



Nordic Welfare and U.S. Employment Policy: Public Policies that Reflect Equality as a Normative Political Value

DOI:

[DOI: 10.1111/polp.12075](https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12075)

Document Version

Final published version

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Anderson, L. (2014). *Nordic Welfare and U.S. Employment Policy: Public Policies that Reflect Equality as a Normative Political Value*. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1111/polp.12075>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.



Review Essay: Nordic Welfare and U.S. Employment Policy: Public Policies that Reflect Equality as a Normative Political Value

LORI ANDERSON

Indiana University Northwest

Kvist, Jon, Johan Fritzell, Bjørn Hvinden, and Olli Kangas. 2012. *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press, University of Bristol.

Stainback, Kevin, and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2012. *Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Two recent books examine Nordic welfare and U.S. employment policies from a historical perspective, asking how these public policies have changed over time, assessing their current status, and considering their likely futures. In *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century*, Kvist and others (2012) examine the ways equality characterizes Nordic countries and how this has changed over the last three decades, within and among Nordic countries and also as compared with non-Nordic countries. In *Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act*, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) trace U.S. private workplace integration from the 1960s to 2005.

At first glance, these two works appear to have little in common. Here they are considered as examples of public policies that reflect normative political values, and the contributions of their differing methodologies to the accelerating trend of cross-national comparative analysis are examined. The value of the research reported in each work to academic and practitioner communities is also considered.

Public Policies Reflects Equality as a Normative Political Value

Public policies reflect normative political values (Eysenck 1956, 1975; Ferguson 1941, 1942; Ferguson, Humphreys, and Strong 1941; Rokeach 1973).

Nordic welfare and U.S. employment policies are two public policy arenas that both reflect and address equality as a normative political value. The substantive conclusions of these two works are reviewed as it relates to the ways in which the public policy under examination addresses equality as a normative political value.

Against a backdrop of mass media proclamations that Nordic countries are experiencing an end to equality, *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century* (Kvist *et al.* 2012) critically examines the ways equality actually characterizes Nordic countries and how this has changed over the last three decades, within and among Nordic countries and also as compared with non-Nordic countries. Kvist and others (2012) take as their starting point the international trend of increasing income inequalities that took hold in the 1980s and has persisted until the current recession. While most recent treatments of income inequalities have taken a broad macroeconomic and political view, used aggregated economic indicators, and focused on governmental responses (see e.g., Bermeo and Pontusson 2012). Kvist and others work from a much broader conceptualization of welfare, well-being, and social inequality, and they focus on the impacts for individuals and families, a view that undergirds the Nordic strand of welfare research. Relying on Richard Titmuss' (1958) framing of welfare as a command over resources, Sten Johansson's (1970, 25) definition of a person's level of living as "the command over resources in terms of money, possessions, knowledge, psychological and physical energy, social relations, security and so on by means of which the individual can control and consciously direct her conditions of life," and Johansson's (138) definition of welfare as the "living conditions in the areas where citizens seek to influence through collective decisions and through commitments in institutional forms, i.e. through politics," Kvist and others propose a multidimensional model of welfare that is explicitly actor oriented.

Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century (Kvist *et al.* 2012) explores how the activities and programs of the welfare state affect patterns of social inequality, both in ameliorating and preventing problems. Therefore, the authors examine the *outcomes* of Nordic welfare programs. The specific welfare areas considered include earnings and disposable income, participation in paid employment and informal care, educational achievements, health, and well-being.

Kvist and others (2012) suggest that there have been some important changes in the past 30 years, especially in the areas of immigration, employment patterns, and health and that Nordic countries are changing their conception of equality as synonymous with sameness and homogeneity to a more complex understanding of equality as equal worth and parity of participation. They further posit that policy makers have adopted discourses of exclusion, misrecognition, segregation, discrimination, and inaccessibility and that researchers have altered the framing of Scandinavian welfare.

