



Course Book, abbreviated version,

University of Humanistic Studies,
Utrecht, The Netherlands

Welfare State Change and the Redistribution- Recognition Debate

Dr. E. Grootegoed
V. Hölsgens MA
Prof. dr. E. Tonkens

2nd Edition, July 2016

INTRODUCTION

Current Dutch welfare state reform, including the devolution of responsibilities for public tasks from the central government to local governments has a tremendous impact on the execution of public tasks by organizations as well as the professionals and citizens involved. In this course we will first look into what these changes contain within an international context seen from a normative perspective and secondly what these changes mean for different stakeholders in their daily practice.

We will analyze these changes and their consequences in terms of redistribution and recognition. A well-known philosophical debate between Honneth and Fraser on redistribution and recognition will give us insight into these concepts. Another important perspective of this course concerns the emotional consequences of welfare reform: the moral and social complexity of the emotions involved in lived experiences of welfare reform, in terms of feeling and framing rules. Here we build on the work of Arlie Hochschild

Literature

Mandatory reading

Course book Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A political-philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso. 1-189.

Other texts

Aronson, J. (2006) 'Silenced complaint, suppressed expectations: the cumulative effects of home care rationing', *International Journal of Health Services* , 36, 3, 535–56.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). The abdication of the state. & An impossible mission. In: *The weight of the world. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. 181-202.

Clarke, J. & J. Newman (2012). The alchemy of austerity. In: *Critical Social Policy*. 32(3): 299-319.

Cox, R.H. (1998). The consequences of welfare reform: how conceptions of social rights are changing. In: *Journal of Social Policy*. 27(10): 1-16.

Eliasoph, N. (2011). Making volunteers. Chapter 6. Harmless and destructive plug-in volunteers. 117-145.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) Chapter 1. The three political economies of the welfare state. In: *The Three Worlds of Welfare*

Capitalism. Oxford: Polity Press. 9-34.

Grootegoed, E. & Dijk, D., van (2012), The return of the family? Welfare state retrenchment and client autonomy in long-term care. *Journal of Social Policy* 41(4): 677-694.

Hemerijck, A. (2013). Chapter 4. Welfare recalibration as social learning. In: *Changing welfare states*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 118-151.

Karp, D. A., & Tanarugsachock, V. (2000). Mental illness, caregiving, and emotion management. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 6-25.

Leslie, K & Camwell, A (2010) Leadership at all levels: Leading public sector organisations in an age of austerity. *European Management Journal* 28: 297– 305.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). Citizenship and Social Class. In: Manza, J. & M. Sander. (2009). *Inequality and Society: social science perspectives on social stratification*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. 148-154.

Muehlebach, A. (2012). *The moral neoliberal: Welfare and citizenship in Italy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Chapter 2 and 4. 31-52; 103-135.

Rodriquez, Jason. 2014. *Labors of Love: Nursing Homes and the Structures of Care Work*. Introduction + Chapters 3 and 6. New York: NYU Press.

Thompson, S. (2006). *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Introduction and Chapter 5. 1-14;102-126.

Tonkens, E., Grootegoed, E. and Duyvendak, J.W. (2013). Introduction: Welfare State Reform, Recognition and Emotional Labour. *Social Policy and Society*, 12, pp 407-413.

Tonkens, E. (2012). Working with Arlie Hochschild: connecting feelings to social change. In: *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19(2), 194-218.

Webb, S.A. (2010). (Re)Assembling the Left: The Politics of Redistribution and Recognition in Social Work. *The British Journal of Social work*, 40, 2364-2379.

2 COURSE PROGRAMME

2.1 Course Schedule

<i>Week</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Subject</i>	<i>Teacher</i>
1	6-9-2016	12.30 – 17.15	The origins of the welfare state	Dr. E. Grootegoed
2	13-9-2016	12.30 – 17.15	Assessing welfare state change	Dr. E. Grootegoed
3	20-9-2016	12.30 – 17.15	Active citizenship: ideals & practices	V. Hölsgens (MA)
4	27-9-2016	12.30 – 17.15	Executive organizations: care, social work, welfare and labour market integration	Prof. dr. E. Tonkens
5	4-10-2016	12.30 – 17.15	The changing role of professionals	V. Hölsgens (MA)
6	11-10-2016	12.30 – 17.15	Civic initiatives and volunteering	Dr. E. Grootegoed, Prof.dr. E. Tonkens
Autumn break	18-10-2016	--	Self-study	--
7	25-10-2016	12.30 – 17.15	Client (and their 'social networks')	Dr. E. Grootegoed
8	1-11-2016	12.30 – 17.15	Final debate	Dr.E. Grootegoed, Prof.dr. E. Tonkens, V. Hölsgens (MA)
9	8-11-2016	--	Self-study	--
10	18-11-2016		Handing in papers	

DESCRIPTION OF LECTURES

WEEK 1:

The origins of the welfare state

In this introductory week we focus on the history of welfare state foundation and welfare state change. The social transformation of society at the end of the 19th century has led to social security arranged by the state; the beginning of the welfare state. In the post-war period the spending on welfare has grown; a complex system of regulations on social security has been established. During the crisis in the 80's the expenditures in the welfare state became more and more criticized; citizens should rely less on the government and take more responsibility for their own lives. How do these long-term developments relate to the original welfare state?

