

**Welfare state attitudes and economic integration in the EU.**

**A multilevel investigation in 10 member states between 1992 and 2002.**

Ferry Koster

Faculty of Law, Department of Economics

Leiden University

Steenschuur 25, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands

Tel: +31 (0)71 527 8569

E-mail: [f.koster@law.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:f.koster@law.leidenuniv.nl)

Website: [www.ferrykoster.nl](http://www.ferrykoster.nl)

**Number of words:** 7,047

**Running head:** Welfare state attitudes and economic integration in the EU

**ABSTRACT**

This study extends earlier research efforts investigating the impact of the European Union (EU) on welfare states by examining whether citizen's attitudes towards the welfare state have converged and to what extent the economic dimension of European integration can explain this. Two waves from the *European and World Values Study* (EVS/WVS) are combined with *UNCTAD* data about EU trade, creating a dataset with 34,122 citizens living in 10 EU countries. Multilevel analysis provides evidence for convergence of welfare state attitudes due to economic integration in the EU.

Welfare states consist of social provisions organized at the national level and are funded with taxes collected among the citizens of a country. Such formal systems of collecting and redistributing public resources spread individual risks over a larger group of people and can be a means to overcome market failures associated with private arrangements such as voluntary insurances (Swank, 1998; Lindbeck, 2008). Although most of these provisions are based on institutionalized solidarity between beneficiaries and contributors living in the same country, welfare states do not operate in a vacuum and international developments may have an impact on them. With respect to member states of the European Union (EU), the ongoing process of economic integration due to the single European market is among the key international factors they face and it is widely debated to what extent and how this affects welfare provisions (Rhodes, 1995; Scharpf, 1997; Moravcsik, 1998; Ferrera, 2005; Pollack, 2005). Whereas the EU may have a direct effect through regulations and conditions due to the political dimension of the EU, it may also have an indirect effect resulting from the increased economic integration rendering the social provisions of the member states vulnerable to tax flight of companies and individuals, an increased burden of a social security system attracting people from other countries, and policy competition among EU members (Guillén and Matsaganis, 2000; Threlfall, 2003; O'Connor, 2005; Falkner, 2007). The opinion that national welfare states are affected by economic integration within the EU is widely shared by researchers, but there is little agreement among them with regard to the direction in which welfare states are changing. Provided that empirical studies in this field generated contradictory results, this debate is far from settled (Gould, 1999; O'Connor, 2003; Sotiropoulos, 2004). Besides answering the question in what direction welfare states in the EU are developing, it has proven to be a difficult task to

show that these changes result from European integration and are not caused by other developments at the national or international level. Statements about the impact of the EU on national welfare states are complicated by a number of methodological issues. This holds particularly for quantitative studies because the relatively small number of cases that can be included limits the application of statistical analyses (Haverland, 2006). To some extent the empirical approach usually applied contributes to this state of affairs, with two similarities among the majority of these studies are relevant here. First, most of these investigations include more or less the same dependent variable, namely the welfare state measured terms of social spending or the generosity of the provisions. Secondly, in the studies the focus is on characteristics of welfare state at the national level (Bennett, 1991; Greve, 1996; Leibfried, 2000; Cornelisse and Goudswaard, 2002; Bouget, 2003; López-Santana, 2006; Alsasua, Bilbao-Ubillos and Olaskoaga, 2007). As a result, the number of cases that can be included in a study is limited by the number of member states at a given point in time. Researchers applying quantitative analyses have dealt with this methodological issue in two ways, now and again applying both solutions in a single analysis. First, longitudinal data are analyzed to examine the relationship between developments in the EU and changes in the welfare states and secondly member states are compared with nonmember states to investigate the difference between these two groups. Such analyses have advanced the knowledge about the relationship between the EU and welfare states by showing trajectories of welfare state change and the extent to which these developments differ within and outside the EU. Nevertheless, most of these studies are descriptive and therefore lack variables explaining these developments. In addition to these studies, the analysis reported in this article investigates a third solution to the methodological issue and explores its value for welfare state research. The approach investigated here

differs from the earlier studies with respect to the dependent variable, the level of analysis, and the method applied to analyze the empirical data. With regard to the dependent variable and the level of analysis, this study focuses on public support for the welfare state at the individual level instead of the formal aspects of the welfare state at the national level as investigated in earlier studies. As such, the present analysis is related to the literature arguing that welfare states are not merely a matter of formal arrangements providing help to certain groups in society but that such systems also need to be legitimized by the public to remain viable in the future (Weatherford, 1992; Burstein, 1998) and that the level of support that these arrangements get from the public may explain welfare state changes to a certain extent. What is more, from a policy point of view regarding the question whether it is possible to integrate national welfare state systems it is of interest to know how much these individual attitudes differ between countries and if it is likely that they will increase or decrease in the future. To investigate the impact of European integration on these attitudes towards the welfare state, these individual level data are combined with national level information about a country's economic integration into the EU. The structure of the data is the third difference with earlier investigations that only include data at the national level. To deal with the nested structure of the data multilevel regression analysis is used.