Among their findings, Kvist and others (2012) conclude that immigration has posed some challenges to the Nordic model. Immigrants experience lower employment rates than other groups; non-European Union immigrants are at a higher risk of poverty than other immigrant groups and utilize more services; and home childcare allowances reinforce traditional gendered roles and decreased female participation in employment and underuse of childcare services among immigrants from non-Western countries. Furthermore, the underuse of childcare services may lead to diminished future educational and work-related achievements. Overall, while immigration has little impact on the long-term sustainability of the Nordic system, the Nordic welfare model does not adequately address labor market integration and poverty prevention for recent immigrants.

They also find that, compared with other European countries, Scandinavian countries experience a more pronounced social stratification of health-related behaviors, such as smoking and diet. The authors note that a growing prominence of dual-income families reflects a paradoxical and unintended result of the social value of gender equality. Consequently, setting a new normative standard, dual-income families fare better economically than young single adults and single parents. They suggest that the historical Nordic focus on end-state equality is coming under fire as the demand for a system that accommodates a greater range of values emerges.

Kvist and others (2012) expect an increase in political pressures for more diverse welfare services and a greater division of responsibility between the public and private sectors, with subsequent impacts on individual choice in services. All this points to a forecast for greater degrees of social inequality. According to the authors, the criteria used for means-tested minimum income schemes have not kept pace with earnings and are therefore not mitigating poverty as designed. This may reflect a perceived need to control public expenditure. It may also reflect the value of work that underpins the Nordic model and may reflect an incentive to work.

Kvist and others (2012) conclude that overall, in comparison with other European countries, Scandinavia generally does a better job at limiting income inequality and reducing and preventing poverty, and that the Netherlands seems to lead Nordic countries in preventing persistent poverty. As a result of formal childcare schemes, generally, Scandinavia also is making greater progress than most other countries in defamilization and equality-promoting potential. However, inequality has increased in Scandinavia. In other words, “Nordic countries have become ‘more European’ with regard to income inequalities and poverty risk” (Kvist *et al.* 2012, 204). According to the study, Nordic countries remain distinct in maintaining income inequalities, low poverty, and in providing child care. However, their lead has decreased. “Other countries are becoming ‘more Nordic’ ” (205). The gap has narrowed both because other countries have caught up and because inequality and poverty are expanding in Nordic countries.

In considering Kvist and others' (2012) work from the perspective of the ways in which Nordic welfare policy addresses equality as a normative political value, it seems clear that equality has been a strong historical value for citizens of Nordic countries, remains so today, and is forecasted to remain so, at least in the near future. Yet their global position as leader of equality as a normative political value, at least as expressed in welfare policy, may have slipped in recent years because of the simultaneous influences of multidirectional challenges within Nordic countries and also because of relative progress of other European countries.

A closer examination of the study reveals that their working definition of welfare is important to the perspective of the ways in which Nordic welfare policy addresses equality as a normative political value. How welfare is defined is essential to understanding the normative political values it reflects. The broad Nordic view of welfare places many policies under one umbrella. Kvist and others (2012) use a broad multidimensional and multidisciplinary model of welfare that is explicitly actor oriented. They also look beyond economic impacts and political responses to focus on the impacts for individuals and families. At least in theory, this more holistic and humanistic model takes into account intangibles, such as knowledge, psychological and physical energy, social relations, and security. Such rich models are simultaneously valuable in guiding our understanding of complex human conditions, such as welfare and well-being, and also a challenge to measure. This is seen in the work of Kvist and others. The multidimensional model guides a collection of studies that focus on measuring one or a few areas of welfare (earnings and disposable income, participation in paid employment and informal care, educational achievements, and health and well-being) and then considering the implications of these diverse findings from a more holistic viewpoint. Beyond the measurement and assessment challenges, defining welfare broadly also defines equality as a normative political value broadly. From a Nordic perspective, equality is multidimensional. This is much less the case in the United States.

Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012) analyzes Employer Information Reports (EEO-1) collected by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) from 1966 to 2005 to assess racial and gender integration in private workplace from the 1960s to 2005. First, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) consider national trajectories away from institutionalized white male privilege by historical periods ranging from the 1960s to 2005. Focusing on macroprocesses of social change, they examine the organizational changes that result from the shifts in political and legal environments. Their core argument is that the effectiveness of law and regulation are contingent upon political pressure for change and uncertainty of what human resource approaches will be deemed acceptable as an alternative approach by regulators and the courts. Next, they examine local inequality regimes. They trace the progress of white men, white women, black men, and black women at

different times and in different organizational settings. They explore emergent variations in race and gender hierarchies in varying labor markets, industries, and organizational dynamics.

In their framing of the subject, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) challenge several “erroneous societal views.” One is that white men have been unfairly disadvantaged; they are the victims of “reverse discrimination.” They find that even though white male advantages have eroded, they remain the norm in most private workplaces. Furthermore, as white males have steadily been hired at lower rates, they have simultaneously risen to the highest organizational positions. Another societal view that Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey challenge is that black women have benefited doubly by filling “two quotas.” In fact, evidence supports the opposite: that black women have benefited the least. Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey also challenge the belief that Americans are less prejudiced and therefore, any apparent discrimination represents individual differences. Rather, they suggest that there remains widespread cognitive and attitudinal racial bias among Americans. They also note that organizational change does not occur parallel to individual change and that organizations are not mere sums of their aggregate individual attitudes. Therefore, even if racism were negligible in the United States, it would not follow that organizations no longer discriminate. Instead, organizations have their own logics, routines, and goals, and structure social relationships and behavioral and attitudinal expectations to meet those goals and to replicate those routines. Also, group decision making increases the likelihood of prejudice. Therefore, for Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey, social psychology changes not as a result of preventing bias, but by changing organizational practice.

Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) claim that desegregation progress is greatest when internal constituencies demand it and when there are environmental pressures for change, such as the civil rights and women’s movements, federal legislation and regulation, and judicial rulings. The pace of change slowed after the 1980s when racial and gender employment inequality faded from the political discourse. Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey contend that one of their fundamental contributions is the idea that progress is neither inevitable nor continuous. Among their findings, they conclude that after 1990, white male advantages actually increased and that high-wage industries were the most likely to resegregate. Female and minority progress is greatest in low-paying jobs. They also find that formalized workplaces that use merit-based criteria and that implement managerial accountability for racialized and gendered employment outcomes have the strongest equal opportunity trajectories. Furthermore, white women, black men, and black women make the most progress in jobs that use education as a criterion for employment decisions.

Considering Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey’s (2012) work from the perspective of the ways in which U.S. employment policy addresses equality as

a normative political value, it is illuminating to briefly view how equality is treated in key legislation, especially the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In the United States, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a landmark legislation that reflects America's struggle with equality as a normative political value. With eleven subsections or titles, it has a sweeping reach, prohibiting segregation and discrimination in many areas of civic life. Each of the eleven titles bans segregation and discrimination based on explicitly defined *protected categories*, which include *color*, *race*, *religion*, *national origin*, and *sex* (gender), either by explicitly naming the protected categories in the 1964 legislation, by continuing the usage of protected categories as defined in previous legislation, or by referring to previous titles in the 1964 Act. However, the protected categories are not consistent across all eleven titles.

In sharp contrast to the—at least historic—Nordic conceptualization of equality as a universal characteristic, the United States defines specific characteristics that are to be used to establish equality among citizens. Therefore, characteristics that are not named explicitly in the law are not considered dimensions requiring equal treatment under the law. A brief review of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in context and, more specifically, a look at the use of these protected categories in the eleven titles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 vividly illustrates this.

