Latin America is a fascinating region for the study of social policy: it combines past inequalities with a recent expansion, struggles with segmented social programs and presents diverse policy outcomes. The contributors from this book – a combination of renowned experts and exciting early career scholars from different parts of the world – offer many examples of the region’s richness. After reading the book, you will understand better how difficult it is to build more equitable social programs, but also how urgent it is in today’s world.

– Diego Sánchez Ancochea, Professor of the Political Economy of Development, University of Oxford, UK

Bringing new research and analytic perspectives, Welfare and Social Protection in Contemporary Latin America engages key debates over the history, economics and politics of Latin America’s welfare systems, and proposes new ways of classifying and comparing them. A wide-ranging interdisciplinary collection of quality contributions makes this book a most welcome addition to the field. It deserves wide readership within both policy and academic communities.

– Maxine Molyneux, Professor of Sociology, UCL Institute of the Americas, UK

This edited collection brings together a group of young and established academics in the field of Latin American social policy to explore recent advances in the welfare regimes and the national and global actors shaping social protection systems. The case studies and comparative analyses in this book expand our knowledge of welfare systems in the Global South.

– Luis Moreno, Research Professor, Spanish National Research Council (CSIC), Spain

This excellent edited book brings together scholars from numerous countries and disciplines in presenting a comprehensive analysis of welfare regimes in Latin America. They discuss how both national and global actors shape social policy in the region and examine the most salient issues in current debates surrounding welfare systems in Latin America. Theoretically rich and empirically rigorous, this book is an outstanding contribution to our knowledge of social protection and welfare regimes in Latin America. It will be widely read, assigned and cited.

– Nora Nagels, Professor of Development and International Cooperation, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada

We needed a volume that, in a comprehensive and rigorous way, investigated the study of welfare regimes and social policies in Latin America. This work successfully satisfies this need by offering a comparative perspective and integrated view of the main debates and challenges of the social dimension of the State.

– Gemma Ubasart-González, Professor of Political Science and Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Law, Universitat de Girona, Spain
Social protection serves as an important development tool, helping to alleviate deprivation, reduce social risks, raise household income and develop human capital. This book brings together an interdisciplinary team of international experts to analyse social protection systems and welfare regimes across contemporary Latin America.

The book starts with a section tracking the expansion of social assistance and social insurance in Latin America through the state-led development era, the neoliberal era and the pink-tide. The second section explores the role played by local and external actors modelling social policy in the region. The third and final section addresses a variety of contemporary debates and challenges around social protection and welfare in the region, such as gender roles and the empowerment of CCT beneficiaries, and welfare provision for rural outsiders. The book touches on key topics such as conditional cash transfer programmes, trade union inclusionary strategies, transnational social policy, state-led versus market-led welfare provision, explanatory factors in the emerging dualism of social protection institutions, social citizenship rights as a consequence of changing social policy architecture and different poverty reduction strategies.

This interdisciplinary volume will be of interest to economists, political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists and historians working on social protection in Latin America or interested in welfare systems in the global south.
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Part I

Social policy and welfare regimes in contemporary Latin America
1 Comparative social policy in contemporary Latin America

Concepts, theories and a research agenda

Gibrán Cruz-Martínez

Introduction

Pioneer countries in Latin America created their first welfare programmes in the early twentieth century (Mesa-Lago, 1978). The consolidation of welfare programmes and institutions took place during the state-led industrialisation era following an import-substitution–industrialisation strategy engineered by structuralists at the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (Graziano and Jessoula, 2018). Social insurance programmes spread in the consolidation period to the vast majority of Latin American countries following the corporatist–statist welfare regime model, in which mainly unionised urban formal workers and the military benefited. Rather than reducing poverty and income inequality, this strategy exacerbated the differences between the economic/political elites and the majority of the population working in the informal and rural sector.

Following Heclo’s (1981) stages of welfare state development, we can argue the Latin American region is in the process of social policy expansion, or what Garay (2016) calls the ‘inclusive turn’. Since the beginning of the century, a large part of the region has been governed by centre-left or left-wing parties — although the ‘progressive cycle’ appears to have ended — (Muñoz, 2016). The commodity boom and the exponential hike in primary commodities prices created the conditions for exceptional economic growth in the region (Aravena et al., 2015). Moreover, the implementation of social assistance policies to the already established social insurance programmes created an inclusionary path for outsiders — population in the rural areas, working in the informal sector and the unemployed — into the social protection systems (Cecchini et al., 2015). The twenty-first century saw an increase in social expenditure, an extension of the generosity and coverage of welfare programmes, and improvements in the movements towards equitable universalisation of social policies (Cruz-Martínez, 2015; Martinez-Franzoni and Sánchez-Ancochea, 2016).

However, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL) recently confirmed that the improvements of social and labour inclusion during the first 15 years of the new millennium have been insufficient (e.g., only 28.6 per cent of households in the region have reached a minimum level of
double inclusion – social and labour inclusion) (CEPAL, 2017). Social protection systems in Latin America are fragmented and inequitable, and the commodification and privatisation of the health and pension systems, guided by profit, have negatively impacted inequality and social welfare (Sojo, 2017). Therefore, even though the improvements in the welfare state development are unquestionable, there is still a long road ahead to secure a decent quality of life with real equal opportunities for all residents in Latin America.

We can measure the degree of welfare state development in the region by taking into account multiple dimensions of the welfare state. The Multidimensional Welfare Index (MWI) combines indicators from three different dimensions (i.e., social spending, coverage of welfare programmes and outcomes of welfare institutions) to operationalise the welfare state development in 17 Latin American countries during the 1940s–1970s (Cruz-Martinez, 2014) and 2000–2010 (Cruz-Martinez, 2017c). Countries are grouped into three clusters based on the 2010 MWI results. Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil and Chile exhibit MWI scores in the first tertile – top 33 per cent – and are labelled as countries with a relatively high degree of welfare state development. Costa Rica, Venezuela, Panama, Colombia, Mexico, Peru and El Salvador obtained MWI scores in the middle 33 per cent and are considered to have an intermediate welfare state development. Ecuador, Dominican Republic, Paraguay, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Honduras and Guatemala had the lowest MWI scores and therefore are considered to be countries with a relatively low degree of welfare state development.

