Social Policy & Society (2013) 12:4, 547–552
© *Cambridge University Press 2013* doi:10.1017/S1474746413000298

Introduction
'New' Welfare in Practice: Trends, Challenges and Dilemmas

Marion Ellison* and Menno Fenger**

**Sociology and Social Policy, Queen Margaret University Edinburgh*
E-mail: mellison@qmu.ac.uk

***Department of Public Administration, Erasmus University Rotterdam*
E-mail: fenger@fsw.eur.nl

European welfare states have a tradition of compensating for social risks. But across Europe, remarkable transformations may be observed that shift the focus from a needs/rights based compensatory approach towards a more individualistic 'social risk management' approach to welfare (see Schmid, 2006; Abrahamson, 2010). The basic idea of social risk management is that citizens have their own responsibility for preventing social risks. The 'new' welfare state mirrors this approach by adopting the role of equipping individual citizens for this task. The concept of the 'new welfare state' has been discussed under different labels, including 'positive welfare' (Giddens, 1998), 'enabling welfare' (Gilbert, 2002), 'new welfare' (Taylor-Gooby, 2008) and 'social investment state' (Engelen *et al*., 2007).

The formative ideas of 'new welfare' policy approaches emerged during the 1990s. Early exponents of these ideas included Anthony Giddens (1998), who regarded the social investment state as a future-orientated model, defined by a rational architecture for welfare with three key principles. First, state expenditure was viewed as a positive investment in human capital benefitting the overall economic capacity and growth of the nation. Second, citizenship within the social investment state would be framed by notions of individual responsibility for risk. Third, government would lead and facilitate investment in the social economy particularly encouraging entrepreneurship and public–private partnership in the development of economic and social enterprises.

A central tenet of the new welfare approach lies in its role in the productive economies of modern states. Drawing from a central productive role of welfare within Keynesian economics, social investment strategies are regarded as central to the competitive capacity of nations within an increasingly competitive global economic market. Here, the commitment to investment in welfare institutions that enhance human capital, such as education and training relevant to labour market needs, is regarded as central.

The contributions in this themed section critically analyse the recent empirical evidence relating to the implementation of 'new welfare' in specific European settings. Three key themes emerge from these contributions:

1. The legitimacy and effectiveness of new welfare as a productive social investment instrument within distinct settings. The focal point of this debate lies in the axiom between social protection and investment mechanisms, particularly in the light of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

situational constraints created by high levels of poverty during the current economic crises and use of austerity measures.
2. The individualisation of risk and the notion of the responsible citizen. Of concern here are the processes of governance which characterise the public framing and legitimisation of new welfare approaches and the responsabilisation of citizens within distinct settings.
3. The mediation of new welfare within specific economic and political contexts. In particular, it is argued that the analysis of the legitimacy and effectiveness of new welfare measures is a complex task which requires cognisance of prevailing socio-economic conditions within specific states, particularly in relation to levels of inequality and societal risk. Societal risk is defined as the capacity of states to ensure that individuals are able to reach their potential within functioning education, health and labour market structures and systems, ensuring their well-being and also contributing to wider economic and social capacity and potential of the society in which they live.

New welfare as social investment

The productive rationale of new welfare is articulated by Esping-Andersen (1992) in his characterisation of central elements of the social democratic model. He argues that social democratic states invest heavily in education, family services, employment and job mobility to ensure a coordinated approach to the economy. In this sense, a social investment approach is socially just and economically efficient as it enables all its citizens to reach their potential, not only for the benefit of individual citizens and families but also for the benefit of the economy. Importantly however, social investment was and is regarded as one strand of the social democratic approach. The redistributive element of social democracy is still regarded by many exponents as being critical to the effective functioning of society and economy in nation-states such as Sweden, Denmark and Norway (Esping-Andersen, 1992; Midgley, 1999; Lorenz, 2008). In contrast 'new welfare', with its focus on equality of opportunity and individual responsibility, is viewed as an architecture designed to cope with the challenges faced by European welfare states within an increasingly competitive global economy, with ageing populations and in the midst of global economic recession and volatility. Critics have argued that growing levels of social inequality mitigate both the economic effectiveness and the democratic legitimacy of a social investment approach which rests solely upon the creation of equal opportunity (Lister, 2003; Hay, 2005). At the centre of the debate is the relationship between the labour market and social protection. As Cantillon and Van Lancker argue in this themed section, 'labour market integration is not only regarded as a superior way to achieve income protection and social inclusion at the individual level, but also an indispensable feature of "productive" social policy systems because higher employment levels decrease benefit dependency and contribute to sound public finances, hence to the future sustainability of the welfare state. The prime channel to achieve this ideal of social inclusion through labour market participation is long-term investment in human capital, to begin in early life (Hemerijck, 2012).'