Two of the eleven titles of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are extensions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, and therefore continue the usage of the protected categories in those preceding acts. The first federal legislation addressing civil rights since the Civil War, the Civil Rights Act of 1957 addresses discrimination in voting rights and creates a Commission on Civil Rights, a bipartisan board of six members appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate, which investigates claims of citizens being denied the right to vote based on their *color*, *race*, *religion*, or *national origin*. The Commission also appraises federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection and reports their findings to the president and Congress. After making a final report within two years, the Commission is scheduled to disband. Pertinent to this discussion, Title III (of seven titles) of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 requires the preservation of election records; Title IV extends the existence and the powers of the Commission on Civil Rights; and Title VI grants the Attorney General the authority to adjudicate whether the denial of registered voters the right to vote that is based on *race* or *color* constitutes a pattern or practice, and outlines provisions for voting in such cases.

Extensions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlaws unequal application of voter registration requirements, and Title V expands the Civil Rights Commission. Both of these titles continue the use of *four* protected categories established in the 1957 and 1960 statutes, *color*, *race*, *religion*, or *national origin*.

The 1964 Act prohibits segregation and discrimination based on these *four* protected categories *race*, *color*, *religion*, and *national origin* in four additional

areas of civic life by specifically naming them in the 1964 legislation. Title II bans segregation and discrimination in public accommodations, such as hotels and restaurants; Title III forbids segregation and discrimination in governmental facilities; Title IV outlaws segregation and discrimination in the assignment of pupils to public schools; and Title IX provides a means for the Attorney General to certify cases claiming discrimination as general public importance and to move these cases to federal courts.

Three titles of the 1964 legislation prohibit segregation and discrimination based on *three* protected categories, *race*, *color*, and *national origin*. Title VI forbids government agencies that receive federal funds to discriminate based on these three protected categories; Title VIII requires the Commission on Civil Rights to survey, in areas at its determination, voter registration and voting patterns by race, color, and national origin. Title X establishes the Community Relations Services, which is tasked with assisting communities and individuals in disputes concerning discrimination in these three areas.

Title X outlines provisions for criminal contempt cases arising out of Titles II through VII. By referring to previous titles in the 1964 act, this title relies on the protected categories as defined in those titles.

The primary focus of Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey's (2012) work, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 addresses segregation and discrimination in employment and is based on *five* protected categories, *race*, *color*, *religion*, *sex*, and *national origin*. In 1964, it is noteworthy that the Act outlaws segregation and discrimination based on gender (*sex*) in only one area of civic life, employment. Title VII also establishes the EEOC, a bipartisan board of five members appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate that serve a term of five years. The EEOC investigates, mediates, and files lawsuits on behalf of workers that make claims of discrimination.

Today employment discrimination is unlawful in the United States on the basis of age (The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967), pregnancy (The Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978), and disability (The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990). The Civil Rights Act of 1991 amends the 1964 statute to allow jury trials and compensatory and punitive damage awards in cases of intentional discrimination. In 2012, The EEOC ruled that Title VII also protects against employment discrimination based on gender identity and transgender status.

As can be seen in these two very different studies, Nordic welfare and U.S. employment policies are two public policy areas that reflect equality as a normative political value. Among other factors, perhaps the collective perception of homogeneity in a culture is an important factor in a polity's response to equality as a normative value. A major recent challenge to the Nordic conceptualization of equality is immigration (Kvist *et al.* 2012), and the United States has experienced varying and uneven progress in racial and gender equality in private workplaces (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012). It is possible that a (at least near) universal human response is that it

is easier, or at least more likely, to value equality in groups we perceive as more like ourselves.

Furthermore, public policy not only reflects a polity's historical and current normative values; it also becomes an actor in the polity's future values. There is a reciprocal relationship between normative political values and public policy. Public policy reflects a polity's values, and public policy also shapes those values. These two works do an excellent job of examining policies from a historical perspective, assessing their current status, and considering their likely trajectories based on their recent trends. An additional important question for public policy studies is how does a changing policy environment likely shape not only our future policies, but also our normative political values? If the outcomes of Nordic welfare and U.S. employment policies do indeed reflect an overall recent decrease in gains in equality, as Kvist and others (2012) and Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) suggest, then shouldn't we also be asking in what ways is this new policy environment likely to be a variable in future normative political values as well as in future policy directions?