Welfare state development in the twenty-first century seems to be an effective way of tackling individual income and capabilities deprivations in Latin America and the Caribbean. However, welfare state development does not appear to be effective for reducing income inequality in the region (Cruz-Martinez, 2017c). This does not mean that inequality has not been reduced; several studies confirm the reduction of inequality in the still most unequal region in the world (Lustig and McLeod, 2011; Soares et al., 2007; Tsounta and Osueke, 2014). However, what Cruz-Martinez (2017c) finds is that changes in the levels of social expenditure, coverage and outcomes of the welfare state do not explain the reductions in income inequality. One explanation for this result might be the existence of a dual social protection system. A minority of the population continues to benefit from developments in the welfare state programmes – mainly through improvements in the social insurance programmes for workers in the formal sector – while the majority of Latin American residents benefit from targeted, conditional and stigmatised social assistance programmes.

If not welfare state development, then, what explains the reduction in income inequality? Nora Lustig and her research team conclude that one of the leading causes of income inequality reduction in the region is the wage structure effect. For example, Brazil has seen an increase in the minimum salary (favouring low-skilled workers) and Mexico has seen an increase of skilled workers with higher salaries (Lustig et al., 2016). Income inequality reduction in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Peru occurred thanks to a decrease in the earnings gap between
skilled and low-skilled workers and an increase in government transfers to the poor” (López-Calva and Lustig, 2010, p. 5).

This book brings together a group of renowned experts and early-career scholars in the broad field of social policy and welfare studies. The purpose of the book is threefold: (i) to present a historical and theoretical analysis of social protection systems and welfare regimes in contemporary Latin America; (ii) to discuss the politics of contemporary social protection and how national/global actors and institutions shape social policy in the region; and (iii) to examine several debates on social protection and welfare systems in contemporary Latin America.

Political scientists, sociologists and economists examine from a multidisciplinary perspective the following aspects of social protection and welfare regimes:

- The shift in the welfare regime: from a social assistance state to a universalistic state
- The explanatory factors in the emerging dualism of social protection institutions (i.e., social assistance for outsiders and social insurance for insiders)
- Construction of social citizenship rights as a consequence of changing social policy architecture
- Nature of welfare regime reforms in the most advanced emerging welfare states of the region (Costa Rica, Chile, Brazil, Argentina and Uruguay)
- Theoretical foundations of conditional cash transfer programmes and the domestication of global policy norms
- Social protection in trade agreements (transnational social policy)
- Neoliberalism and trade union inclusionary strategies
- State-led versus market-led welfare provision according to the desire of rural ‘outsiders’ in the areas of education and pensions
- Discriminatory targeting mechanisms of citizenship and identity for welfare entitlements
- Cash transfer programmes as a means for women’s empowerment or the reproduction of gender roles in the patriarchal society
- The future of social protection in the face of accelerated technological, labour and climate challenges and changes

The previously mentioned topics give structure to the book. The book is divided into three parts, each devoted to exploring one of the three main goals. The first part examines the welfare regimes in Latin America. It tracks the expansion of social assistance and social insurance through the state-led development era, the neoliberal or Washington Consensus era and the pink-tide. The part asks: what has been the impact of social policy reforms on the architecture of welfare regimes in contemporary Latin America? Can we generalise a welfare regime model for the whole region, or do we need to disaggregate it with intra-regional typologies? Have the expansion of social assistance and the inclusion of ‘outsiders’ created dual social protection institutions? If so, what are some of the explanatory factors for this dualism? What has been the impact of welfare regimes’ reforms in the universalisation of social citizenship rights?
The second part explores the role played by national and international actors shaping social policy in the region. Regarding national actors, the part examines the role played by national identification registries determining who is a citizen entitled to social citizens' rights (i.e., critically addressing the role played by national institutions in the social inclusion and exclusion of individuals). Trade unions are the second national actor considered in this part. What has been the role of trade unions in the process of policy change from a Bismarckian to a hybrid welfare regime? Do trade unions support the inclusion of ‘outsiders’ in the ‘inclusive turn’?

The second part also considers the role of international financial institutions and international trade agreements in the politics of social protection. What influence do international finance institutions have in the creation and implementation of national social protection schemes? Does the official narrative of the creation of conditional cash transfer programmes omit or include the exogenous influence played by international finance institutions? In regards to the international trade agreements, the part asks: what are the main implications of incorporating labour rights provisions in an international trade agreement between the European Union and a Latin American country? These research questions contribute to the literature on global social policy.

The third and final part addresses a variety of debates around social protection and welfare in the region. First, it contributes to the debate on the role of conditional cash transfer programmes (CCTs) to empower women. Do CCTs empower the recipient of the cash transfers? Alternatively, as feminist research argues, do conditionalities and co-responsibilities promote a gendered vision of care in a traditional family structure? The second debate deals with the dilemma of state- or market-led welfare provision. Do social welfare programmes in place correspond with the visions and desires of the beneficiaries? Do beneficiaries in the rural Andean region prefer social security and education financed and provided by the state or by private actors? Finally, the book ends with an analysis of the actual and future challenges that need to be addressed to maintain social protection coverage and keep institutions afloat (e.g., ageing, automation, economic crises).

This introductory chapter is organised as follows. The next section presents the state-of-the-art research in the areas of social policy and welfare examined in each of the three parts of the book. Particular attention is paid to the contribution made by chapters in this edited volume to the social policy literature. The chapter concludes with a description of the content and results of each chapter.

Conceptual framework and state of the art in contemporary Latin American social policy studies

First, let’s start by defining the two concepts linking the chapters in this edited volume. Social protection is a key social policy tool used by emerging or consolidated welfare states for a multiplicity of reasons beyond income poverty reduction. For example, social protection is used to promote human development and the capabilities of individuals; to promote inclusive growth; to empower
marginalised sectors of the population; to improve livelihoods; and to reduce inequalities by redistributing income and providing public services (e.g., public education and health care) (Barrientos and Hulme, 2009; ILO, 2018). Midgley (2014) considers social protection a social development practice because it raises the income of the population while developing the human capital of beneficiaries. Therefore, social protection involves the transference of cash benefits to individuals and the provision of benefits in kind (e.g., public education, health care, housing).

Social policy could be defined as the “collective interventions directly affecting transformation in social welfare, social institutions and social relations” (Mkandawire, 2001, p. 1). Figure 1.1 shows the social policy menu and the variety of social protection programmes available. Cash transfer programmes are organised either in social insurance or social assistance schemes. One of the main traits of social insurance is the conditionality of a direct contribution to a general fund as an eligibility requirement to become a beneficiary of such programmes. On the contrary, social assistance does not require direct contributions as an eligibility requirement, and cash benefits can be either universal (i.e., everyone is eligible) or targeted (i.e., only those meeting a categorical or means-based eligibility criteria are eligible). Social insurance programmes follow a consumption-smoothing logic (i.e., income redistribution through the life cycle of an individual), while social assistance programmes are implemented to level individuals up to a societal minimum (i.e., social protection floor).

