

**The European Network for Social Policy Analysis/*Journal
of European Social Policy* Doctoral Researcher Prize Essay
2016**

Beyond the ‘Train-First/‘Work-First’ Dichotomy: How Welfare
States Help or Hinder Maternal Employment

Helen Kowalewska

Manuscript accepted for publication in *Journal of European Social Policy* on 15.07.16 and due
to be published in the first issue in 2017.

Beyond the ‘Train-First’/‘Work-First’ Dichotomy: How Welfare States Help or Hinder Maternal Employment

Abstract

Since the mid-1990s, welfare states have introduced various ‘activation’ policies designed to promote employment. Most typologies distinguish between a Nordic-style ‘train-first’ approach focused on developing jobseekers’ employability, and an Anglo-Saxon ‘work-first’ approach that emphasises quick job (re-)entry. These typologies tell us what activation means for the unemployed (male) worker. But by ignoring the family, they overlook what activation means for the (female) parent-worker with childcare responsibilities. To contribute to filling this gap, this article uses fuzzy-set ideal type analysis to compare twenty-two countries representing five ‘worlds’ of welfare by how (de-)activating their labour market policies, parental leave provisions, childcare services and the scheduling of primary education are for lone mothers. It reveals that cross-national variations in support for maternal activation are not well captured by the Nordic-style ‘train-first’/Anglo-Saxon ‘work-first’ dichotomy. Hence, despite the greater attention to gender and ‘new social risks’ within comparative social policy scholarship, the activation literature remains gender-blind.

Keywords: [active labour market policies; childcare; lone parents; mothers’ employment; typologies]

Introduction: Why We Need a Typology of Lone Mother Activation

Since the late-1990s, welfare states across Europe and elsewhere have progressively converged on an ‘adult-worker’ model of welfare whereby all able-bodied men and women are required to be in paid work. Consequently, mothers are no longer excused from employment for the purposes of caregiving, but are instead subject to compulsory ‘activation’ (e.g. Lewis, 2001; Daly, 2011; Jenson, 2015). Yet, the precise meaning of activation and different ways in which welfare states seek to encourage, compel and prepare mothers for employment are not immediately clear. This is because an extremely diverse range of policy instruments can be subsumed under the label of activation. Moreover, these different instruments often have different characteristics and reflect sharply contrasting ideas about the causes of unemployment, why it is a problem, who is responsible for managing it, and what the best solution is (Bonoli, 2012).

To disambiguate the meaning of activation and capture its nuances, a significant body of comparative social policy literature has emerged which organises the different policy approaches welfare states take in activating the unemployed into a number of ‘ideal types’. Most of the literature distinguishes between a ‘work-first’ or ‘employment-first’ approach to activation that seeks to pressurise the unemployed into (any) jobs quickly, and a ‘human capital development’ or ‘train-first’ approach that instead aims to develop individuals’ long-term employability. While the employment-first approach tends to be more dominant in Anglo-Saxon states, especially the United States, the human capital development approach is more characteristic of Sweden and other Nordics (e.g. Lødemel and Trickey, 2000; Peck and Theodore, 2001; Eichhorst et al., 2008). Most of the activation literature agrees that there is no coherent ‘Continental’ activation strategy, as different Continental countries combine the employment-first and human capital development approaches to differing degrees (e.g. Barbier and Ludwig-Mayerhofer, 2004). Meanwhile, Mediterranean and post-Soviet states are typically described as weakly activating (e.g. Morel et al., 2012) or as emphasising the duties and obligations of the unemployed only (e.g. the Czech Republic and Portugal in Serrano Pascual’s (2007) typology), if they are considered at all.

