

COVID-19 and the Nordic Paradox

A Call to Measure the Inequality Reducing Benefits of Welfare Systems in the Wake of the Pandemic

Joseph Friedman¹, Alhelí Calderon-Villarreal², Kristian Heggebø^{3,4}, Mirza Balaj³, Clare Bamba⁵, Terje Andreas Eikemo^{3*}

¹ Center for Social Medicine and Humanities, University of California, Los Angeles

² Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, University of California, San Diego

³ Centre for Global Health Inequalities Research (CHAIN), Department of Sociology and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway

⁴NOVA, Oslo Metropolitan University

⁵Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University

*Correspondence to: terje.eikemo@ntnu.no

Abstract

The *Nordic Paradox* of inequality describes how the Nordic countries have puzzlingly high levels of relative health inequalities compared to other nations, despite extensive universal welfare systems and progressive tax regimes that redistribute income. However, the veracity and origins of this paradox have been contested across decades of literature, as many scholars argue it relates to measurement issues or historical coincidences. Disentangling between potential explanations is crucial to determine if widespread adoption of the Nordic model could represent a sufficient panacea for lowering health inequalities, or if new approaches must be pioneered. As newfound challenges to welfare systems continue to emerge, evidence describing the benefits of welfare systems is becoming ever more important. Preliminary evidence indicates that the COVID-19 pandemic is drastically exacerbating social inequalities in health across the world, via direct and indirect effects. We argue that the COVID-19 pandemic therefore represents a unique opportunity to measure the value of welfare systems in insulating their populations from rising social inequalities in health. However, COVID-19 has also created new measurement challenges and interrupted data collection mechanisms. Robust academic studies will therefore be needed—drawing on novel data collection methods—to measure increasing social inequalities in health in a timely fashion. In order to assure that policies implemented to reduce inequalities can be guided by accurate and updated information, policymakers, academics, and the international community must work together to ensure streamlined data collection, reporting, analysis, and evidence-based decision-making. In this way, the pandemic may offer the opportunity to finally clarify some of the mechanisms underpinning the Nordic Paradox, and potentially more firmly establish the merits of the Nordic model as a global example for reducing social inequalities in health.

Keywords: Nordic Paradox; COVID-19 Pandemic; Welfare Systems; Health Inequalities; Social Inequality

1. The Nordic Paradox

The *Nordic Paradox* of inequality describes how the Nordic countries have puzzlingly high levels of health inequalities compared to other European nations^{1,2}. This line of reasoning—albeit controversial—argues that relatively large social inequalities in health can be found in the Nordic countries, despite extensive universal welfare systems and progressive tax regimes that redistribute income, which should, in theory, reduce health inequalities³.

Although this surprising empirical pattern could have serious policy implications in advanced welfare states, many scholars have argued that the pattern stems from either measurement issues (such as using relative vs. absolute inequality metrics⁴⁻⁶) or historical coincidences¹⁻³. Alternatively, others argue the paradox is a real and persistent finding indicating that the Nordic model insufficiently reduces health inequalities in its current form. It may be that people with higher socioeconomic status are better at taking advantage of the universally available welfare resources in Nordic welfare states, for example, by maneuvering more smoothly in complicated bureaucratic landscapes⁷. Or perhaps we must consider the causality in reverse; healthier people could, in fact, be more likely to improve their socioeconomic status as family background is less relevant where universal access to education and opportunities abound. Alternatively, perhaps the risk factors underpinning health inequalities in Nordic welfare states, such as behavioral and occupational exposures, are simply less amenable to universal services and the redistribution of income⁸. Disentangling between these potential explanations is crucial before proceeding to policy implications. Yet at its core, the Nordic Paradox remains a critical issue for those interested in decreasing inequality, as it questions if widespread adoption of the Nordic model is a sufficient panacea for lowering health inequalities, or if new approaches must be pioneered.

It is also important to note that Nordic countries' population health is among the best in the world⁹, and is expected to only improve¹⁰. Regardless of its effects on health inequalities, the Scandinavian approach to health policy inarguably has robust benefits for lifting up the average person's wellbeing and health. Nevertheless, it is curious that relative health inequalities are noticeably lower in a number of other European countries, despite lacking the robust social protection mechanisms that the Nordic countries have¹¹⁻¹³. The persistence of the Nordic paradox as an unsettled matter across decades of literature points to methodological difficulties of measuring the real benefits of welfare protections in human societies. This presents an issue of increasing importance, as challenges to welfare states grow.