The approach proposed in this article requires information about European integration and the welfare state attitudes EU citizens. A country's economic integration into the EU is based on information from the *UNCTAD Handbook of Statistics* (UNCTAD, 2008). The *European and World Values Study* (EVS/WVS) provides data about individual attitudes from people living in a large number of countries, including EU member states. So far, four waves of the EVS/WVS are

available. Wave 2, gathered between 1989 and 1992, and Wave 4, collected between 1999 and 2004, provide sufficient data for the present analysis. In total the analysis is based on information from 34,122 persons living in 10 countries. The article is structured as follows. Section 2 and 3 discuss welfare state attitudes towards the welfare state and economic integration in the EU. Based on this discussion a research hypothesis is formulated which is tested in Section 4 and Section 5. The results and their implications for research and welfare state policies are discussed in Section 6.

### **ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE WELFARE STATE**

People's attitudes towards the welfare state can be placed on a continuum ranging from economic individualism to social equality, the first emphasizing individual responsibility for a person's welfare and the latter focusing on the collective responsibility regarding individual welfare. Clearly, these two ideologies differ with respect to welfare state support; people in favor of economic individualism show less support for the welfare state than those appreciating social equality. Empirical research into welfare state attitudes initially focused on investigating why people do or do not support social provisions. Since most of these studies are based on information about public opinions in a single country, the majority of these studies aim at finding individual level explanations (AuClaire, 1984; Eisemeir, 1982; Feagin, 1975; Hasenfeld and Rafferty, 1989; Iversen and Soskice, 2001; Lewin-Epstein, Kaplan and Levanon, 2003; Moene and Wallerstein, 2001; Shapiro and Young, 1989). This line of research shows that self-interest predicts a large portion of support for the welfare state, also after controlling for other individual motives and characteristics. These investigations thus support the hypothesis that persons who run the risk of becoming dependent on the welfare state because of their vulnerable position are

more supportive of social provisions organized through the government. At the same time, these researchers emphasize that individual motives alone do not explain attitudes towards the welfare state completely and that the analyses should include data from multiple countries to account for national differences. For a long time, lack of international comparative data restricted empirical studies examining country level variables do indeed lead to a better explanation of attitudes towards the welfare state beyond the individual level determinants found in the single country studies (Korpi, 1980; Esping-Andersen, 1990). Recently, the possibilities for data analysis widened due to the collection of international comparative datasets, leading to an increasing number of studies that aim at investigating the extent to which people's attitudes towards the welfare state differ across countries and how national and international factors may explain these differences (Rothstein, 1998; Svallfors, 1997, 1999; Blomberg and Kroll, 1999; Arts and Gelissen, 2001; Lipsmeyer and Nordstrom, 2003).

Comparative welfare state research focuses on country differences with regard to social provisions and how to explain them. Globalization, the economic openness of countries and the extent to which they are integrated in international markets, is widely believed to explain quite a portion of the variety in welfare states, both with respect to a country's financial ability to fund the social provisions as well as the support and legitimacy it receives from the public (Swank, 1998; Koster, 2007). Whereas the relationship between effects of economic openness on formal welfare state provisions received a lot of attention in the literature (Mishra, 1999; Sykes, Palier and Prior, 2001; Brady, Beckfield and Zhao, 2007), empirical studies investigating their impact of globalization on welfare state attitudes across different countries are scarce, and the extent to which European integration affects these

attitudes is not explored in the literature to date (De Beer and Koster, 2007).

### **ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF THE EU**

The notion of economic integration is central to both globalization, referring to the process through which countries become part of a world market, and the economic dimension of the EU. Given this conceptual overlap between the two kinds of economic integration, it is tempting to regard the economic dimension of the EU as a special case of globalization (Leibfried, 2000). Assuming such a similarity implies that their impact on welfare states will also be the same and that the level of economic integration of countries in the global market or the EU market explains this. From such a point of view the prediction follows that European economic integration leads to a reduction of the welfare state due to a race to the bottom or leads to welfare state expansion because of increased volatility, which are two of the main hypotheses formulated in the area investigation the link between globalization and the welfare state (Bowles and Wagman, 1997; Rodrik, 1998; Brady, Beckfield and Seeleib-Kaiser, 2005). Nevertheless, taking a closer look at the two kinds of economic integration shows that they do not coincide completely and that there are also some important differences between them. This especially becomes evident if one examines how they relate to each other. The main question that can be asked here is whether integration into the world market and integration into the EU have the same consequences for countries. In addition to that it can be questioned whether the single market within the EU is an example of a more advanced form of globalization or instead means that there are trade blocks within the global market. The presence of such trade blocks is in fact a kind of de-globalization since globalization implies an integrated market at the world level, visualized by the metaphor of a “flat” world