In focusing on the individual's relationship firstly with the welfare state and secondly with the market, the human capital development/employment-first dichotomy tells us what activation means for the average unemployed worker. The problem is that this dichotomy overlooks the role of the family. As a result, it excludes childcare and other policies which support the activation of specifically mothers given the gendered division of caregiving within the family. In turn, existing activation typologies ignore the potential for policies to 'de-activate' mothers by reinforcing their caregiving, rather than supporting their employment. For example, certain states provide flat-rate 'home-care' cash benefits to stay-at-home parents with young children for three or more years. But in more than 90 per cent of cases, the mother is the recipient (Westlund, 2007; Duvander and Ellingsæter, 2016). Moreover, employment or the use of state-subsidised childcare services can preclude entitlement (OECD, 2007, 2011). So while home-care allowances are couched in gender-neutral language, in practice, the gendered division of care work means that such allowances can serve to de-activate mothers with young children (Westlund, 2007).

This article addresses the shortcomings of the mainstream activation literature in relation to the specific situations of mothers. It does this by focusing on how labour market policies support lone mothers to reconcile activation and childcare and by treating childcare policies, parental leave provisions and the scheduling of primary school systems as integrated components of the active welfare state. Through a fuzzy-set ideal type analysis of twenty-two countries representing five 'worlds' of welfare (Anglo-Saxon, Nordic, Continental, Mediterranean and post-Soviet), I examine how a range of benefits and services beyond labour market ones alone address the employment/childcare dilemma for lone parents¹. Hence, following previous feminist research (e.g. Orloff, 1993; Hobson, 1994; Skevik, 2005), I treat the situation of single parents as a 'litmus test' for all mothers. This is because mothers head, on average, 85 per cent of lone parent households across the OECD (OECD, 2016). Therefore, lone parents tend to be lone mothers, who are, by definition, women maintaining households with children independently of men². Thus, I use the terms 'lone parent' and 'lone mother' interchangeably and assume that if policies are good enough to allow single mothers to

reconcile the demands of employment and childcare, they will be good enough for all mothers irrespective of any partners' role in caregiving.

Although mothers in couple households tend to have more and younger children than single mothers (Chzhen and Bradshaw, 2012), and welfare states often treat mothers differently according to their partnership status, policies for single mothers are still relevant for their partnered counterparts. Firstly, they give an indication of mothers' 'exit' options from relationships. That is, the better the situation for single mothers, the more empowered partnered mothers will be to exercise voice within relationships and leave undesirable ones (Hobson, 1990; Orloff, 2009). Secondly, transformations in family structures and behaviour over the last four decades have made single parenthood a life course stage for increasing numbers of women (Bonoli, 2005). For instance, across the seventeen Western states included in Andersson and Philipov's (2002) study, on average, one-quarter of women will spend at least some time as a single parent by age forty. So while lone parenthood is often transient, as single mothers often re-partner and children eventually leave home, lone parenthood is nevertheless a 'new social risk' to which a significant proportion of women are now exposed.

The article reveals that cross-national variations in support for maternal activation are not well-captured by the dichotomy between a Nordic-style human capital development approach and an Anglo-Saxon employment-first one. On the one hand, policies to develop mothers' human capital are not as extensive across the Nordics as predicted by the existing activation literature and against the common assumption of a single 'women-friendly' and gender-equal Nordic model of welfare (e.g. Gornick and Meyers, 2009). Furthermore, policies in Finland are potentially de-activating for mothers. On the other hand, policies towards lone parents in Australia and the United Kingdom are not conducive to rapid job (re-)entry against the characterisation of these states as employment-first. What is more, the findings show that the mainstream activation literature underestimates the extent to which certain Mediterranean and post-Soviet states are activating for mothers. Overall, these results indicate that despite the greater attention to gender and new social risks within the comparative social policy literature, the branch of this literature which focuses on activation still ignores women.

The next section summarises existing research on lone mother activation. I then outline the methods in the third and fourth sections, followed by the findings in the fifth. I conclude by highlighting the contribution of these findings to the activation literature.

Lone Mother Activation: State of the Art

During the 1990s, research interest in lone mothers within the field of comparative social policy peaked. This was partly due to the increased prevalence of lone mothers and concerns about their relatively high rates of poverty and welfare dependency. But it was also because lone mothers offered an instructive category for analysing how welfare states resolved the employment/childcare dilemma for all mothers, independently of any partners' contributions (e.g. Orloff, 1993; Hobson, 1994; Lewis and Hobson, 1997). Lewis and Hobson (1997) subsequently identified two main care regimes according to how they treated lone mothers: the 'caregiver' model, which assumed that all lone and partnered mothers were full-time carers; and the 'parent-worker' or 'adult-worker' model, which treated lone mothers and other parents as full-time workers.

