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How can we define Welfare State?

A system of (social) policies which introduces (social) rights as well as duties in order to cope with demands originated by modernization.

Different models developed as result of interaction among the main actors (political parties, lobbies, trade unions, NPOs) and the institutional legacy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare State pillars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Social Insurance (e.g. pension) | Contributions | • Standardized  
• Automatic  
• Certain  
(rights <-> duties) | Employed |
| Social Security (e.g. Citizenship’s Income) | Tax | • Equal | Universalism (citizenship) |
| Social Assistance | Tax | • Means-tested  
• Uncertain | Residual |
The welfare diamond

Evil, Pijl, e Ungerson (1994)
Esping-Andersen Typology

- The degree of *decommodification*, i.e. the degree to which a (social) service is rendered as a matter of right, and the degree to which a person can maintain a livelihood without reliance on the market.

- The kind of social stratification and solidarities, i.e. which social stratification system is promoted by social policy and does the welfare state build narrow or broad solidarities?

1) Liberal (the UK, the U.S.A., Canada)
2) Conservatory-corporative (Continental Europe)
3) Social-democratic (Scandinavian countries)
Ferrera M. Developments and classification:

4 welfare regimes/models

1. Liberal
2. Social-democratic
3. Corporative
4. Mediterranean or familistic model
   (Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal)
The Italian Welfare Model

Mediterranean model:
- Influenced by continental model (social insurance)
- Functional distorsion (what)
  - Old age vs. other risks (especially “social exclusion”)
  - Social Insurance and Social Assistance vs. Social Services
- Distributive distorsion (who)
- There is not “income support” policy (Italy, Greece, Hungary)

Strong polarization between insiders and outsiders
Public social expenditure in Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V.a.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% on GDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public expenditure for social protection</td>
<td>321.691</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>215.619</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care</td>
<td>82.516</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social work – social assistance</td>
<td>22.095</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interaction with labour market and family

• Weak labour market and strong black economy in the South

• Family as safety valve (especially in the South) without support from State (*passive subsidiarization* [Kazepov 2009])

→ Social-cultural-economic changes in the last decades cause overload of family care role

→ Geographic area (N-S) matters
Particularistic system:

- Welfare resources ↔ electoral support
- Social rights as a bargaining chip (clientelism)

Low grade of “stateness” ➔
- Low assumption of responsibility regards social protection
- Low autonomy and independency of statutory authorities from social and political organisations (parties, lobbies)
Restructuring the welfare systems in Europe

Crisis of traditional welfare state

• **Work**
  End of full-time employment
  Need for a new systems of social security (pension schemes)
  Financial crises

• **Family**
  Gender based division of labour
  Different balance between paid work and care work
  Stronger citizenship of women
Social priorities and new public agenda

• Increasing and multidimensional poverty

• Social exclusion

• New social risks
  • From unpredictable and short-lasting to predictable and long-lasting
Why do we need Third Sector?

Modern – post industrial societies have to cope with problems related to the lack of “relations”

Need for “relational goods” that may only be “produced” by *ad hoc* organizations different from the State and the market

Non profit organizations which are deeply rooted within local communities and know people needs
From welfare state to welfare mix
Welfare mix models

✓ Welfare pluralism
  ✓ Enabling state (sustains and enables private [nonprofit and for-profit] sector’s role within welfare system because considered more effective and efficient)
  ✓ Quasi-market to lead welfare allocation.
    ✓ Statutory bodies to control over competition in order to avoid asymmetry of information
    ✓ However minimal regulation as the goods provided (e.g. social services) are too complex to be fully evaluated
  ✓ Clear juridical profile of Third Sector to promote its independency from local and national government
Subsidiary model

Collaboration between State and Third Sector

- Funding to TS (awareness of its weakness) but respect for its autonomy
- TS part of policy-making (just like other intermediate bodies) for a consensual development of policies and their aims

Boundaries between State and TS less clear-cut than in the “welfare pluralism”

- TS is kind of integrated within the public system → pros and cons
- Great accountability for their action
- Risk to develop particularistic relationship with political actors, therefore…
- …improper way to use public money to support inefficient/ineffective organizations
- Mellow weakness (Seibel): Government use TS as scapegoat
Welfare mix models (3)

✓ **Centralizing model**
  ✓ TS is not outside the State (welfare pluralism) neither inside (subsidiary model) since...
    ✓ it provides public services it is not really accountable for them
    ✓ It is not legitimate into policy making (at central and local level)
    ✓ Mutual accommodation (particularistic and clientelar relationships with political parties)

✓ No (real) quasi-market regulation (unlike welfare pluralism)
✓ No promotion of third sector as such
✓ Lately (Italy): L. 328/2000 → from government to governance
The national law n.328/2000

- Repeals previous law, the so-called Crispi’s Law (1890)
  - Until now only specific laws (for disabilities, children...)
- Confirms the new social work paradigm introduced by DPR 616/77 (shift from relief and philanthropic to social work paradigm to cope with social needs)
- Designs a model of social care based on vertical and horizontal subsidiarity, where local authorities (from education, health, social services...) needs to cooperate among themselves and to involve nonprofit sector (both in programming and providing services) to best meet social needs ➔ network and multi-level governance approach
- Targets:
  - Individuals
  - Families
  - Communities
- Social Policies Planning: from national to local
Conclusions

- Welfare is still a national issue, enforced by globalization. There’s no such thing as a “European Welfare”
- Boundaries among different welfare models more and more blurred
  - Decentralization: from government to governance (the actual challenge)
  - Significant growth of social economy in terms of organizations, responsibilities, financial resources, employment, outcomes
  - Community oriented approach
  - Stress on better organizational performances (efficiency and effectiveness)
  - Limited budget issues

Social workers to deal with these challenges