2. The Pandemic as a Natural Experiment to Clarify the Nordic Paradox

The COVID-19 pandemic represents a unique opportunity to measure the true value of welfare systems in insulating their populations from rising social inequalities in health. As health inequalities increase sharply in many countries as a result of the disruption caused by the pandemic, there is a rare chance to measure the impact of the degree of social protections enjoyed in each country. If the Nordic countries experience the same increases in health inequalities during the pandemic as other countries with less developed welfare systems, this will be quite a strong reinforcement of the idea that social protection, alone, are insufficient to decrease inequalities. If, on the other hand, evidence supporting the notion that the Nordic Paradox may be driven largely by other contextual factors. In other words, the Nordic model may be quite effective in reducing health inequalities, but this has been somewhat masked by a population that is predisposed to large relative health inequalities, for historical reasons.

The pandemic therefore represents a natural experiment, offering the chance to demonstrate if and why the Nordic Paradox emerged and endures, and potentially more widely re-affirm the importance of robust welfare systems for combating social inequalities in health.

3. Rising Global Health Inequalities

Preliminary evidence indicates that the COVID-19 pandemic is drastically exacerbating social inequalities in health across the world, via direct and indirect effects¹⁴. Immediate and direct effects are visible in many countries as the brunt of COVID-19 infections and mortality has fallen disproportionately on racial/ethnic minorities and people with low socioeconomic status¹⁵. A social gradient will most likely appear in the medium- and long-term direct effects of COVID-19 infection as well, with people in lower socioeconomic strata being more exposed to the symptoms of 'long covid', such as fatigue, muscle pain and other chronic health conditions post-COVID-19-infection¹⁶. Perhaps even more troubling, the indirect economic effects of the pandemic threaten to strongly amplify social inequalities for years to come. A huge fraction of the world's labor force has been pushed out of work¹⁷, and even in countries like Norway layoffs are more common among lower socio-economic groups¹⁸. A record number of children are going hungry, and many are out of school¹⁹. The burden of mental illness and 'deaths of despair' have reached an all-time high in many places^{20,21}. These deleterious consequences together represent a growing, global syndemic of unprecedented proportions¹⁴. Some of these syndemic properties will resolve as the pandemic passes, yet other consequences are likely to persist for at least a generation.

These deleterious social consequences have been experienced more sharply among women, even in the highest-income settings, due to their overrepresentation in certain industries, and because women are more likely to work temporary jobs which have fewer legal protections^{22,23}. Further, these inequalities must be viewed intersectionally, as women are often embedded in environments conferring multiple dimensions of disadvantage based on employment, fertility, migrant status, race/ethnicity, and educational background^{24,25}.

Particularly concerning, the pandemic has caused never-before-seen disruptions to schooling, which is uniquely linked to inequalities and social mobility. At the peak of pandemic-related lockdowns, over 80% of the world's nearly 2 billion learners were out-of-school¹⁹. Millions of children around the world continue to learn remotely. Yet, even in high-income countries like the United States, many lack computers, internet access, and other resources required to continue to learn²⁶. Millions of children will suffer substantial learning losses. Even more problematically, in the face of increased economic precarity, many children globally are expected to drop out of school altogether in order to help their families survive in the short-term¹⁹. As education is a key social determinant of health, and driver of economic and social growth, widening educational gaps may ripple out into disparities across numerous sectors of society^{27,28}.

A related serious issue is children being continuously exposed to a toxic home environment during prolonged periods of lockdown^{29,30}. Being forced to spending more time at home is synonymous with an increased risk of violence and/or sexual abuse for many children, of which the harmful effects will have a long reach. More household poverty, and associated parental stress, could also lead to a substantial deterioration in living conditions for numerous children, with long-term impact on educational attainment, life chances and health and longevity.