Since the late-1990s, however, welfare states across Europe and elsewhere have progressively converged on the adult-worker model (Lewis, 2001). As a result, participation in paid work or employment-related activities has become compulsory for lone parents (Haux, 2013). Several studies examine this policy development in detail. They show that lone mother conditionality in Anglo-Saxon states, excluding the US, is 'light' by international standards. Nevertheless, policies in Anglo-Saxon states, and increasingly Continental ones too, focus mainly on securing rapid job placement by overcoming practical obstacles to lone mothers' employment (e.g. Strell and Duncan, 2001; Knijn et al., 2007; Finn and Gloster, 2010). Yet, as the family policy literature also shows, working parents in Anglo-Saxon states are given minimal support to reconcile activation and childcare as they are largely expected to make their own arrangements through the market (e.g. Gornick and Meyers, 2004). Meanwhile, despite some modernisation in recent years (e.g. Häusermann, 2006), Continental states (excluding Belgium and France) remain focused on promoting mothers' caregiving over their employment (e.g. Leitner, 2003). In contrast, activation in Nordic countries focuses

more positively on integrating lone mothers into employment by improving their social skills and confidence, and widespread childcare facilities and comprehensive leave policies support mothers' continuous employment (e.g. Rowlingson and Millar, 2002; Skevik, 2005), albeit less so in Finland and Norway (e.g. Ciccia and Bleijenbergh, 2014).

Thus, existing studies of lone mother activation detail how certain welfare states activate lone mothers. Yet, they do not go far enough in capturing the full diversity of policy approaches. This is because they either focus on a single country at a time or compare just a small number (three to seven) of welfare states. Hence, the extent to which the policy approaches of these select few countries are idiosyncratic to them only, or are instead representative of the approaches that other welfare states take, is unclear. Furthermore, because existing studies focus exclusively on Anglo-Saxon, Nordic or Continental countries, not enough is known about the diversity and characteristics of lone mother activation policies in Mediterranean and post-Soviet states.

More recently, Haux's (2013) typology of lone mother activation captures some of the diversity missing in earlier studies by encompassing twenty-nine welfare states. She identifies three broad approaches to activating lone mothers. The first approach, *voluntary activation*, involves no compulsory activation. However, no country any longer conforms to this approach (author's update from Haux, 2013). Conversely, countries which adhere to the *general activation* approach expect (almost) all single parents to be available for employment. Most Mediterranean and post-Soviet states follow this approach. Finally, countries following the *age of child approach* exempt lone parents from activation requirements until their youngest child reaches a certain age. This age threshold varies from a few weeks (many Canadian provinces and US states) to a few years (the Czech Republic, Norway and most Continental states) or compulsory school age (other Anglo-Saxon states and the Netherlands). France and Norway additionally exempt the custodial parent from employment requirements during the first year of lone parenthood. Meanwhile, Belgium, the Netherlands, most Nordic countries and a few US states additionally use trained caseworkers to decide whether or not to impose job-search requirements case-by-case given a single parent's particular circumstances and/or the availability of local jobs and childcare.

While Haux's typology elucidates the approaches that a wide range of welfare states take in identifying lone mothers for compulsory activation, it still paints an incomplete picture of lone mother activation. This is because countries are categorised by variation on one dimension of lone mother activation only, namely the point at which lone mothers are no longer excused from employment for the purposes of full-time caregiving and are instead subject to compulsory activation. Thus, Haux's typology does not detail how welfare states seek to move lone mothers into jobs or support them to reconcile employment and childcare once they are deemed 'work-ready'. This article therefore builds on Haux's typology by incorporating these additional important dimensions into a more holistic typology of lone mother activation. Specifically, it compares welfare states by: (i) the strictness of job availability and search conditions imposed on lone mothers; (ii) lone mothers' access to training measures to enhance their employability; and (iii) the degree to which family and education policies support lone mothers to balance employment and childcare.