This book does not use the United States usage of the welfare concept as an income-tested benefit. Welfare is considered to be a human right for human agency and well-being as fundamental as civil and political rights. Following Griffin (2008), we must be careful with this normative consideration because, at the moment, welfare rights are at best civil rights (i.e., ethical rights we have as citizens). However, the actual limitation of citizenship targeting and the link-age of welfare rights to members of an “imagined community” (Anderson, 2006) do not imply that an ethical, normative analysis must necessarily consider that a right to welfare is a human right. Nonetheless, for welfare to be considered a human right, truly universal welfare programmes must be implemented throughout the world. According to Barr (2012), individual welfare comes from at least four sources: (i) labour market via wages; (ii) private provision via private insurance and individual saving; (iii) voluntary welfare via care provided by the family, community and NGOs; and (iv) the state via cash benefits, benefits in kind and tax concessions. Therefore, social protection is a tool for welfare promotion and provision.

**What do we know about welfare regimes in Latin America?**

Following Esping-Andersen (1999, pp. 34–35), a welfare regime refers to the interdependent way in which the state, market and family (i.e., welfare actors or welfare providers) combine to allocate risks and produce well-being. Basically, the welfare regime informs us about how the state, market, family, NGOs,
Figure 1.1  The social policy menu
Source: Elaborated by the author
communities and other alternative actors combine to produce welfare. We can identify three groups of researchers who have proposed welfare regimes for the Latin American region. First, researchers have grouped all Latin American countries in a joint regional welfare regime. Second, a larger group of scholars has identified intra-regional welfare regimes in Latin America. Third, more recently, another group proposed intra-national welfare regimes. This subsection briefly describes these three groups and highlights the added-value of the chapters of the first part to the welfare regimes literature.

Gough (2013, p. 205) “reconceptualise[s] the welfare regime paradigm developed within Northern social policy studies to understand the nature and diversity of social policies in the South”. Based on previous research with Geoff Wood, he proposes an informal (in)security regime for the global south as an analogue ideal-type welfare state regime model (Gough and Wood, 2004; Wood and Gough, 2006). Barrientos (2004) follows a similar logic to Gough (2013), expanding Esping-Andersen’s approach to include Latin America. His main argument is that “there is enough commonality in welfare provision across Latin American countries to argue that they share a common welfare regime” (Barrientos, 2004, p. 122). In Chapter 2 of this edited volume, Barrientos expands his previous research to explore variables that might help us understand why the Latin American welfare regime shifted from a conservative–informal model to a liberal–informal model. Changes in economic and social institutions after the Washington Consensus brought an increased reliance on the market for welfare provision as well as a greater burden on the individual. Barrientos argues that the lack of a basic safety net (i.e., social protection floor) contributes to the ‘informal’ characterisation of Latin American welfare regimes.

Critiques of a single Latin American welfare regime argue that grouping Latin American welfare systems into one model does not show justice to the intra-regional disparities. During the last two decades, students of Latin American social policy have concentrated their efforts in examining the national picture of welfare regimes. Filgueira (1999), Barba Solano (2009), Huber and Stephens (2005), Pribble (2011), Martínez Franzoni (2008), and Marcel and Rivera (2008) have proposed welfare regime typologies showcasing the intra-regional variety of welfare-mixes. Filgueira’s typology results in three regimes. The main difference between the three is the degree of the population excluded from the welfare programmes – around half of the population in dual regimes, the vast majority in exclusionary regimes and relatively low levels of exclusion in the stratified universalism regimes – although with differentiated quality and access to welfare benefits across class.

Barba Solano (2009) portrays the Latin American regime during the state-led industrialisation era (i.e., 1940s–1970s) very closely to the European corporatist regime. During this period of consolidation of the welfare state in the region, benefits of social security programmes were linked to class and status in the labour market, and the family played a primordial role in the welfare-mix. Following Marshall (1950), we can argue that the emerging welfare states of Latin America during this period guaranteed exclusive social rights for a few
rather than social citizen rights for all. High informality rates, the underdevelopment of fiscal institutions for revenue-collection, and regressive tax systems were – and still are – reasons to understand the developmental trait of Latin American welfare systems. Like Filgueira, Barba Solano (2003) proposes three welfare regimes under the umbrella of the social security paradigm: the universalist, the dualist and the exclusionary. Universalist regimes are similar to the corporatist regimes in Europe, with active states in social welfare aspects who developed a social protection system following a Bismarckian gradual expansion with particular benefits linked to class, trade union membership and status in the formal market (i.e., Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and Costa Rica). The dual regimes in Brazil, Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela are similar to the universalist, but with a higher share of the population left without social security coverage. The exclusionary regimes in Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and El Salvador have an even weaker degree of participation of the state in welfare provision – with a regressive trait – and with a high degree of familialisation (i.e., welfare is highly dependent on the family). The differences between the welfare regimes are mainly in the degree of coverage and quality of welfare benefits, rather than in the nature of the welfare programmes. Barba Solano describes with more details the criteria to group countries in these regimes in the second chapter of this edited volume.

Huber and Stephens (2005) identify five clusters of social policy regimes in Latin America and the Caribbean. They examined the coverage, magnitude, rules for entitlements and modes of financing of social welfare programmes providing cash transfers and benefits in kind. In line with Barba Solano and Filgueira, the main difference between clusters is the degree of coverage and effort. However, they highlighted a fifth regime in which English-speaking Caribbean countries and Costa Rica exhibited a difference in nature with the first four clusters (i.e., stronger importance on health and education expenditure relative to social security).

