

## Türkiye'nin Refah Rejimine İlişkin Karşılaştırmalı Bir Yaklaşım: Yapısal Bir Analiz

### *A Comparative Approach Regarding Turkey's Welfare Regime: Structural Analyze*

Yavuz Selim KAYMAZ <sup>1</sup>

#### **Yayın geçmişi:**

Makale gelişi:  
17.11.2022  
Revizyon:  
23.12.2022  
Kabul tarihi:  
30.01.2023  
Yayımlanma tarihi:  
20.03.2023

#### **Anahtar kelimeler:**

*Türkiye,  
Refah Rejimi,  
Sosyal Politika*

#### **Keywords:**

*Turkey,  
Welfare Regime,  
Social Policy*

**Özet:** Refah rejimi kavramı, ülke politikalarının uluslararası düzeyde karşılaştırılmasını ve refah kümelerinin hareketlerinin analiz edilmesini sağlayan bir gruplandırma işlemidir. Refah rejimi çeşitli kriterlerden oluşmaktadır ve birden fazla ülkeyi içerdiği için kapsamlı bir özelliğe sahiptir. Kalıntı-kurumsal yaklaşım, dekomüdfikasyon, olgunlaşmamışlık, cinsiyet, din ve aile tipolojilerini oluşturmak için zaman içinde türetilen bazı önemli refah kriterleridir ve çalışmada mevcut kriterler de incelenmiştir. Türkiye'nin yapısal özelliklerini açıklığa kavuşturmak için çeşitli tipolojilerden yararlanarak karşılaştırmalı bir yaklaşım oluşturmak çalışmanın temel amacıdır, bu nedenle Türkiye'nin temel özellikleri çalışmada ortaya koyulmuştur. İdeolojiler, aile yapısı, refah hizmetlerinin sunum yolları ve kaynakları derinlemesine incelenmiş ve Türkiye'yi çeşitli sınıflandırmalara uyarlayarak ortak noktalar somutlaştırılmıştır. Genel yaklaşım Türkiye'nin Güneydoğu Akdeniz grubuna ait olduğu yönünde olmakla birlikte, Türkiye ile kesişen tipolojiler birden fazla gruba işaret ettiğinden dolayı Türkiye'nin belirli bir gruba uygulanması uygun görülmemektedir.

**Abstract:** The concept of welfare regime is a grouping transaction which provides to compare country policies at international level and to analyze the motion of the welfare clusters. Welfare regime consists of various criteria, and it has comprehensive feature as it contains more than one country. The residual-institutional approach, decommodification, immaturity, gender, religion and family are some major welfare criterions have been derived by time to compose the typologies also current criterions also examined in the study. Generating a comparative approach by using various typologies to clarify Turkey's structural features is the main objective of the study therefore, Turkey's basic features unveiled in the study. Ideologies, family structure, welfare services delivery ways and sources examined deeply and by adopting Turkey to various classifications, the common points were embodied. While the general approach is that Turkey belongs to the Southeastern Mediterranean group, the typologies that intersect with Turkey indicate more than one group, so it is not considered appropriate to apply Turkey to a particular group.

## **Introduction**

The concept of “welfare regime” is a clustering transaction consist of identified implementations which leads separations among the countries. This clustering transaction provides to compare the country policies at international level and helps to analyze the motion, transformation and the trend of clusters. Wilensky-Lebaux’s classification of “residual-institutional” approach in narrow sense, there have been derived lots of criteria including “family role”, “gender”, “decommodification”, “immaturity” and “ideologies” are some examples have been put forth by time to classification literature , mentioned in the study, so by implementing the criteria’s

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Yavuz Selim Kaymaz, [yavuzselimkymz@gmail.com](mailto:yavuzselimkymz@gmail.com), ORCID: [0000-0002-0698-9011](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0698-9011)

Turkey's position was clarified. Prominent point to be emphasized among the clustering criterions is "intention" of the governments, the "immaturity" which is about if beneficiaries can reach to services equally, is a "container" caption, has directly relevance with the countries "rule of law (law state)" feature and their sociological structure.

