Master year 2017-2018

Examiner: Dr. E. Grootegoed

Course Book
Redistribution and Recognition in the Changing Welfare State

Authors: Dr. Ellen
                        Grootegoed
                        Prof. dr. Evelien
                        Tonkens
                        Jante Schmidt, M.A.

3rd Edition, July 2017

Content

INTRODUCTION

This course forms together with Education 2 and Research 2 the core of the second year of the master Humanistic Studies. It gives a deepening of the knowledge gained in Organization 1. Organization 2 is a concretization of Organization 1 as it focuses on the organization of social solidarity in the welfare state.

Graduates of Humanistic Studies are likely to work in the public sector as policy officers, management consultants, trainers, counsellors or researchers. Pastoral work or spiritual guidance also forms part of public sector work, e.g. in hospitals or palliative care. Therefore, an understanding of the developments in the public sector is essential. That is why we focus on the origins and development of social policy within developed welfare states, with a particular focus on the Netherlands.

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 will give us insight into these two key concepts and its relation to the welfare state and its solidarity principles. 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), which is studied through a sociological lens.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION MASTER HUMANISTIC STUDIES

The three-year Master degree program in Humanistic Studies focuses on professional development and Chaplaincy competences for Humanistic Counselling. We refer to Humanistic Counselling in a broad sense: in addition to World View- based counselling abilities, students also develop educational competencies and acquire knowledge and skills in the fields of organizational – and policy studies. After all, Humanistic Counsellors are expected to work within organizations (Care, Defence Force and Justice Department) where they are also expected to carry out educational tasks (e.g. in the field of Ethics). Furthermore, the field of Humanistic Counselling demands a contemporary orientation to World View based professions and Chaplaincy. Humanistic Counselling prepares students to work in diverse professional fields, including those beyond traditional institutional frameworks. The University of Humanistic Studies aims to educate students who become professionals who are specialized in addressing existential and ethical problems in divergent social contexts, including scientific research.

1 COURSE INFORMATION

1.1 General content information

Course Title: Redistribution and recognition in the changing welfare state
Course code: 2-OR20
Ephorus hand-in code[1] : 2-OR20
http://www.uvh.nl/mijnuvh/voorzieningen-a- z/inleveren-werkstukken
Year: 2017-2018
Period: I
Credits: 7,5 (EC, European Credit system)
Part of: Master in Humanistic Studies
Target group: Master
Mandatory for: Master of Humanistics students
Foreknowledge: 1-OR10 *Organisatie 1*, Basics of Organisation Studies

NB Completion of this course is a prerequisite for attending the next educational components: none.

Examiner/teacher: Dr. Ellen Grootegoed
Room: 2.16
Tel. / e-mail: 030- 2390134 / e.grootegoed@uvh.nl
Subjects: Welfare state reform and long-term care

Teacher: Prof. dr. Evelien Tonkens
Room: 2.15
Tel. / e-mail: 030 - 239 01 83/ e.tonkens@uvh.nl
Subjects: Citizenship and humanization of the public sector; welfare state reform

Teacher: Jante Schmidt, MA
Room: 0.16
Tel./ e-mail: 030 - 239 01 13 / J.Schmidt@UvH.nl
Subjects: Welfare state policies and human dignity

---

[1] Ephorus: security, privacy and copyright: How uses Ephorus your files and personal information, please view: (in English) www.ephorus.com, (in Dutch) www.ephorus.com/nl/faq.

1.2 Examination fraud and plagiarism

The UvH pays special attention to fraud and plagiarism. A finished paper must be delivered via mijnuvh.nl using a specific Ephorus delivery code (see 1.1. General Information). The text will be screened automatically and placed in the personal file of the examiner. Plagiarism would be the use of quotes, texts, illustrations and opinions of others without referring to the original source, whereby it appears as your own work. These matters are viewed as serious misuse of academic practice, because it makes fair grading of your own efforts impossible. Fraud and plagiarism is also considered an unjust act against your fellow students. Matters of fraud and plagiarism will not be taken lightly. Sanctions can be as harsh as exclusion from UvH degree programs in general. For more information see: http://mijn.uvh.nl/onderwijs/examencommissie/tentamenfraude-en-plagiaat.(Dutch only). More information about how to write a paper see: http://mijn.uvh.nl/onderwijs/master (Dutch only)

1.3 Aims and learning objectives

After successful completion of the course *2-OR2 The Welfare State and the Redistribution-Recognition Debate* students are able to:

1. Define the characteristics of a welfare state and identify different welfare regimes
2. Describe the history and features of main social policies of the Dutch welfare state, including its recent changes
3. Interpret and discuss current Dutch welfare state reform in terms of recognition and redistribution
4. Evaluate the impact of recent Dutch welfare state reform on organizations, professionals and clients, using a sociological perspective
2. Make an original contribution to the redistribution-recognition debate, centered on a specific social problem and/or social policy.