Differing Research Methodologies Contribute to Comparative Analysis

While international and cross-national public policy and political analysis has been a steady influence in public policy and political science, the trend to consider public policy and its political implications from a comparative perspective is accelerating, as evidenced by the recent refocusing of *Politics & Policy*. More than merely a change-phobic minority, there is a perspective in the study of public policy and politics that national context matters. So how do we, as a growingly global profession, address this dynamic tension between the continued need for in-depth national studies and the call for more comparative analysis? One way is to consider the value of differing research methodologies to the accelerating trend of cross-national comparative analysis.

These two books share a common focus and strength; they both examine public policies from a historical perspective, asking how these public policies have changed over time, assessing their current status, and considering their likely futures. They differ in several ways, each of which is a strength in understanding public policy and its political implications from a comparative perspective.

To assess the contributions the differing research methodologies of these two works make to the accelerating trend of cross-national comparative analysis, four criteria are used; the degree to which each work (1) examines the public policy comparatively and cross-nationally, (2) employs common research methods, (3) examines the historical context of the specific research question, and (4) explores the dynamic tension between focusing on aggregated similarities and variations within political, social, and economic contexts. By no means inclusive, these criteria represent a few of the dynamic tensions between the in-depth national versus comparative analysis

perspectives, and are used here for their utility in considering the ways in which varying research methods and lenses may make a positive contribution to comparative analyses.

As an edited collection that is part of a comparative public policy analysis series, the research and findings reported in *Changing Social Equality: The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century* (Kvist *et al.* 2012) are most richly understood in the context of the series. Within the series, five edited books examine Nordic welfare states. Each book represents a collection of studies, most of which employ quantitative research designs and methods that are mainstream to much of political science.

The first two books (Erikson *et al.* 1987; Hansen *et al.* 1993) review the historical development of the Scandinavian welfare model and focus primarily on similarities within Scandinavian countries. Erikson and others (1987) review the development of Scandinavian societies from agrarian to modern industrial economies and welfare states by outlining the development of economic, social, and political structures in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. Their contribution lies in an aggregate analysis from semifeudal societies and absolutist states to contemporary democratic regimes with comprehensive welfare policies. They acknowledge a trade-off of their approach is the preclusion of in-depth inter- and intra-country variations. They follow their historical review with an analysis of the particular welfare problems of inequality, poverty, redistribution, and gender, and they conclude by presenting theory and methods of welfare research. Expanding their analysis to include Iceland and continuing the treatment of Nordic countries as a unit of nations, Hansen and others (1993) discuss the development of the welfare state in Scandinavian countries and the impact of societal changes on welfare policy and delivery during the period of modest economic growth beginning in the mid-1970s. Focusing on the similarities in Nordic countries, they take an in-depth look at labor market benefits, education and social mobility, class and inequality, income distribution and trajectories, and health.

The next book in the series (Kautto *et al.* 1999) expands the comparative focus to look at variations among Scandinavian countries. Retaining the focus on Scandinavian countries, these authors take a more critical intra-country comparative perspective, highlighting the differences in the Nordic countries and challenging the prevailing view that treats Scandinavia as a unit of nations that share more commonalities than distinctions. Examining variations across Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, they focus on the evolution and developments in the Nordic welfare states in the 1990s; examine the changed preconditions of welfare policies; analyze changes in welfare measures; investigate developments in the welfare of the people; and look at developments in public support for the welfare states. They find that Nordic welfare states have indeed developed in a relatively similar manner.