The analyze about Turkey's structure was also mentioned in the PHD thesis "Welfare Regime in Terms of Transformation of The Welfare State in Turkey: Neoliberalism and Social Policies, (2021)" superficially. By mentioning the criteria and comparing typologies, to extend the slight analyze mentioned in thesis and to identify if Turkey belongs to peculiar welfare system, are main objective of the study.

While Turkey's welfare regime as it is an element of "Southeastern Mediterranean" group in particular by referring the caption of "immaturity" however Turkey's complex structure makes this acknowledgement unaffordable. The aim of article to clarify Turkey's structural features by applying various classifications to generate a new perspective to Turkey's welfare system.

## 1. Welfare Regimes

The concept of "welfare regime" is distinctly more comprehensive than the concept of "welfare state" as it contains various countries while "welfare state" is about the functions about the state and its citizens well-being status. However, "welfare regime", defined as "*refers to a set of rules, institutions and structured interests that constrain individuals through compliance procedures*". (Wood, Gough, 2006:1968). Moreover, "welfare regime" has also have intersection with social policy as explained, "*The classification of systems is a way of making sense of information that can otherwise seem disconnected and disorderly, and for that reason it has become an important contribution to understanding social policy*". (Spicker, 2014:167) The definitions about the "welfare regime" concept expresses it consists of various components including state, institutions, citizenship, law, and culture which create the social capital, therefore the concept of "welfare regime" has multidimensional structure and the mentioned components have interwoven relation. The interactions existing in welfare groups, generate the "motion" which is called "convergence and divergence", also the clustering transaction helps to analyze the orientations. (Achterberg, Yerkes, 2009:191) When the "motion" of clusters embodied; marketisation and privatization policies which are reflections of neoliberalism generate "convergence" to "liberal" model or "universal-institutional" extent of services to "social democratic" model or inequality of benefits to "immature model", therefore transformation and tendency of groups might be analyzed in context of highlighting features.

Beginning from Wilensky-Lebaux's typology consist of "residual- institutional" criteria seem in narrow sense; various approaches have been derived by time. (Abrahamson, 2002:395) Another typology transaction claimed by Effinger is "welfare arrangement" approach, relies on "culture" and illuminates the differentiations by referring interactions of institutions and interest. (Effinger, 2005:5-6) As a consequence the dynamics like neoliberalism, globalization having wide-reaching influences, generate various reactions according to the country's cultural attributes, therefore clustering transaction is an inevitable issue.

A popular approach, Andersen's typology constructed on "decommodification" which is about individual independence to market mechanism, consist of three captions. (Liberal, conservative-corporatist, social democrat). Andersen defines "decommodification"; "*...citizens can freely, and without potential loss of job, income, or general welfare, optout of work when they themselves consider it necessary.*" (Andersen, 1990:23) It can be perceived, as person's well-being status sustainability in the case of unemployment situation and it has also adherence with psychological side (sense of justice, social exclusion) of social policy.

Another criterion about typologies is "gender", Korpi emphasizes the "gender equality" as a major function of welfare state. (Korpi, 2000:1) Lewis evaluates another gender-oriented approach by

criticizing Andersen's typology; the approach declares unpaid work should be included with the paid work by referring to breadwinner role. (Lewis,1992:161)

Holliday makes a general assessment about welfare groups in simple sense, he states the liberal regimes as they are based on "market", conservative regimes "status", the social democratic model "prosperity" and the productivist regime "economic growth". (Holliday, 2000:709) Even the countries have differentiations each other however highlighting features about their systems allocate and gather them under clusters.