This course contributes to the following general Learning Outcomes of the Master Degree in Humanistic Studies:

1. Knowledge and understanding of foundational concepts of humanistic studies
3. Knowledge and understanding of normative professionalization
7. General academic skills and attitude
9. Knowledge of the work sphere / professional practice

1.4   Format and weekly study load

Format:
There is a mixed format with lectures, guest lectures and student participation. The participation of students includes individual tasks, group work, peer review and self-study.
The structure of the format is the same every week. The first three hours are plenary sessions, wherein we start with lectures on the weekly theme, occasionally followed by a guest lecture from someone active in the field.

The third hour is devoted to student's presentations, wherein they critically discuss the literature of the week. After this we have two hours of workgroups; the first hour we will discuss the literature; the second hour is reserved for working on your paper.

*Total study load (*in Dutch: *studiebelastingsuren, SBU):*

Activity:	Hours:
Class activities (lecture, other activities)	48 (4,8H per week)
Preparation seminar, self-study	91,5 (9,2H per week)
Preparation paper	70,5 (7H per week)
Total Study load:	**210 (average 21 per week)**

Calculation of reading load:

The reading varies, including philosophical and social-scientific texts as well as policy texts. On average, the reading will take 7 pages per hour. Students are supposed to work 21 hours per week, of which 4 hours are dedicated to the class, 17 to reading, preparation of the weekly presentation and the writing of the paper.

1.5. Examination

Prerequisites: *structural attendance, active involvement*

Active participation, i.e. active preparation of the classes, as well as active, structural attendance, is required. It is expected that students read all weekly literature prior to the weekly classes; lectures and work groups build on this knowledge. We regard attendance as an individual responsibility yet expect that students meet obligations towards one another: providing extensive, constructive peer feedback on papers, preparing for workgroups including the weekly exercises, listening and providing productive feedback to student presentations. Structural attendance and active involvement is beneficial for all, as it enhances the quality of the classes, student interaction and learning curves.

Exam

(1) Scientific paper (75%) – *final version due at the end of the course [14 November]*

Students are assigned to write a scientific paper wherein they show proof of understanding of the course literature. Students may choose a topic of their own interest which allows them to critically discuss welfare state policies and welfare state change. The paper must at least entail the following ingredients:
- It must discuss a social problem and/or social policy
- The theme must be placed in a historical and/or internationally comparative context
- Connects the course handbook, and minimally 5 other texts of the course literature to self-sought literature that is specifically centered on one's topic
- The main research question is either philosophical or sociological
- Includes (an attempt to make) an original contribution to the redistribution-recognition debate
- **Min. 4000 and max. 5000 words** (including notes and figures; excluding references)

In the beginning of the course, students will be paired to allow for continuous peer feedback on work-in-progress. Continuous peer feedback will help students to keep on track, and develop their analyses and writing skills. Peer grading is used to evaluate each other's work(-in-progress).

(2) Group presentation (25%) – follows a weekly schedule

On a weekly basis, students are responsible to give a presentation. In the first week, a schedule is made. The weekly presentation is much more than a summary of the literature. Rather, students are assigned to critically review the literature and compare different authors and viewpoints in relation to an overriding empirical and/or philosophical question. Students find additional materials needed to address a particular theme, for example scientific articles, newspaper articles, videos, policy papers. They take a standpoint in answering their own question, after which they invite students to engage in the debate. The students lead the debate and round off the discussion with a final reflection.

Altogether the presentation **minimally lasts 30 minutes, and maximally 35**, of which **at least 10 minutes debate** (plenary or in smaller groups)

Directly following the presentation, students give oral feedback to the presenters on the quality of their presentation, and fill in an evaluation form. Grades are made

known at the end of the course. If the presentation does not meet the minimal quality standards, students receive an alternative, written assignment.