(Keohane and Nye, 2000; Friedman, 2005). Answering these questions most likely leads to the conclusion that the two differ at least with regard to one of their defining features, namely the level at which the economic integration is situated, with globalization referring to the increased economic openness and economic integration at a global scale including all conceivable countries and economic integration into the EU excluding non-member states. As such, globalization refers to worldwide developments while integration into the EU market can be regarded as a form of localization. This dissimilarity necessitates to treat them as different kinds of integration. Making such a distinction is not just important for the sake of conceptual clarity, but it is especially valuable if the effects of globalization and economic integration into the EU differ across countries (Fligstein and Stone Sweet, 2001; Korpi, 2003; Hay, 2006; Beckfield, 2006).

In empirical analyses, convergence is oftentimes empirically investigated by comparing indicators of welfare states, usually social expenditures or generosity of the provisions, at two points in time. Convergence is found if the variation decreased during the period under study and divergence takes place if the comparison shows the opposite pattern of change in variation. Such an approach does provide a description of how much welfare state changed, nevertheless, it does not allow to argue that certain changes in national welfare states results from European integration, because the impact of the EU is not observed directly but assumed as an explanation without ruling out other possible explanations. This problem remains even if the analyses are extended by comparing member states and non-members states (Haverland, 2006). The following illustration may underline this with the possible outcomes of a comparison between member states and non-member states in mind. If the welfare states diverged, the conclusion is that there is no impact of the EU, at least not in the

direction of convergence. Nevertheless, this does not imply that the reverse is true as well. If the member states converge and the non-member not, the EU may have had an effect, but this does not prove that it is the case because there is no explanatory variable included in the analysis. The same line of reasoning holds if both members and non-members converge. If that is the case, there still is the possibility of an EU effect but other causes cannot be excluded. Therefore, the descriptive analysis of welfare states is limited; it does provide insight into welfare state developments, it does show whether differences between countries increase or decrease, and at most it allows to compare these changes among member states and non-member states. However, it cannot explain these developments and differences because this requires an indicator measuring the EU.

Such an indicator can be derived from the observation that European integration refers to the intensification of economic exchanges within the EU (Fligstein and Stone Sweet, 2002; Beckfield, 2006). Thus defined, a member state's share of trade with other EU countries, compared to its total international trade, indicates its level of economic integration in the EU. This measure serves two purposes: first, it examines the direct effect of European integration, in terms of international trade with the EU, on welfare state attitudes and secondly the investigation of convergence and divergence is based on it by extending research on globalization and the welfare state. As emphasized in these studies, welfare state convergence results from two forces of economic integration that work in opposite directions (Bowles and Wagman, 1997; Brady, Beckfield and Seeleib-Kaiser, 2005). The convergence argument holds that the effect of economic openness on the welfare state differs between countries that are relatively closed and the ones that have a more open economy. As the closed economies become more open, their level of welfare

spending increases whereas countries with an open economy will experience a crisis of their welfare state with increasing openness. The prediction is therefore that economic openness and welfare state effort have a curvilinear relationship, with less spending at low and high levels of economic openness and the most extensive welfare states in the middle. In quantitative studies, convergence means that there is a positive effect in the linear term and a negative effect in the squared term (Brady Beckfield and Seeleib-Kaiser, 2005). Likewise, a positive squared term provides evidence for divergence. These general notions about the effects of economic openness on the welfare state also apply to the impact of trade with the EU on welfare state attitudes; convergence of these attitudes takes place if the squared term of trade with the EU has a negative effect and that they diverge in the case of a positive effect in the squared term.

The preceding sections lead to the research hypothesis investigated in this study. In accordance with earlier research investigating the effects of the EU on welfare state provisions at the national level, this study aims at examining whether individual attitudes with the EU are changing due to increased economic integration within the EU. As argued above, focusing on this kind of integration provides an indicator capturing the EU's influence on member states. With this information, it is possible to investigate patterns of convergence and divergence due to European integration. Convergence is defined as a curvilinear relationship between economic integration and welfare state attitudes. This translates into the following hypothesis:

*The process of European integration, in terms of a country's level of trade with other EU members at the national level, explains convergence of welfare state attitudes of EU citizens at the individual level.*

## **DATA, MEASURES AND METHOD**

### DATA

Two data sources are combined for the empirical test of the hypothesis. The *European and World Values Study* (EVS/WVS) dataset provides data about attitudes and background characteristics at the individual level. This large-scale, cross-national and longitudinal survey research program offers insights into the preferences and orientations of various populations covering a wide range of economic, social, political and cultural variations (Halman, 2001; ICPSR, 2006). From the beginning of the 80s, different waves of the EVS/WVS are collected. For the present study, data are used from the second wave (1989-1993) and the fourth wave (1999-2004). These individual level data are merged with national level data indicating trade with the EU, taken from the *UNCTAD Handbook of Statistics* (UNCTAD, 2008). 10 of the 12 EU member states, namely Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Ireland, Spain and Portugal, are included in the analysis since data are available for both waves.