The fourth book (Kautto *et al.* 2001) expands their comparative focus yet again to compare welfare state development in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and

Sweden with that of Germany, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and other Western European countries; and concludes that while the distinct traits of the Nordic model remain intact, there is actually a greater ambiguity regarding variation and trends than is commonly suggested. Contrary to the general expectation that there has been a Europeanization of Nordic welfare states, Kautto and others (2001) find evidence that the Nordic model has influenced the European approach to welfare.

Changing Social Equality: The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century (Kvist *et al.* 2012) is ambitious in its comparative analysis by examining welfare trends within and across Scandinavian countries and also comparing the Nordic countries with other European countries. Taking into account dissimilar institutional designs of welfare provision among Nordic countries, *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century* examines data spanning three decades to compare the capacity of Scandinavian countries to redistribute wealth. Kvist and others (2012) also assess whether Nordic countries are addressing what the authors identify as an “international tide of inequality” better, worse, or differently than other European countries.

Therefore, collectively, the five edited books that focus on Nordic welfare within the public policy analysis series, of which *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century* (Kvist *et al.* 2012) is a part, meet the criteria suggested here for contributing to the accelerating trend of cross-national comparative analysis. Taken together, the five books examine the public policy comparatively and cross-nationally, employ quantitative research designs and methods that are mainstream to much of political science, examine the historical context of Nordic welfare, and explore the dynamic tension between focusing on aggregated similarities and variations within Scandinavian countries. It took five books, 25 years, and many scholars and collaborations.

In contrast, *Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act* (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012) does not seem to be a strong contender for contributing to the accelerating trend of cross-national comparative analysis. It offers an in-depth national study and does not examine public policy comparatively or cross-nationally. Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) employ two innovative research lenses, or at least ones that are less frequently used for examining public policy and its political implications. Therefore, they do not meet the first two criteria suggested here as important to comparative analysis.

Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) organize their finding to produce narratives, defined as events (which occur without a preordained outcome or content and which evolve as a sequence to form social life) strung together retrospectively to create a story that explains what happened and why. They suggest that the more race and gender are institutionalized, the fewer the narratives. According to the authors, from 1966 to 2005, America has moved

away from a single narrative of white male privilege and has moved toward multiple narratives that are contingent upon historical context and organizational settings. In other words, America has moved from a national inequality regime to multiple local inequality regimes.

Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) also approach their analysis from the theoretical grounding of organizational theory. Their primary focus is on organizational responses to external pressures, such as legislation and judicial activity. They find that organizations change when both the motivation to change is present, in the form of inspired leadership or coercion, and when specific alternative models of behavior are available and required. They highlight three main catalysts for organizational change in race and gender inequality: the environmental uncertainty associated with social movements and political pressure, the institutionalization of models of equal opportunity compliance and regulatory oversight, and the pressure from workplace constituencies.

Of the remaining two criteria for contributing to comparative analysis, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) certainly examine the historical context of their specific research question, filling a research gap in the examination of racial and gender equality in U.S. private workplaces since the passing of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. They also explore the dynamic tension between focusing on aggregated similarities by examining national trajectories and also considering variations within the political, social, and economic contexts by examining local inequality regimes.

Edited books have many strengths, among them is a breadth of subjects that would be impractical for a single project and which has a particular value for comparative analyses. A trade-off to this breadth may be a reduced cohesion in focus. Considering Nordic countries as a unit poses both strengths and trade-offs as the authors readily acknowledge. Especially when published as a part of a public policy analysis series, the edited book is an unequivocal foundation for cross-national comparative analysis. *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century* (Kvist *et al.* 2012) is a strong addition to our understanding of welfare from a comparative perspective.

The more problematic question is the role of in-depth national analyses, especially those that employ less frequently used research lenses, to the accelerating the trend to consider public policy and its political implications from a comparative perspective. Studies such as that provided by Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) have the potential to ground illuminating cross-national analyses. One of our challenges is to build more flexible institutional arrangements that support international and cross-national collaborations that have the capacity to produce in-depth comparative studies. Our current institutions often lead to choices between broad comparative studies and in-depth national studies. If the accelerating trend to consider public policy and its political implications from a comparative perspective privileges

broad studies at the cost of reduced value for in-depth studies, this will be a loss to our profession. Both are vital to a rich understanding of public policy and its political implications, especially one that supports both academic and practitioner perspectives.