The analysis also goes beyond previous aforementioned studies of lone mother activation based on national case studies by incorporating a larger number (twenty-two) of welfare states. For comparability with the mainstream activation literature, I include a range of countries representing the three main 'worlds' of welfare for which data are available. I also incorporate Mediterranean and post-Soviet states for which data on the key indicators are available. As aforementioned, previous studies of lone mother activation and the wider activation literature generally overlook these two regions; yet, they have received increasing attention within the family policy literature. Much of this literature initially characterised family policies in these two regions as rudimentary (e.g. Leitner, 2003). However, recent studies suggest that policies in some of these countries are actually highly supportive of maternal employment, potentially even to the same extent as in the Nordic system (e.g. Szelewa and Polakowski, 2008; Javornik, 2012; Tavora, 2012). Thus, lone mother activation in these states deserves greater attention and to be placed within comparative context, which is an aim of this analysis.

Method: Fuzzy-Set Ideal Type Analysis

To compare a relatively large number (twenty-two) of countries across multiple (three) dimensions, I use fuzzy-set ideal type analysis. This method is more adept than traditional statistical methods to capturing variation between welfare states across multiple policy dimensions. This is because countries are assigned to ideal types according to theoretical and substantive knowledge, rather than statistical averages or degrees of statistical association. Consequently, fuzzy-set ideal type analysis is not prone to ‘outlier effects’, whereby a welfare state’s exceptionally high or exceptionally low score on one policy dimension only determines its overall classification within a typology irrespective of its scores on other policy dimensions of interest (Hudson and Kühner, 2010).

At the same time, fuzzy-set ideal type analysis is better equipped for comparing a relatively large number of countries than other case-based methods. Case-oriented methods typically involve comparing countries on the basis of national case studies that capture the idiosyncrasies of each individual case. The volume and complexity of data generated make it difficult to compare more than a handful of countries in a systematic and thorough way. However, fuzzy-set ideal type analysis is unique among case-based methods in that it involves comparing countries using a set of fixed thresholds and agreed-on, logical principles (Fiss, 2009). By reducing the complexity of the data so that it becomes more manageable (George and Bennett, 2005; Ragin and Sonnett, 2005), these thresholds and principles permit comparison of a larger number of countries (Ragin, 2008).

In fuzzy-set ideal type analysis, each policy dimension of interest is defined as a ‘set’ to which countries have varying degrees of membership. To determine countries’ membership to each set, the set must be ‘calibrated’. This involves establishing, on the basis of theoretical and substantive knowledge, three ‘qualitative breakpoints’ or thresholds. The lower qualitative breakpoint of zero denotes a country as fully out of the set, while the upper qualitative breakpoint of one denotes it as is fully in. The ‘crossover point’ (0.5) signals that a country is neither more in nor more out of the set. Hence, for

a country to belong to a set, it must achieve a score greater than 0.5 to indicate that it is more in the set than out of it (Kvist, 1999).

Set membership provides the basis for categorising welfare states into ideal types. With k being the number of policy dimensions or sets, there are 2^k possible ideal types (Vis, 2007). Two logical principles underpin the organisation of countries into these ideal types. The first is the ‘negation principle’. This stipulates that the degree to which a welfare state exhibits the ‘negation’ or reverse of a given set is one minus its membership score to that set. For instance, if A has a membership score of 0.1 to set ‘ x ’, then its membership score to the ‘NOT x ’ set is $1 - 0.1 = 0.9$. The second principle is the ‘minimum principle’. This states that a welfare state’s membership to an ideal type is the lowest of its set scores. Thus, if A has a score of 0.1 for set ‘ x ’ and 0.7 for set ‘ y ’, then A ’s membership to the xy ideal type is 0.1, the lowest of these set scores (Kvist, 1999). In other words, A is not a member of the xy ideal type.