Exam deadlines

Exam:	Individual paper
Exam Content:	see above
Exam Deadline:	**14 November** 2017 before midnight
Re-sit Deadline:	**29 January** 2018 before 13.00 in the afternoon
	This second date is only possible if the paper has been handed in on 14 November 2017 before midnight by email to the teachers. Non-compliance with either the exam or re-sit date means that the student has opted to redo the whole course the following year or, if not, then forfeit the course.
Grading:	Grading based on scale from 1 to 10.
Result Date	3 weeks after the exam.
Feedback	on paper and by appointment

Feedback
In this course there will be both *formative* and *summative* feedback. *Formative* feedback is given during the classes and aims at increasing insights in the student's learning process after the "short communication events". The *summative* feedback is given at the end of the course not just as feedback on the group paper and your individual paper, but also as feedback on your contribution to the research group. A comment will be written once the paper has been evaluated. Personal feedback is possible by appointment

Re-sit of previous academic year

For those student that have to do a re-sit the following applies:
- Structural attendance is also required for re-sitters
- Satisfactory grades for last years' assignments are kept
- As the course design has altered, a re-sit must be done as following:
    o The presentation assignment replaces last years' "empirical paper"
    o The paper assignment replaces last years' "theoretical paper"

1.6. Grading Criteria

General writing skills for papers are:
1 – The object of research must be clearly formulated and properly delimited

2 – The argument must be logical and clear
3 – Conclusions must follow from the argument
4 – Critical reflection about the subject of research must be explicit
5 – Concepts and language must be clear
6 – Reference system used is: APA

Specific criteria for the paper related to the course aims:
1 – The paper shows an adequate understanding of the issue or literature.
2 – The subject of research is adequately embedded in existing scholarly literature and course literature
3 – Different perspectives are addressed in a clarifying way
4 – The student develops his/her own independent perspective
5 – The relevance of the subject of research is addressed from the beginning

1.7 Literature

Mandatory reading

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

Other texts (in chronological order)

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompon, S. (2006) Chapter 6: Recognition and democracy. Pp. 128-158. In: Thompson, S., The political theory of recognition.

Stephen Hilgartner , and Charles L. Bosk , "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model," *American Journal of Sociology* 94, no. 1 (Jul., 1988): 53-78.

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.

Fraser N and Gordon L (1994) A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 19(2): 309-36.

Hochschild, A (2016) Preface, pp. ix-xii. And chapter 10: The team player: loyalty above all. Pp.153-167. In: Strangers in their own land. The New Press: New York.

Thompson, S. (2006). Chapter 7. Struggles for recognition. In: *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction.* Cambridge: Polity Press. 159-185.

Cox RH (1998) The consequences of welfare reform: how conceptions of social rights

are changing. Journal of Social Policy 27(10): 1–16.

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.

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

Clare, S. (*2005*). *Finding dignity* in *dirty work*: The *constraints* and *rewards* of *low-wage home care labor*. Sociology of Health and Illness, 27(6), 831-854.

Knijn, T. and M. Kremer (1997), 'Gender and the caring dimension of welfare states: toward inclusive citizenship', *Social Politics. International Studies in Gender, State and Society,* 4: 328-361.

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

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

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.

Forst, R. (2010) First Things First. Redistribution, Recognition and Justification. *European Journal of Political Theory*, Vol. 6(3): 291-304.

1.8 Quality assurance

The UvH values the continual enhancement of the quality of teaching and learning experiences of students (in individual courses as well as in its comprehensive programme). For this purpose, all courses are evaluated by a range of complementary ways:

- A oral evaluation half way through each course; by students and staff (see schedule)
- A written evaluation at the conclusion of the course; during its final class meeting or after the exam
- A final evaluation of the entire quarterly period; dialogue with student cohort representatives (StuF) and the Director of Education, Anja Machielse.

Four weeks after students hand in their written course evaluations, a comprehensive report is submitted to the office of Student Affairs. A summary of quantitative data of each course evaluation will be published on the intranet for students. A full evaluation report, including

responses to open ended questions, will be sent to all involved academic staff, the Director of Education, the Academic Programme Committee and the involved Head of Department. The combined feedback serves as a basis to improve the quality of the course as taught in the following academic year. Student feedback is also considered in the performance appraisal of academic staff.

Quality assurance encompasses much more, including alumni reports, comprehensive evaluations of degree programmes/academic year programmes, as well as the National Student Survey. For more information, see the intranet or contact Quality Assurance Officer Sophie Wils (room 0.07, s.wils@uvh.nl, Mon-Tues-Thurs).

1.9 Recordings of Educational Activities

Recordings (audio and/or visual) of lectures and other educational activities are only permitted after explicit approval by involved academic staff or the Director of Education. The academic staff/Director of Education may also pose certain conditions or withhold permission to use these recordings. Sharing any recordings with others is not allowed, unless the involved academic staff and/or the Director of Education gave prior permission.

1.10 Intellectual property educational materials

The intellectual property of all educational materials used in lectures, tutorials and other educational activities as shown through a beamer, or posted on the Electronic Learning Environment, rests with the University.

1.11 Student Counsellor

Students can make an appointment with Student Counsellor Hielke Bosma to confidentially discuss personal – and/or study-related problems. Hielke Bosma is available on Mondays and Thursdays between 09h00 and 17h00 in room 0.09. On both days he is also available without a prior appointment, between 12h00 and 14h00. To schedule an appointment, he can be contacted by mail: h.bosma@uvh.nl, or telephonically: 030-2390161.