In developing this argument, Cantillon and Van Lancker successfully articulate the relationship between social investment and social protection as a symbiotic mechanism which simultaneously reduces poverty whilst increasing individual and societal

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well-being and potential. In particular, the article provides an evidential base for the continuing relevance of class and inequality upon human potential and social risks, including unemployment, illness and disability, early school dropout and low educational attainment. In conclusion, Cantillon and Van Lancker highlight the need for the continued provision of social protection across modern European societies. Reinforcing these findings, Gatt and Armeni utilise evidence from a major transnational study, 'INCLUD-ED', an FP6 project of the European Commission focusing on educational practices promoting social cohesion as a form of new welfare to highlight the value of collectively organised multi-sectorial approaches. Here, new welfare becomes shaped within positive transformative approaches and outcomes within schools and across neighbouring communities located within six successful schools in five countries. These transformations involved an integrated programme of support at the school and community level. In particular, the programme mirrors previous approaches to community development in Denmark in linking education to the fulfillment of the community labour market, health and housing needs. The local relevance of the programme was identified as making an important contribution to positive outcomes. Importantly, the programme is also evidenced as benefitting levels of political participation.

'New Wefare' and the construction of the responsible citizen

Responsibilisation is also a central tenet of 'new welfare' approaches. In particular, the self-regulation of risky behaviour is regarded as being integral to personal well-being and to integration within society. Here, solidarity with the value consensus of the state is articulated through responsible behaviours towards individual health and well-being. In defining a 'Risk Society' as 'an inescapable structural condition of advanced industrialization', Beck (2006) has argued that social policies directed at mitigating risk are themselves defined by ethical, moral and political judgments conceptualising risk as a socially constructed phenomenon. Thus, approaches towards responsibilisation in distinct societies vary according to how 'risk' and knowledge relating to risk is defined by powerful actors in society. Here, acting as a form of inequality, Beck regards risk as a power game in which the powerful actors in society maximise risks for others and minimise risks for themselves (Beck, 2006). As Peters argues in his contribution, this leads us to consider the form and processes of governance in the public framing and legitimisation of new welfare approaches underpinned by the responsabilisation of citizens. Dutch youth policy is analysed as a construction of Dutch political discourse to reveal ways in which the Dutch government developed mechanisms to justify new approaches to social issues. Peters traces the mechanisms which enable a politicisation of citizen behaviour encouraging citizens as co-operators of political will formation. Fenger and Qaran follow a similar theme by deconstructing the normative and ideological implications of decisions concerning the coverage of health treatments within distinct European settings. They provide an evidential base to reveal three key findings relating to the incursion of ideas of new welfare into health care systems across Europe. A key finding is the way in which the discourse of public debate is directed by the framing of health issues, such as low fertility as an illness or a consequence of individual choices or lack of patience. By framing the debate in this way, health authorities are placing a normative stance on discussions which may be regarded as really belonging to unique cases. For example, taking a bio psychosocial model of health, a more holistic approach to infertility would focus on the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

way in which the couple themselves defines the issue and the experiences around the issue. This would then take account of biographical, social, environmental and political factors implicated in the lived experience of infertility. Importantly, as Fenger and Qaran point out, a key consideration is the degree to which differential income levels impact on access to fertility treatments given that infertility is almost being regarded in dominant medical discourse as a matter of behavioural or moral choices. Another key finding of their article is the resource-led nature of health provision within the areas analysed. Here, despite dominant moral discourses which centrally pivot upon the lifestyle of user groups when final decisions are taken with regard to eligibility for treatment, financial resource limitations dominate the process. As Fenger and Qaran argue, this raises serious questions relating to the relationship between innovative approaches in health care and the equitable distribution of effective treatments within distinct European settings.

The legitimacy and effectiveness of new welfare within specific economic and political contexts

Finally, many theoretical contributions to debates relating to new welfare have coalesced around the impact of ideas of 'new' politics and economics on the legitimacy and effectiveness of new welfare. Here, the central challenge for 'new welfare' is to mediate the tension between capitalism and democracy. The review article in this themed section critically dissects the implications of this theoretical premise and draws upon recent theoretical contributions to develop an analytical framework for the analysis of new welfare as it impacts on socio-economic conditions and welfare politics within specific economic and political settings in Europe. Importantly, the article examines the potential of social investment approaches by comparing recent evidence from the neo-liberal welfare of Britain with evidence from social democratic settings. It is recognised that debates surrounding the impact of globalisation and neo-liberalism are contested. The perception of neo-liberalism as having a harmful effect on the organisation, legitimation and effectiveness of welfare has been articulated by a substantive body of theoretical and empirical work in this field, often fitting new conceptualisations of democracy to the changing circumstances of global economics (Trevellion, 1997; Pugh and Gould, 2000; Lorenz, 2001; Andersen and Guillemard, 2006). The contested nature of this view is amplified by writers such as Deacon (2001) who argues that neo-liberalism and globalisation offer the possibility of the creation of a new global social policy. A number of commentators have argued that neo-liberalism destabilises economic and social organisation in society (Rhodes, 1996; Trevelllion, 1997; Navarro, 1998). Moreover, economic and social dis-welfares arising from changes in the organisation of production and consumption increase the need for welfare while at the same time emphasising the need to reduce the resources available to meet these needs (Andersen and Guillemard, 2006). Thus, neo-liberal contexts can limit the capacity of social investment strategies and measures to produce positive outcomes. Further, as Cantillon and Van Lancker have revealed in this themed section, 'social investment is not a full-fledged and necessarily coherent paradigm, but a set of ideas which can be and have been interpreted and implemented in different ways'. The review article argues that the analysis of the implementation of new welfare strategies requires the identification, measurement and qualitative understanding of social inequalities within distinct settings. The central relevance of Cantillon and Van Lancker's argument is that social investment 'cannot and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will not' enable social progress to occur unless it is combined with the implementation of traditional forms of social protection. Recent research has provided an evidential base to support the view that social investment cannot be the only principle guiding welfare interventions; democratically legitimate and economically effective measures also require adequate levels of social protection (Taylor *et al*., 2012; Grusky and Kricheli-Katz, 2012).