### MEASURES

#### Dependent variable

The dependent variable *welfare state attitudes* is measured as follows. Respondents are asked to rate on a scale from 1 to 10 whether they think individuals should take more responsibility for providing for themselves (1) or that the state should take more responsibility to ensure that everyone is provided for (10). This variable reflects a preference between the two social ideologies: economic individualism (individual responsibility) and social equality (government responsibility). Using this measure has two advantages compared to variables in other studies. First, its interpretation is

straightforward whereas other measures consisting of items on various issues like redistribution, provision of basic income and public responsibility concerning specific groups may imply that variables measuring different theoretical dimensions are combined (Kangas, 1997; Jæger, 2006). Second, this measure offers respondents a clear choice about the division of responsibility between individuals and the governments, while welfare state attitudes are usually measured by asking individuals for a number of issues whether they think the government should or should not take care of them. Critics of such an approach argue that it may not validly measure attitudes towards the welfare state since there is no clear alternative provided in the question (Arts and Van der Veen, 1992; Arts and Gelissen, 2001).

#### Independent variables

The economic dimension of *European integration* refers to the economic exchanges between countries within the EU. The variable *trade with the EU as a share of a country's total international trade* indicates a country's integration into the EU market. The squared term of this variable indicates patterns of *convergence* or *divergence*; a negative effect of the squared term indicates convergence and a positive effect means that the divergence of welfare state attitudes (Brady, Beckfield and Seeleib-Kaiser, 2005; Beckfield, 2006).

#### Control variables

The analysis includes several control variables. At the national level, the economic development may have an effect on public attitudes towards the welfare state. To control for that the variable *GDP per capita* is added to the regression analysis. To account for possible variations in GDP during the collection of the different waves of

the EVS/WVS, the mean level was computed for 1989-1993 and 1999-2004. Furthermore, individual level variables are included based on earlier studies investigating determinants of attitudes towards the welfare state, like socioeconomic status and perceived program waste (e.g. Hasenfeld and Rafferty, 1989). Here, a number of these variables are added to control for their possible effect on welfare state attitudes. The EVS/WVS provides information about the socioeconomic status and other individual background variables including *gender*, *age*, and *employment status*. In addition, two indicators of social context of the individual are measured, namely *religious denomination* and *town size*. Furthermore, the dataset is gathered at two points in time and therefore a dummy variable is included controlling for wave of the EVS/WVS (Wave 2 = 0; Wave 4 = 1).

## METHOD

The dataset contains information at the individual level (level 1) and the national level (level 2). The dependent variable *welfare state attitudes* is measured at the individual level, and the independent variables reside at the individual and the national level. Given this hierarchical structure of the data it is not possible to use Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression analysis (e.g. DiPrete and Foristal, 1994). Moreover, such a dataset violates the assumption of independent explanatory variables because the national level variables are the same for all people within the same country. Using multilevel regression analysis allows investigating effects at different levels of analysis and at the same time (Bryk and Raudenbush, 1992; Snijders and Bosker, 1999). Multilevel models explain micro level outcomes by showing that the parameters at the micro level are a function of the macro level and that this relationship can be expressed in terms of the macro level variables (DiPrete

and Forristal, 1994). In its general form, the multilevel model has a fixed part (the linear function of the independent variables) and a random part (in this particular case the unexplained variation at the individual level and the unexplained variation between the countries) (Snijders, 2003). All variables, except the dummy variables, are standardized and grand mean centered. The most basic form of centering is used because there are no theoretical reasons to do otherwise. Standardizing the variables allows for comparing the size of the effects.

The multilevel analysis is performed in the following steps. First, an empty model is computed (Model 0). The empty model is an unconditional model without independent variables and serves as a baseline to compare the next model that includes the control variables at the national and individual level (Model 1). In the final model (Model 2) trade with the EU is added. Model 2 tests for Europeanization by investigating the effect and the sign of the squared term of this variable. The parameters in these models are estimated by the maximum likelihood method (Goldstein, 2003) and the regression coefficients are tested by Wald tests (Snijders, 2003). The deviance between the models evaluates the fit of the different models.