2 COURSE PROGRAMME

2.1 Course Schedule

Week	Date	Time	Subject	Teacher
1	5-9-2017	12.30 – 17.15	The path to social justice: recognition and/or redistribution?	Dr. E. Grootegoed, Prof. dr. E. Tonkens
2	12-9-2017	12.30 – 17.15	Pursuing social justice: the politics or representation	Prof.dr. E.Tonkens
3	19-9-2017	12.30 – 17.15	Pursuing social justice: the role of the welfare state	Dr. E. Grootegoed, Prof.dr. E. Tonkens
4	26-9-2017	12.30 – 17.15	Welfare dependency and human dignity	Jante Schmidt (MA),
5	3-10-2017	12.30 – 17.15	The Dutch welfare state in transition	Dr. E. Grootegoed/ Prof. dr. E. Tonkens/
6	10-10-2017	12.30 – 17.15	Social policy: (in)formal care labour	V. Hölsgens (MA)
Autumn break	17-10-2017	--	Self-study	--
7	24-10-2017 **23-10-2017**	12.30 – 17.15	Social policy: schemes for care recipients **Handing in draft paper**	Dr. E. Grootegoed,

8	31-10-2017	12.30 – 17.15	Final debate: recognition, redistribution or both? **Draft paper review**	Participants TBA, chaired by Prof.dr. E. Tonkens
9	7-11-2017	--	Self-study	--
10	**14-11-2017**		**Handing in paper**	

2.2 DESCRIPTION OF LECTURES

<u>**WEEK 1**</u>

<u>Tuesday 5 September 2017</u>
12.30 – 17.15 h.
Dr. E Grootegoed & Prof. dr. E. Tonkens

The path to social justice: recognition and/or redistribution?

In this introductory week, we familiarize ourselves with the recognition-redistribution debate, most prominently led by Nancy Fraser and Axel Honneth. Based upon the mandatory literature for week 1, we discuss our common understanding of Fraser's two-dimensional approach to social justice. What does redistributive justice entail, and how does it relate to (mis)recognition, according to Fraser's theory? We discuss the strengths and possible criticisms of Fraser's theory, including the opposing view of Axel Honneth (whose writings we will read in the following weeks) that recognition is the main ingredient of social justice.

Second, we discuss an article by Mills about 'sociological imagination', which encourages students and scholars to be good craftsmen. Since the main course assignment consists of an individual project (scientific paper), we encourage you from week 1 on to develop your own interests and critical reflection on the recognition-redistribution debate.

Reading   **Mandatory**

 Main course book:

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

Fraser, N. (2003) Chapter 1: pages 7-48. In: Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. Introduction. London: Verso.

Other mandatory reading:

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sociologist Mills encourages students and scholars alike to engage in social scientific research as a "good craftsman", by developing and using sociological imagination. The main assignment of this course is the writing of an individual paper: use Mills' ideas to develop your interests starting from week 1.

Emp. workgroup

A schedule is made for the weekly presentations, partners are given for the peer review and the weekly literature and course outline is further discussed.

WEEK 2

Tuesday 12 September 2017
12.30 – 17.15 h.
Prof. dr. E. Tonkens & Dr. F. Bredewold

Pursuing social justice: the politics or representation

In the second week we discuss the political dimension of social justice, in particular the debate on the definition of social problems. When and how does a private problem become a public problem requiring a collective response? What role does politics play in the recognition of needs of citizens? How can we tie Fraser's (guidelines for deliberation, p. 86-88) and Honneth's (participatory self-rule) idea of (routes to) representational justice to the reality of the limited carrying capacities of public arenas? Which needs are seen, and which needs are (potentially) overlooked?

Reading   **Mandatory**

Main course book: Fraser, N. Chapter 1: pages 48-94. In: Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange.

Other mandatory reading:

Thompon, S. (2006) Chapter 6: Recognition and democracy. Pp. 128-158. In: Thompson, S., The political theory of recognition.

Stephen Hilgartner , and Charles L. Bosk , "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model," *American Journal of Sociology* 94, no. 1 (Jul., 1988): 53-78.

This paper develops a model of the process through which social problems rise and fall. Treating public attention as a scarce resource, the model emphasizes competition and selection in the media and other arenas of public discourse.

Recommended reading: Fraser, N (1989) Talking about Needs: Interpretive Contests as Political Conflicts in Welfare-State Societies Ethics 99 (2): 291-313.

Fraser introduces the concept of "needs talk" within the context of a welfare state to illustrate how groups and individuals struggle for the recognition of their rights and interests within dominant political discourses.