The most significant shortcoming of the method used in this study concerns the lack of objective standards for establishing the choice of indicators and thresholds which determine welfare states’ (non-)membership to each set (Ragin, 2008). To address this, I follow Marchal and Van Mechelen (2015) in using sensitivity analyses to measure the impact of a selection of alternative indicators and cut-off points on welfare states’ (non-)membership to each set. There is of course an infinite number of potential variations in indicators and cut-off points which could be tested. However, for parsimony, I focus on six alternative ways of operationalising the sets for which the strongest justifications can be made (Appendix 4).

Dimensions of Comparison

This section gives details of the three sets which represent the dimensions of comparison. Reflecting the human capital development/employment-first dichotomy, the first set captures lone mothers’ access to training opportunities, while the second set measures the strictness of employment-related conditions imposed on lone mothers. To capture how welfare states help lone mothers to combine family and employment, the third set

measures the degree to which family policies and primary school schedules support maternal employment. Where membership to a set is measured by more than one indicator, a country's overall set score is the lowest of its scores on each of the indicators which captures that set (minimum principle). Appendix 1 provides details of sources.

Opportunities for Training

Comparative data that zoom in on training opportunities for specifically lone mothers do not exist. Nevertheless, two indicators offer adequate proxies. The first indicator, spending on training³, captures the priority given to improving the skills of the unemployed. Following previous studies (e.g. Nickell and Layard, 1999; OECD, 2003; Vis, 2007), I use spending on training per person unemployed, expressed as a percentage of GDP per person employed. This is to adjust for cross-national differences in unemployment rates and economy size. It also ensures that high spending on training does not simply reflect high unemployment. The indicator is given by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\text{Spending on training/total registered unemployed}}{\text{GDP/total number of employed persons}} \\
 &= \frac{\text{Spending on training/GDP}}{\text{Total registered unemployed/total number of employed persons}} \\
 &= \frac{\text{Spending on training as a \% of GDP}}{\text{Unemployment rate, \%}}
 \end{aligned}$$

More simply, the resulting figure can be expressed as the percentage of GDP spent on training for every 1 per cent of unemployment.

According to existing studies that focus on spending on all activation policies, 'activating countries' spend 0.20-0.25 per cent or more of GDP on activation for every 1 per cent of unemployment (e.g. OECD, 2003; Vis, 2007). However, training comprises just one of five types of policy encompassed under the label of activation. Therefore, assuming that training commands at least its 'equal' share of the total activation budget in 'activating

countries' – that is, one-fifth (Hudson and Kühner, 2009) – the upper qualitative breakpoint (fully in) is: $0.25/5=0.05$. Hence, when welfare states spend 0.05 per cent or more of GDP on training for every 1 per cent of unemployment, opportunities for training are considered widespread.

Meanwhile, studies that focus on spending on all activation policies identify countries which spend 0.05 per cent of GDP or less on total activation policies for every 1 per cent of unemployment as having the lowest activation spending profiles (OECD, 2003; Vis, 2007). Again assuming that training commands at least its equal share of the activation budget (one-fifth), the lower qualitative breakpoint (fully out) is therefore: $0.05/5=0.01$. So when welfare states spend 0.01 per cent or less of GDP on training for every 1 per cent of unemployment, opportunities for training are few and far between. The crossover point (neither in nor out) is the mid-point between the upper and lower breakpoints of 0.03 per cent.

The second indicator gives a proxy of the extent to which lone mothers' caregiving may be an obstacle to their participation in training programmes. It is based on survey data from the Adult Education Survey and Survey of Adult Skills (PIAAC), which asked women to identify the reason(s) why they did not participate in lifelong learning during the last twelve months, despite wanting to. Specifically, the second indicator is based on the percentages of women surveyed who identified family responsibilities as a barrier to their participation in education or training. The breakpoints are 40 per cent for fully out, 10 per cent for fully in, and 25 per cent for neither in nor out (Chłoń-Domińczak and Lis, 2013). When over 40 per cent of women identify family responsibilities as a barrier, this suggests strong cultural support for women's caregiving, a lack of 'care-compatible' training courses, or a shortage or lack of information about the availability of childcare services. Consequently, lone mothers' position as sole caregiver within the household is likely to prevent many from accessing available training opportunities. Conversely, when nine in ten women do not identify family responsibilities as a barrier to training, education/childcare conflicts are less likely an issue for lone mothers.

