

Three Worlds of Social Insurance. On the validity of Esping-Andersen's welfare regime dimensions

ONLINE APPENDIX

The data-analysis of the article was conducted with the SPSS 19.0 package, in which AMOS is the structural equation modelling program.

A1 Data on the seven indicators of social stratification

country	corporatism	etatism	poor relief	private pensions	private health	universalism	benefit differentials
Australia	1	0.7	3.3	30	36	33	0.00
Austria	7	3.8	2.8	3	36	72	0.48
Belgium	5	3.0	4.5	8	13	67	0.21
Canada	2	0.2	15.6	38	26	93	0.52
Denmark	2	1.1	1.0	17	15	87	0.01
Finland	4	2.5	1,9	3	21	88	0.28
France	10	3.1	11.2	8	28	70	0.45
Germany	6	2.2	4.9	11	20	72	0.44
Ireland	1	2.2	5.9	10	6	60	0.23
Italy	12	2.2	9.3	2	12	59	0.48
Japan	7	0.9	7.0	23	28	63	0.68
Netherlands	3	1.8	6.9	13	22	87	0.43
New Zealand	1	0.8	2.3	4	18	33	0.00
Norway	4	0.9	2.1	8	1	95	0.31
Sweden	2	1.0	1.1	6	7	90	0.18
Switzerland	2	1.0	8.8	20	35	96	0.52
United Kingdom	2	2.0	1.0	12	10	76	0.36
United States	2	1.5	18.2	21	57	54	0.78
mean	4.1	1.7	5.9	13	22	72	0.35
s.d.	3.2	1.0	5.1	10	14	19	0.22

Source: *Three Worlds*, Table 3.1, p. 70. For reasons explained in section 2.1 of the text, benefit equality is given as benefit differentials = 1 – benefit equality.

Table A1.A: Country values on the seven indicator variables (original 1980 data)

country	corporatism	etatism	poor relief	private pensions	private health	universalism	benefit differentials
Australia	1	0.7	43.0	30	37	28	0.00
Austria	7	3.8	3.1	3	31	81	0.21
Belgium	5	3.0	2.9	8	17	86	0.11
Canada	1	0.2	20.2	38	24	85	0.00
Denmark	1	1.1	12.7	17	12	86	0.00
Finland	6	2.4	13.0	3	21	87	0.33
France	9	2.8	15.8	8	21	84	0.31
Germany	6	2.4	4.1	11	21	83	0.25
Ireland	1	2.1	2.5	10	19	71	0.12
Italy	12	2.2	3.4	2	20	71	0.67
Japan	7	1.4	11.9	23	29	65	0.39
Netherlands	1	1.8	6.2	13	31	95	0.10
New Zealand	2	0.8	33.0	4	12	33	0.00
Norway	6	0.9	8.8	8	15	98	0.35
Sweden	2	2.4	11.2	6	7	91	0.17
Switzerland	1	0.8	8.4	20	39	97	0.44
United Kingdom	1	1.3	15.7	12	11	91	0.01
United States	3	1.8	20.2	21	54	59	0.37
mean	4.0	1.8	13.1	13	23.3	77.3	0.21
s.d.	3.4	1.0	10.8	10	11.7	20.1	0.19

Source: Scruggs and Allan 2008, Tables 2, 3 and 4. For reasons explained in section 2.1 of the text, benefit equality is given as benefit differentials = 1 – benefit equality.

