

University of Toronto
Department of Political Science
Pol 439/2139 H-F

The Canadian Welfare State in Comparative Perspective
Fall 2020

Professor: Rodney Haddow

Class time: Thursday, 2 - 4 PM

Class location: This course will be taught remotely, using Blackboard Collaborate. Students will have to participate in the class during its meeting time ('simultaneously') in order to receive credit for participation.

Office hours: I will post two office hours for each week, one shortly after this class meets on Thursday, another later on Wednesday afternoon. I will provide you with more details when classes begin.

E-mail: r.haddow@utoronto.ca; this is the best way to get in touch with me outside of class time or office hours.

Course description: Welfare states receive considerable attention in political science due to their prominence among state functions, and because of the fiscal and demographic pressures they face in an age of globalization and postindustrialism. They are the focus of some of the most interesting theoretical and empirical debates on the comparative politics of industrial societies and in scholarship about Canadian politics. This course examines recent trends in Canadian social policy in light of the comparative scholarship.

The first substantive seminar addresses the legitimacy of the welfare state from the perspective of political theory. Section A then reviews leading themes in the comparative study of welfare states in industrial societies. Section B treats aspects of Canada's welfare state.

Format: This is a seminar course; classroom sessions will be devoted to a discussion of the readings assigned for that session. Students are expected to complete the readings required of them, even when they are not submitting a paper or making an oral presentation.

Readings: There are four articles listed for each week of the course. *All four of these readings are required for graduate students, and must be incorporated into submitted essays. Undergraduate students are required only to read three of these readings each week, and to write about those three when preparing a paper.* (I recommend that

undergraduates read the first three readings listed as required, but you may choose to do otherwise).

There is one textbook:

Keith Banting and John Myles, eds. 2013. *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution* (Vancouver: UBC Press).

All other readings are available electronically from our course Quercus page.

Grading Scheme and Course Requirements:

Pol 439H:

4 short essays (4-5 pages each) (each is worth 20%, except your weakest, which is worth 15%)	75%
1 oral presentation	10%
Oral participation	15%

Pol 2139H:

5 short essays (5-6 pages each) (each essay is worth 15%)	75%
1 oral presentation	10%
Oral participation	15%

*Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to **Turnitin.com** for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of the Turnitin.com service are described on the turnitin.com web site. If, as a student, you object to using turnitin.com, please see me to establish alternative arrangements for submission of your written assignments.*

Written and oral assignments: The most important responsibility for students in the course is to prepare four 4-5 page (1000-1250 words) (undergraduate) or five 5-6 page (graduate) (1250-1500 word) papers, based on the assigned readings. There is considerable flexibility regarding which topics you write on, but at least one paper **must be submitted by October 29th** to comply with the university's course-drop deadline.

These essays will be expected to accomplish two tasks: [a] they should provide a clear account of the main arguments made by each of the readings assigned for that week, indicating where they differ and where they converge; and [b] they should make an

argument, by pointing to a major issue or theme addressed in the readings, comparing what the different authors have to say about this question, and evaluating these different perspectives. I recommend that students address their argument to the question that forms part of the title of the weekly session for which they are writing a paper. Needless to say, papers should be written in good Standard English, and with appropriate references to the sources used

Essays are due at the beginning of the class, on the date when their topic will be discussed in the seminar. Please submit them via our Quercus page. Because the seminar discussion should serve to clarify the readings for all participants, it would not be fair for me to accept papers submitted late without significant penalty. Consequently, ***late papers will be subject to a penalty of 10% during the first 24 hours after they are due, and of 20% thereafter.*** The 10% penalty will rise to 20% for a second or subsequent one-day-late assignment. ***Please note that all term work must, according to University regulations, be submitted by December 9th.***

Each student will also make one 10-minute presentation of an argument about one week's readings, in class. This could be done in conjunction with one of the required essays. ***Students will sign up for a presentation topic during the second week of the course.*** Presentations should ***not*** simply summarize the readings. They should be argumentative, and provide a cogent analysis of a theme relevant to the readings. The presenter should assume that other seminar participants are familiar with the readings.