More recently, Pribble (2011) identified four social policy regimes in the region: the ‘mobilising incorporation–industrialist’, the ‘corporatist incorporation–industrialist’, the ‘interrupted incorporation–agrarian’ and the ‘exclusionary–agrarian’. Pribble grouped countries using proxy measures along two dimensions of the coverage of social protection policies (i.e., risk prevention [social investment in education and health care] and risk coping [pension coverage of workers in the formal and informal sector]). Even though Filgueira, Barba Solano, Pribble, Huber and Stephens identified different welfare regimes in the region, in reality these portray differences in the degree of coverage, expenditure and welfare outcomes and not necessarily differences in nature. Therefore, previous researchers have all considered Latin American welfare regimes under the Bismarckian welfare tradition. This broad picture helps us understand the generalisations in the welfare provision by the multiple actors in the welfare-mix. However, it does not do justice in presenting the different worlds of welfare across/inside countries.
Martinez-Franzoni (2008) goes beyond distinguishing countries based on the different degrees of coverage, social expenditure and welfare outcomes to prove empirically qualitatively different roles played by actors in the welfare-mix. Her welfare regimes examined the interaction and allocation of resources between public policy, the labour market and family/unpaid work. Following Rudra (2007), Martinez-Franzoni takes into account the role played by public policy in welfare production by promoting access to the market or protecting people from the market. She also considers Orloff’s (1996) arguments on the role of the family in unpaid care-taking provision. Martinez-Franzoni distinguishes three welfare regimes: the state–productivist, where public policy emphasises productivity in the labour market (i.e., emphasis on the commodification of labour work with state-targeted provisions); the state–protectionist, where public policy provides welfare mainly via social protection linked to formal employment (i.e., emphasis on the de-commodification of welfare with state-stratified provisions); and the non-state–familialist, where the role of public policies to provide welfare is weak or non-existent and thus there is a high level of dependence on the family (i.e., emphasis in the de-familialisation of welfare with targeted, conditional and basic social assistance programmes).

Martinez-Franzoni overcomes the state-centric limitation by incorporating the role of the family in the unpaid work of care-taking. However, a top-down approach persists in her cutting-edge work. A large part of the literature on welfare regimes in Latin America – and the world – rely on what the state claims to do (i.e., state-centric approach) via social expenditure, coverage and outcomes; what the market and family claims to do; and to what individuals are entitled. However, this does not inform what the population reports as actually having access to, and more importantly, it does not describe how each actor provides welfare to individuals. A second limitation in the previously mentioned literature is its nation–state-centric perspective.

The third group of welfare regime literature proposes the need to go beyond the national level to explore potential intra-national welfare regimes and show territorial dynamics of social policy. Welfare regimes in countries with robust welfare states, such as those examined by Esping-Andersen (1990), report significant variations across social policy sectors. Gough (2013, p. 207) made this evident when highlighting that the so-called “liberal Britain still retains a universal National Health Service”. Ratigan (2017) recently showed a systematic subnational variation with distinct worlds of welfare across Chinese provinces. Cruz-Martinez (2017b, 2018) recently confirmed the existence of intra-national welfare regimes in a Latin American country. Following Marcel and Rivera’s (2008) alternative welfare regime, Cruz-Martinez (2018) classified the welfare regimes in Puerto Rico following a bottom-up approach, relying on the basis of the importance of traditional and alternative welfare providers to cope with social risks and promote well-being in the following eight policy areas: housing, nourishment, health, education, maternity/paternity, disability, work-unemployment and older age.
The bottom-up characterisation of Puerto Rico’s welfare regime shows different types of welfare-mixes co-existing inside the national level. Residents from marginalised communities evidence five configurations of intra-national welfare-mixes across the eight policy sectors mentioned above. Results show intra-national variations of welfare regimes across policy areas. The market and the family play a central role in the distribution of social risks associated with the housing area (i.e., evidencing a liberal welfare regime). The market play a central role in the nourishment and health area. However, the state intervenes in a residual role using targeted social assistance programmes. This is why the initial classification of a liberal welfare regime for the nourishment and health area is rectified as liberal–residual. The family play a central role in the maternity/paternity welfare area, with a care-taking role (i.e., showing a conservative–familialist welfare regime).

The state has a dominant role in the remaining four areas: education, disability, work-unemployment and older age. In the education area, the provision is universal and free in elementary, intermediate and high school. Meanwhile, in the other three areas, the corporatist role of the state is evident, as only those working in the formal sector and meeting the eligibility requirements related to contributions are able to become beneficiaries of disability, pension and unemployment programmes.

Besides describing the welfare regime for the case of Puerto Rico, this research highlights the relevance of examining Latin American welfare regimes (i) using a bottom-up approach to enable a comprehensive analysis of welfare production based on recipients’ perceptions; (ii) incorporating alternative actors in the welfare-mix to present a more real picture of the allocation of social risks by the multiplicity of traditional and alternative actors involved; and (iii) considering the possibility of having different welfare-mixes across policy areas, thus needing to examine the intra-national variation of welfare regimes. Ubasart-González and Minteguiaga (2017) ratify the relevance of considering alternative welfare providers when examining Latin American welfare regimes, where indigenous and grassroots organisations actively participate in the welfare-mix.

The second and fourth chapter in the edited volume contribute to the intra-regional welfare regime literature by deepening our knowledge of national variations of welfare regimes. The third chapter adds value to the regional welfare regime literature by proposing a research agenda of potential explanatory factors that could help us understand the transformations of the Latin American welfare regime.

What do we know about the role of (f)actors shaping social protection development and inclusion?

Local and external actors and factors play an essential role in the politics of social protection systems by shaping, promoting or inhibiting the development of the emerging welfare state. Traditionally, social protection literature in Latin America has focused on examining the role of political and economic local (f)actors (Castiglioni, 2005; Garay, 2016; Niedzwiecki, 2018; Priddle, 2013). Global social policy literature adds important explanatory factors to understand the role played by international and supranational actors in the development,
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diffusion and consolidation of social policy in the region (Bianculli, 2018; Mahon, 2015; Munck, 2006). Chapters in the second part consider the role of both local and external players in the politics of social protection.

Students of Latin American social policy have highlighted several variables and theories that help us comprehend the different degrees of welfare state development across the region, as well as the factors behind the emergence, consolidation and expansion of the welfare systems. The policy legacies of welfare institutions matter, as there is a strong positive relationship between the historical experience of social security systems and the development of the welfare state in the region (Mesa-Lago, 1978; Sanchez de Dios, 2015). Democracy is a necessary although not sufficient condition for welfare state development (Cruz-Martínez, 2017a; Graziano and Jessoula, 2018). Research has shown how democracy enabled the ‘left’ to implement redistributive policies after the Washington Consensus (Huber and Stephens, 2012), created the space for electoral and interest group competition (Haggard and Kaufman, 2004) and facilitated the inclusion of ‘outsiders’ into social protection systems (Garay, 2016). Social and labour mobilisations combined with “the electoral competition for the vote of outsiders” are the main drivers behind the social policy expansion in the inclusive twenty-first century (Garay, 2016, p. 25). Garay finds that when centre-right parties are strong, and the expansion is negotiated in Congress, it results in a restrictive inclusion of a small number of outsiders and low generosity. However, when social movements take an active part in the negotiation of the expansion, it produces an inclusive expansion of a large number of outsiders with relatively generous benefit levels.

