Nevertheless, this reviewer had some concerns. First, the authors use OECD statistics on the introduction of PRP uncritically, although other researchers have commented that the OECD does not always provide accurate data on PRP. Second, in their comparisons of public employment regimes in Germany, France, Sweden, and the UK, the authors do not always provide like-for-like comparison; for instance, in Chapter 5 the gender distribution in the French public sector is discussed in some detail (p. 133), but the gender distribution in the UK public sector is not even mentioned. Third, a few points of details are misleading. For instance, the authors say that in UK waste management employees have “no active right to strike” (p. 226), which is correct in that British strike law is founded on immunities, not rights, but waste collectors have come out on strike (cf. the Winter of Discontent in 1979–80) and can still strike, subject currently to the same constraints as other British employees.

The authors, when summing up (pp. 292, 293), comment that although “the same issues have been raised across all countries and the same goals of reform have been articulated...operational changes have followed different, and in part contradictory trajectories”, a conclusion that adds to the literature, but is not a lightbulb moment.

Susan Corby

University of Greenwich, London, United Kingdom

DOI: 10.1111/spol.12396

Comparative welfare capitalism in East Asia: Productivist models of social policy

Edited by Mason M.S. Kim

Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. ISBN 978-1-137-47184-0; £60 (hbk).

Succinctly and accurately describing the development of welfare states in East Asia is an unenviable task given the rapid yet uneven economic and social developments experienced in the region over the last half a century. Nevertheless, Kim's description of the various forms of productivist welfare states within East Asia provides a comprehensive overview of the primary dynamics at play within East Asian policy developments, as well as providing a broad comparative landscape in which to examine how these dynamics vary across the region.

Kim argues that the welfare state systems of East Asia can be placed into three types of productivist welfare capitalism: inclusive, market, and dualist. Inclusive productivist welfare states are those that provide traditional, risk-pooling social security systems. They differ from European models in so much as they do not aim at redistribution or the assertion of social right, but merely at protecting the economy during external shocks. Market productivist welfare states by contrast are those that facilitate individual savings arrangements through the creation of individual insurance and pension schemes. Dualist systems are those that use a mixture of these two.

In laying out these three models, Kim provides a clear overview of welfare state variation across East Asia; however, there is a sense that the work has needlessly adopted a typological approach that is in keeping with welfare state analysis traditions. Ultimately, the typology presented is a spectrum rather than a typology that is defined by two independent dimensions (market efficiency and risk pooling) which come together to describe the degree to which the welfare state is market orientated. Kim's argument could be simplified to illustrate the varying degree of market orientation in productivist welfare states. This argument is an incredibly valuable one that helps the reader better understand the diversity in productivist welfare states, but the tradition of welfare state typologies provides little added value in understanding this.

The typology of welfare states provided by Kim generates many interesting hypotheses as to the role of welfare state institutions in both reacting to and driving rapid socio-economic change in the region. These are particularly well drawn out in Chapter 3 where the factors driving this diversity are discussed. Indeed, the three case studies in Chapter 4 suggest fertile ground for comparative research in the region. Despite this, the case studies and theoretical framework seem to lack a broader context of welfare state origins than in the European welfare state tradition. Classic texts on European welfare states and institutional diversity typically anchor their analysis deep in the geography, culture, and history of nation states. Kim compares Korea, China, and Singapore without fully acknowledging such differences. For example, in Chapter 4, Kim asserts that the degree of reliance on foreign direct investment directly affects policymakers' decisions in the design of welfare state institutions. Whilst true, this ignores the broader picture given that Singapore is effectively a port city, Korea has a dense but largely homogenous population, and China is a vast, diverse, largely federalized state. By not fully acknowledging these factors in the shaping of national institutions, the narrative of welfare state development offered seems a little too narrow to base strong and insightful comparative research upon.

Regardless, Kim's main thesis is compelling, and any graduate reading list on East Asian social policy would be enriched by the addition of this text, as it succinctly challenges the orthodoxy that there is a singular welfare model for East Asia in a cogent and accessible manner.

Tom Emery

*Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute &
Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands*

DOI: 10.1111/spol.12397

Cash transfers and basic social protection— Towards a development revolution?

Edited by Moritz von Gliszczynski

Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. ISBN 978-1-137-50568-2; £58.00 (hbk).

Gliszczynski's book appears to offer the intriguing prospect of delving into the policy machinery of social protection discourses and cash transfers in particular. Although the keywords in the book title itself ("development revolution") are, I would argue, slightly overused in the international development literature, the contents list of this book are certainly highly pertinent. They address conceptual and policy issues which, I would also argue, are under-theorized in development. The analysis is ideational and constructivist in nature. The book offers a historical overview of how the idea of cash transfers (also referred to as social cash transfers) emerged, and how they have evolved over time since the early 2000s. This genealogy traces the idea of cash transfers across four main global discourses: poverty, development, risk, and human rights. It is not an approach that is commonly found in the academic literature; and, therefore, the book's in-depth analysis of the discourse, language, and ideational drivers behind cash transfers from the Global North through international donor agencies to the Global South is a welcome contribution.

There is a clear focus on donor agencies as the prime policy actors in this book. The discussion of policy discourses and ideational drivers that is mentioned above is only in relation to international agencies, namely the UN agencies, ILO, DFID, and the World Bank: architects of the current social protection and cash transfer policy paradigms. The book does not address how national governments in developing countries, nor how non-governmental