač, and T. Rakar (2011) 'Welfare states in transition: the development of the welfare system in Slovenia', in *Welfare states in transition: 20 years after the Yugoslav welfare model*, edited by S. Dehnert, and M. Stambolieva, pp. 288–309. Sofia: Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- B. Leruth, (2017) 'The Europeanisation of the Welfare State: the case for a differentiated European Social Model', in P. Taylor-Gooby, B. Leruth and H. Chung (Eds) *After Austerity: Welfare State Transformation in Europe after the Great Recession*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- T. Likki, and C. Staerklé (2015) 'Welfare support in Europe: interplay of dependency culture beliefs and meritocratic contexts', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 27(1), 138-153.
- N. Morel, B. Palier and J. Palme (2012) *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State? Ideas, Policies and Challenges*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- P. Norris (2011) *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- F. Roosma, J. Gelissen, and W. van Oorschot, W. (2013) 'The multidimensionality of welfare state attitudes: A European cross-national study', *Social Indicators Research*, 113(1), 235-255.
- S. Svallfors (2012) *Contested welfare states: Welfare attitudes in Europe and beyond*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- L. Scruggs (2007) "Welfare state generosity across space and time." In *Investigating Welfare State Change. The 'Dependent Variable Problem' in Comparative Analysis*, eds. Jochen Clasen, and Nico A. Siegel. Cheltenham: Elgar, 133-65.
- P. Taylor-Gooby, B.Leruth and H.Chung (ed. 2017) *After Austerity: The New Politics of Welfare in Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- W. van Oorschot, F.Roosma, B.Meuleman and T.Reeskens (eds. 2017) *The Social Legitimacy of Targeted Welfare*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.