

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

*The Canadian Welfare State in Comparative Perspective*  
*Fall 2022*

**Professor:** Rodney Haddow

**Class time:** Thursday, 2 - 4 PM

**Class location:** SS 2114

**Office hours:** Wednesday, 4 PM – 5 PM via zoom; I am also available by appointment at other times. Details of the zoom connection will be provided at the first class. My office is located at 3119 Sydney Smith Hall; but note that the regular office hours will be virtual.

**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).

This text will be available at the U of T bookstore, and elsewhere. Used copies are fine! 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%

*The base for calculating the participation grade will be reduced by 1% for each class missed without medical documentation after the second week of classes. So, for instance, if a student misses three classes after that point, their participation will be marked out of 12, not 15. If that student receives a grade of 80% for participation during the classes attended, their overall participation grade would be  $80 \times .12 = 9.6\%$ . If that student had attended all ten classes after the second week, the figure would be  $80 \times .15 = 12\%$*

**Written and oral assignments:** The most important responsibility for students in the course is to prepare four 4–5-page (undergraduate) or five 5–6-page (graduate) papers, based on the assigned readings. Papers will be double-spaced and submitted in Times Roman 12 pt. font. *There is considerable flexibility regarding which topics you write on, but at least one paper must be submitted by October 27th to comply with the Faculty's course drop deadline (which is November 16<sup>th</sup>).* These essays are expected to accomplish two tasks: [a] they should provide a clear review of the main arguments made by each of the readings assigned for that week; and [b] they should make an

*original argument of their own, 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 the strengths different perspectives. I propose that you address the question listed for your topic on the syllabus.* Needless to say, papers should be written in good Standard English, and with appropriate references to the sources used.

*Essays should be submitted electronically through Quercus by the beginning of class, on the date when their topic will be discussed in the seminar.* Because the seminar discussion should clarify the readings for all participants, it would not be fair to other students 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.

Extensions for assignments will be granted only with acceptable documentation. The preferred options, recognized by the Faculty of Arts and Science, are the following documents:

- *The UofT Verification of Illness or Injury Form.*
- *A Student Health or Disability Related Certificate.*
- *A Letter of Accommodation from Accessibility Services.*
- *A letter from your College Registrar.*

*Normally, students will be required to submit their course assignments to the University's **plagiarism detection tool** website for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their material to be included as source documents in the University's plagiarism detection tool 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 University's plagiarism detection tool service are described on the company web site.*

Possibly in conjunction with one of these essays, each student will also make one ten-minute presentation of their argument in class. Presentations should *not* simply summarize the readings or a submitted essay. 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. *Students will sign up for a presentation during the second week of classes;* there will be a maximum of two presentations per class, unless enrolment is so large as to require more.

*How do I evaluate students in relation to oral participation, which is worth 15% of the final grade? It is not essential that you be talking constantly. But I do expect each student to try 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 a sound 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 8: Introduction to the Course***

### ***[2] September 15: 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. Focus, especially, on pp. 11-13, 60-65, 75 (bottom) & 78-80.

Martha Nussbaum. 2003. "Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice," *Feminist Economics*, 9 (2-3): 33-59.

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

## **Section A: Comparing Welfare States in Industrial Societies:**

### ***[3] September 22: 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] September 29: Gender and the Welfare State: When does the welfare state promote equity for women?***

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

Sylvia Avram and Daria Popova. 2022. "Do Taxes and Transfers Reduce Gender Income Inequality? Evidence from Eight European Welfare States," *Social Science Research*, 102: 1-12.

Rense Nieuwenhuis. 2022. "No activation without reconciliation? The interplay between ALMP and ECEC in relation to women's employment, unemployment and inactivity in 30 OECD countries, 1985-2018," *Social Policy & Administration*, 56 (5): 808-826.

Jennifer L. Hook and Eunjeong Paek. 2020. "National Family Policies and Mothers' Employment: How Earnings Inequality Shapes Policy Effects across and within Countries," *American Sociological Review* 85 (3), 381-416

***[5] October 6: 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.

Silja Hausermann, Michael Pinggera, Macarena Ares and Matthias Enggist. 2022. “Class and social policy in the knowledge economy,” *European Journal of Political Research*, 61: 462–484.

Anthony Kevins, 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.

Stefan Thewissen 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 13: 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.

Gabriele Magni. 2021. “Economic Inequality, Immigrants and Selective Solidarity: From Perceived Lack of Opportunity to In-group Favoritism,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 51: 1357–1380.

Brian Burgoon and Matthijs Rooduijn. 2021. “‘Immigrationization’ of welfare politics? Anti-immigration and welfare attitudes in context,” *West European Politics* 44 (2): 177-203.

***[7] October 20: Power Resources Theory: Are welfare states and redistribution (still) strongly conditioned by the power balance between organized representatives of the working (left parties and unions) and middle/upper (right parties and business) classes?***

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

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

Jingjing Huo. 2019. “Left Partisanship and Top Management Pay in Affluent Capitalist Democracies,” *Social Forces*, 98 (1) 93–118

Oyvind Soraas Skorge and Magnus Bergli Rasmussen. 2022. “Volte-Face on the Welfare State: Social Partners, Knowledge Economies and the Expansion of Work-Family Policies,” *Politics and Society*, 50 (2): 222-254.

**[8] October 27: Radical right parties have emerged as a major political force in many countries. How have they affected welfare states (or how will they)?**

Juliana Chueri. 2021. "Social policy outcomes of government participation by radical right parties," *Party Politics*, 27 (6): 1092-1104.

Matthias Enggist and Michael Pinggera. 2022. "Radical right parties and their welfare state stances – not so blurry after all?" *West European Politics*, 45 (1): 102-128.

Zhen Jie Im. 2021. "Welfare chauvinism in times of labour market segmentation: how different employment contracts moderate the impact of welfare chauvinism on support for radical right parties," *Comparative European Politics*, 19: 94–116.

Marius R. Busemeyer, Philip Rathgeb and Alexander H. J. Sahm. 2022. "Authoritarian values and the welfare state: the social policy preferences of radical right voters," *West European Politics*, 45 (1): 77–101.

## **Section B: Canadian Social Policy and Politics**

**[9] November 3: 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 10:** Reading week; no class.

**[10] November 17: 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 24: 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 1: 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.

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