Strict Conditionality

To capture the extent to which welfare states rely on compulsion to activate lone mothers, the second set is operationalised by an index of the employment-related conditions and sanctions imposed on lone mothers not currently in employment (Appendix 2). The index comprises four distinct items which are given equal weights. Each item is measured by one or more sub-items, and scores for each item are given by the average of scores across these sub-items. Scores range from a high of five to indicate very strict employment-related conditions, to a low of one to signify weak conditionality.

Item 1 draws on Haux's (2013) aforementioned typology of the approaches welfare states take in identifying lone mothers for compulsory activation. Countries which impose compulsory activation on all or most lone mothers receive higher scores, while countries which are more sensitive to each lone mother's particular circumstances receive lower scores. Items 2-4 are based on Langenbucher's (2015) index of the conditions attached to unemployment benefits (see Appendix 4 for the impact on the results of measuring the conditions attached to social assistance instead). Item 2 captures the strictness of job availability criteria and how much flexibility lone mothers have to turn down job offers. Item 3 concerns the degree of monitoring of lone mothers' job-search activities, while item 4 captures the severity of sanctions in cases of non-compliance with employment-related conditions. The extent to which welfare states treat lone mothers differently from other jobseekers varies across these different indicators. Consequently, while scoring on certain items reflects the treatment of specifically lone mothers or mothers/parents more broadly, scoring on other items reflects the treatment of all jobseekers.

Because eligibility for unemployment benefits in the United States is determined mainly at the state-level, scoring on the conditionality index is based on legislation and guidelines in Michigan. This is partly because detailed information on eligibility requirements are available for this state. Moreover, Michigan offers a good benchmark for ascertaining how the US in general treats lone mothers, since most of its policies match those in the majority of other states and are a mix of policy 'carrots' and 'sticks' (Blank and Haskins, 2001; Seefeldt and Castelli, 2009).

Activating Childcare Policies

The final set is also operationalised by a summary index. This index captures the extent to which a country's family policies and primary school schedule support maternal employment, regardless of whether this is their intention (Appendix 3). The index comprises three items. Again, a country's overall index score is the average of its scores across these three items. An overall score of one indicates limited to no support for mothers to be in or remain in employment, while an average score of five signifies strong support for maternal employment.

The first item in the index captures the extent to which childcare policies support maternal employment in the three years immediately following childbirth. It is measured by three sub-items. Sub-item (i) concerns the duration of maternity and parental leaves. Without access to paid leave, new mothers may be forced to withdraw from employment altogether. Very short leaves can have the same effect. Recent studies suggest that leave periods should be at least thirty to thirty-nine weeks for mothers' employment continuity and career progression (Akgunduz and Plantenga, 2013; Keck and Saraceno, 2013). However, long leaves can be detrimental too as a result of substantial losses to mothers' human capital, missed opportunities for career advancement, and potential difficulties in being re-employed by the same employer (Fagnani, 1998). Many studies mark one year as the turning point beyond which additional years of leave are associated with (marginal) wage penalties (Grimshaw and Rubery, 2015). Yet, Pettit and Hook (2005) find that the most detrimental effects begin only after around three years' leave. Consequently, leaves shorter than thirty weeks or longer than three years receive equally low scores on sub-item (i)⁴.

Sub-item (ii) covers the generosity of leave provisions. Leave paid at 70-80 per cent of previous earnings provides strong incentives for mothers to return to their previous employer once the period of paid leave expires in order to avoid a sharp drop in income (Gornick and Meyers, 2003; Wall et al., 2009; Bonoli, 2013). In contrast, low replacement rates give limited pressure for mothers to return to their previous employer once the period of paid leave expires (Bonoli, 2013). 'Low' is here defined as 20 per cent of previous earnings. National consumption surveys suggest that individuals cannot afford

to maintain their standard of living when replacement rates fall below this threshold (Kvist, 2007).

