**Appendix: Summary of 40 articles**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AUTHOR | Author’s institutional affiliation/ (language of article) | Cases | Concepts and Data | Method | Classification, and comments |
| **West-based authors** | | | | | |
| W1. Castles and Mitchell (1992) | Australia (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | Expenditure and benefit equality, based on Esping-Andersen’s (1990) data. | 2x2 matrix | **Liberal:**  Japan, Switzerland and USA classified together according to criteria of political configuration (non-right incumbency and trade union density), welfare expenditure (low transfers and taxes), and welfare expenditure and benefit equality. |
| W2. Esping-Andersen (1997) | Italy (English) | Japan only | Concepts of state, market and family from Esping-Andersen (1990), with some ad hoc data illustrating these dimensions | Conceptual construction/ Case Study | **Hybrid (or Difficult to classify)** |
| W3. Korpi & Palme (1998) | Sweden (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | Four types of insurance institutions: encompassing, corporatist, basic security, targeted based on data from the Social Citizenship Indicator Program/ SCIP and Luxembourg Income Study | Tabulation and analysis of descriptive statistics | **Corporatist (≒ Conservative)**  “During the Meiji Restoration, the Japanese government was influenced by the then new German social insurance legislation and attempted to modify it for domestic use.” (p 670) |
| W4. Goodin (2001) | Australia (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | Welfare regime, Post-productivist welfare regime in addition to three conventional welfare regimes, based on OECD dataset | 2x2 matrix | **Liberal** |
| W5. Obinger & Wagschal (2001) | Germany  (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 + 3 Southern EU nations - New Zealand = 20 nations | Families of nation approach based on OECD datasets and others | cluster analysis | **Anglo-Saxon family (≒Liberal )**  Japan is Liberal in general but appears to be moving towards the Anglo-Saxon family |
| W6. Powell & Barrientos (2004) | UK (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 + 3 Southern EU nations= 21 nations | welfare mix, and Active Labour Market Policies, based on OECD, ILO and UNDP datasets | hierarchical and k-means cluster analysis | **Liberal**: together with nations such as the USA, the UK and Switzerland. |
| W7. Bambra (2006) | UK (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | De-commodification, based on updating Esping-Andersen’s (1990) data | Index scores | **Liberal:** Japan was in the Conservative group in Esping-Andersen (1990) but the recalculation placed the nation in the Liberal group. |
| W8. Scruggs & Allan (2006) | USA (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | Decommdification, based on Welfare Entitlement dataset, | Index scores | **Liberal:** "In the case of Japan, the reason for the change in position is substantially due to an error in the original volume which has been long overlooked by users of the decommodification index. Japan’s score, based on the programme data provided in the book should be 22.3, not 27.3, making it one of the least generous and most commodifying welfare states" (p. 61) |
| W9. Shalev (2007) | Israel (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | Comparative social policy, based on raw data from Esping-Andersen (1990) | Principal component analysis | **Liberal:** Grouped with the USA, Canada, Switzerland “in which working class mobilization is very weak and, in North America, the conservative heritage is absent" (p 294) |
| W10. Castles and Obinger (2008) | Australia (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 + 3 Southern EU nations - New Zealand = 20 nations | 16 outcome variables, based on OECD revenue statistics and Economic Outlook Database | Hierarchical and k-means cluster analysis | **Liberal:**  For 1960-75, Japan and Switzerland are clear outliers that do not belong to any of the particular families, but by 2000-04, show increasing similarities with the ‘English-speaking’ nations (eg UK and USA) |
| W11. Schröder (2009) | Germany (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 + Spain, Portugal = 20 nations | Welfare typologies and Varieties of Capitalism typologies, based on OECD datasets | principal component and cluster analysis | **Separate:** " Switzerland and Japan do not belong to any specific group" (p. 24) |
| W12. Hudson and Kühner (2009) | UK (English) | 23 OECD countries | Protective and productive dimensions, based on OECD Social Expenditure Database, OCED Tax Benefit models | Fuzzy set ideal type analysis | **Weak protective hybrid:**  “Japan is characterized by our data as a weak-protective hybrid alongside countries like Spain, France, the Czech Republic and Portugal.” (p 42) |
| W13. Hudson and Kühner (2012) | UK (English) | 55 high and higher-middle income countries | Protective and productive dimensions, based on IMF’s Government Financial Statistics, OECD datasets | Fuzzy set ideal type analysis (FslTA) | **Weak:**  along with Australia, Bulgaria, UK |
| W14. Ferragina et al (2013) | UK (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 nations | Unemployment protection and family policy, based on OECD datasets | Multiple correspondence analysis | **Liberal:**  “At the top of the vertical axis we find Japan, Canada, Italy, Switzerland, the United States, and the United Kingdom, which can be considered Liberal welfare states with a low degree of universality and ‘lean’ cash transfers.” (p. 7) |
| W15.  Nan Yang (2017) | UK (English) | six nations | productivist welfare, based on welfare state typology, | fuzzy-set ideal analysis (FslTA) | **Residual balanced model**:  Japan has both relatively weak productivist elements and relatively weak protective elements. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Asia-based authors in English | | | | | |
| A1 Kwon (1997) | South Korea (English) | Japan, Korea | Esping-Andersen’s (1990) welfare regime type, drawing on national datasets of the two nations | Conceptual construction/ Case Study | **East Asian welfare model:**  Japan differs from Esping-Andersen’s conservative welfare regime in two ways: 1) the importance of the regulation of policy intervention, and 2) the importance of private transfers playing a significant part |
