

## i Information about exam

### SOS2603 – Nordic welfare society – contemporary perspectives

- Written home exam november 17th at 9.00 AM - 1.00 PM
- Fall semester 2021

#### Specification:

- You must answer both question 1 and question 2.
- Question 1 counts 1/3, and question 2 counts 2/3 of the final exam grade. In question 1, you will answer two of three assignments. In question 2, you will answer one of either assignment A, B or C.
- In question 1: ca. 200-400 words for each answer.  
In question 2: ca 1100 - 2000 words.  
Line spacing, font and size can not be adjusted in the Inspera format.
- The exam can be written in English, Norwegian, Swedish or Danish.
- Use of sources and references:
  - . You may refer to different sources directly in the text, as you would do in a school exam situation.
  - . If you make direct quotes, references and page numbers must be provided.
  - . You do not need to provide a list of references, only make a note in the text.
- All exams are routinely checked for plagiarism.
- Remember that your submission needs to be anonymous, do not write your name in your submission.
- All examination support materials are permitted. You are allowed to gather information from available sources, but we advise you to assess the information quality, and put together a submission based on your own processing of the content. In that way the submission will reflect your individual level of knowledge.
- Be aware of the limited time available. It may be wise to consider the exam situation as similar to a school exam.

#### How to submit in Inspera:

- Read about submissions in Inspera.
- When you have started to answer the exam directly in the text box, you will see that it is saved to your submission.
- You can write the text in Word and paste in the text box.
- You can change your exam answer until the test closes.
- When the test closes, your answer will automatically be delivered for grading.

#### Questions during the exam:

- If you have questions during the exam, you may send an email from your UiO-address to [hjemmeeksamen@sv.uio.no](mailto:hjemmeeksamen@sv.uio.no) or [info@sv.uio.no](mailto:info@sv.uio.no). Write the course code in the subject field (SOS2603).
- If any information is given to all candidates during the exam, this information will be posted in Canvas. Make sure that you receive Canvas notifications.
- If you have questions before the exam day or after you have submitted your exam, please contact SV-info.

#### After the exam:

- After the submission deadline make sure that you find your submission under Archive in Inspira.
- Send an e-mail immediately to [hjemmeeksamen@sv.uio.no](mailto:hjemmeeksamen@sv.uio.no) or [info@sv.uio.no](mailto:info@sv.uio.no) if you do not see your submission. Attach your exam answer if you have this as a file.

Good luck!

## 1 Short answer

**Question 1:**

**Outline and discuss briefly two (2) of the three (3) following concepts:**

(ca. 200-400 words for each answer)

- A. Statist individualism
- B. Social democratic welfare regime
- C. Tripartite collaboration

**Fill in your answer here**

---

Maximum marks: 10

## 2 Essay

### Question 2:

Discuss one (1) of the following three (3) topics:

(ca. 1100 - 2000 words)

1. There has been a “civic turn” in policy related to integration of immigrants and citizenship in the Nordic countries. What kind of development does this term refer to and how do the Nordic countries differ in their attitude to immigrants and immigration politics
2. Discuss the development of family policy in Scandinavia. Why is cash for childcare seen as a contestant to the earner-carer model?
3. What is characteristic of the gig and platform economy and how does it relate to the Nordic model of work-life and tripartite collaboration?

**Fill in your answer here**

---

Maximum marks: 10

## Sensorveiledning SOS2603 Fall 2021

Short questions (2 out of 3)

### *Statist individualism*

There are three articles or rather one article and two research notes by Lars Trägårdh in the required curricula: Trägårdh 1997, 2020, Berggren/Trägårdh 2011). They all present this concept. Furthermore, Kettunen (1999/2012) refers to the concept and compares it with Esping-Andersens concept of decommodification. In the lecture, particularly lecture 2, I have outlined how the concept relates to a cultural perspective on the Nordic model and also connected it to “the Swedish theory of love” and the movie by the same name as well as the way the concept was used in the promotion material for the Nordic region at the Davos meeting in 2011 (Berggren/Trägårdh 2011).

A satisfactory answer defines the concept and connects it to development of a universal idea of welfare and also a context with relative generous individual benefits like student loans, as well as a legal context with individual tax reports. A good answer may discuss its relationship to the concept of decommodification or Swedish/Nordic exceptionalism. It would be particularly interesting to make a note of how Trägårdh in the 1997 article presents an argument of a Swedish National Character which is very different from the way Esping-Andersen and the resource mobilization school in welfare studies see the development (see also Bengtsson (2020) for a critique of culturalist approaches).

### *Social democratic welfare regime*

The term was introduced by Esping-Andersen (1990) and is discussed or referred to in many of the contributions and lectures, e.g. Stein Kuhnle , Trägårdh 1997, Teigen/Skeie e.g. (Neergård uses the term social democratic capitalism).

A satisfactory answer refers to the most important dimensions where the Nordic welfare states differ from the conservative and liberal welfare states (universalism, generosity, individual benefits etc. A strong answer discusses some of the criticism of the term, e.g. Kuhnles critique that the term should rather be referring to geography (Nordic) or those who has found that the Nordic countries do not really differ that much from other kinds of welfare states (both in the original data set or not any more) or the further development of the understanding of the Nordic welfare states as “women-friendly” which has also sometimes taken off from a critique of the Esping-Andersen perspective but nonetheless stick to the same categorizations (see Teigen/Skeie).