Reading:

Mandatory:

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) Chapter 1. The three political economies of the welfare state. In: *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Oxford: Polity Press. 9-34.

Marshall, T.H. (1950). Citizenship and Social Class. In: Manza, J. & M. Sander. (2009). *Inequality and Society: social science perspectives on social stratification*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. 148-154.

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. Introduction. London: Verso. 1-5.

Thompson, S. (2006). Introduction. In: *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1-14

Thompson, S. (2006). Chapter 5. Recognition and redistribution. In: *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 102-126.

Recommended

Kappelhof, T. (2007). 'Omdat het historisch gegroeid is.' De Londense Commissie Van Rhijn en de ontwikkeling van de sociale verzekeringen in Nederland (1937-1952). In: *Tijdschrift voor sociale en economische geschiedenis*. 1 [2004]. Nr. 2. 71-91.

Sennett, R. (2003). *Respect in a World of Inequality*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Thompson, S. (2006). Chapter 2-4. Recognition as love/respect/esteem. In: *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 19-100

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 1. Fraser: IV. London: Verso. 49-69.

Cox, R.H. (1998). The consequences of welfare reform: how conceptions of social rights are changing. In: *Journal of Social Policy*. 27(10): 1-16.

Muehlebach, A. (2012). Chapter 2. Ethical Citizenship. In: *The moral neoliberal: Welfare and citizenship in Italy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 31-52.

Tonkens, E. (2012). Working with Arlie Hochschild: connecting feelings to social change. In: *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19(2), 194-218.

WEEK 2:

Assessing welfare state change

How can we analyze welfare state change? How can we characterize transformations, especially in terms of a shifting balance in redistribution and recognition?

We apply these questions to the Dutch welfare state where local governments have acquired many new welfare responsibilities as part of a decentralization process. Since 2015 municipalities are responsible for the execution of the extended Social Support Act, Youth Care and the Participation Act. This emphasis on local welfare comes with many – and sometimes contradictory – promises of increased efficiency and quality. We discuss how we can put this in international comparative perspective and how we can critically assess these recent policy trends, which is also a leading goal for the rest of the course. We also introduce emotion sociology; a theoretical perspective by which we can investigate the various emotional impacts of changing balances of redistribution and recognition.

Reading:

Mandatory:

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 1. Nancy Fraser: I-II. London: Verso, pp. 7-47.

Hemerijck, A. (2013). Chapter 4. Welfare recalibration as social learning. In: *Changing welfare states*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 118-151.

Tonkens, E., Grootegoed, E. and Duyvendak, J.W. (2013). Introduction: Welfare State Reform, Recognition and Emotional Labour. *Social Policy and Society*, 12, pp 407-413.

Recommended:

Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'postsocialist' age. In: *New Left Review*. I/212. 68-93.

Gilbert, N. (2004). Chapter 1. New course or marginal adjustment. In: *Transformation of the Welfare State: The silent surrender of public responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 9-31.

Pierson, P. (1996). The new politics of the welfare state. In: *World Politics*. 48(2): 79-141.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (ed). (2004). New risks, new welfare. The transformation of the European welfare state. Oxford: Oxford University Press

WEEK 3

Active Citizenship: ideals vs. practices.

Recent welfare reform in the Netherlands (and several other Western European countries) has a daily impact on various groups of citizens. This week we compare policy ideals with policy as 'practice', i.e. the lived consequences of welfare state change. It recognizes that policymakers, bureaucratic and managerial gatekeepers, care and welfare professionals, and service users embody policy. How do assumptions made in policies compare to citizen practices and preferences? We focus on the demand for more 'active' citizenship in the Dutch welfare state, where citizens are expected to take more care responsibility for themselves and their social network. We place this in international comparative perspective and question how policies aimed at creating more self-responsible citizens are enacted.

Reading:

Mandatory:

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 1. Fraser: IV. London: Verso. 49-69.

Cox, R.H. (1998). The consequences of welfare reform: how conceptions of social rights are changing. In: *Journal of Social Policy*. 27(10): 1-16.