To capture the availability of formal childcare services for under-threes, sub-item (iii) concerns enrolment rates in formal childcare services for this age group. Low enrolment rates indicate a potential shortage of childcare services, while high enrolment rates suggest that services are extensive and generally accessible to most parents. Countries receive a score of five on this sub-item when enrolment rates for under threes exceed 33 per cent, as this figure reflects the European Union’s ‘Barcelona target’. To reflect enrolment rates in those countries which are ‘falling behind’ (37) this target, countries receive the minimum score of one when enrolment is below 15 per cent (Mills et al., 2014).

The second item on the childcare index covers childcare policies for mothers with pre-primary education age children. Sub-item (iv) concerns enrolment rates in formal childcare services for three to five year olds. Countries with enrolment rates of at least 90 per cent receive the maximum score of five on this sub-item, again reflecting the EU’s Barcelona targets. Conversely, countries with enrolment rates below 70 per cent receive the minimum score of one to reflect enrolment rates in countries lagging behind the EU’s target for this age group (Mills et al., 2014). To avoid the distortion of a country having high childcare coverage but for limited hours only, full-time equivalent (FTE) childcare enrolment rates are used. These represent what enrolment rates would be if all those children attending formal childcare services did so on a full-time basis. FTEs are usually standardised by a thirty-hour week (e.g. OECD, 2016). However, because I am interested in the extent of support for maternal employment, I define ‘full-time’ as forty hours to reflect a full-time working week. FTEs are given by the following formula:

$$\text{FTE} = \frac{\text{percentage of children in formal childcare arrangements} \times \text{average weekly hours of attendance}}{40}$$

The third item in the childcare index covers policies for mothers with school-age children. It is measured by two sub-items. Sub-item (v) captures the length and continuity

of the primary school week. Countries with school schedules that align more closely with regular, full-time employment hours receive higher scores (Gornick et al., 1997; Plantenga and Remery, 2013). In contrast, lower scores are awarded to countries with low school weekly hours or discontinuous schedules, whereby children are sent home during their lunch breaks or have certain parts of the week off. Sub-item (vi) captures the prevalence of out-of-school services by average enrolment rates. Countries receive the maximum score of five when 80 per cent or more of children attend out-of-school services, as this figure reflects enrolment rates in countries with very high coverage of out-of-school services according to the OECD (2016). Conversely, countries with enrolment rates in out-of-school services of below 10 per cent receive the minimum score of one to reflect enrolment rates in countries where coverage is low (OECD, 2016).

Results: Lone Mother Activation Regimes

Table 1 details the countries' membership scores to the different sets and their classification into lone mother activation models. Countries belong to one of seven such models. The first two models, *general coercion* and *delayed coercion*, are both characterised by membership to the 'strict conditionality set' only. However, I treat them as distinct lone mother activation models to reflect significant substantive differences between them. Table 2 details each country's overall membership score to its respective lone mother activation model.

The first lone mother activation model is labelled *general coercion*. Most of the Central and Eastern European states, in addition to the Mediterranean states of Italy and Spain and the liberal state of the United States, are in this model. Here, joblessness is understood primarily as a behavioural problem. The aim is to push the jobless into (any) paid work by imposing strict employment-related conditions while simultaneously offering few training opportunities. At the same time, policies to support the reconciliation of employment and care are limited. Although primary school schedules for lone mothers with school-age children in the Czech Republic, Lithuania and Poland are generally conducive to a forty-hour working week, this is not the case elsewhere. Instead, insufficient out-of-school services or irregular and/or part-time school hours mean that

Table 1. Membership scores of twenty-two OECD countries to three fuzzy sets and their classification into seven lone mother activation models.