### 2.1. The Immature Model

The "immaturity" substantially differs than the other criterion as it is not governments' intentional preference to deliver the welfare services. The immature model is about if beneficiaries can reach to welfare services "equally", in other words it is about the function of state's preventing the dualist structure relying on "beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries". When social rights considered as a component of human rights "the immature model", directly has adherence with the governments' "law state (rule of law)" property. Rule of law is defined as "...the principle that power of the state and its officials must be limited by the law and that no one is above the law", definition indicates the "equality" principle. (Sodaro, 2007:177) "Rule of law" is about social rights is also function of modern welfare state. In case of the unsatisfaction of the "justice sense" among the citizens which leads "sharp polarization" problem; while some citizens get benefit and the others do not. (Spicker, 2000:86) The other component of immature model are some sociological issues like gender gap, privileged groups,

By the way another point to be explored about social policy is the "psychological" impact of social rights. The "immaturity" which may cause the emergence of "fraud" problem due to the inequalities which might prevent the welfare outcomes. "*Welfare fraud and tax evasion*" problems exist, despite broadly attention, gained in public finance due to "*abuse and dishonesty*". (Yaniv,1997:436) While the ultimate outcome of welfare policies is well-being of the society, the existing inequalities might become trigger for social conflict due the unsatisfaction of citizens, whereas "*absence of abuse*" is one of welfare state functions. (Barr, 1992: 749)

If some groups examined in terms of immaturity; Latin America regime has "privileged groups", differentiations in beneficiaries and in rural region and informal employees are in excluded position in countries as Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Brazil. (Flueury, 2017:2) The mentioned features obviously indicate the dualist structure. In addition, "Post-Communist and West Europe" countries including Bulgaria, Chechia, Poland and Slovakia have experienced transformation after collapse of Soviet Union, social issues occurred such as unemployment, social exclusion, income distribution. (Parlak, Ak, 2019:2-8) Moreover differentiations among salary workers and professional workers in low level, hidden privileged groups are seen in this group therefore another component of immature model is "Post-Communist and West Europe" regime. (Deacon, 2000:147)

East Asian regime with both Bismarckian and provident fund system has role in social insurance system, also having strong social assistance to survive power which lets existing privileged groups and wide part of population excluded, therefore the properties indicate "immature model". (Aspalter, 2015:741) Gough mentions about East Asian regime, while having economic growth success, the social expenditure is in low level and the differentiations among beneficiaries exist and unsuccessful income redistribution are some features which indicate the immaturity. (Gough, 2003:37-42)

Southeastern Mediterranean group was proclaimed by various scholars referring to common point "immaturity" and the other components including religion, family, residuality. Leibfried, unlike Andersen's triple classification, adds the fourth implement the "immaturity" and describes these countries as "Latin Rim". For the fourth group, the approach proclaims that welfare is not delivered as "right" and traditional methods have influence, unlike the Scandinavian countries

they have “residual” characteristics and finally identifies as “*institutionalized promise*” states. (Leibfried, 1993:128-129) Ferrara mentions about Southeastern Mediterranean group, welfare services are undeveloped, family has traditional structure, Catholicism has influence, clientelism and particularism seen in services and identifies groups as “*rudimentary*” or “*Catholic welfare regimes*”. (Ferrera, 1996:18) J.Gal has approach about “Southeastern Mediterranean” group, he expands the group countries to “*Cyprus, Greece, Israel, Italy, Malta, Spain, Portugal and Turkey*” also referring the religion criteria by adding “*How important is God in your life?*” index.(Gal, 2010:290) While Ferrara evaluating the “Southeastern Mediterranean” dominantly with the “Catholicism” which indicates the European countries, Gal expands the “religion” concept by addressing various beliefs of more countries.

In summary, the “immature model” is more comprehensive than common accepted “Southeastern Mediterranean” group, means the “immature model criteria” is a container caption differs from other intentional preferences.