Muehlebach, A. (2012). Chapter 2. Ethical Citizenship. In: *The moral neoliberal: Welfare and citizenship in Italy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 31-52.

Tonkens, E. (2012). Working with Arlie Hochschild: connecting feelings to social change. In: *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19(2), 194-218.

Recommended:

Gilbert, N. (2004). Chapter 2: Towards the enabling state. In: *Transformation of the Welfare State: The silent surrender of public responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 32-52.

Le Grand, J. (1997). Knights, knaves or pawns? Human behaviour and social policy. In:

Journal of Social Policy. 26(2): 69-149.

Dekker, P. & J. den Ridder. (2013). Meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid in de publieke opinie: wat willen Nederlanders? In: Kampen, Verhoeven & Verplanke (eds). *De affectieve burger*. Amsterdam: Van Genneep. 41-60

Lister, R. (2002). The dilemmas of pendulum politics: balancing paid work, care and citizenship. In: *Economy and Society*. 31(4): 520-532.

Williams, F. (1999). Good enough principles for social welfare. In: *Journal of Social Policy*. 28(4): 667-687.

WEEK 4:

Executive organizations: care, social work, welfare and labour market integration

What does welfare state reform imply for organisations involved, such as organisations for long-term care, welfare, social work, labour market integration? How did these organisations develop over the past decades? How are they organised? Where are they heading now?

From this more general introduction to the role of organisations in the welfare state, we turn to the most recent welfare state reform: the turn to the ‘participation society’ as it is called in Dutch. How do organizations in the public sector handle this transformation? They have to adapt to new policies at a rapid pace and often faced with financial cuts. Further they have to translate these policies to executable tasks for professionals who have to deal with the unruly reality of daily life. What are decisive arguments in choices that have to be made in this process? How can we relate these to the debate on redistribution

Reading:

Mandatory:

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 1. Fraser: V. London: Verso. 69-94.

Clarke, J. & J. Newman (2012). The alchemy of austerity. In: *Critical Social Policy*. 32(3): 299-319.

Leslie, K & Camwell, A (2010) Leadership at all levels: Leading public sector organisations in an age of austerity. *European Management Journal* 28: 297– 305.

Rodriguez, Jason. 2014. Labors of Love: Nursing Homes and the Structures of Care Work. New York: NYU Press. Introduction + Chapter 3 p. 1-20 and 57-76.

Recommended:

Newman, J. et al. (2004). Public participation and collaborative governance. In: *Journal of Social Policy*. 33(2): 203-223.

Aronson, J. (2006). Silenced complaints, suppressed expectations: the cumulative effects of home care rationing. *International Journal of Health Services*, 36(3), 535-556.

Aronson, J. (2006). Silenced complaints, suppressed expectations: the cumulative effects of home care rationing. *International Journal of Health Services*, 36(3), 535-556.

WEEK 5

The changing role of professionals

Professionals have crucial role in the welfare state. As 'street level bureaucrats' they have also been a major object of welfare state criticism: they were criticized for being authoritarian and paternalistic in the 1970s and 1980s, as bureaucratic and rule-bound from the 1990s. Professionals themselves have also complained that welfare state reforms have led to deprofessionalisation and have ruined their professional ethos. In this meeting we try to understand these criticisms, their backgrounds and their impacts. Currents decentralisations can be understood as a reaction to these criticisms. The shift to generalists rather than specialist for example is an attempt to reduce bureaucratisation and augment professional ethos and discretion. How does this work out in practice? How do professionals deal with institutional tensions in the changing welfare state and which moral and emotional dilemmas do they encounter in their daily practice?

Reading:

Mandatory:

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 2. Honneth: I. London: Verso, 110-135.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). The abdication of the state. & An impossible mission. In: *The weight of the world. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*. 181-202.

Rodriguez, Jason. 2014. Labors of Love: Nursing Homes and the Structures of Care Work. New York: NYU Press. Chapter 6, p.115-138.

Webb, S.A. (2010). (Re)Assembling the Left: The Politics of Redistribution and Recognition in Social Work. *The British Journal of Social work*, 40, 2364-2379.

Recommended:

Brochure Welzijn Nieuwe Stijl.

http://www.invoeringwmo.nl/sites/default/documenten/Brochure_WNS.pdf

Ende, T. van den. (2011). Kantelmomenten: over het belang van normatieve professionalisering in het werk. In: *Waarden aan het werk: over kantelmomenten en normatieve complexiteit in het werk van professionals*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij SWP. 30-

40.