| A2 Holliday (2000) | Hong Kong  (English) | Japan; Hong- Kong; Singapore; Korea; Taiwan | NA  Esping-Andersen’s (1990) welfare regime | Conceptual construction/ Case Study | **Fourth World of Productive Welfare Capitalism**: developmental-universalist sub-set |
| A3 Aspalter (2006) | South Korea  (English) | Japan, South Korea, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Malaysia and Singapore | Ideal-typical welfare model, The Individual (weak); the Family (strong); the Market (strong); the State (weak) | Conceptual construction/ Case Study | (East Asian) **Conservative Welfare Regime** as **a distinct and fourth world**:  which is different from the Corporatist/Christian Democratic welfare regime. |
| A4 Lee and Ku (2007) | Taiwan (English) | Esping-Andersen’s 18 + Korea + Taiwan = 20 nations | Esping-Andersen’s (1990) welfare regime, and developmental welfare state, based on international datasets from ILO, IMF, OECD and World Bank | Factor analysis and Cluster analysis | **Corporatist, ‘pro-corporatist’; or Hybrid (which sits in between developmentalism and corporatism):**  “Japan may better be described  as having more ‘pro-corporatist’ characteristics than typical corporatist ones” (p. 207)  “Japan is in between the corporatist group (Austria, Italy, France and Germany) and the  East Asian group (Taiwan and South Korea).” |
| A5 Aspalter (2011) | China (English) | China, Hong Kong, South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Tailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia | Ideal-typical welfare regime, with unclear data sources | Conceptual construction, drawing on Case Study Categorical table analysis | **Pro-welfare Conservative Welfare Regime in East Asia:**  which has productive social rights; low wage levels, state pensions, and social assistance; universal social investment in education, health care, housing; Bismarckian social insurance |
| A6 Choi (2012) | South Korea  (English) | Japan, Korea, China | Productivist welfare capitalism/ OECD dataset | Conceptual construction/ cases study | **Changes over time: Productivist welfare-state regime, Productivist/ Informal Security Regime (-1970s); productivist/ welfare state regime (1980s-2000s); Post-productivist/ welfare state regime (2010s?)** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Japan-based authors | | | | | |
| J1 Uzuhashi (1995) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology, drawing on  Esping-Andersen’s (1990) decommodification and stratification data, Ragin’s (1994) cluster analysis of pension data; Uzuhashi’s (1994) income distribution data; and OECD dataset on unemployment and other datasets | Review of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries, and comparing the Japanese welfare state in with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types | **Hybrid of Liberal and Conservative:**  Japan has strong conservative elements such as strong social insurance and family roles but liberal elements such as low-level benefits remain. |
| J2 Miyamoto  (1997) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Suggests a new theoretical framework combining employment and welfare regimes, based on international datasets on labour market, Gini indices, public spending, family welfare and social expenditure | Analysis of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries, and a review of the Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Japan-style welfare regime**:  Japan has developed a ‘small regime’ because job security for male breadwinner employees in each private companies and familialism replace the role of the state social security. |
| J3  Shizume  (1997) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology, absed on  Castles and Mitchell’s (1992) decommodification and stratification data | Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types, together with an analysis of Japan’s long-term care insurance system, which was legislated in 1997 and implemented in 2000. | **Hybrid between Liberal and Conservative** |
| J4  Shinkawa  (2000) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology, with no clear data source (conceptual /case/ historical study) | Historical and institutional analysis of Japan’s social security development since the Second World War. | **Hybrid between Liberal and Conservative:**  Unlike the Liberal model, liberalism in Japan is intertwined with familism. |
| J5 Nimiya (2002) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology,  with no clear data source (conceptual /case/ historical study) | Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types  Review of four East Asian nations’ historical and institutional backgrounds | **Conservative (?):**  A hybrid closer to the Conservative model, but moving toward the Liberal regime |
| J6  Miura  (2003) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Warns against an uncritical application of Esping-Andersen’s welfare typology to Japan. It examines compare job security and income security, using datasets on employment outcomes, labour market regulation and OECD Social Expenditure. | International comparative analysis of characteristics and outcomes of policy and systems (especially employment and labour market policy) of welfare states  Review of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Japan-style welfare regime**,  It has some elements of the Social Democratic welfare regime and the Conservative welfare regime), but  job security eclipses income security (welfare through employment). |
| J7  Miyamoto  , Ito & Uzuhashi  (2003) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Difficult to compare Western welfare states with Japan, given the relatively late development of Japan’s welfare state, but uses  international datasets on income source of retirees, income structure, ratio of care serviced, labour market, public assistance expenditure, birth rate, and family welfare | Analysis of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries  Review of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types  International comparative analysis of characteristics and outcomes of policy and systems of welfare states. | **Late-coming welfare state:**  Japan has formed and developed family welfare and corporate welfare instead of the welfare state |