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

WEEK 3

Pursuing social justice: the role of the welfare state

Tuesday 19 September 2017
12.30 – 17.15 h.
Dr. E. Grootegoed & Dr. E. Tonkens

In the third week we discuss the role of the welfare state in advancing social justice. We begin by asking ourselves: What is a welfare state? And what are its functions? To address these basic yet important questions, we discuss the history of welfare state foundation. We use the redistribution and recognition debate and Esping-Andersen's welfare state typology, to address variations in welfare regimes that are connected to different conceptions of social justice and citizenship ideals. We discuss how the Dutch welfare state can be typified.

Mandatory reading

Main course book:	Honneth, A. (2003). Chapter 2: pages 110-159. In: Fraser & Honneth, Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. London: Verso.
Other mandatory reading:	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.
	Esping-Andersen is a classic author on the comparative analysis of welfare states. In this chapter he discerns three types of welfare regimes (which have since then been debated and/or extended in the literature) and discusses its main principles of social justice.
Recommended reading	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.
	Kappelhof, T. (2007). 'Omdat het historisch gegroeid is.' De Londense Commissie Van Rhijn en de ontwikkeling van de socia- le verzekeringen in Nederland (1937-1952). In: *Tijdschrift voor sociale en economische geschiedenis*. 1 [2004]. Nr. 2. 71-91.
Exercise of the week:	Bring a newspaper article to the workgroup in which the responsibilities of the (Dutch) welfare state are discussed in relation to ideas of social justice, and analyze its arguments using the weekly literature.
Emp. Workgroup:	Next to the weekly literature, students discuss possible topics for their individual papers

WEEK 4

Tuesday 26 September 2017
12.30 – 17.15 h.
J. Schmidt (MA) & Dr. F. Bredewold

Welfare dependency and human dignity

The welfare state is a key social institution which applies principles of how to achieve a just and fair society. Social policy

can advance a parity of participation, to speak in Fraser's terms, but it can also create negative stigma's of "welfare dependency". We discuss the general discourse of dependence in the welfare state, with particular attention to "it feels" to receive public support. We use examples from the USA to illustrate how the recognition of citizens' needs is tied to discourses of (a lack of) self-respect.

Mandatory reading

Main course book: Honneth, A. (2003). Chapter 2: pages: 160-189. In: Fraser & Honneth. Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. London: Verso.

Other mandatory reading: Fraser N and Gordon L (1994) A genealogy of dependency: Tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 19(2): 309-36.

Dependency, and the reduction of dependency, has become a key word in recent care and welfare policy. This article describes how welfare dependency has gained new meanings over time in the USA. The article is highly relevant as the disappearance of the "good" welfare dependence is salient in other countries too.

Hochschild, A (2016) Preface, pp. ix-xii. And chapter 10: The team player: loyalty above all. Pp.153-167. In: Strangers in their own land. The New Press: New York.

Thompson, S. (2006). Chapter 7. Struggles for recognition. In: *The Political Theory of Recognition: A critical introduction.* Cambridge: Polity Press. 159-185. Discusses Honneth's link between social (in)justice and feelings.

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

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.

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

Emp. workgroup: Writing tips are given for the paper, and students work on their research question.

<u>**WEEK 5**</u>

<u>Tuesday 3 October 2017</u>
12.30 – 17.15 h.
Prof. dr. Evelien Tonkens, dr. E. Grootegoed & dr. F. Bredewold

The Dutch welfare state in transition

This week we apply the redistribution/recognition debate to events closer to home: we discuss the general trends in recent policy reform in de Dutch welfare state, of which most prominently the greater emphasis on 'active' citizenship. Since 2007, many care and welfare responsibilities have been devolved from national to local authorities. Since 2015 municipalities are responsible for the execution of the extended Social Support Act, Youth Care and the Participation Act (the "3 Decentralisations"). This emphasis on local welfare comes with many – and sometimes contradictory – promises of increased efficiency and quality. One of the key changes is that citizens are expected to take more care responsibility for themselves and their social network. Whilst informal care seemingly receives more recognition, it is often felt as merely a lip service, without sufficient monetary support. Theoretically, we discuss whether this recent turn to active citizenship leads to more recognition (claims) as Fraser and Tonkens et al. argue.

Reading   **Mandatory**

Main course book: Fraser, N. Chapter 3: Pages 198-233. In: Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. 2.Honneth: I. London: Verso, 110-135.

Other mandatory reading: Cox RH (1998) The consequences of welfare reform: how conceptions of social rights are changing. Journal of Social Policy 27(10): 1–16.
As we witness a shift from public to private care and welfare

responsibilities in most welfare states, Cox analytically reviews its effects on how conceptions of social rights.