### *Tripartite collaboration*

Kettunen (2012) is discussing how the Nordic tradition of symmetry between labor market parties emerged and Moene, Dølvik, Neergård and Esping-Andersen further outline the functions and consequences of this collaborative system. I have discussed the Nordic industrial relations system particularly in lecture 7, but also some of the history in lecture 2.

A good answer presents the main elements of the system as institutionalized cooperation among employers, unions and the state, but puts emphasis on the negotiated order and refers to its historical origins. A good answer outlines some of the institutions involved or/and discusses the different explanations for the development of such collaborations (resource mobilization vs more a general tradition of institutional design/neocorporatism (Kuhle). Also comparisons among countries are welcome or examples that show how the system work (e.g. frontline industries bargain first, the Ghent system etc.)

*Essay, 1 out of 3*

It has been argued that there has been a “civic turn” in policy related to integration of immigrants and citizenship in the Nordic countries. What kind of developments do this term refer to and how do the Nordic countries differ in their attitude to immigrants and immigration politics

(Aaron Ponce lecture, Borevi et al. is main source in readings )

Civic turn:

Ponce: see ppt 31-40

“Authors adopt the term “civic turn” ◦a shift in focus from concerns of the collective identities of immigrants to a preoccupation of defining and strengthening the host national identity”

Summary lecture

## Immigration and citizenship (L4)

- A Scandinavian immigration model? Tough externally, soft internally, from humanitarian immigration to labor, change after 2016, labor market in focus
  - Liberal Sweden, restrictive Denmark, Norway in middle
- Citizenship policies and the civic turn
  - What is the basis for citizenship?
  - Shared heritage, territory or shared activities? Right of blood (heritage), right of soil, (birth in territory), right of dwelling (how long lived here?) Ethnos vs demos
  - Citizenship policy varies, S: participation/belonging D: Reward for integration, N: in between
- The civic turn: Shift from concerns of collective identities to strengthening host national identity
  - Is this turn towards stricter citizenship requirements a tool for integration or rather an attempt to keep numbers of immigrants down?
  - D: society-centered, S: state-centered N: In the middle. How to explain these differences? S:early immigration, neutrality S+D: sami people etc.. Role of populist parties different

Byrkjeflot 2021

A good answer defines the concept and outlines some of the more general reasons for a “civic turn” and says something about how it relates to philosophies of integration of immigrants and/or citizenship policies. A satisfactory answer should also say something about differences among the Nordic countries. A discussion of the reasons for such variations and paradoxes/dilemmas that emerge in the various approaches will be a plus and may qualify for an even better grade.

*Discuss the development of family policy in Scandinavia. Why is cash for childcare seen as a contestant to the earner-carer model?*

Ellingsæter and Teigen lectures discusses how dual earner care get challenged by the cash for welfare institution and also the discursive backlash against some of the family policy instruments that are supposed to bring women into the labor market.

A satisfactory answer points out the development from single to dual breadwinner ideal and some of the main family policy instruments/reforms that have aimed at bringing women into the labor markets. It will be a plus if they outline some differences among Nordic countries in speed of reforms or generosity of welfare benefits/subsidies related to kindergartens, family leave etc. The cash for welfare contestation of dual breadwinner needs to be outlined and discussed but they have to say something more general about family policies as well. If they are able to create a clear link from the cash for welfare example and family policy in general or varieties of such family policies it may qualify for an even better grade.

Ellingsæter ppt # 10:

UiO  University of Oslo

## The earner-carer model - and a contestant

- **Key earner-carer policies:**
- **Parental leave** encourages mother's continued employment and a redistribution of care from mother to father; but leaves may be of different types 1) equality impeding, 2) equality enabling, 3) equality promoting
- High quality affordable/accessible subsidised **childcare services**, redistribute care from family to society, i.e. defamilise care - for under 3s litmus test of modern family policies
  
- **Contestant:**
- **Cash for care**; counteracts redistribution of care, motivated by 'parental choice', presuming or neutral to gender traditionalism, familises care

*What is characteristic of the gig and platform economy and how does it relate to the Nordic model of work-life and tripartite collaboration?*

The definition of gig and platform economy is found in the readings associated with Oppegaard's lectures and his powerpoint presentations.

In his lecture and in the report with Jesnes as coauthor Oppegaard distinguishes between an erosion and taming narrative related to the effects of the rise of platform and gig work in a Nordic industrial relations setting. According to the erosion narrative the new kind of work associated with digitalization poses a threat to established work relations, whereas the taming narrative is more optimistic in relation to the possibilities for integrate it into the established industrial relations framework. A satisfactory response defines the gig and platform economy, give examples and indicate and discuss consequences for Nordic work relations or/and industrial relations systems. An even better response is able to do this but also reflect around the likelihood of the various development paths and perhaps also reflect more in general around the impact of digitalization and what kind of challenges that more long-term developments (e.g. digitalization) or even the Korona pandemic has posed to the established work relations in the Nordic countries. Also oppegaard have some examples that may be discussed, Fodora and Uber as well as Covid-19 impact on work relations

Oppegaard lecture and readings for his lecture, such as:

@Jesnes, K., & Oppegaard, S. M. N. (2020). Platform work in the Nordic models: Issues, cases and responses. Nordic Council of Ministers (<http://norden.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1431693/FULLTEXT01.pdf>). 11-23, 79-83 (17s)