| J8  Takegawa  (2005b) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Criticises the uncritical application of Esping-Andersen’s welfare typology to Japan, suggesting a new theoretical framework consisting of welfare politics, benefit state, regulation state, drawing on  international datasets on social spending, and social security benefits | Analysis of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries  Review of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Japan-style welfare regime**:  Japan has ‘weak social democracy and strong state bureaucracy’, ‘low social spending and high spending on public projects’ and ‘strong regulation on economy and weak regulation on society’ |
| J9  Hiraoka (2006) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology, combined with gender approach  with no clear data source (conceptual /case/ historical study) | Historical and institutional analysis of development of universal health and pension insurances implemented in 1961 since the second W.W. | **Hybrid between Liberal and Conservative:**  Stratification is weaker given that Japan’s social insurance pursues equality by public financial support. Japan has a strong familialistic element. |
| J10  Moriyama (2007) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology/  OECD Social Expenditure Database 1980-2003 for Japan’s family policy | Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types.  Historical and institutional analysis of family policy and analysis of spending on various social policy areas. | **Hybrid between Liberal and Conservative:**  The Liberal element is based on the role of private companies as major actors, while the Conservative element is based on the role of families |
| J11  Nakahara  (2007) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology, based on OECD Social Expenditure data and the European Commission’s Eurostat Labour Cost data. | Historical and institutional analysis of development of Japan’s welfare state.  Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Japan-style ‘workfare’ welfare regime**:  which pursues full employment.  Japan has a trinity welfare regime with state forming a certain level of welfare system and family and corporate taking complementary roles, |
| J12  Osawa  (2007; 2013) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Combining gender-oriented approach and third-sector-oriented approach in addition to the conventional welfare regime typology, drawing on data on gender inequality, ILO LABORSAT female labour statistics, OECD StatExtracts, and OECD Social Expenditure datasets. | Analysis of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries.  International comparative analysis of characteristics and outcomes of policy and systems of welfare states. | **Japan-style welfare regime**:  1) Male bread winner model (continental Europe and Japan)  2) Model supporting both genders’(North Europe),  3) ‘Market-oriented model’(Anglo-Saxon nations) |
| J13  Ito  (2008) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology,  with no clear data source (conceptual /case/ historical study) | Historical and institutional analysis of development of Japan’s welfare state since 1990s.  Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Hybrid between Liberal and Conservative:**  Increasing Liberal elements due to retreat of familialism and rising maketisation since the 1990s. |
| J14  Shinkawa  (2009) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology, based on OECD Social Expenditure Database | Historical and institutional analysis of development of Japan’s welfare state.  Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Familialist welfare regime as the fourth type:**  Japan has controlled public social spending since the mid- 1970s by increasing the roles of family and private company.  Japan’s liberal trend has become significant since the 1990s, while maintaining its familialistic welfare regime. |
| J15  Ochiai, Abe, Uzuhashi, Tamiya & Shikata  (2010) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Analysis focuses on the formula ‘care = role of families’, using data on social expenditure, and care service users | Analysis of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries.  Review of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Japan-style welfare regime**:  which combines familialism and workfare.  Familialism remains despite the neoliberal reforms since the 1990s. |
| J16  Kim (2012) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Warns against an uncritical application of Esping-Andersen’s welfare typology to Japan. It is difficult to compare Western welfare states with Japan, given the relatively late development of Japan’s welfare state, | Analysis of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries.  Review of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Japan as a ‘late-coming’ welfare state**  Job security, corporate welfare, family welfare, serving as de-facto social insurance system, are the main characteristics of Japan’s welfare when compared with the Western welfare states. This is due to the late development of Japan’s welfare state. |
| J17  Tsuji  (2012) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology  gender approach/  Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications’ statistics on workforce, child care centres and others, data on Japan’s political parties and elections | Historical and institutional analysis of development of Japan’s welfare state.  Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Familialist welfare regime as the fourth type:**  Reforms have changed the familialistic welfare regime since the 1990s but it is unclear where these reforms are heading toward. |
| J18  Shizume & Kondo (2013) | Japan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology/  Not applicable (conceptual /case study) | Review of historical and institutional differences between Japan and Western countries.  Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Familialist welfare regime as the fourth type** |
| J19  Ahn, Lin & Shinkawa  (2015) | Japan, South Korea, Taiwan (Japanese) | Japan | Welfare regime typology,  with no clear data source (conceptual /case/ historical study) | Historical and institutional analysis of development of Japan’s welfare state.  Analysis of Japanese welfare state in comparison with Esping-Andersen’s three ideal types. | **Familialist welfare regime as the fourth type**:  Japan maintains its familialistic welfare regime while strengthening its liberal elements since the 1990s. |
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