Following power resources theory, research shows the importance of labour movements’ strength and the power of the left. Niedzwiecki (2015) confirmed in a regional cross-country analysis the importance of trade union strength to explain social expenditure in South America. Pribble and Huber (2013) highlight the role played by left-wing governments in welfare state reforms with a social democratic character. Even though right-wing parties are less likely to pursue policies that promote the welfare state (Amable et al., 2006), Niedzwiecki and Pribble (2017) recently showed that right-wing governments in Argentina and Chile have not engaged in deep social spending cuts due to the recent transformation of the Latin American scenario (i.e., the consolidation of democracy and the experience of left party rule). In sum, there are still disagreements in the Latin American social policy literature on the role of the left shaping social policy adoption and expansion. While Pribble (2013) confirmed the positive role of the left, Fairfield and Garay (2017) found little evidence of the effects of left-wing parties.

The fifth chapter incorporates state-institutions as important actors in the politics of social policy. Hayes de Kalaf (2017) argues that the state can promote social inclusion or exclusion based on the criteria of labelling someone as a deserving individual of social citizenship rights. Therefore, the ability to recognise someone in the binary categories of national or with a foreign ancestry plays an exclusionary/inclusionary role in the social policy expansion. The sixth
chapter contributes to the literature of the role of trade unions by arguing that even though the inclusion of outsiders did not directly benefit union members, trade unions in Argentina and Uruguay supported the inclusionary measures. In other words, trade unions appear to have an important role in regional social policy expansion.

What about the role of external actors shaping social policy in the region? In the interconnected and globalised world of the twenty-first century, domestic social policy-making is modelled by foreign influences (e.g., ideas, actors) (Weyland, 2005). According to Kaasch (2018), transnational actors and factors have significantly gained importance in comparative studies of the welfare state. The literature has signalled the role played by actors such as international financial institutions (e.g., World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, International Monetary Fund), cross-national networks, trade partnerships, economic ties with other countries and international organisations (e.g., UNASUR).

Following the social policy diffusion framework, research shows that if a country has economic ties with another country, there is a higher chance of replicating social policy dynamics (Schmitt, 2013). Therefore, economic interdependencies appear to be more important than a similar cultural background or geographical proximity to explain social policy dynamics. Social policy diffusion — the wave-like spread of social policy ideas, programmes and institutions from one country to the other — is generally distinguished in the literature using four mechanisms: learning from pioneers, economic competition among proximate countries, emulation and coercion (Shipan and Volden, 2008).

Cross-national networks, especially solidarity and counter-hegemonic networks (e.g., Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas — ALBA), have shaped social policy in third countries. Artaraz (2011) examines the development of social policy programmes in Bolivia via a south–south policy transfer among countries in the ALBA network, illustrating principles of solidarity and non-market-driven policy delivery. Artaraz confirmed that the collaboration and support of ALBA and Cuban experts facilitated the development of Bolivia’s National Development Plan, especially in the policy areas of health and education.

Sugiyama (2011) explores the domestic and external pressures behind the rapid expansion of conditional cash transfer programmes in Latin America. In a decade’s time, the emulation process was almost total. Only two countries had CCTs in 1998 (Mexico and Brazil), and in 2018 all countries have implemented one except Cuba and Venezuela. Sugiyama (2011, p. 261) finds that “domestic political constraints bear no statistically significant effect on the adoption of CCTs in the Americas”. In contrast, the only external variable considered in the paper — neighbouring effect — appears to be significant. Several additional external pressures are also considered — although not empirically tested — as relevant in the transnational diffusion of CCTs: learning through technocratic exchanges and shared norms and coercion through international financial institutions. The IADB and the World Bank have been active supporters of CCTs by providing loans and technical assistance for the implementation of such anti-poverty programmes (Hall, 2008; Teichman, 2007). A variety of scholars have shown the
role of international organisations in the diffusion of CCTs throughout Latin America (Brooks, 2015; Martínez-Franzoni and Voorend, 2011; Osorio Gonnet, 2018).

International organisations have also influenced the social policy agenda in the region. In contrast to the US-dominated model of cooperation with the Organisation of American States or the neoliberal open regionalism of MERCOSUR, the “UNASUR comes as part of the new cycle of politicisation in regional politics (Dabene, 2012) or as Riggirozzi and Tussie (2012) posit, as part of a struggle for post hegemonic regionalism” (Herrero and Tussie, 2015, p. 262). In this process, UNASUR’s Health Council contributed to a broader regional understanding of health diplomacy and to what Herrero (2014) calls the ‘unasurization’ of health policies (i.e., the process of building a new health framework in South America).

Abrahamson (2007) questions if signing free trade agreements might have spillover effects in social citizens rights of the underdeveloped side of the treaty. The author examines the Central American Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR) and argues that “there are tangible effects on social citizenship, in particular, relating to labour rights that can be credited to the signing of the agreement” (2007, p. 339). Yeates and Deacon (2006) also agree that the transnational pressures of signing free trade agreements elsewhere are expected to increase the importance of developing a labour and social policy agenda.

The seventh chapter of this edited volume examines the role of the World Bank in creating a CCT social policy model. Therefore, rather than an autochthonous national development of Mexico and Brazil, this chapter highlights the role of international financial institutions in the social policy creation and diffusion of CCTs, specifically by highlighting the coercion to implement policies developed and praised by technocrats and social policy experts in international financial institutions. The eighth chapter contributes to the bilateral expression of transnational social policy by questioning the positive role of free trade agreements in spreading social policy developments. After examining the free trade agreement between the European Union and Colombia, the chapter concludes there is no substantial evidence of positive externalities deriving from the free trade agreement and leading to an improvement of the Colombian social and labour protection provisions.

What do we know about recent debates regarding social protection and welfare in Latin America?

This section deals with three debates around social protection and welfare in the region: (i) private or public provision of welfare in the process of social policy expansion; (ii) bottom-up or top-down approach of social protection entitlements; and (iii) the link between social assistance and the empowerment of women.