Table A1.B: Country values on the seven indicator variables (new 1980 data)

country	corporatism	etatism	poor relief	private pensions	private health	universalism	benefit differentials
Australia	1	1.3	49.0	30	31	22	0.00
Austria	7	3.5	3.4	3	31	79	0.30
Belgium	5	3.5	5.3	8	28	89	0.06
Canada	1	0.6	16.5	38	29	85	0.02
Denmark	1	1.2	13.6	17	17	94	0.00
Finland	7	2.8	12.7	3	25	91	1.00
France	9	3.4	10.5	8	24	85	0.43
Germany	5	1.9	6.2	11	25	86	0.25
Ireland	1	0.8	3.3	10	27	99	0.00
Italy	3	1.8	6.2	2	27	71	0.74
Japan	3	1.0	7.2	23	22	69	0.37
Netherlands	1	1.1	2.8	13	37	98	0.16
New Zealand	1	0.7	27.9	4	22	33	0.00
Norway	6	1.1	18.1	8	15	95	0.14
Sweden	1	1.7	12.0	6	15	93	0.13
Switzerland	1	0.5	9.5	20	44	70	0.49
United Kingdom	1	2.3	15.9	12	19	90	0.06
United States	3	2.1	19.7	21	56	60	0.42
mean	3.2	1.7	13.3	13	27.4	78.3	0.25
s.d.	2.7	1.0	11.1	10	10.2	21.5	0.28

Source: Scruggs and Allan 2008, Tables 2, 3 and 4. For reasons explained in section 2.1 of the text, benefit equality is given as benefit differentials = 1 – benefit equality.

Table A1.C: Country values on the seven indicator variables (new 1996-2002 data)

Indicator	Mean correlation	Cronbach Alpha for standardized items**	Variance explained by component 1**	Variance explained by component 2 if eigenvalue > 1
corporatism	0.78	0.91	0.85	-
etatism	0.87	0.95	0.91	-
private health	0.87	0.95	0.91	-
universalism	0.87	0.95	0.91	-
benefit differentials	0.61	0.83	0.75	-
poor relief	0.30*	0.56	0.65	0.33

Table A1.2 Reliability and unidimensionality statistics of the seven indicators in the three datasets

* for poor relief, the Esping-Andersen 1980 item correlates 0.04 and -0.08 with the items of Scruggs and Allan for 1980 and 1996-2001 respectively. These last two items correlate at 0.94.

** The three indicator items may be said to form a reliable scale if the standardized Cronbach Alpha is above 0.80. The scale can be accepted as a good measure of an onedimensional concept (defined by the meaning of the indicator label) if a PCA shows that only one component is extracted with an eigenvalue > 1, and the variance explained is high. Owing to the intercorrelations of the poor relief items, this indicator fails both the reliability and unidimensionality requirements.

Endnote 25 of the article refers to Table A1.2.

A2 The social insurance country typologies based on the Scruggs and Allan datasets

Section 4.3 of the article refers to Tables A2.A and A2.B below.

Regime Country	Conservative SI		Liberal SI		Universalism		TYPE
	FS SA1980	Rank	FS SA1980	Rank	Standardized SA1980	Rank	
Australia	-1.28	Low	1.35	Strong	-2.45	Low	Liberal
Austria	1.81	Strong	0.46	Medium	0.19	Medium	Conservative
Belgium	0.92	Strong	-0.47	Low	0.43	Strong	Hybrid1
Canada	-1.91	Low	0.71	Strong	0.38	Strong	Hybrid1
Denmark	0.92	Low	-0.82	Low	0.43	Strong	Universalist
Finland	0.83	Strong	-0.41	Low	0.48	Strong	Hybrid1
France	1.24	Strong	-0.07	Medium	0.33	Medium	Conservative
Germany	0.58	Strong	-0.11	Medium	0.28	Medium	Conservative
Ireland	-0.19	Medium	-0.52	Low	-0.31	Medium	Hybrid2
Italy	1.54	Strong	-0.29	Low	-0.31	Medium	Conservative
Japan	-0.07	Low	0.84	Strong	-0.61	Low	Liberal
Netherlands	-0.33	Medium	0.39	Medium	0.88	Strong	Universalist
New Zealand	-0.51	Low	-1.29	Low	-2.20	Low	Hybrid2
Norway	-0.06	Low	-0.76	Low	1.03	Strong	Universalist
Sweden	0.11	Medium	-1.42	Low	0.68	Strong	Universalist
Switzerland	-0.94	Low	1.12	Strong	0.98	Strong	Hybrid1
United Kingdom	-0.68	Low	-1.06	Low	0.21	Medium	Hybrid2
United States	-0.14	Low	2.35	Strong	-0.93	Low	Liberal