## **RESULTS**

### **DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS**

Table 1 provides information about the number of respondents, the country level mean and standard deviation for the welfare state attitude variable, and the share of trade with the EU as a percentage of total international trade per country and wave. With respect to the placement on the individual versus government scale, people are more in favor of individual responsibility in France ( $m = 4.15$  and  $m = 3.99$ ) and Denmark ( $m = 4.20$  and  $m = 4.39$ ) and the citizens of Spain ( $m = 5.90$  and  $m = 6.38$ )

and Italy ( $m = 5.53$  and  $m = 5.63$ ) are more supportive of government responsibility. On average, the mean of the welfare state attitude variable remained the same during Wave 2 and 4. However, at the country level there are some difference. The means of the United Kingdom and Ireland dropped with 0.84 and 0.32 respectively, indicating that the public opinion towards the welfare state in these countries moved towards individual responsibility in that period. On the other hand, people in Spain and Germany became more in favor of government responsibility with increases of 0.48 and 0.56. Trade levels with the EU compared to the total international trade varies between the countries and changes considerably in the period of 10 years studied here. In 1992, the Netherlands has the highest share (76 percent) and the United Kingdom the lowest share (59.5 percent). In 2002, the United Kingdom still has the lowest trade with the EU (55 percent), but the Netherlands went from place 1 to place 5 on the list that is at that time headed by Portugal with 80 percent. The share of trade with the EU decreases with 3.15 percent. Major drops in this respect are found in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands with a 10 and 9 percent less trade with the EU. The levels of Denmark and Portugal increased the most in that period, with 2 and 2.5 percent.

#### MULTILEVEL ANALYSIS

The results of the multilevel regression analyses are presented in Table 2. Model 1 examines the relationship between the control variables and attitudes towards the welfare state. Including these variables increases the fit of the regression model significantly (Deviance = 1,708.005;  $p < 0.01$ ). All of the individual level characteristics that were found to be related to welfare state attitudes in earlier studies are also significant in this study. At the individual level, the model replicates the

existing research about public opinions towards the welfare state. According to Model 1 in Table 2, women and people living in bigger town are more in favor of government responsibility and older people, those who are employed, and those belonging to a religious denomination are more supportive of individual responsibility. Furthermore, as was expected, the national variation in attitudes towards the welfare state are explained by the economic development of a country. Finally, as the wave variable in Model 1 shows, there has been a change between the two EVS/WVS waves in the 10 countries studied here, in the sense that support for government responsibility is higher in the fourth wave compared to the second wave.

Model 2 includes the linear and the squared term of the variable measuring EU trade. Adding these two variables leads to a significant improvement of the regression model (Deviance = 26.023;  $p < 0.01$ ). In the linear term, a country's integration in the EU market is not related to attitudes towards the welfare state. The squared term turns out to be significant and negative. This finding indicates that economic integration into the EU is curvilinear related to public attitudes following a reversed U-shape pattern. People living in EU countries with intermediate levels of trade with other EU members are more in favor of government responsibility compared to the people residing in the countries that are less integrated into the EU market and the ones living in the countries trading more with other members states. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is confirmed. There is convergence of welfare state attitudes within the EU, providing support for a process of Europeanization, and that economic integration into the EU accounts for this development.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The analyses presented here provide evidence that welfare state attitudes in the

European Union converged. Furthermore, the outcomes show that the attitudes towards the welfare state have shifted slightly into the direction of more support for government responsibility.

The present study offers a number of contributions from which research into welfare state convergence research may benefit in at least two ways. First, a different dependent variable is used than in earlier studies; instead of examining national level indicators such as social spending and generosity, the focus is on individual level opinions towards the welfare state. Secondly, the extent to which these attitudes are converging or diverging is investigated using explanatory variables at the national level to establish whether there is an influence of economic integration in the EU on people's attitudes towards the welfare state. Future work is needed to decide how valuable these contributions are for the study of the effects of EU integration on other aspects of the welfare state and whether the conclusions from this single study remain after additional investigations. Besides that, these future studies could also include variables measuring the political dimension of the EU and investigate its impact on welfare state provisions and individual attitudes. The current investigation offers a point of reference to compare the outcomes of such an extension. Furthermore, the present investigation contributes to the growing literature on international comparative research into welfare state attitudes since it shows that such attitudes not only differ across countries but may also be explained by economic integration into the EU. Finally, the literature on Europeanization and globalization can benefit from this study since it suggests that these two processes refer to different kinds of international developments that may also differ in their consequences. Again, future research is required to investigate the link between the two kinds of economic integration and how they relate to individual opinions more closely.

The study shows an upward convergence of welfare state support in the EU between the nineties and the beginning of the twentieth century. There are two contrasting interpretations of this finding. On the one hand this may imply that the EU serves as a safeguard against other international developments like globalization. According to this interpretation, the EU forms a buffer against these international threats and increases people's trust in the welfare state, thus increasing their support for such collective arrangements. On the other hand the interpretation may be in the opposite direction and in line with research focusing on the increased insecurity from international trade stating that people demand more security from their government (Rodrik, 1998). That interpretation implies that the EU increases the level of insecurity that citizens experience. In that case the convergence of welfare state attitudes found here result from what may be called the Europeanization of insecurity. With the current study it is not possible to choose between these two contrasting interpretations and additional research may be aimed at providing information to do so. Such an investigation will especially be valuable from a policy perspective because the two interpretations differ with respect to the reason why people are in favor of government responsibility. According to the safeguard interpretation, people support the welfare state and since there is an upward convergence of these opinions, this may even give way for coordination at the EU level. In contrast to that, the insecurity interpretation implies that European integration increases the demand for protection rather than that it leads to higher level of welfare state support. According to that interpretation, increasing European integration and coordination will not be advisable since it can result in increased insecurity that in turn results in even more demand for social security. Which of these explanations holds cannot be examined in the present article and remains a question for future research.