The debate around private versus public provision of welfare is an ideological one. Through contemporary history, we find different dominant ideologies in regards to the role of the state in the economy. Following Sottoli (2000) and the
Latin American welfare regimes by Barrientos (2004), we can identify the critical junctures in the twentieth century regarding the dominant social policy and the dominant welfare regime. Before the emergence of social protection systems in the 1920s and 1930s, the dominant social policy was charity due to the absence of state-sponsored social welfare provisions (Dixon and Scheurrell, 1990). The 1930s could then be considered as a critical juncture in which the state gained the responsibility of providing social insurance to the population in the formal market, the military and unionised urban workers (i.e., traditional Bismarckian social policy). Therefore, the idea of social citizenship with entitled social protection as a citizen right was in its embryonic form. The 1980s–1990s economic and debt crises could be considered another critical juncture, as they brought about a new dominant social policy with the arrival of the Washington Consensus and the neoliberal era. The new social policy increased the role of the market forces and the individual responsibility in the provision of welfare, although it incorporated as well the vast majority of the population that were not previously benefiting from social protection systems. The new social policy incorporated outsiders into social assistance programmes (e.g., CCTs, social pensions, family allowances). However, the majority still lacked coverage in the relatively higher-quality and generous social insurance programmes that were reserved for specific workers in the formal sector.

Therefore, we can argue that Latin America has shifted from an informal welfare regime to a corporatist–informal welfare regime as a consequence of the emergence of social protection programmes in the early twentieth century, and to a liberal–informal regime from the Washington Consensus period (Powell and Barrientos, 2004; Wood and Gough, 2006). Chapter 9 incorporates the debates on public versus private welfare provision with the bottom-up versus top-down welfare provision – previously discussed above. The chapter highlights the role of a private actor providing education and health programmes to outsiders in the rural sector, and how beneficiaries claim that what they desire is a state-led welfare provision. Therefore, outsiders are benefiting from the new market-led social policy, although what they desire is access to traditional state-led social policy, which is understood as a social citizen entitlement.

The second debate deals with the empowerment or lack of empowerment of women thanks to the cash transfers of the CCTs. United Nations organisations have been working with different approaches to promoting equality between women and men. The gender and development approach (1980s–1990s) started to focus more on gender rather than just women, to critically examine the social construction of women in relation to men and the reproduction of gender roles (Moser, 1993). However, even though women’s empowerment and the gender perspective were considered in every development programme, once the neoliberal era arrived, these approaches did not survive (Summerfield, 2007). PROGRESA, the first CCT programme in Mexico, had among its original goals the empowerment of women and the improvement of gender equality. However, this initial goal disappeared from future CCT programmes in Mexico and the rest of the region. Clearly, “gender empowerment was not a priority” (Jenson and Nagels, 2018, p. 329).
In an influential and highly cited article, Molyneux (2006, pp. 425–426) argues that:

gender bias and masculine prerogative have prevailed in social policy as in social life more broadly, with entitlements resting on culturally sanctioned and deeply rooted notions of gender difference and patriarchal authority. These have generally accorded with idealized assumptions about the asymmetric social positions occupied by the sexes, with male breadwinners and female mother-dependants receiving benefits according to these normative social roles.

Following the social investment perspective, Nagels (2016) has shown that the investment in girls is more effective than investing in women. CCT promoters have an instrumentalist view of gender awareness, as mothers are portrayed as better spenders than men and thus are the traditional recipients of cash transfers (Holmes et al., 2010). However, CCT promoters “remain cautious about whether relations and ‘bargaining power’ have been altered by transfers to mothers” (Fiszbein and Schady, 2009, p. xii; in Jenson and Nagels, 2018, p. 329). Molyneux (2006, p. 440) highlights the successes and failures of the Oportunidades CCT flagship programme in Latin America: coverage expansion, detachment of poverty relief from political patronage and enabling risk-coping of low-income household with school children. However, Molyneux doubts the reach of the CCTs in empowering women because the success of the programme relies heavily on “fortifying and normalizing the responsibilities of motherhood [. . .] with fathers marginal to childcare and [. . .] the state [playing] an active role in re-traditionalizing gender roles and identities” (Molyneux, 2006, p. 440). Therefore, Chant (2008) argues that CCTs are feminising the responsibility and obligation for managing poverty in Latin America. The tenth chapter contributes a case study to this literature and confirms that the Mexican CCT empowers women in one of the three dimensions considered, although it reproduces the gender roles of the patriarchal society.

Structure of the book and the contribution of each chapter

Part I is titled “Social policy and welfare regimes in contemporary Latin America”. This part is composed of three chapters by Carlos Barba Solano, Armando Barrientos and Manuel Sánchez de Dios.

Carlos Barba Solano presents his welfare regimes typology based on the regional experience during the state-led industrialisation period in Chapter 2. Using his typology as a framework, Barba Solano evaluates the scope of the welfare reforms in the last three decades. The second section of the chapter deals with the reforms carried out during the 1980s/1990s, driven by a new constellation of global and local actors, who, in parallel to the processes of structural adjustment, set in motion a liberal social reform agenda. Barba Solano argues that the axes of this liberal agenda were the creation of targeted programmes to reduce
The third section of the chapter analyses the gradual deployment of a new wave of reforms, which began in the mid-1990s. According to Barba Solano, these have pursued universalist goals, such as the inclusion of the majority of income-deprived sectors of the population in the framework of social protection, the universalisation of access to health coverage and the development of political and social institutions responsible of the provision of care. This third set of reforms has materialised in the construction of non-contributory pillars, which in varying degrees have sought to de-commodify social welfare but have had an unequal reach and repercussions at the regional level. Barba Solano concludes the chapter by analysing the achievements, limitations, pending tasks and the potential of social policy reforms, in the current context of an economic and political crisis.

In the third chapter, Armando Barrientos highlights the need to examine the causal process that led to growing dualism in the Latin American social protection system. Social insurance has traditionally protected workers in the formal sector (insiders), and the emergence of social assistance is supporting low-income individuals and workers in the informal sector (outsiders). Armando presents an interesting analysis of the social policy expansion in the region, moving from a truncated to a dual system. The main added-value of this chapter is the exploratory analysis of the potential explanatory factors behind the breakdown of the Bismarckian model and the emergence and expansion of social assistance in the 1990s as a separate component from the traditional model. Political coalitions, development strategies and (de)industrialisation are some of the factors considered by Armando in regards to the emergence and decline of the social insurance model. On the other hand, explaining the 1990s critical juncture in the Latin American social protection system is more complicated. Here Armando sheds light first by clearly differentiating the different types of redistribution involved in social insurance (i.e., horizontal) and social assistance (i.e., vertical). Second, he differentiates the different supporting forces for each type of redistribution – self-interest and risk pooling in the former, and solidarity in the latter. The chapter concludes that in order to understand the growth and institutionalisation of the social assistance model in the region, researchers must explore the renewal of social contracts rather than the myopic view of electoral gains and losses. Armando extends an invitation to look for positive explanations and not just normative proposals.