## 2.2. Ideological Scheme

Ideologies have multidimensional interactions; as described “[*An ideology is a more or less coherent set of ideas that provides a basis for organized political action, whether this is intended to preserve, modify or overthrow the existing system of power relationships*].” (Heywood, 2013:28) The definition indicates that the ideologies have profound influence about welfare system. The citizens are “beneficiaries” of welfare services, having ideological views, they are also voters as components of welfare systems, their behaviors have influence on governments, according to their ideological views. The mentioned relation was also put forth by Huntington as he reveals; “*Liberalism is the ideology of the bourgeoisie, socialism and Marxism the ideologies of the proletariat, and conservatism the ideology of the aristocracy*”. (Huntington, 1957:454) This explanation about ideologies demonstrates the intersections of welfare systems and ideologies mentioned in Andersen’s typology as ideologies and welfare regimes have interwoven relation. Andersen while composing his popular typology he implements three major ideologies which indicate the country’s peculiarities: *socialism* for “*social democratic*” model, *conservatism* for “*conservatist corporatist*” model and “*liberalism*” for “*liberal model*”. (Andersen, 1990:74)

When Turkey’s group is evaluated through the ideological perspective, “conservatism” has dominant influence in particular ruling right wing parties which rely on dominantly conservative ideology, has taken role in Turkey’s political history. In addition, in Turkey conservatism’s role was expressed as “*...functioned in converting and adapting old concepts and practices into the new social milieu Turkey has come to experience*”. (Kalaycıoğlu, 2007:235)

A highlighting footstep to be emphasized in republican period is “İzmir Economical Congress” where decisions taken in, evaluated in the axis of “nation state” policies which relies on “nationalism”. (Boratav, 2003:46) Moreover, decisions having cooperative structure also includes employee rights and social policy also until 1930’s and the liberal polices implemented with the congress. (Çelik, 2014:214) Reflection of liberal policies in Turkey again begins in 1980’s. (Heper, 2013:145) Moreover, Dorlach emphasizes the period starts with the elections in 2002 to nowadays as “liberalization and privatization” attempts, reflections of neoliberal policies. (Dorlach, 2007: 59)

In summary the “market” as a source has never been abandoned from the beginning of republican period and by the time “liberal” policies transformed to “neoliberal” form after 1980’s. From the republican period generally nationalism, liberalism-neoliberalism, conservatism the ideologies having profound influence on Turkey’s regime.

## 3. Turkey’s Welfare Regime

To identify the Turkey’s regime, the major structural features should be unveiled; welfare services, cultural accumulation in particular ideologies, role of family, social expenditure rates, the equality of beneficiaries, are some points to clarify the structure of Turkey. In one

introduction, definitions about Turkey's welfare regime indicate tips about the Turkey's regime: [*"eclectic social security regime", "successful informal security regime", "Southern European or Mediterranean,", "inegalitarian corporatist,", "minimalist welfare state", "residual", "productive plus regime" and "egalitarian corporatist system"*]. (Powell, Yörük, 2017:87) Also, Grütjen reveals main pillars of Turkey's regime, *"central organized social security", "family", "municipality-Ngo's"*. (Grütjen, 2006:113) In summary; social security system, family role, inequalities and selective-residual structure are some inferences from definitions about Turkey's regime, which indicates the "eclectic" structure. Therefore, the major structural points should be explained more comprehensive to embody Turkey's position.

Some scholars proclaim that Turkey is element of "Southeastern Mediterranean" regime. (Gough, 1996:1), (Grütjen, 2008:119), (Gal, 2010:284), (Powell, Yörük, 2017:104) In Turkish literature Buğra and Keyder proclaims Turkey is compatible with the Southern Mediterranean regime as Turkey's formal social security system, high-level and hierarchical structure due to differentiated healthcare and retirement benefits according to working status and the also they express the importance of family actor as it has played an important role from the past and still its importance continues. (Buğra, Keyder, 2006:212) The definitions about Turkey the "immaturity" is another highlighting feature relies on inequalities, differentiations among workers - non workers and the other beneficiaries.