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. This article argues that it is important to study how citizens are affected emotionally by social policy reforms, as an indicator of experiences of human (in)dignity *(NB: to what extent do you agree with the authors' standpoint on the shifting balance between redistribution and recognition?)*

Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'postsocialist' age. In: *New Left Review*. I/212. 68-93.
Fraser argues that there is reason to believe that recognition is fast becoming the paradigmatic form of political conflict in the late twentieth century, and that it potentially displaces displaces socioeconomic redistribution as the remedy for injustice and the goal of political struggle.

Recommended reading:

Gilbert, N. (2004). Chapter 1+2. In*: Transformation of the Welfare State: The silent surren- der of public responsibility.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 9-52.

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 verantwoordelijk-heid in de publieke opinie: wat willen Nederlanders? In: Kampen, Verhoeven & Verplanke (eds). *De affectieve burger*. Amsterdam: Van Gennep. 41-60

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

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

Emp. work group   Paper: Send two A4 plan for your paper, including problem analysis, aims and research question, and the literature you wish to seek and/or use, to your peer before 29 September 2017, 17.00pm and bring to class. Peers read the concept before the start of the class, and give oral feedback in class.

WEEK 6

<u>Tuesday 10 October 2017</u>
12.30 – 17.15 h.
Dr. V. Holsgens & Dr. F. Bredewold

Social policy: (in)formal care labour

Care is a fundamental need in society, as we are all interdependent. People with a disability or long-term illness have a structural need for care, which can be supplied by professional carers and/or informal carers. Care work is tied to questions of inclusive citizenship, especially given its low societal rewards. Gender plays an important role in the analysis of the status of caring, as women are usually overrepresented in care work. Using the H&F debate, we analyse the dignity of care work, and the daily experiences of (mis)recognition of those performing it. We discuss the recent emphasis on social care a 'natural' aspect of intimate, social relations (informal care/mantelzorg & vrijwilligerszorg) rather than an key task of the welfare state. You are invited to argue if and how the position of carers would benefit or not from specific redistributive principles and/or recognition measures.

Reading   **Mandatory**

Main course book:
Honneth. Chapter: 4: 237-265. In: Fraser, N. & Honneth, A. (2003). Redistribution or Recognition? A political-Philosophical Exchange. London: Verso.

Other mandatory reading:
Clare, S. (*2005*). *Finding dignity* in *dirty work*: The *constraints* and *rewards* of *low-wage home care labor*. Sociology of Health and Illness, 27(6), 831-854.

This article questions how care workers derive meaning from their work in a time when care work is increasingly low-paid, and its professionalism heavily debated.

Knijn, T. and M. Kremer (1997), 'Gender and the caring dimension of welfare states: toward inclusive citizenship', *Social Politics. International Studies in Gender, State and Society,* 4: 328-361.

The authors review how care is tied to citizenship, and argue that the way modern welfare states have shaped needs and rights of caregivers and care receivers contributes to gender inequality in citizenship rights.

Recommended reading:

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

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.

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 Gennep. 187-203.

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

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.

Exercise of the week:

Closely read the "Handreiking mantelzorgwaardering" and argue if and how the proposed measures mirror recognitional or redistributive accounts of social justice, and how you evaluate

them, using H+F and the weeks' literature.
[https://www.mezzo.nl/uploads/content/file/Handreiking%20waarde](https://www.mezzo.nl/uploads/content/file/Handreiking%20waarderen%20van%20mantelzorgers.pdf)
[ren%20van%20mantelzorgers.pdf](https://www.mezzo.nl/uploads/content/file/Handreiking%20waarderen%20van%20mantelzorgers.pdf)

Guest Lectures   Cora Postema, "Sprekende Mantelzorger"

Cora is door haar langdurige inzet als mantelzorger ervaringsdeskundige binnen ons complexe zorgstelsel. Zij stelt met de nodige humor en relativering heel wat zwakke plekken en taboes aan de orde. Waarom hebben we alles zo geregeld? Hoe centraal staat de cliënt nu echt en wie heeft de regie over een mensenleven binnen de zorg? Met Cora wordt een discussie op scherp gesteld maar deze scherpte leidt ook tot praktische oplossingen en een menselijkere zorg.