Manuel Sánchez de Dios closes the first section with an exploration of recent reforms in the Argentinian, Brazilian, Chilean, Costa Rican and Uruguayan welfare regimes. Following a comparative analysis method, Manuel shows how targeted programmes to fight poverty have been modified in the twenty-first century following an institutional, universalistic and redistributive nature. The chapter takes into consideration theories about institutional reform – mainly historical institutionalism and rational institutionalism – to understand the changes, ruptures and evolution of Latin American emerging welfare states from a social assistance state to an institutionalist–redistributive state. The chapter distinguishes between exogenous or endogenous shocks, which enabled institutional change by paying
attention to the power distribution and rent seekers’ behaviour. In the empirical and analytical section of the chapter, Manuel performs a path-dependence analysis of institutional welfare reforms in contemporary Latin America. He focuses on the processes of positive feedbacks created by welfare institutions and identifies ‘branching points’ and ‘critical junctures’ responsible for modifying the path of welfare institutions through a process of incremental institutional change. Manuel highlights the push factors and the resulting equilibrium in the historical trajectories of the welfare reforms of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica and Uruguay by focusing on the evolution of a set of social spending indicators, rates of informal work and relative income poverty.

Part II is titled “Politics of social protection in Latin America: stakeholders and institutions”. The first two chapters of this part, by Eve Hayes de Kalaf and Angelica Puricelli, deal with national actors, while the last two chapters, by Lauri Heimo and Joan Tejedor, examine the role of external actors in the politics of social protection.

Eve Hayes de Kalaf starts the second part with a ground-breaking and interdisciplinary Chapter 5. Eve links both citizenship and welfare state studies to show how social policy can be a tool for both social inclusion and exclusion. When entitlements of the welfare state are linked to citizenship status, the entity in charge of deciding who is a citizen (i.e., the state) can exclude individuals from benefits and public services. Therefore, the state has the power to decide who is a ‘deserving’ individual. This chapter invites us to revisit and critically assess normalised labels in social policy scholarship. For example, does a ‘universal’ social protection programme need to provide welfare to all individuals, or just those considered deserving? Can citizenship act as a stratifying mechanism, targeting the already-targeted population? Using the case of the Dominican Republic, Eve shows how foreign-descended populations have been stripped of their citizenship – and all entitlements linked to it – because their national origin, or skin tone, does not fit comfortably within the state-centred ‘imagined community’. Native-born populations – largely of Haitian ancestry – are the subject of social exclusion in the modernisation of Dominican public administration. The chapter also shows how international institutions (e.g., the World Bank) play a role in the exclusionary process of denying social citizenship rights to Dominicans of foreign ancestry. The World Bank has argued for the need to include the most vulnerable Dominicans in the social protection programmes; however, as an interviewed former employee in the Dominican Republic states: “The ones that were the most vulnerable . . . were the ones with no legal existence. So, the World Bank pushed for that to happen”. The chapter points to an existing gap in the social policy literature that overlooks how legal identification can arbitrarily exclude native-born populations from social rights linked to state membership.

In the sixth chapter, Angelica Puricelli examines the role of trade unions in the inclusion of outsiders into the pension systems. Using the cases of Argentina and Uruguay, the insiders/outsiders theory elaborated by Rueda (2007) is tested in the context of pension systems reforms. Her findings, which contradict previous literature, argue that two trade unions in Argentina and Uruguay were
important stakeholders in the policy change (from a Bismarckian social protection scheme to a hybrid model), even if their members did not benefit directly from the reform due to not being their core constituencies. By applying a “process tracing” method, the chapter demonstrates that trade unions in both South American countries supported pro-outsider policies. Indeed, in Argentina, the corporatist relationship with the government seems to be crucial for the support of pro-outsider measures, while in Uruguay class-identity matters more. However, in both cases, the effects of neoliberalism on labour market segmentation have influenced trade unions’ strategies. Neoliberal policies blurred the boundaries between insiders and outsiders and pushed workers’ organisations to support inclusive measures. The CGT trade union in Argentina and the PIT–CNT in Uruguay supported the governments’ strategy based on relaxing requirements to access pension systems, thus reducing the barriers to pension coverage.

Who came up with the conditional cash transfer policy model? In Chapter 7, Lauri Heimo critically assesses the prevailing narrative of one of the most – if not the most – popular anti-poverty social assistance programme in the region: conditional cash transfers (CCT). The official narrative of the Mexican social assistance scheme PROGRESA portrays the programme as a novel, endogenous and innovative policy model to fight poverty while promoting social capital development. Lauri presents a counter-narrative where exogenous actors (e.g., international financial institutions) ‘domesticated’ global policy norms and prescriptions alongside social policymakers, politicians and researchers, which is then shown to be a national and innovative social policy framework. Besides the influence of the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank, the official narrative omits previous experiences at the municipal level in Brazil. Lauri provides strong evidence linking thematic convergence between PROGRESA and the World Bank’s policy recommendations before the implementation of the Mexican program. This chapter reminds us that local actors are not the only ones shaping social policy creation, implementation and reform. We must extend our analysis out of the nation–state borders and consider global actors and institutions if we genuinely want to understand the big picture of social policy dynamics.

Joan Miguel Tejedor-Estupiñán examines the labour provisions in the Free Trade Agreement between Colombia and the European Union in the eighth chapter to confirm if explicit clauses on social protection and labour rights are promotional or conditional. Following the ILO conceptualisation, labour provisions are conditional if labour standards obligations are linked to economic sanctions or incentives. If there are no sanctions or incentives, and the labour obligations rely on cooperation and dialogue, then the labour provisions in the Free Trade Agreement are considered promotional. Joan argues there is a lack of empirical evidence on the effects of integrating social protection provisions in trade agreements signed between countries or regions with evident economic and social asymmetries. Based on a literature review and following a comparative analysis, Joan points out the main features of the EU–Colombia trade agreement and discusses the implications of including labour requirements on the social protection systems and clauses regarding the reduction of unemployment,
poverty and income inequality. His main conclusion is that promotional labour provisions in the trade agreement have not produced positive externalities to the Colombian labour legislation and much less on labour rights. Joan claims this contradicts the European Union principles, which adversely affects the less developed party in the trade agreement, in this case Colombia.