Finally, students will be graded for participation. Five marks will be assigned based on attendance at class. Only documented medical grounds will be accepted as an explanation of non-attendance. ***I reserve the right to count a student as absent who persistently shows up late for class (i.e., more than 5 minutes after the normal start time).*** Students will lose one per cent of their term grade for each class missed without evidence of such grounds. (If more than five classes are missed, further grades will be deducted). The other ten marks will be based on the quality and quantity of each student's involvement in oral discussions. It is not essential that you be talking all the time. But I do expect each student to make an effort to contribute to each week's seminar discussion. In evaluating this participation, I am particularly interested in the extent to which the oral contribution shows an accurate understanding of the readings, and gives evidence that the student has reflected upon them. Particular emphasis will be attached to each student's contribution during weeks when they are *not* submitting an essay.

Seminar themes and readings:

[1] September 10: Introduction to the Course

[2] September 17: Are welfare states justifiable? How much should the state reduce inequality and poverty?

Milton Friedman. 1962. *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 161-176, 190-195.

John Rawls. 1971. *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press), 11-17, 54-80.

G.A. Cohen. 2001. "Why not Socialism?" in Edward Broadbent, ed., *Democratic Equality* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press.), chapter 4.

Amartya Sen. 1995. *Inequality Reexamined* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), chapter 3.

Section A: Comparing Welfare States in Industrial Societies:

[3] September 24: Welfare State Variations: How do welfare states differ? Why?

Gøsta Esping-Andersen. 1985. "Power and Distributional Regimes," *Politics and Society*, 14 (2): 223-256.

Margarita Estevez-Abe, Torben Iversen and David Soskice. 2001 "Social Protection and the Formation of Skills: A Reinterpretation of the Welfare State," in Peter Hall and Soskice, eds., *Varieties of Capitalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 145-183.

Paul Pierson. 1996. "The New Politics of the Welfare State," *World Politics*, 48 (2): 143-179.

David Rueda. 2005. "Insider-Outsider Politics in Industrialized Democracies: The Challenge to Social Democratic Parties." *American Political Science Review*, 99 (1): 61-74.

[4] October 1: Gender and the Welfare State: When does the welfare state promote equity for women?

Ann Orloff, "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship." 1993. *American Sociological Review*, 58 (3): 303-328.

Cebrian, Immaculada, Maria Davia, Nuria Legazpe and Gloria Moreno. 2019. "Mother's Employment and Child Care Choices Across the European Union." *Social Science Research* 80: 66-82.

Brady, David, Agnes Blome and Julie Kmec. 2020. "Work-Family Reconciliation Policies and Women's and Mothers' Labour Market Outcomes in Rich Democracies." *Socio-Economic Review* 18 (1): 125-161.

Hufkens, Tine, Francesco Figari, Dieter Vandelannoote and Gerlinde Verbist. 2020. "Investing in Subsidized Childcare to Reduce Poverty." *Journal of European Social Policy* 30 (3): 306-319.

[5] October 8: What factors condition support for welfare states and redistribution? Why?

Robert Andersen and Josh Curtis, "Public Opinion on Social Spending in Canada, 1980-2005," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 6.

Keivins, Anthony, Alexander Horn, Carsten Jensen and Kees van Kerbergen. 2018. "Yardsticks of Inequality: Preferences for Redistribution in Advanced Democracies." *Journal of European Social Policy* 28 (4): 402-418.

Koos, Sebastian, and Patrick Sachweh. 2019. "The Moral Economies of Market Societies." *Socio-Economic Review* 17 (4) 793-821.

Thewissen, Stefan, and David Rueda. 2019. "Automation and the Welfare State: Technological Change as a Determinant of Redistributive Preferences." *Comparative Political Studies* 52 (2): 171-208.

[6] October 15: Multiculturalism and Immigration: Does ethno-cultural diversity undermine support for the welfare state?

David Brady and Ryan Finnigan. 2014. "Does Immigration Undermine Public Support for Social Policy?" *American Sociological Review*, vol. 79 (1): 17-42.

Keith Banting, Stuart Soroka and Edward Koning, "Ethnic Diversity and Solidarity: Support for Redistribution in a Multicultural Welfare State," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 7.

Yakter, Alon. 2019. "The Heterogeneous Effect of Diversity: Ascriptive Identities, Class and Redistribution in Developed Democracies." *European Journal of Political Research* 58: 315-340.

Kristian Hansen and Carsten Jensen. 2017. "Politized Coalitions: Social Affinity and the Politics of Redistribution", *Comparative European Politics* 15 (2): 204-219.