Table A2.A Country typology of the social insurance model (Scruggs and Allan 1980 data)

Note: ‘FS’ denotes the factor regression scores of conservative and liberal social insurance. ‘Rank’ refers to Esping-Andersen’s three-way ranking of countries on each regime dimension. The conservative and universalism scores below -0,33 are ranked as Low, scores between -0,33 and 0,33 as Medium, and scores above 0,33 are ranked as Strong, following the comparability convention described in the text. Likewise for the liberal regime, scores below -0,2 are ranked as Low, scores between -0,2 and 0,6 as Medium and scores above 0,6 are ranked as Strong. The entries of column ‘TYPE’ classify a country as liberal, conservative or universalist whenever it is Strong on the respective regime dimension *and* not Strong on the two others. ‘Hybrid1’, means that a country is ranked Strong on more than one regime dimension, while ‘Hybrid2’ refers to countries not ranked as Strong on any regime dimension. In this column, highlighted countries disagree with Esping-Andersen’s typology shown in Table 1 of the text.

Regime	Conservative SI		Liberal SI		Universalism		TYPE
Country	FS SAlatest	Rank	FS SAlatest	Rank	Standardized SAlatest	Rank	
Australia	-1.00	Low	0.87	Strong	-2.61	Low	Liberal
Austria	1.74	Strong	0.16	Medium	0.03	Medium	Conservative
Belgium	1.25	Strong	0.08	Medium	0.50	Strong	Hybrid1
Canada	-1.56	Low	0.95	Strong	0.31	Medium	Liberal
Denmark	-0.78	Low	-0.79	Low	0.73	Strong	Universalist
Finland	1.38	Strong	-0.41	Low	0.59	Strong	Hybrid1
France	1.84	Strong	-0.18	Medium	0.31	Medium	Conservative
Germany	0.42	Strong	-0.23	Low	0.36	Strong	Hybrid1
Ireland	-0.70	Low	-0.32	Low	0.96	Strong	Universalist
Italy	0.31	Medium	-0.48	Low	-0.34	Low	Hybrid2
Japan	-0.67	Low	-0.13	Medium	-0.43	Low	Hybrid2
Netherlands	-0.58	Medium	0.64	Strong	0.92	Strong	Hybrid1
New Zealand	-0.61	Low	-0.97	Low	-2.10	Low	Hybrid2
Norway	0.24	Medium	-1.23	Low	0.78	Strong	Universalist
Sweden	-0.25	Low	-1.33	Low	0.68	Strong	Universalist
Switzerland	-1.01	Low	1.41	Strong	-0.38	Low	Liberal
United Kingdom	-0.12	Low	-.70	Low	0.54	Strong	Universalist
United States	0.10	Low	2.64	Strong	-0.85	Low	Liberal

Table A2.B Country typology of the social insurance model (Scruggs and Allan 1996-2001 data)

Note: 'FS' denotes the factor regression scores of conservative and liberal social insurance. 'Rank' refers to Esping-Andersen's threeway ranking of countries on each regime dimension. The conservative and universalism scores below -0,33 are ranked as Low, scores between -0,33 and 0,33 as Medium, and scores above 0,33 are ranked as Strong, following the comparability convention described in the text. Likewise for the liberal regime, scores below -0,2 are ranked as Low, scores between -0,2 and 0,6 as Medium and scores above 0,6 are ranked as Strong. The entries of column 'TYPE' classify a country as liberal, conservative or universalist whenever it is Strong on the respective regime dimension *and* not Strong on the two others. 'Hybrid1', means that a country is ranked Strong on more than one regime dimension, while 'Hybrid2' refers to countries not ranked as Strong on any regime dimension. In this column, highlighted countries disagree with Esping-Andersen's typology shown in Table 1 of the text.