All in all, this study shows that welfare state attitudes are related to the process of economic integration with the EU. Due to the enlargement of the EU as well as the continuation of gathering comparative data at the individual level, offers a chance to investigate the link between the ongoing process of European integration and people's attitudes towards the welfare state in much more detail. For policy makers this will generate even more information about how likely it is that a single European welfare state will receive public support.

**REFERENCES**

- Alsasua, J., Bilbao-Ubillos, J. and Olaskoaga, J. (2007) 'The EU integration process and the convergence of social protection benefits at national level', *International Journal of Social Welfare* 16: 297-315.
- Arts, W.A. and Van der Veen, R. (1992) 'Sociological approaches to distributive justice and procedural justice', in K.R. Scherer (ed), *Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp 143-176), Cambridge University Press.
- Arts, W.A. and Gelissen, J. (2001) 'Welfare states, solidarity and justice principles: does the type really matter', *Acta Sociologica* 44: 283-300.
- AuClaire, P.A. (1984) 'Public attitudes toward social welfare expenditures', *Social Work* 29: 139-45.
- Beckfield, J. (2006) 'European integration and income inequality', *American Sociological Review* 71: 964-985.
- Beer, P.T. and Koster, F. (2007) *Voor Elkaar of uit Elkaar? Individualisering, Globalisering en Solidariteit [Sticking Together or Falling Apart? Individualization, Globalization, and Solidarity]*, Aksant.
- Bennett, C.J. (1991) 'What is policy convergence and what causes it?', *British Journal of Political Science* 21: 215-233.
- Blomberg, H. and Kroll, C. (1999) 'Do structural contexts matter? Macro-sociological factors and popular attitudes towards public welfare services', *Acta Sociologica* 42: 300-318.
- Bouget, D. (2003) 'Convergence in the social welfare systems in Europe: from goal to reality', *Social Policy & Administration* 37: 674-693.
- Bowles, P. and Wagman, B. (1997) 'Globalization and the welfare state: four hypotheses and some empirical evidence', *Eastern Economic Journal* 23: 317-

27.

Brady, D., Beckfield, J. and Seeleib-Kaiser, M. (2005) 'Economic globalization and the welfare state in affluent democracies, 1975-2001', *American Sociological Review* 70: 921-948.

Brady, D., Beckfield, J. and Zhao, W. (2007) 'The consequences of economic globalization for affluent democracies', *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 313-334.

Bryk, A.S. and Raudenbush, S.W. (1992) *Hierarchical Linear Models. Applications and Data Analysis Methods*, Sage.

Burstein, P. (1998) 'Bringing the public back in: should sociologists consider the impact of public opinion on public policy?' *Social Forces* 77: 27-62.

Cornelisse, P.A. and Goudswaard, K.P. (2002) 'On the convergence of social protection systems in the European Union', *International Social Security Review* 55: 3-17.

DiPrete, T.A. and Forristal, J.D. (1994) 'Multilevel models: methods and substance', *Annual Review of Sociology* 20: 331-357.

Eisemeier, T.J. (1982) 'Public preferences about government spending: partisan, social and attitudinal sources of policy differences', *Political Behavior* 4: 133-46.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Polity Press.

Falkner, G. (2007) 'Social policy', in M.P. Vink and Graziano, P. (eds) *Europeanization: New Research Agendas* (pp 253-265), Palgrave MacMillan.

Feagin, J.R. (1975) *Subordinating the Poor: Welfare and American Beliefs*. Prentice-Hall.

Ferrera, M. (2005) *The Boundaries of Welfare: European Integration and the New*

*Spatial Politics of Social Protection*, Oxford University Press.

Fligstein, N. and Stone Sweet, A. (2001) 'Institutionalizing the Treaty of Rome', in A.

Stone Sweet, W. Sandholtz and N. Fligstein (eds), *The institutionalization of*

*Europe* (pp 29-25), Oxford University Press.

Fligstein, N. and Stone Sweet, A. (2002) 'Constructing politics and markets: an

institutionalist account of European integration', *American Journal of*

*Sociology* 107: 1206-1243.

Friedman, T.L. (2005) *The World is Flat. A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*,

Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Goldstein, H. (2003) *Multilevel Statistical Models*, Hodder Arnold.