In the midst of the social and economic fallout of the pandemic, strong social welfare systems—such as those enjoyed by the Nordic countries—are likely to be effective in buffering against the worst of these social consequences of the pandemic. Great diversity can be seen in welfare systems and income maintenance schemes between high-income countries, ranging from generous social protections and income redistribution in Nordic countries to the threadbare social safety net of the United States³¹. Each of these systems are in the midst of perhaps their most significant challenge, and COVID-19 therefore offers a unique opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of each system for protecting against rising social inequalities in health.

4. New Research Agendas Needed to Measure the Inequality Reducing Benefits of Welfare Systems During Global Crises

As newfound challenges to welfare systems continue to emerge, evidence describing the benefits of welfare systems will become ever more important. Populist Right and Far-Right parties have gained substantial power across Europe and the Americas, representing a threat to the fundamental premises of universal social protection mechanisms^{32–34}. Similarly, powerful interests have continued to promote policies that privatize public resources and slash social safety nets, even in the midst of unprecedented increases in precarity during the pandemic³⁵. In the post-pandemic recovery period, calls for austerity measures will likely grow louder and challenge social safety nets in many countries across the world. In this context, robust academic studies will be needed to measure trends in health inequalities, to highlight the potential protective effects of the different welfare systems, and to pin down the systems that are most effective in insulating their populations from rising inequalities.

4.1 Rapid and Socially Detailed Data Sources

To facilitate this, data collection mechanisms must be prioritized that are rapidly available, cover a range of social and health outcomes, and include social stratifiers, such as educational attainment, wealth, income, occupational class, and race/ethnicity. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown that rapid—even daily—data collection and reporting is possible for outcomes such as mortality, when political and logistical barriers can be overcome. However, for many of the pressing social and economic ramifications of the pandemic—which have enormous potential implications for health and well-being—data collection has been largely disrupted and reporting lags more than ever. Even where outcome measures are available rapidly, trends disaggregated by socioeconomic status are often lacking³⁶. In a particularly egregious example, the New York Times had to sue the Trump administration in the United States to force it to disclose COVID-19 mortality records stratified by race and ethnicity, even as those data had been internally available for months³⁶. Once revealed, the data showed enormous disparities in COVID-19 deaths along lines of race and class in the United States. Countless similar inequalities are likely to be present globally, yet they will remain hidden unless both data and analyses are made available stratified by the most important social and socioeconomic dimensions.

In order to facilitate timely surveillance of social inequalities in health during the pandemic and post-pandemic periods, new approaches should be considered. For example, surveys rapidly deployed on social media platforms have already offered invaluable data about social and behavioral responses to COVID-19³⁷. Data collection through mobile and online formats offers important avenues to generate near real-time information about social conditions. Nevertheless, these rapid approaches also pose challenges, including limited representativeness, especially in more resource-poor settings. Centralized

coordination will be required to integrate data, standardize definitions and methodologies, and provide rapid and reliable analysis to detect emerging problems.

4.2 Novel Health Outcomes and Methods to Measure Social Inequalities

The pandemic has also created a number of novel health outcomes, which must be assessed with an equity lens. Of particular importance is quantifying the inequality in excess mortality. The true toll of the pandemic is still not fully known³⁸. Already, numerous efforts are underway to measure the extent of mortality stemming from the pandemic globally. Fully stratifying the direct and indirect mortality toll from COVID-19 by socioeconomic status and ethnicity, race and/or immigrant background will be essential in conveying the magnitude of health inequalities created by the pandemic. Similarly, COVID-19 vaccination status has already been shown to vary strongly by socioeconomic status within³⁹, and between countries^{40,41}. Careful accounting of these acute disparities, as well as long-term social and economic outcomes, will be necessary to chart the full implications of the pandemic for health and social equity. Novel methods (such as natural policy experiment designs and micro-simulations) are also needed to evaluate the impact of social security policies on health inequalities⁴².