Kunneman, H. & M. Slob. (2007). Thuiszorg in transitie: een onderzoek naar de gevolgen van het recente overheidsbeleid voor centrale waarden in de thuiszorg. 1-35

WEEK 6

Civic initiatives and volunteering

What has been and is the role of civic and voluntary organisations in the welfare state? The turn to active citizenship implies rising expectations of these organisations. At the same time, these organisations are independent and should be decided on their policies themselves rather than be instruments of state policy.

What effect does the current policy trend aim at/have on civic initiatives? What new patterns of interaction evolve between civic and voluntary organisations on the one hand and governments on the other hand?

Within the decentralisations civic initiatives are warmly welcomed. Local civic initiatives are believed to be better able to organize care and support since they are closer to clients and less bureaucratic than public institutions. How does this promise of proximity this work out in practice?

Reading:

Mandatory

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 2. Honneth: II. London: Verso. 135-159.

Eliasoph, N. (2011). Making volunteers. Chapter 6. Harmless and destructive plug-in volunteers. 117-145.

Muehlebach, A. (2012). Chapter 4. The production of compassion. In: *The moral neoliberal: Welfare and citizenship in Italy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 103-135.

Recommended:

Bochove, M., I. Verhoeven & S. Roggeveen. (2013). Sterke vrijwilligers, volhardende professionals. Nieuwe verhoudingen door de Wmo. In: Kampen, Verhoeven & Verplanke (eds). *De affectieve burger*. Amsterdam: Van Genneep. 187-203.

Bredewold, F., E. Tonkens & M. Trappenburg. (2013). Wederkerigheid tussen weerbare en kwetsbare burgers. Wat zijn de mogelijkheden en voorwaarden? In: Kampen, Verhoeven & Verplanke (eds). *De affectieve burger*. Amsterdam: Van Genneep. 168-186.

Houwelingen, P. van., A. Boele & P. Dekker. (2014). Burgermacht op eigen kracht? Een brede verkenning van ontwikkelingen in burgerparticipatie. Den Haag: SCP. 1-266.

Stadelmann-Steffen, I. (2011). Social volunteering in welfare states: where crowding out should occur. In: *Political Studies*.59(1). 135-155.

WEEK 7

Clients (and their ‘social networks’)

What meaning does the current policy trend have on people who are dependent on care and support and their neighbours?

Citizens in the new welfare state are expected to take responsibility for their own lives and support each other, instead of ‘passively’ consume services. Social networks will become increasingly important, as citizens are called upon to take care of each other. In contrast to the post-war Welfare state, where new social services were seen as a pathway to freedom and independence from family, now dependency and support from others are viewed as the ‘new ideals’. It means that family members, friends, but also neighbours are called upon to take care of each other, if they cannot take care of themselves. This goes for all citizens, but also for the vulnerable citizens among them, like people with intellectual or psychiatric disabilities, fragile elderly and chronically ill. This raises some pressing questions. Does everyone indeed participate in a social support network? Is everyone capable of supporting others? What sort of help can be provided and asked by various groups (nuclear family, extended kin, friends and neighbours)? What to do when people resist becoming dependent

Reading:

Mandatory:

Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 2. Honneth: III. London: Verso, 160-189.

Aronson, J. (2006) ‘Silenced complaint, suppressed expectations: the cumulative effects of home care rationing’, *International Journal of Health Services*, 36, 3, 535–56.

Karp, D. A., & Tanarugsachock, V. (2000). Mental illness, caregiving, and emotion management. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 6-25.

Grootegoed, E. & Dijk, D., van (2012), The return of the family? Welfare state retrenchment and client autonomy in long-term care. *Journal of Social Policy* 41(4): 677-694.

Recommended:

Bredewold, Tonkens & Trappenburg (2013). Wederkerigheid tussen weerbare en kwetsbare burgers. Wat zijn de mogelijkheden en voorwaarden? In: Kampen, Verhoeven & Verplanke (eds). *De affectieve burger*. Amsterdam: Van Gennep. 168-186.

Danermark, B. & Gellerstedt, L.C. (2004). Social Justice: redistribution and recognition – a non-reductionist perspective on disability. In: *Disability & Society*. 19(4). 339-353.

Balazs, G. (1999). Solitude. In: Bourdieu. *The weight of the world. Social suffering in contemporary society*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 599-605.

Fraser, N. & L. Gordon. (1994). A genealogy of dependency: tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state. In: *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 19(2): 336-309.

Thompson, S. (2006). Chapter 7. Struggles for recognition. & Conclusion. In: *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 159-187.

Tonkens, E. & J.W. Duyvendak. (2013). Een hardhandige affectieve revolutie. In: Kampen, Verhoeven & Verplanke (eds). *De affectieve burger*. Amsterdam: Van Genneep. 233-248.

WEEK 8:

Final debate