The Value to Academic and Practitioner Communities

The research reported in these books is of significant value to both academic and practitioner communities, and both are worthy of a detailed review. Kvist and others' (2012) research is focused more toward academics, and its comparisons are focused primarily within and among Nordic countries, and between Scandinavian countries and Europe. A recent study by Byrne and Dixon (2013) adds a U.S. perspective and a more direct policy suggestion to one of the questions that Kvist and others consider: the question of immigration. Byrne and Dixon's study is an example of the findings of an in-depth national study complementing a comparative collection in a way that broadens our global perspective and brings a practical utility to our research.

Byrne and Dixon (2013) consider how the structure of identity translates to policy preference in the U.S. Taking as their premise that individuals construct identities from a structure of dimensions that determine the ease with which outsiders may join the polity, they find an interactive effect between ethnocultural and civic-political dimensions. Specifically, the impact of ethnoculturalism is strongest when individuals choose between the status quo and reducing immigration, and therefore, ethnoculturalism has the greatest impact on neutral and negative immigration attitudes. Thus, as an individual's sense of ethnocultural identity increases, he or she is more likely to favor more restrictive immigration policy. Additionally, they find that when both identities are observed strongly by individuals, this contributes to negative attitudes toward immigration. For Byrne and Dixon, ethnoculturalism is not solely responsible for restrictive attitudes. Even when individuals have little affinity for ethnocultural concepts of identity, increasing their affinity for the civic-political dimension increases their hostility toward immigrants. They suggest that there is an interactive effect between the civic-political and the ethnocultural dimensions. Both dimensions have a tendency to build an in-group and an out-group through the concept of a shared identity. While they do not cancel each other out, they rely on the same notion of group exclusivity that promotes negative policy preferences regarding immigration. They also find that only the civic-republican dimension lowered the likelihood that a person would favor more restrictive policies. In other words, commitment to community and personal service to the group moderates negative attitudes. According to Byrne and Dixon, action-oriented policies that encourage citizens to become more informed concerning politics and more involved in their local communities as

well as at the national level should be the most effective at promoting more positive attitudes toward immigration. Therefore, they suggest that policies that promote the old deTocqueville model of civic engagement, such as the immigration roundtables, are the ones most likely to provide the desired results.

Goldstein (2013) faults *Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act* (Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey 2012) with underrating the impact of the Supreme Court to workplace integration. While this is true and an essential point to be made in *Law and Politics Book Review*, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey (2012) do not claim to include a thorough review of the impact of judicial action.

Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey's (2012) work is also focused more toward academics, but its narrative and organizational lenses may make its conclusions more accessible to practitioners. However, there are two elements of the authors' study that may pose challenges to the application of their findings. They frame their project as rebutting "erroneous societal views" (also referred to as "traditional" and "old fashioned" views), such as quotas represent reverse discrimination against white males, the double benefit black women experience by filling two quotas, and the ubiquitous belief that Americans are less prejudiced today and therefore, apparent discrimination actually represents individual differences. For a work that is otherwise explicit concerning its theoretical grounding, one of which is the use of narratives that represent various viewpoints, the reader is left to ask who shares these ubiquitous "societal views." At best, these are the views of some. In a society with a history of white male privilege, these views represent the perspective of white male privilege. A more nuanced framing of this otherwise strong conceptual and methodological study that included multiple viewpoints of more marginalized voices would add richness to this article. Also a possible challenge to the application of their findings is Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey's use of four categories available from their earlier data: white men, white women, black men, and black women. While these categories are illuminating in understanding U.S. conceptualization of race and gender in 1964, they make translating the findings to a more a contemporary environment more challenging.