Gould, A. (1999) 'The erosion of the welfare state: Swedish social policy and the

EU', *Journal of European Social Policy* 9: 165-174.

Greve, B. (1996) 'Indications of social policy convergence in Europe', *Social Policy*

*& Administration* 30: 348-367.

Guillén, A.M. and Matsaganis, M. (2000) 'Testing the 'social dumping' hypothesis in

Southern Europe: welfare policies in Greece and Spain during the last 20

years', *Journal of European Social Policy* 10: 120-145.

Halman, L. (2001) *The European Values Study: A Third Wave*, EVS/WORC.

Hasenfeld, Y. and Rafferty, J.A. (1989) 'The determinants of public attitudes toward

the welfare state', *Social Forces* 64: 1027-1048.

Haverland, M. (2006) 'Does the EU cause domestic developments? Improving case

selection in Europeanisation research', *West European Politics* 29: 134-146.

Hay, C. (2006) 'What's globalization got to do with it? Economic interdependence

and the future of European welfare states', *Government and Opposition* 41:

1-23.

- ICPSR (2006) 'World European and World Values Surveys Integrated Data File',  
ICPSR.
- Iversen, T. and Soskice, D. (2001) 'An asset theory of social policy preferences',  
*American Political Science Review* 95: 875-895.
- Jæger, M.M. (2006) 'Welfare regimes and attitudes towards redistribution: the regime  
hypothesis revisited', *European Sociological Review* 22: 157-170.
- Kangas, O. (1997) 'Self-interest and the common good: the impact of norms,  
selfishness and context in social policy opinions', *Journal of Socio-Economics*  
26: 475-494.
- Keohane, R.O. and Nye Jr., J.S. (2000) 'Globalization: what's new? What's not? (And  
so what?)', *Foreign Policy* 118: 104-119.
- Korpi, W. (1980) 'Social policy and distributional conflict in the capitalist  
democracies. A preliminary comparative framework', *West European Politics*  
3: 296-316.
- Korpi, W. (2003) 'Welfare-state regress in Western Europe: politics, institutions,  
globalization, and Europeanization', *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 589-609.
- Koster, F. (2007) 'Globalization, social structure, and the willingness to help others: a  
multilevel analysis across 26 countries', *European Sociological Review* 23:  
537-551.
- Leibfried, S. (2000) 'National welfare states, European integration and globalization:  
a perspective for the next century', *Social Policy & Administration* 34: 44-63.
- Lewin-Epstein, N., Kaplan, A. and Levanon, A. (2003) 'Distributive justice and  
attitudes toward the welfare state', *Social Justice Research* 16: 1-27.
- Lindbeck, A. (2008) 'Welfare state', in S.N. Durlauf and L.E. Blume (eds), *The New  
Palgrave Dictionary of Economics* (pp 673-677), Palgrave Macmillan.

- Lipsmeyer, C. and Nordstrom, T. (2003) 'East versus West: comparing political attitudes and welfare preferences across European societies', *Journal of European Public Policy* 10: 339-364.
- López-Santana, M. (2006) 'The domestic implications of European soft law: framing and transmitting change in employment policy', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 14: 481-499.
- Mishra, R. (1999) *Globalization and the Welfare State*, Edward Elgar.
- Moene, K.O. and Wallerstein, M. (2001) 'Inequality, social insurance, and redistribution', *American Political Science Review* 95: 859-74.
- Moravcsik, A. (1998) *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*, Cornell University Press.
- O'Connor, J.S. (2003) 'Welfare state development in the context of European integration and economic convergence: situating Ireland', *Policy & Politics* 31: 387-404.
- O'Connor, J.S. (2005) 'Policy coordination, social indicators and the social-policy agenda in the European Union' *Journal of European Social Policy* 15: 345-361.
- Pollack, M.A. (2005) 'Theorizing the European Union: international organization, domestic polity, or experiment in new governance?', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8: 357-398.
- Rhodes, M. (1995) 'Subversive liberalism: market integration, globalization, and the European welfare state', *Journal of European Public Policy* 2: 384-406.
- Rodrik, D. (1998) 'Why do open economies have bigger governments?', *Journal of Political Economy* 106: 997-1032.
- Rothstein, B. (1998) *Just Institutions Matter: The Moral and Political Logic of the*

*Universal Welfare State*, Cambridge University Press.