Paper progress   Define which course texts you can use for your paper, and what added literature you will seek

WEEK 7

Tuesday 24 October 2017
12.30 – 15.15 h.
Dr. E. Grootegoed & Dr. F. Bredewold

Social policy: schemes for care recipients

This week we turn to the other side of the care chain: the receiving end. We discuss how welfare state policies and recent reforms impact the daily lives of people with a disability or long-term care need. From a client perspective we discuss how care needs receive (mis)recognition and/or face (mal)distribution, and what this does to feelings of self-esteem and self-respect. We discuss if and how disability or illness can shape one's identity, also in the struggle for individual and/or collective recognition of one's care needs, one's autonomy and/or one's talents. The discussion is closely tied to the recently enacted Wmo (2015) which seeks to stress disabled and elderly people's self-sufficiency, and de-medicalize care to achieve their participation on a par.

Reading   **Mandatory**

Main course book
Completed

Other mandatory reading:

Danermark, B. & Gellerstedt, L.C. (2004). Social Justice: redistribution and recognition – a non-reductionist perspective on disability. In: *Disability & Society*. 19(4). 339-353.
The purpose of this article is to present some recent contributions to discussions on social justice and recognition in the context of disability research.

Aronson, J. (2006). Silenced complaints, suppressed expectations: the cumulative effects of home care rationing. *International Journal of Health Services*, *36*(3), 535-556.
This Canadian study reveals how elderly people silence their complaints about insufficient home care.

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.
This article shows how in the Dutch welfare state, there is an increased emphasis on informal care, with far-reaching consequences for the experienced autonomy of cares receivers.

Recommended reading   Andersen, J. and Honneth, A. (2005) Autonomy, Vulnerability, Recognition, and Justice In: Autonomy, and the challenges of liberalism: new essays, ed. John Philip Christman and Joel Anderson. Cmabridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 127-149.

McLaughlin, J. et al. (ed) (2011) Contesting Recognition. Chapters 2 (disability and the pitfalls of recognition) & 8 (the paradox of recognition: success or stigma for children with learning disabilities). NY, Palgrave Macmillan.

Guest Lecture   Yvonne Lammertink
Yvonne Lammertink, UvH alumna, heeft de progressieve spierziekte SMA en is rolstoelgebonden. Ze is fysiek gezien volledig afhankelijk van de zorg van anderen. In haar dagelijks leven is ze bestuurslid van Per Saldo en heeft haar eigen bedrijf: http://www.ilonk.nl/over-ilonk. Als geen ander kan Yvonne vertellen over de impact van een fysieke beperking op haar leven, mede in de context van veranderende wetten en regelgeving. Ze zal reflecteren op de humaniserende en de-humaniserende werking van de transities in het sociaal domein, alsook wat volwaardig burgerschap voor haar betekent.

Empirical work group: "Hand in your draft paper, including all required elements, by …?? to your peer, so that he/she has to to review it before class based on the standard assessment form.

WEEK 8

Final Debate: recognition, redistribution or both?

Tuesday 31 October 2017
12.30 – 17.15 h.
Chaired by
Prof.dr. E.Tonkens

This final week we have two important aims: First, we review the redistribution-recognition debate in the context of the welfare state, by invited both students and UvH colleagues to present their concluding thoughts on whose view they favor and why. In the discussion, we focus on Fraser's dialogic approach versus Honneth's monologic approach to social justice Moreover, we discuss the importance of representation in achieving social justice, based on this week's literature. We use Forst's and Hilgartner's article to review if and how H+F's theories can be enriched to do justice to the analysis of recognition claims in political arenas with limited space for social problems. A panel of judges may decide whose argumentation they find most convincing.

Second, students receive the written peer feedback on their draft paper, and discuss it in-class with their peer, and teacher, to see if and what changes are necessary for a good result.

Reading   **Mandatory**

Forst, R. (2010) First Things First. Redistribution, Recognition and Justification. *European Journal of Political Theory*, Vol. 6(3): 291-304.

Differing both from Fraser's 'twodimensional' view of 'participatory parity' and from Honneth's 'monistic' theory of recognition, the article argues for a third view of 'justificatory monism and diagnostic-evaluative pluralism', also called the 'first-things-first' approach.

WEEK 9

Tuesday 7 November 2017
Study week – preparation of the final paper

WEEK 10

<u>Tuesday 14 November 2017</u>
Exam: Handing in papers before midnight, via both **email** and **Ephorus**. A **hard copy** must be handed in as well, this may be done the next day (15 November) before 17.00, in the mailbox of examiner Ellen Grootegoed or alternatively Femmianne Bredewold.

<u>Monday 29 January 2018</u>
Re-sit: Handing in papers via mail, Ephorus **before 13.00 in the afternoon,** hardcopy the same day before 17.00.

APPENDICES

I: End terms Master Humanistic Studies
The aims and objectives of the program are:

1. *Knowledge and understanding of foundational concepts of humanistic studies*
   The graduate has thorough knowledge of and insight into the foundational concepts of humanistic studies (meanings of life and humanisation), and also of relevant perspectives on these concepts, which are provided by the different academic fields and disciplines. The graduate is able to compare and engage these perspectives and apply them to current debates and practical issues within the professional fields relating to humanistic studies and to socio-political developments.