### 3.1. Welfare Services

Welfare services such as education, social security, healthcare system, housing and labor market policies are major services to be delivered through "state institutions" or "market" mechanism and prominent components of the welfare regimes and governments' intentional preferences to deliver these services give tips about welfare typologies. In constitution, it was declared *"...is a democratic, secular and social State governed by the rule of law"* the functions of modern welfare state. (The Constitution of the Turkish Republic, Article 2) and some major services like education, housing etc. are constitutional rights and the other component of welfare state in social economic rights in *"Social and Economic "Rights and Duties"*, legal basis about welfare system was created. (The Constitution of the Turkish Republic, Chapter: 3)

When a look from the welfare service terms about Turkey, with the removal of "green card" and the implementation of "General Health Insurance" which was supplied by World Bank, healthcare services transformed to "universal" form and with same program encouraged the marketisation. There have been prominent footsteps indicate liberal state such as "marketisation" in education services which have universal structure, Private Employment Agencies (PEA) in labor market policies, Private Pension System (PPS) in social security and the legislation of "Mortgage Law" in 2007 the bank credits stimulated and marketisation in housing policy were supplied. (Kaymaz, 2021:71-72) The aforementioned situations outlined demonstrate Turkey to "liberal regime" the convergence occurs to "liberal regime". In addition, Turkey's Bismarckian social insurance service form illustrate "Conservative-Corporatist" regime feature. (Ulutaş, 2017:29)

### 3.2. Family Role

Family is a source of welfare services such as state and market (Bozçağa, 2013:178) which Wilensky, Andersen, Bonoli typologies do not include. Also, as a source of welfare services, "family" is a "sociological institution" which has frontline role compels to "residual" structure. In a broad definition which points out differentiations about Turkey's family structure, explained as *"...the state's endorsement of the family as the main element in welfare provision by modeling its social policies after a Family and Kin Solidarity Model that differs in specific traits from the Male Breadwinner Model predominantly found in Continental Europe"* (Grütjen, 2008:112-113). Another highlighting group about family is East Asian countries which have applied modernity without breaking their ties with their traditions, while increasing the female workforce with industrialization they have continued the traditional responsibilities of woman within the family. (Pascall, Sung, 2014:5-6)

In Turkey's welfare regime, social support sources rely on kinship relations and philanthropy, state and non-state actors coexist. Today there is a new structure where boundaries between state and civil society blurred so the formal welfare institutions were liquated and the family got stronger. (Ulutaş, 2017:32) As an outstanding actor the family protects individuals from social risks therefore the Turkey exhibits "residual" structure. The broad meaning of residuality defined; "Concept of the residual, or marginal, welfare state tries to capture exactly this property of the liberal paradigm; namely, that public obligation enters only where the market fails: the commodity logic is supreme."(Andersen, 1990:20) As a public policy family actor was emphasized "As from the day that the AKP came to power, the principal role attributed to the family in providing welfare has also been underscored in their party programs" in summary so , "family" was reinforced by ruling party. (Bozçağa, 2013:183).

**TABLE:1 TURKEY'S STRUCTURAL FEATURES**

<b>Turkey's Features</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Familiar Regimes</b>
<b>Social Insurance</b>	Bismarckian Model/Selective	State/Market	Conservative-Corporatist, Asian
<b>Welfare Services</b> Housing, Employment, Social Security	Selective	State /Market	Liberal
<b>Healthcare System, Education Services</b>	Universal	State/Market	Liberal, Southeastern Mediterranean,
<b>Ideologies</b>	Roughly three major ideologies. "Nationalism, liberalism- neoliberalism and Conservatism."		Liberal, Conservative- Corporatist, Asian, Southeastern Mediterranean
<b>Family Role</b>	"Residual model" with frontline role of family.		Conservative-Corporatist, Southeastern Mediterranean, Asian
<b>Immature Model</b>	Shadow Employment, Particularism, Differentiations among beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, workers. Gender gap. Dualist structure of society.		Southeastern Mediterranean, Post-Communist, Asian, Latin America

### 3.3. Comparative Typology Approach

-Wilensky's dualist approach consist of "residual-institutional" head dual titles also by neglecting immaturity and family gender, when it is applied to Turkey, most of welfare services excluding "healthcare and education", has "residual-selective" structure Turkey's position indicates the "residual" welfare regime. With the current typology the divergence exists with "social democratic" model which has universal-institutional form. The other groups including Liberal, Asian, Conservative Corporatist, Latin America, and Post-Communist and Western Europe and Southeastern Mediterranean countries might be gathered with Turkey under the "residual" model classification.