- Scharpf, F.W. (1997) 'Economic integration, democracy and the welfare state',  
*Journal of European Public Policy* 4: 18-36.
- Shapiro, R.Y. and Young, J.T. (1989) 'Public opinion and the welfare state: the United States in comparative perspective', *Political Science Quarterly* 104: 59- 89.
- Snijders, T.A.B. (2003) 'Multilevel analysis', in M. Lewis-Beck, A.E. Bryman, and T.F. Liao (eds), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods* (pp 673-677), Sage.
- Snijders, T. and Bosker, R. (1999) *Multilevel Analysis: An Introduction to Basic and Advanced Multilevel Modeling*, Sage.
- Sotiropoulos, D.A. (2004) 'The EU's impact on the Greek welfare state: Europeanization on paper?', *Journal of European Social Policy* 14: 267-284.
- Svallfors, S. (1997) 'Worlds of welfare and attitudes to redistribution: a comparison of eight Western nations', *European Sociological Review* 13: 283-304.
- Svallfors, S. (1999) 'Political trust and attitudes towards redistribution. A comparison of Sweden and Norway', *European Societies* 1: 241-268.
- Swank, D. (1998) 'Funding the welfare state: globalization and the taxation of business in advanced market economies', *Political Studies* 46: 671-692.
- Sykes, R.S., Palier, B. and Prior, P. (2001) *Globalization and European Welfare States: Challenges and Changes*, Palgrave.
- Threlfall, M. (2003) 'European social integration: harmonization, convergence and single social areas', *Journal of European Social Policy* 13: 121-139.
- UNCTAD (2008) 'Handbook of statistics' (retrieved 29 April 2008), [www.unctad.org](http://www.unctad.org).
- Weatherford, M.S. (1992) 'Measuring political legitimacy', *American Political Science Review* 86: 149-66.

**TABLES**

**Table 1**  
**Descriptives per country and wave**

	Wave 2			Wave 4			Change	
	N	Welfare state attitude M (SD)	Trade with EU	N	Welfare state attitude M (SD)	Trade with EU	Welfare state attitude	Trade with EU
Belgium	2,792	4.78 (2.78)	78.50	1,912	4.99 (2.73)	74.00	0.21	-4.50
France	1,002	4.15 (2.46)	65.50	1,615	3.99 (2.51)	66.00	-0.16	0.50
Germany	3,437	4.17 (2.76)	66.00	2,036	4.73 (2.70)	62.00	0.56	-4.00
Italy	20,18	5.53 (2.93)	64.50	2,000	5.63 (2.68)	59.50	0.10	-5.00
Netherlands	1,017	4.68 (2.21)	76.00	1,003	4.68 (2.11)	67.00	0.00	-9.00
United Kingdom	1,484	5.29 (2.68)	59.50	1,000	4.45 (2.39)	55.00	-0.84	-4.50
Denmark	1,030	4.20 (2.35)	70.50	1,023	4.39 (2.15)	72.50	0.19	2.00
Ireland	1,000	4.86 (2.77)	74.00	1,012	4.54 (2.54)	64.00	-0.32	-10.00
Spain	4,147	5.90 (2.70)	69.50	2,409	6.38 (2.51)	70.00	0.48	0.50
Portugal	1,185	5.02 (2.90)	77.50	1,000	4.83 (2.73)	80.00	-0.19	2.50
	<b>19,112</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>70.15</b>	<b>15,010</b>	<b>4.86</b>	<b>67.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>-3.15</b>

N = 34,122 respondents in 10 countries.  
Sources: EVS/WVS and UNCTAD

**Table 2**  
**Multilevel analysis of welfare state attitudes**

	(1)		(2)	
	Coefficient	S.E.	Coefficient	S.E.
<b>National level (Level 2)</b>				
EU trade			-0.005	0.021
EU trade <sup>2</sup>			-0.044 ***	0.009
<b>Control variables</b>				
<b>Wave</b>				
Wave (1 = wave 4)	0.184 ***	0.021	0.209 ***	0.022
<b>National level (Level 2)</b>				
GDP per capita	-0.150 ***	0.019	-0.165 ***	0.022
<b>Individual level (Level 1)</b>				
Gender (1 = female)	0.107 ***	0.011	0.106 ***	0.011
Age	-0.034 ***	0.006	-0.035 ***	0.006
Employed (1 = yes)	-0.076 ***	0.012	-0.079 ***	0.012
Religious denomination (1= yes)	-0.092 ***	0.006	-0.087 ***	0.013
Town size	0.019 ***	0.006	0.021 ***	0.006
Variance level 2	0.031 **	0.014	0.030 **	0.014
Variance level 1	0.935 ***	0.058	0.934 ***	0.007
Intercept	-0.092	0.058	-0.057	0.064
Intraclass Correlation (ICC)		3.209		3.112
-2Loglikelihood		89,870.170		89,844.147
Deviance		1,780.005***		26.023***

Standardized regressions coefficients are reported, standard errors in parentheses; \* p < 0.10; \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01.

N = 34,122 respondents in 10 countries.

Empty model: intercept = -0.050 (0.067); variance level 2 = 0.045\*\*\* (0.020); variance level = 0.942\*\*\* (0.007); Intraclass

Correlation (ICC) = 4.559; -2Loglikelihood = 91,578.225.

Sources: EVS/WVS and UNCTAD.