2. *Knowledge and skills concerning worldviews and ethics*
   Besides extensive knowledge of humanist traditions and humanism as a cultural and social movement and practice, the graduate also has broad knowledge of contemporary religions (esp. Christianity and Islam), religious and philosophical traditions, modern systems of meaning and contemporary ethics; is familiar with historical and current debates on the place and meaning of these worldviews in a modern, secular society; is able to develop a vision on the complexity and diversity of today's society and the globalized context in which it evolves; is able to engage in dialogues with diverse groups on themes relating to ethics and meaning and connect these dialogues with perspectives from humanism and humanist studies.

3. *Knowledge and understanding of normative professionalization*
   The graduate has thorough knowledge of theories contributing to the body of thought on normative professionalization, the historical and ethical backgrounds of this concept, its social relevance and important related themes. The graduate also understands the role of (self)reflection and the nature of moral learning, and is able to identify and deal with normative professional issues in concrete (humanistic and other) professional practices, as well as the various norms and values that are at stake.

4. *Knowledge and understanding of diversity, multiculturalism and globalization*
   The graduate understands current issues concerning diversity and is able to relate these to processes of globalization, to cosmopolitan dimensions of humanism and to other related academic theories and debates. The graduate also understands these issues in a historical and social context, is able to recognize these issues in concrete practices and form an informed stance towards these issues.

5. *Knowledge and understanding of philosophy of science and methodology*
   The graduate has thorough knowledge and understanding of the methodology, objectives, assumptions and values of academic knowledge development in the field of humanistic

studies, and is able to connect relevant paradigms, especially narrative-hermeneutical approaches, with humanistic research and critically assess these paradigms. The graduate is also able to reflect on the scope and limitations of humanistic research in general, as well as on the assumptions underlying the (graduate) research, and is able to provide an account of the normative orientation in the (graduate) research.

6. *Research skills*
   The graduate is able to independently design and carry out a scientifically sound (historical, philosophical or qualitative empirical) research project that is relevant to humanistic studies; can present the results in a transparent, systemic and argumentatively convincing way, and clearly and unambiguously convey these results to an audience of specialists and non-specialists.

7. *General academic skills and attitude*
   The graduate demonstrates an independent critical attitude towards existing theories and knowledge; is able to take position regarding a scientific argument in the field of humanistic studies and critically evaluate this argument; is open to new or unusual approaches to current issues and solutions; is able to assess what conclusions can be made based on incomplete or limited information, taking into account the social and ethical responsibilities involved with the application of one's own knowledge and judgments; keeps up with the developments in the field of humanistic studies; and has the learning skills needed to independently carry out further studies.

8. *Professional core activities and skills*
   The graduate is capable of supporting and inspiring individuals, groups and/or organizations in engaging with issues of meaning and humanisation, and initiating this engagement, in particular in one of the different humanistic professional fields (and focussed on one or more of the following professional roles: guide, advise, educate/train, research); has acquired the skills needed with these professional roles; is able to work both individually as well as in a team; is able to work together with colleagues one's own professional group as well as with other professions and take a personal position; can adequately function in a multicultural work environment.

9. *Knowledge of the work sphere / professional practice*
   The graduate has thorough knowledge of and insight into the relevant aspects of the professional practice of the humanistic studies graduate, of professional content and processes, methods, central themes and topical discussions, organizational and institutional relations, and of socio-political and global developments and contexts; has knowledge of current social scientific, philosophical and ethical perspectives on these aspects of the professional practice.

10. *Skills regarding the occupational context*

The graduate can contribute to the clarification of questions relating to the identity and culture of an organization, can deliver an (educational) presentation, can function at different levels within an organization, can effectively develop policies within organiza-

tions and (local) governments, and is able to solve multi- and interdisciplinary issues in the occupational practice.

11. *Skills and attitude of a normative professional*

    The graduate fits the profile of a normative professional: he/she has an open life stance and a well-developed normative framework with a (self-) reflective attitude, attention to self-care, dialogical skills and respect for those who think different, is capable to explain and justify one's own inspiration and professional vision, knows one's own capabilities and limitations regarding the professional practice, is able to give and receive feedback, can contribute to a further development and positioning of the work through ethical reflection with colleagues and clients, theoretical reflection and carrying out of applied research; all this from a commitment to humane values, in particular focused on bridging differences, engaging in dialogue and combating inhumane situations, relations and structures.

Objectives 1 to 7 specify the academic training within humanistic studies. Objectives 8 to 11 specify the professional training.