- When Turkey is adopted Andersen's triple approach together with the neglection of "immaturity", "Bismarckian" form of social insurance and the role of family having frontline position with "residual structure", ideologic influences (conservatism-liberalism), substantially demonstrate Turkey's position to "conservative-corporatist" model. As Wilensky's dualist typology the divergence occurs with "social democratic" countries on the other side marketisation footsteps as aforementioned including PPS, PAE, HTP and the others indicate the tendency to "liberal regime" together with the countries with UK, USA, Canada, and New Zealand.

-Bonoli's two head caption model "Bismarck-Beveridge" model when it is adapted to Turkey; with social expenditure rate which is under OECD average %20. (Social Expenditure Database, <https://www.oecd.org/social/expenditure.htm>) and Bismarckian social insurance system, equals Turkey position to Bonoli's low-Bismarckian model with the countries "Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal, Switzerland", except Switzerland the countries are in the same countries belong to "Southeastern Mediterranean" group. (Bonoli, 1997:361)

-Gender oriented approaches having the assumption that "gender equality" as a major function of welfare state by the way "Global Gender Gap" might be an indicator for clustering current analysis. "Global Gender Gap Index" covers 146 countries and occurs with some parameters: "economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival, political empowerment". (Global Gender Gap Index, 2022:8) Turkey takes the 124<sup>th</sup> place in the index while Sweden 5<sup>th</sup>, Germany 10<sup>th</sup>, France 15<sup>th</sup>, Spain 17<sup>th</sup>, Portugal 29<sup>th</sup>, Italy 63<sup>rd</sup>. (Global Gap Index: 2002:10). Current index proclaims some information about Turkey; "Turkey having made steady progress of 12 percentage points on this indicator. There is, however, a growing gender gap in the labour-force participation rate across all Central Asian economies with the exception of Tajikistan. Additionally, the gender gap in estimated earned income also grew in five countries: Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Turkey and Moldova." (Global Gender Gap Index, 2022:19) The unemployed population is a problem of exclusion of citizens equals Turkey position to "immature model" and "gender gap" intensifies this situation, in future if the earned income grows, the immaturity will intensify according to "Gender Gap Index" information.

-The immaturity as described before as a "container caption" for welfare clustering transaction, having dualist structure in society cause of various reasons including shadow employment, particularism and disordered social assistance, privileged groups fit Turkey to "Southeastern Mediterranean" model including countries Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal. However, the immaturity with the assumption of container caption therefore Latin America, Post-Communist and East Europe and Asian regime countries are the other components of "immature model".

-Ideologies having intersections with social policy therefore while composing the clusters another comparing instrument to be considered. For Turkey conservatism, has contribution of Islamic belief and having relationship with the other welfare source "family". Similarly, Asian welfare regime culturally Confucianism is a legacy which is the most important element of rapid economic growth successes with hard work, education, and dutifulness concepts. On the other side women in disadvantageous position as the system based on "father-husband-son-child." (Pascall, Sung, 2007:4). "Conservative-Corporatist" regime with "Catholicism" and Asian regime

with “Confucianism” gathers Turkey under “conservative” ideology on the other hand the divergence occurs with the “social democrat” and “liberal” model.

The common points from definitions and comparing transaction to be inferred about Turkey's structural features; roughly might be sum up; “residual”, “conservatist”, “liberal”, “inequal-(immature)”. Having complex structure also indicates that Turkey cannot be allocated to a particular unique group; Turkey does not have an idiosyncratic welfare system, it is the result of combination of various country applications.

### **Conclusion**

Identifying Turkey's welfare regime is the main subject of the article and to implement Turkey to unique group is controversial issue. While Turkey is being implemented to Southeastern Mediterranean regime Turkey's structure complicates this situation. The major actors to clarify the Turkey's position welfare service delivery ways, the sources (family, state, market), ideological influences were embodied in the essay, Turkey's appearance clarified through the comparison with other countries. The prominent point about the criterions is the intention of the governments; while service delivery ways are governments' intentional preferences, immaturity, family and gender gap are sociological institutions as they are not intentional preference, they are components of welfare regimes.

