Before we start: presentation delivery instructions

Your presentations are due **Sunday 27 November at 8pm**

- Record your presentation after Tutorial 7 (N.B. I need to hear your talk and see your slides; there is no obligation to film yourselves delivering the presentation)

- Save your presentation as a MOV or MP4 file, and keep its file size under **250MB** (use Handbrake if needed)

- Upload it to the ‘Student presentations’ folder on Google Drive (create a subfolder with your group number, e.g. ‘Group 4.2’, and upload it there)
Final tutorials schedule

- **Tutorial 7 (next week)** will offer some final advice on how to deliver your presentations
  
  → see also the second half of all tutorial slides so far

- **Tutorial 8 (in two weeks)** will be a ‘presentation viva’ session: your group will only have to attend at a given time (to be confirmed next week), in order to discuss the presentation with me for 10–15’

  At the end of your viva, you will also be asked to provide some feedback on how the tutorials went for you
Exam-related advice

1. List the **methodological** and **theoretical** elements of the reading that might be useful to know for the final exam.

   N.B. The reading for this week, as well as the previous ones not covered by the midterm exam (Readings 4–6), will be on your **final exam**.

2. Summarise the reading in a **single paragraph**, using its **main concept** in your summary.

   Your final exam will be primarily composed of questions requiring such ‘one or two paragraphs’ answers.
What **politicization** does to policy-making

A key test of a political system is its capacity to solve important societal problems. Few policy areas in the United States are more problem-ridden than health care. American medical care is expensive and wasteful, and the quality of care (even for the well-insured) often falls short of best practice (Hacker 2008; McGlynn et al. 2003). One idea to improve health care is to eliminate gaps in the medical evidence base through “comparative effectiveness research” (CER). By identifying what treatments, tests, and technologies work best for patients with different diseases and conditions, CER could help doctors, patients, and payers make better decisions about medical options—and help reduce wasteful health care spending.

Gerber and Patashnik 2010
What **politicization** does to policy-making

Until recently, CER was a technocratic, third-tier issue. It received attention from policy experts based in universities, foundations, and think tanks, but hardly anyone else. During the past year, however, this obscure policy initiative got caught up in the wider ideological struggle over national health reform. The Obama Administration pushed for CER funding to be included in the massive economic stimulus bill, in order to lay the groundwork for a more evidence-based medical system. In the context of the heated partisan debate over how to improve the American health care system, in turn, CER became the target of charges from conservatives that the Obama Administration was promoting “rationing” and government intrusion in the private lives of patients.

Gerber and Patashnik 2010
Exam-related advice

- Midterm and final exam questions usually revolve around **concepts**, **models** and **theories**
- In your answers, always include
  1. A **definition** of the concept under discussion, citing the author(s) who submitted it
  2. A **critical view** of the concept: its history, its strengths (usefulness), and its weaknesses (shortcomings)
  3. An **example** of its application, often taken from the course (lecture or tutorials readings)
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This week’s case study (welfare state reform)

- Comparing welfare states
  cf. concepts and typologies
- Welfare reform trajectories
  cf. sequences, convergence
- Paradigms as explanations
  cf. Hall’s 1/2/3-order changes
- Role of politics
  cf. left/right-wing parties
### Esping-Andersen’s welfare state typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decommodification</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Social-democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratification</th>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Social-democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual: means-tested</td>
<td>High: insurance-based schemes to preserve social rights according to status</td>
<td>Low: universal entitlements for preserving equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in social provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Examples                | United States, UK, New Zealand, Ireland                                   | Germany, Switzerland, France, Austria                                       | Sweden, Finland, Norway                                                          |

Welfare state crisis/reforms pre-2008

The (Different) Responses to Crisis

Three distinct approaches to welfare system restructuring can be identified, reflecting specific historical and institutional challenges posed to each particular social protection regime. Different welfare states responded differently to the challenges raised by globalization. Paul Pierson (2001) proposed that one type of reform dominates each social protection regime: in liberal regimes reform was based on recommodification; in social democratic regimes it was based on cost containment; and in continental systems it was based on recalibration (the adjustment of social programmes to new risks and needs).
CONCLUSION: THE DESTABILIZING EFFECTS OF THE CRISIS