[7] October 22: Power Resources Theory: Are welfare states strongly conditioned by the power balance between organized representatives of the working (left parties and unions) and middle/upper (right parties and business) classes?

Korpi, Walter, and Joakim Palme. 2003. "New Politics and Class Politics in the Context of Austerity and Globalization." *American Political Science Review* 97 (3): 425-446.

Savage, Lee. 2019. "The Politics of Social Spending after the Great Recession: The Return of Partisan Policy Making." *Governance* 32: 123-141.

Nijhuis, Dennie Oude. 2020. "Business, Labour and the Costs of Welfare State Development." *Journal of European Social Policy* 30 (1): 20-33.

Brandau, Frank, and Leo Ahrens. 2020. "The Impact of Partisanship in the Era of Retrenchment." *Journal of European Social Policy* 30 (1): 34-47.

[8] October 29: The Welfare State and Happiness: Are ampler welfare states and more equality conducive to greater happiness and well-being?

Christopher Anderson and Jason Hecht. 2015. "Happiness and the Welfare State: Decommmodification and the Political Economy of Subjective Well-Being," in Pablo Beramendi, et al., eds. *The Politics of Advanced Capitalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 357-380.

Schneider, Simone. 2019. "Why Income Inequality is Dissatisfying." *European Sociological Review* 35 (3): 409-430.

Laura Ravazzini, and Florian Chavez-Juarez. 2018. "Which Inequality Makes People Dissatisfied with Their Lives?" *Social Science Indicators* 137: 1119-1143.

Pickett, Kate, and Richard Wilkinson. 2015. "Income Inequality and Health: A Causal Review." *Social Science and Medicine* 128: 315-316.

Section B: Canadian Social Policy and Politics

[9] November 5: Canada's Welfare State: Is it 'Liberal' with 'special characteristics'? How is it Changing?

Keith Banting and John Myles, "Introduction: The Fading of Redistributive Politics," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013), chapter 1.

Jane Jenson, "Historical Transformations of Canada's Social Architecture," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 2.

Rodney Haddow. 2014. "Power Resources and the Canadian Welfare State: Unions, Partisanship and Interprovincial Differences in Inequality and Poverty Reduction," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 47 (4): 717-740.

Alain Noël, "Quebec's New Politics of Redistribution," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 11.

November 12: Reading week; no class.

[10] November 19: Inputs: What changes have occurred in the factors influencing Canada's welfare state since the 1980s? What have been the consequences?

Richard Johnston, "The Party System, Elections and Social Policy," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 8.

Susan Phillips, "Restructuring Civil Society in Canada; Muting the Politics of Redistribution," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 5.

David Good, "The New Bureaucratic Politics of Redistribution," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 9.

William Coleman, "Business, Labour and Redistributive Politics," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 4.

[11] November 26: Outcomes: How much less successful is Canada's welfare state now than in the past in achieving equality? It is because of changes in market income, redistribution, or both?

Miles Corak, "'Inequality is the Root of Social Evil,' or Maybe Not? Two Stories About Inequality and Public Policy." 2016. *Canadian Public Policy* 42 (4): 367-414.

Lars Osberg, *The Age of Increasing Inequality*. 2018. (Toronto: Lorimer), chapter 1.

Rodney Haddow, "Labour Market Income Transfers and Redistribution in Canada," in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 16.

Robin Boadway and Katherine Cuff, “The Recent Evolution of Redistribution in Canada,” in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 14.

[12] December 3: Health Insurance, Public Pensions and Children: What broad design emerged in Canada in these areas during the post-war years? How has it changed recently? Why?

Carolyn Tuohy, “Health Care Policy after Universality: Canada in Comparative Perspective”, in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 12.

John Myles, “Path Dependency and Income Security for Seniors in Canada”, in Banting and Myles, eds., *Inequality and the Fading of Redistribution*, chapter 13.

Peter Burton and Shelley Phipps. 2017. “Economic Well-Being of Canadian Children.” *Canadian Public Policy* 43 (4): 299-330.

MacDonald, Bonnie-Jeanne. 2019. “New Canada Pension Plan Enhancements: What Will They Mean for Canadian Seniors?” *Canadian Public Policy* 45 (4): 403-427.