When Turkey's view constructed from the view of welfare service delivery ways, the marketisation trend in particular PPS (Private Pension System), PEA (Private Employment Agency), HTP (Health Transformation program) indicates the feature of “liberal” regime feature which Andersen classifies with UK, USA, Canada, and New Zealand. The social insurance service which has prominent role about composing classifications, Bismarckian model occurs with contributions of worker and employer is a feature of “conservative regime” containing the countries such as France, Germany and Italy. The family role is one of the key pillars of Turkey's regime is a “frontline” actor also makes convergence with the countries in “Conservative regime”, “Asian regime” and “Southeastern Mediterranean regime” moreover influence of “conservatism” has adherence with the religion, leads “residual” structure with family.

One significant subject “immature model” is about if the services are delivered equally, is a “container” caption and Turkey's features like clientelism, shadow employment, particularism, and gender gap are components of the immature model. The immaturity outlined in the article consists of various inequalities, Latin America, Asian, Southeastern Mediterranean, Post-Communist and West Europe groups might be gathered with Turkey under the “immature model”.

“Family oriented” approach, the role of family as a “frontline” with the impact of conservative ideology makes Turkey's convergence to the “conservative regime” including the countries as France, Italy, Germany, East Asia countries and Southeastern Mediterranean countries. In summary Turkey has three different typology features: “liberal regime” with marketisation footsteps in welfare services, “conservative regime” with family role and Bismarckian social insurance system, “Southeastern Mediterranean” with healthcare services, family structure and immaturity, “residual structure”, current combination also indicates that Turkey does not have idiosyncratic welfare system. In addition, Turkey's motion occurs as convergence substantially to “liberal regime” and “divergence” to “social democrat” regime.

### **References**

- Abrahamson, P. (1999). The Welfare Modelling Business, *Social Policy & Administration*, Vol.33, No.4, pp.394-415.
- Achterberg, P. Yerkes, M. (2009). One welfare state emerging? Convergence versus Divergence in 16 Western Countries, *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare*, Vol.25, No.3, pp.189-201.

- Andersen, G. E. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Princeton University Press.
- Aspalter, C. (2011). The Development of Ideal-Typical Welfare Regime Theory, *International Social Work*, Vol.54, No.6, pp.735–750.
- Barr, N. (1992). Economic Theory and the Welfare State: A Survey and Interpretation, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol.30, No.2, pp.741-803.
- Bonoli, G. (1997). Classifying Welfare States: A Two-dimension Approach, *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 26, No.3, pp.351-372.
- Boratav, K. (2013). *İktisat Tarihi 1908-2009 16. Baskı*, İmge Kitabevi.
- Bozçağa, T. (2013). Women and The Welfare State Regime of Turkey, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol.11, No.4, 2013, pp.177-188.
- Buğra, A. Keyder, Ç. (2006). The Turkish Welfare Regime in Transformation, *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.16, No.3, pp.211–228.
- Çelik, A. (2014). *Avrupa Birliği Sosyal Politikası ve Türkiye*, Kitap Yayınevi.
- Deacon, B. (2000). Eastern European Welfare States: The Impact of The Politics of Globalization, *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.10, No.2, 2000, pp.146-161.
- Dorlach, T. (2016). The AKP between Populism and Neoliberalism: Lessons from Pharmaceutical Policy, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, C.55, 2016, pp.55-83.
- Effinger, B. P. (2005). Culture and Welfare State Policies: Reflections on a Complex Interrelation, *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol.34, S.1, pp.3-20.
- Ferrera, M. (1996). The Southern Model of Welfare in Social Europe, *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.20, No.1, pp..17-37.
- Fleury, S. (2017). The Welfare State in Latin America: Reform, Innovation and Fatigue, *Cad. Saúde Pública*, C.33, No.2, e00058116.
- Gal, J. (2010). Is There an Extended Family of Mediterranean Welfare States? , *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.20, No.4, pp.283–300.
- Gough, I. (2003). Welfare Regimes in East Asia and Europe, Katherine Marshall, Olivier Butzbach, *New Social Policy Agendas for Europe and Asia: Challenges, Experience, and Lessons*, The World Bank, pp.27-42.
- Gough, I. (1996). Social Assistance in Southern Europe, *South European Society and Politics*, Vol.1, No.1, pp.1-23.
- Grütjen, D. (2008). The Turkish Welfare Regime: An Example of The Southern European Model? The Role of the State, Market and Family in Welfare Provision, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol.7, pp.112-113.
- Heper, M. (2013). Islam, Conservatism, and Democracy in Turkey: Comparing Turgut Özal and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, *Insight Turkey*, Vol.15, No.2, pp.141-156.