5. Conclusions

The COVID-19 pandemic has, in many respects, revealed the fault lines of deep structural inequalities within, and between, many of the world's societies⁴³, by elucidating how one's country and social status are of enormous importance in determining health. By providing these sobering insights, the large scale social and economic upheavals occurring during the COVID-19 pandemic offer the possibility for both dramatic improvements and tremendous setbacks. Social inequalities in health have been thrust into the spotlight in a new way, with social gradients emerging as a defining topic for the decade. However, in order to assure that policies implemented to reduce inequalities can be guided by accurate and updated information, policymakers, academics, and the international community must work together to ensure streamlined data collection that overcomes new disruptions to data streams. Data must be reported with social stratifiers, and analyses must be undertaken quickly and thoroughly to track the evolving importance of social factors in driving health inequalities during and in the wake of the pandemic.

In this way, the pandemic may offer the opportunity to finally clarify some of the mechanisms underpinning the Nordic Paradox, and more firmly establish the merits of the Nordic model as a global example for reducing social inequalities in health.

References

- 1 Mackenbach JP, Kunst AE. Socioeconomic inequalities in morbidity and mortality in western Europe. *THE LANCET* 1997; **349**: 5.
- 2 Bambra C. Health inequalities and welfare state regimes: theoretical insights on a public health ‘puzzle’. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 2011; **65**: 740–5.
- 3 Mackenbach JP. Nordic paradox, Southern miracle, Eastern disaster: persistence of inequalities in mortality in Europe. *European Journal of Public Health* 2017; **27**: 14–7.
- 4 Vågerö D, Erikson R. Socioeconomic inequalities in morbidity and mortality in western Europe. *Lancet* 1997; **350**: 516; author reply 517-518.
- 5 Bambra C. In defence of (social) democracy: on health inequalities and the welfare state. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013; **67**: 713–4.
- 6 Popham F, Dibben C, Bambra C. Are health inequalities really not the smallest in the Nordic welfare states? A comparison of mortality inequality in 37 countries. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013; **67**: 412–8.
- 7 Øversveen E, Rydland HT, Bambra C, Eikemo TA. Rethinking the relationship between socio-economic status and health: Making the case for sociological theory in health inequality research. *Scand J Public Health* 2017; **45**: 103–12.
- 8 Balaj M, McNamara CL, Eikemo TA, Bambra C. The social determinants of inequalities in self-reported health in Europe: findings from the European social survey (2014) special module on the social determinants of health. *Eur J Public Health* 2017; **27**: 107–14.
- 9 Lundberg O. Commentary: Politics and public health—some conceptual considerations concerning welfare state characteristics and public health outcomes. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2008; **37**: 1105–8.
- 10 Foreman KJ, Marquez N, Dolgert A, *et al.* Forecasting life expectancy, years of life lost, and all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 250 causes of death: reference and alternative scenarios for 2016–40 for 195 countries and territories. *The Lancet* 2018; published online Oct. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31694-5.
- 11 Mackenbach JP, Valverde JR, Artnik B, *et al.* Trends in health inequalities in 27 European countries. *PNAS* 2018; **115**: 6440–5.
- 12 Mackenbach JP, Cavelaars AE, Kunst AE. Socioeconomic inequalities in morbidity and mortality in western Europe. *The Lancet* 1997; **350**: 517–8.
- 13 Rod NH, Bengtsson J, Budtz-Jørgensen E, *et al.* Trajectories of childhood adversity and mortality in early adulthood: a population-based cohort study. *The Lancet* 2020; **396**: 489–97.
- 14 Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2020; **74**: 964–8.
- 15 Far from equal - Covid-19 has shone a light on racial disparities in health | International | The Economist. <https://www.economist.com/international/2020/11/21/covid-19-has-shone-a-light-on-racial-disparities-in-health> (accessed Dec 11, 2020).
- 16 Whitaker M, Elliott J, Chadeau-Hyam M, *et al.* Persistent symptoms following SARS-CoV-2 infection in a random community sample of 508,707 people. *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2021 DOI:10.1101/2021.06.28.21259452.
- 17 Dias FA. The Racial Gap in Employment and Layoffs during COVID-19 in the United States: A Visualization. *Socius* 2021; **7**: 2378023120988397.
- 18 Carlsen EØ, Caspersen IH, Ask H, Brandlistuen RE, Trogstad L, Magnus P. The association between work situation and life satisfaction during the COVID-19 pandemic: prospective cohort study in Norway. *medRxiv* 2020; : 2020.12.16.20248321.
- 19 Policy Brief: Education during COVID-19 and Beyond. UNESCO https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/08/sg_policy_brief_covid-19_and_education_august_2020.pdf (accessed Jan 14, 2021).
- 20 Friedman J, Beletsky L, Schriger DL. Overdose-Related Cardiac Arrests Observed by Emergency Medical Services During the US COVID-19 Epidemic. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2020; published online Dec 3. DOI:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.4218.
- 21 Arena PJ, Malta M, Rimoin AW, Strathdee SA. Race, COVID-19 and deaths of despair. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020; **25**. DOI:10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100485.
- 22 ILO Monitor: COVID-19 and the world of work. Fifth edition. ; : 22.