Conclusion

In considering two recent books that examine Nordic welfare and U.S. employment policies, three broader points are made to the cross-national comparative analysis of public policy and its political implications. Public policies reflect and shape a polity's normative political values. Especially in changing policy environments, current policies not only establish path dependence for incremental policy changes, but also influence our individual

and collective normative political values. Also, the accelerating trend of cross-national comparative analysis highlights a tension between the continued need for in-depth national studies and the call for more comparative analysis. Edited books have been and remain an unequivocal foundation for cross-national comparative analysis. More problematic is the question of the role of in-depth national analyses, especially those that employ less frequently used research methods and perspectives. We need to build more flexible institutional arrangements that support international and cross-national collaborations that have the capacity to produce in-depth comparative studies. It is important to find avenues to incorporate in-depth national analyses into our comparative research. Finally, public policy studies should meet the criteria of academic rigor and also be of value to practitioners.

References

- BERMEO, NANCY, and JONAS PONTUSSON. 2012. *Coping with Crisis: Government Reactions to the Great Recession*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- BYRNE, JENNIFER, and GREGORY C. DIXON. 2013. "Reevaluating American Attitudes toward Immigrants in the Twenty-First Century: The Role of a Multicreedal National Identity." *Politics & Policy* 41: 83-116. Accessed on March 1, 2014. Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/polp.12002/abstract>
- ERIKSON, ROBERT, ERIK JØRGEN HANSEN, STEIN RINGEN, and HANNU UUSITALO. 1987. *The Scandinavian Model: Welfare States and Welfare Research, Comparative Public Policy Analysis Series*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- EYSENCK, HANS J. 1956. *Sense and Nonsense in Psychology*. Baltimore: Penguin.
- _____. 1975. "The Structure of Social Attitudes." *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 14 (4): 323-331. Accessed on March 1, 2014. Available online at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1975.tb00188.x/abstract>
- FERGUSON, LEONARD W. 1941. "The Stability of the Primary Social Attitudes: I. Regionalism and Humanitarianism." *Journal of Psychology* 12 (2): 283-288.
- _____. 1942. "The Isolation and Measurement of Nationalism." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 16 (2): 215-228.
- FERGUSON, LEONARD W., LLOYD G. HUMPHREYS, and F. W. STRONG. 1941. "A Factorial Analysis of Interests and Values." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 32 (3): 197-204.

GOLDSTEIN, LESLIE F. 2013. "A Review of 'Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act.'" *Law and Politics Book Review* 23 (6): 296-301.

HANSEN, ERIK JØRGEN, STEIN RINGEN, HANNU UUSITALO, and ROBERT ERIKSON. 1993. *Welfare Trends in the Scandinavian Countries*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

JOHANSSON, STEN. 1970. *On the Level of Living Survey*. Translated by Johan Fritzell, Carin Lennartsson, and Olin Lundberg. Swedish National Data Service. Accessed on May 12, 2014. Available online at <http://snd.gu.se>

KAUTTO, MIKKO, JOHAN FRITZELL, BJØRN HVINDEN, JON KVIST, and HANNU UUSITALO. 2001. *Nordic Welfare States in the European Context*. London: Routledge.

KAUTTO, MIKKO, MATTI HEIKKILA, BJØRN HVINDEN, STAFFAN MARKLUND, and NIELS PLOUG. 1999. *Nordic Social Policy: Changing Welfare States*. London: Routledge.

KVIST, JON, JOHAN FRITZELL, BJØRN HVINDEN, and OLLI KANGAS. 2012. *Changing Social Equality, The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century*. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press, University of Bristol.

ROKEACH, MILTON. 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: The Free Press.

STAINBACK, KEVIN, and DONALD TOMASKOVIC-DEVEY. 2012. *Documenting Desegregation, Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

TITMUSS, RICHARD. 1958. *Essays on the Welfare State*. London: George Allen and Unwin.