- Heywood, A. (2013). *Politics, Fourth Edition*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holliday, I. (2000). Productivist Welfare Capitalism: Social Policy in East Asia, *Political Studies*, Vol.48, No.4, pp.706-723.
- Huntington, S.P. (1957). Conservatism as An Ideology, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol.51, No.2, pp.454- 473.
- Kalaycıoğlu, E. (2007). Politics of Conservatism in Turkey, *Turkish Studies*, Vol.8, No.2, pp.233-252.
- Kaymaz, Y.S. (2022). Transformation of Turkey's Welfare Regime, *The Sakarya Journal of Economics*, Vol.11, No.1, 2022, pp.66-76.
- Korpi, W. (2000). Faces of Inequality: Gender, Class, and Patterns of Inequalities in Different Types of Welfare States, *Social Politics*, Vol.7, No.2, pp.127–191.
- Lewis, J. (1992). Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.2, No.3 pp.159–173.
- Orloff, A. (1996). Gender in the Welfare State, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol.22, pp.51-78.
- Özaydın, M., M. (2013). Harmonization of Work and Family Life Issue on The Basis of Gender Based Classifications of Welfare, *Journal of Gazi University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, Vol.15, No.3, pp.47-72.
- Pascall, Gillian, Sung, Sirin, (2014). Gender and East Asia, Gillian Pascall and Sirin Sung *Gender and East Asian Welfare States: from Confucianism to Gender Equality*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp.1-27.
- Powell, M., Yörük, E. (2017). Straddling Two Continents and Beyond Three Worlds? The Case of Turkey's Welfare Regime, *New Perspectives on Turkey*, Vol.57, pp.85-114.
- Sodaro, M. J. (2007). *Comparative Politics: A Global Introduction*, McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Spicker, P. (2000). *The Welfare State: A General Theory*, Sage Publications.
- Spicker, P. (2014). *Social Policy: Theory and Practice Third Edition*, Policy Press.
- The Constitution of the Turkish Republic, *Official Gazette of the Republic of Turkey*, 18.10.1982.
- Ulutürk, Ulutaş, Ç. (2017). Türkiye Refah Rejiminin Dönüşüm Sürecinde Sosyal Yardım Sistemi, *Emek Araştırma Dergisi*, C.8, S.12, pp.27-48.
- Wood, G., Gough, I. (2006). A Comparative Welfare Regime Approach to Global Social Policy, *World Development*, Vol.34, No.10, pp.1696-1712.
- Yaniv, G. (1997). Welfare Fraud and Welfare Stigma, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol.18, No.4, pp.435-451.

**Internet References**

Global Gender Gap Index, <https://www3.weforum.org>, (08.11.2022).

Social Expenditure Database, <https://www.oecd.org/social/expenditure.htm>. (10.11.2022).

**ETİK ve BİLİMSEL İLKELER SORUMLULUK BEYANI**

Bu çalışmanın tüm hazırlanma süreçlerinde etik kurallara ve bilimsel atıf gösterme ilkelerine riayet edildiğini yazar(lar) beyan eder. Aksi bir durumun tespiti halinde Toplumsal Politika Dergisi'nin hiçbir sorumluluğu olmayıp, tüm sorumluluk makale yazarlarına aittir.