Part III is titled "Contemporary debates in Latin American social policy". The third part is composed of three chapters by Alison L. Haworth-Walsh, Pastor Badillo, and Fabio Bertranou, Pablo Casalí and Juan Jacobo Velasco.

In the ninth chapter, Alison L. Haworth-Walsh focuses on how social protection interacts with the demands of beneficiaries; the debate around the public versus private provision of welfare; and the (in)visibility of entitled individuals. Alison argues that the debate over public versus private provision of welfare re-emerged during the Left Turn and brought with it a second debate on who is recognised as a citizen entitled to welfare programmes. The chapter focuses on an initiative in the Bolivian coffee sector, which aims to dignify rural labour by extending social protection benefits to small coffee producers. Alison argues that this scheme shares similarities with the Bismarckian model because benefits are linked to class and status and the scheme segments even more than the dual social protection systems at the national level. However, it shows an alternative path of social policy expansion where a private initiative led by an international NGO incorporates 'outsiders' in rural Bolivia. Café Correcto – the private initiative – provides education and private pension schemes to coffee producers that have been traditionally invisible to the state. This social welfare provision, based on market forces, clashes with the nationalist and redistributive discourse of MAS and Evo Morales. In her fieldwork, Alison discovered that coffee producers are not willing to give up their demands for a state-sponsored social welfare provision based on collective risk-sharing because they consider themselves to be citizens deserving of social welfare entitlements. This chapter contributes to the welfare regime and social policy literature by highlighting the need to go beyond financial and redistributive aspects when creating and implementing social protection schemes and to consider the demands and desires of the population in order to be able to develop successful social protection programmes for development.

Following a three-dimensional framework by Rowlands (1998), Pastor Badillo examines in Chapter 10 if the Oportunidades CCT empowers women in the personal, collective and close relationships dimensions or if it reproduces gender roles of the patriarchal society. Based on qualitative research in Tulancingo de Bravo (Mexico) with 40 semi-structured interviews and field notes, Pastor confirms that the arguments are not exclusionary. His fieldwork demonstrates the Oportunidades programme empowers women in one of the three dimensions. However, while conditional cash transfers promote the decision-making power and confidence of women, they do not change the strongly rooted traditional societal structure, which assigns caring and social reproduction roles to women. Interviewees considered that by being the cash benefit holders, they are also responsible for observing and fulfilling the programmes' conditionalities. The process of making sure conditionalities are met (i.e., visits to the health care clinics,
taking children to school, attending programme meetings) reduces opportunities of labour commodification and overloads women with activities and stress. Oportunidades does not seem to be promoting collective empowerment. However, the mandatory programme meetings allow women to interact and exchange valuable information and experiences. In addition, CCTs increase the intra-household decision-making power of women, but this does not translate to close relationship empowerment of women. The majority of beneficiaries do not perceive the cash transfer as a self-contribution to household income. Moreover, the gendered division of labour is embedded in the beneficiaries’ discourse, which makes them feel responsible for caring and social reproduction even though they have salaried employment. This creates a double shift for salaried working women. Pastor argues that even though Oportunidades has the potential to become a key policy tool to empower Mexican women, at the present time the programme design ties them to the dominant traditional social structure (i.e., the male breadwinner model). Moreover, he argues that Oportunidades needs to adopt a gender perspective in the evaluation phase of public policy to uncover failures in the design of the CCT program.

Chapter 11, by Fabio Bertranou, Pablo Casalí and Juan Jacobo Velasco, concludes the edited volume with an analytical reflection on the future of social protection systems in Latin America. The authors map out the challenges of social protection in the region by conducting a diagnosis and a normative analysis of the following challenges: macroeconomic volatility; new technologies and automation of the labour market; ageing of the population; changes in life expectancy of Latin Americans; social security governance deficits; the incorporation of women into the labour market with the unequal distribution of unpaid work and lack of family-friendly care policies; and, finally, the pressures of climate change on general well-being and resilient recovery after natural disasters. Their analysis raises the need to reformulate the responses to economic, climate and demographic crises with countercyclical active labour market policies and social protection benefits. A three-dimensional reform must be carried out with the formalisation of the labour market, fiscal space expansion and the consolidation of social protection floors. Authors put substantial emphasis on governance by considering that good governance and appropriate administration are the factors that ultimately determine whether a social protection system works or not. Regarding the responses of social protection to climate change, the authors argue that social protection must adapt to create green jobs and provide risk coverage to secure a transition to a green economy framed in the principles of decent work.

Notes

1 CEPAL defines the double inclusion – social and labour – as the access to education, health, social protection and housing with minimum living standards combined with access to salaried jobs with a remuneration commensurate to the task being performed, in decent conditions and with access to social protection.

2 “From 1981 to 2014, 30 countries privatized fully or partially their public mandatory pensions; as of 2018, 18 countries have reversed the privatization” due to underperformance and high costs (Ortiz et al., 2018).
The following three indicators make up the social spending dimension: social spending as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP); social spending as a percentage of public spending; and social spending per capita. The following three indicators form the coverage dimension: percentage of population over 65 years who receive a retirement pension; percentage of employees with retirement coverage; and the number of hospital beds for every 10,000 inhabitants. Finally, the proportion of adults in the age group of 25–65 years with more than 13 years of formal education and the improbability of children under 5 years suffering infant mortality represent the outcome dimension in the multidimensional welfare index (Cruz-Martinez, 2017c, p. 958).

See Cruz-Martinez (2014, 2017c) for data, methodology and more details on the results.

The MWI was constructed using principal component analysis and arithmetic means.

The literature has labelled welfare systems in Latin America as emerging welfare states (Huber and Stephens, 2012) and welfare states in development (Cruz-Martinez, 2017a, 2017c), among others, to refer to the underdevelopment of Latin American welfare programmes and institutions in contrast to the consolidated welfare states in Europe.

This subsection is based primarily on Cruz-Martinez (2018).

See Martín-Mayoral and Sastre (2017) for an overview and recent results of the economic determinants of welfare effort expansion.
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