The contributions which follow provide a useful resource for the exploration of the dilemmas and challenges for welfare within rapidly changing economies across Europe and beyond. The critical analysis of recent research both exposes the central challenge of poverty and inequality in this debate and also raises fundamental questions relating to the legitimacy and effectiveness of new welfare measures as they are implemented within distinct European settings. The gravity and extensiveness of the current economic crises across Europe and more broadly bring a growing urgency for further research into the governance, organisation, delivery and impact of welfare provision across Europe. By making a theoretical and empirical contribution to the critical analysis of the implementation of new welfare measures within European nations, this themed section will stimulate further research and debate into this most important area.

References

Abrahamson, P. (2010) 'European welfare states beyond neoliberalism: toward the social investment state', *Development and Society*, 39, 1, 61–95.

Andersen, J. G. and Guillemard, A.-M. (2006) 'Conclusion: policy change, welfare regimes and active citizenship', in J. G. Andersen, A.-M. Guillemard, P. H. Jensen and B. Pfau-Effinger (eds.), *The Changing Face of Welfare. Consequences and Outcomes from a Citizenship Perspective*, Bristol: The Policy Press, pp. 257–71.

Beck, U. (2006) 'Living in the world risk society', *Economy and Society*, 35, 1, 329–45.

Deacon, B. (2001) 'International organisations, the EU and global social policy', in R. Sykes, B. Palier and P. Prior (eds.), *Globalisation and European Welfare States: Challenges and Change*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 59–76.

Engelen, E., Hemerijck, A. and Trommel, W. (eds.) (2007) *Van sociale bescherming naar sociale investering* [From Social Protection to Social Investment], Den Haag: Lemma.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1992) 'The making of a social democratic welfare state', in K. Misgeld, K. Molin and K. Amark (eds.), *Creating Social Democracy: A Century of the Social Democratic Labor Party in Sweden*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 35–66.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilbert, N. (2002) *Transformations of the Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grusky, D. and Kricheli-Katz, T. (2012) *The New Gilded Age: The Critical Inequality Debates of Our Time*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hay, C. (2005) 'Too important to leave to the economists? The political economy of welfare retrenchment', *Social Policy and Society*, 4, 2, 197–205.

Hemerijck, A. (2012) *Changing Welfare States*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lister, R. (2003) 'Investing in the citizen-workers of the future: transformations in citizenship and the state under New Labour', *Social Policy and Administration*, 37, 5, 427–43.

Lorenz, W. (2001) 'Social work responses to New Labour in Continental European countries', *British Journal of Social Work*, 31, 4, 595–609.

Lorenz, W. (2008) 'Towards a European model of social work',*Australian Social Work*, 61, 1, 7–24.

Midgley, J. (1999) 'Growth, redistribution, and welfare: toward social investment', *Social Service Review*, 73, 1, 3–21.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Navarro, V. (1998) 'Neo liberalism, globalization, unemployment, inequalities and the welfare state', *International Journal of Health Services*, 28, 4, 607–82.

Pugh, R. and Gould, N. (2000) 'Globalisation, social work, and social welfare', *European Journal of Social Work*, 3, 2, 123–38.

Rhodes, M. (1996) 'Globalization and the West European welfare states: a critical review of recent debates', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6, 4, 305–28.

Schmid, G. (2006) 'Social risk management through transitional labour markets', *Socio-Economic Review*, 4, 1, 1–34.

Taylor, M. M., Haux, T. and Pudney, S. (2012) *Can Improving UK Skill Levels Reduce Poverty and Income Inequality by 2020*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2008) 'The new welfare state settlement in Europe', *European Societies*, 10, 1, 3–24.

Trevellion, S. (1997) 'The globalisation of european social work', *Social Work in Europe*, 4, 1, 1–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746413000298 Published online by Cambridge University Press