- 23 Bambra C, Albani V, Franklin P. COVID-19 and the gender health paradox. *Scand J Public Health* 2021; **49**: 17–26.
- 24 Crenshaw K. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 1991; **43**: 1241–99.
- 25 Calderon-Villarreal A, Mujica OJ, Bojorquez I. Social inequalities and prevalence of depressive symptoms: a cross-sectional study of women in a Mexican border city, 2014. *Rev Panam Salud Publica* 2020; **44**. DOI:10.26633/RPSP.2020.9.
- 26 Friedman J, York H, Mokdad A, Gakidou E. US Children ‘Learning Online’ During COVID-19 Without the Internet or a Computer: Visualizing the Gradient by Race/Ethnicity and Parental Educational Attainment. SocArXiv, 2020 DOI:10.31235/osf.io/42trc.
- 27 Lim SS, Updike RL, Kaldjian AS, *et al.* Measuring human capital: a systematic analysis of 195 countries and territories, 1990–2016. *The Lancet* 2018; published online Sept. DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31941-X.
- 28 Friedman J, York H, Graetz N, *et al.* Measuring and forecasting progress towards the education-related SDG targets. *Nature* 2020; **580**: 636–9.
- 29 Chandan JS, Taylor J, Bradbury-Jones C, Nirantharakumar K, Kane E, Bandyopadhyay S. COVID-19: a public health approach to manage domestic violence is needed. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020; **5**: e309.
- 30 Jeyaraman D, Chandan JS. Digital public health: a hopeful strategy to tackle the surge in domestic violence. *The Lancet Public Health* 2020; **5**: e578.
- 31 Bambra C. *The Unequal Pandemic: COVID-19 and Health Inequalities*, First edition. Bristol: Policy Press, 2021.
- 32 Golder M. Far Right Parties in Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science* 2016; **19**: 477–97.
- 33 Blee KM. Ethnographies of the Far Right. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 2007; **36**: 119–28.
- 34 Goldstein AA. The New Far-Right in Brazil and the Construction of a Right-Wing Order. *Latin American Perspectives* 2019; **46**: 245–62.
- 35 Horton R. Offline: Defending the left hand of the state. *The Lancet* 2018; **391**: 2484.
- 36 Murray CJL. Opinion | Why Can’t We See All of the Government’s Virus Data? The New York Times. 2020; published online Oct 23. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/23/opinion/coronavirus-data-secrecy.html> (accessed Jan 25, 2021).
- 37 Our Work on COVID-19. Facebook Data for Good. <https://dataforgood.fb.com/docs/covid19/> (accessed Jan 25, 2021).
- 38 Excess mortality from the Coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19). Our World in Data. <https://ourworldindata.org/excess-mortality-covid> (accessed May 15, 2020).
- 39 Equity Metrics: Toward A More Effective And Inclusive Pandemic Response | Health Affairs Blog. <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20210202.251805/full/> (accessed Feb 3, 2021).
- 40 Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Kern A, *et al.* An ethical framework for global vaccine allocation. *Science* 2020; **369**: 1309–12.
- 41 Todd A, Bambra C. Learning from past mistakes? The COVID-19 vaccine and the inverse equity hypothesis. *European Journal of Public Health* 2021; **31**: 2–2.
- 42 Smith KE, Bambra C, Hill S. *Health Inequalities: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford University Press, 2016.
- 43 Farmer PE, Nizeye B, Stulac S, Keshavjee S. Structural Violence and Clinical Medicine. *PLOS Medicine* 2006; **3**: e449.