Since 2008, the European economy has entered an almost unprecedented period of crisis, whose ramifications for the ongoing restructuring of European welfare states will be immense. Initial reactions to the economic downturn caused by the financial crisis have used traditional instruments to support the economy: automatic stabilizers based on social benefits, and stimulus plans. In 2008, most European countries announced such Keynesian measures. However, in late 2009 and especially since the spring of 2010, all European countries have announced fiscal austerity plans to reduce their deficits and debt, thus abandoning, almost at a stroke, the public commitment to countercyclical measures.
Palier and Hay’s welfare reform paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis of sources of unemployment</th>
<th>Keynesian paradigm</th>
<th>Neoliberal paradigm</th>
<th>Social investment perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment and slow growth due to insufficient demand</td>
<td>Unemployment and inflation due to constrained supply because of labour market rigidities (excessively high labour costs, too much labour regulation, social benefits acting as work disincentives)</td>
<td>Unemployment linked to lack of adequate skills to fill today’s jobs and to create the jobs of tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Social policy and the economy | Positive economic role of social policy: development of social insurances to prop up demand and stimulate growth | Negative economic role of public social expenditure: the welfare state as a cost and as the cause of slow growth and inflation | Positive economic role of new forms of social policy: social policies that invest in human capital to increase employability and employment levels; to |
Palier and Hay’s welfare reform paradigms

Table 17.1 Paradigms, principles, and policies summarized and compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Keynesian paradigm</th>
<th>Neoliberal paradigm</th>
<th>Social investment perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key norms for public action</td>
<td>Big state</td>
<td>Lean state</td>
<td>Empowering State Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central economic planning</td>
<td>Deregulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Welfare state development</td>
<td>Dismantling of the welfare state</td>
<td>Recasting of the welfare state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key instruments</td>
<td>Policies to support demand</td>
<td>Monetarist economic policies to fight inflation</td>
<td>Human capital investment policies to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of social insurance schemes for income</td>
<td>Deregulation of the labour market</td>
<td>increase competitiveness and job creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td>Privatization of social and health services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the public sector</td>
<td>development of capitalization to finance</td>
<td>Development of social services and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment compensation</td>
<td>pension schemes</td>
<td>to support the labour market: early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activation and workforce</td>
<td>childhood education and care;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>higher education and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example questions to answer in your presentation

- Who were the **major players** involved in your policy topic? Who participated in the debate over the topic?  
  (institutions, decisionmakers, experts, stakeholders)

- What were the **major issues** of controversy/negotiation in the debates that occurred?  
  (consensus/dissensus, problems/solutions)

- What role did **politics** play in the policy process?  
  (politicization, partisanship, value conflicts)
Questions to answer if you are comparing cases

- What are the similarities and differences among the political structures (institutions and laws) among the countries discussed?
- Can you identify political institutions that seem similar on the surface across countries, but actually behave quite differently (e.g., legislatures, courts)? How are they different? Why?
- Are there cultural differences that might be important in understanding the behavior of these institutions?
Questions to answer if you are analyzing frames

- How did stakeholders invoke specific frames in their political advocacy? What tactics did they use?
- How did they try to ensure that their framing became the dominant approach to solving the social/policy problem under examination? (i.e. how was issue dominance achieved)
- What made a particular frame more or less successful in the policy debate on your topic? (conditions of success)

Note — The questions asked on the last three slides come from a public policy syllabus by Shobita Parthasarathy
Questions to answer from a theoretical standpoint

- Which theories of the policy process might explain what you observed by researching your case study? (analytical characterization)

- How do those theories ‘compete’ with each other? How do they contradict each other? (delineation of rival hypotheses)

- Which theory provides the most convincing explanation for your case study, and why? (empirical validation)

e.g. you observed policy imitation: was it an instance of policy transfer, convergence or diffusion?
Reminder: use handbooks
SÉCU EN DANGER GOUVERNEMENT RESPONSABLE PAS LES GILETS JAUNES

See you next week