Lone mother activation models and countries	Opportunities for training	Strict conditionality	Activating childcare policies
<i>Model 1: General Coercion</i>			
Bulgaria	0.00	0.63	0.22
Czech Republic	0.00	0.56	0.36
Italy	0.05	0.59	0.43
Latvia	0.00	0.69	0.31
Lithuania	0.00	0.61	0.40
Poland	0.00	0.64	0.43
Slovakia	0.00	0.77	0.28
Spain	0.00	0.53	0.29
United States	0.00	0.70	0.21
<i>Model 2: Delayed Coercion</i>			
Australia	0.00	0.52	0.32
Germany	0.30	0.57	0.44
Netherlands	0.00	0.66	0.42
United Kingdom	0.00	0.68	0.42
<i>Model 3: Care-Sensitive Coercion</i>			
Norway	0.00	0.54	0.63
Portugal	0.21	0.81	0.72
Slovenia	0.00	0.80	0.75
<i>Model 4: Partial Activation</i>			
Austria	0.74	0.57	0.22
France	0.59	0.55	0.40
<i>Model 5: Holistic Activation</i>			
Denmark	0.91	0.55	0.85
<i>Model 6: Optional Activation</i>			
Belgium	0.19	0.47	0.78
Sweden	0.16	0.48	0.69
<i>Model 7: Weak Activation</i>			
Finland	0.44	0.38	0.35

Notes: Scores are between 0 and 1 with bold indicating membership of a set (>0.50) and higher scores signifying stronger membership.

Source: Own calculations.

working longer than part-time hours can be difficult for lone mothers in the absence of informal sources of caregiving. Yet, the scarcity of part-time job opportunities across

Table 2. Membership scores of twenty-two OECD countries to seven lone mother activation models.

Lone mother activation model	Countries (overall membership score to the model)
<i>General Coercion</i>	Slovakia (0.72); United States (0.70); Latvia (0.69); Bulgaria (0.63); Lithuania (0.60); Italy (0.57); Poland (0.57); Czech Republic (0.56); Spain (0.53)
<i>Delayed Coercion</i>	Netherlands (0.58); United Kingdom (0.58); Germany (0.56); Australia (0.52)
<i>Care-Sensitive Coercion</i>	Slovenia (0.75); Portugal (0.72); Norway (0.54)
<i>Partial Activation</i>	Austria (0.57); France (0.55)
<i>Holistic</i>	Denmark (0.55)
<i>Optional Activation</i>	Belgium (0.53); Sweden (0.52)
<i>Weak Activation</i>	Finland (0.56)

Notes: Membership scores are between 0 and 1. Scores greater than 0.50 indicate membership with higher scores signifying stronger membership.

Source: Own calculations.

Central and Eastern European states may shut lone mothers out of employment altogether⁵.

The second lone mother activation model, labelled *delayed coercion*, contains Australia, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Again, lone mothers' inactivity is primarily seen as a behavioural problem. However, the subjection of lone mothers to compulsory activation is 'delayed' in this model by the prioritisation of mothers' caregiving roles while children are small. In Germany, lone mothers are not required to engage in activation programmes until their youngest child turns three and has a guaranteed place in kindergarten. In Australia, the Netherlands and the UK, lone mothers are exempt from employment requirements until children start primary school. Furthermore, once lone mothers become subject to compulsory activation in the *delayed coercion* model, demands on their job availability are tempered by the promotion of a part-time worker/carer model. In Australia, the Netherlands and the UK, lone mothers are permitted to restrict their job availability to part-time or school hours on account of their caregiving responsibilities. Nevertheless, the under-provision of out-of-school care

services and a short school day, which finishes before 3.00/3.30pm and before lunch on Wednesdays and Fridays in the Netherlands, mean that many lone mothers may have little choice but to work part-time anyway. Western Germany similarly promotes a part-time worker/carer model, with most pre-primary education services and primary schools finishing before lunchtime and just one-quarter of school-age children attending out-of-school care services (Plantenga and Remery, 2013; Marcus and Peter, 2015).

However, full-time childcare services for pre-primary education and school-age children are more widespread in Eastern Germany. In Eastern Germany, 68 per cent of three to five year olds have access to full-time day care compared to 25 per cent of three to five year olds in Western Germany (Zabel, 2013). Eastern Germany also contains a greater concentration of all-day schools, which run for around seven hours per day and include a supervised lunch period at least three days per week. In addition, three-quarters of school age children are enrolled in after school services operating until around 6.00pm in Eastern Germany, compared to one-quarter in Western Germany. Therefore, Eastern Germany arguably sits closer to the *care-sensitive coercion* model (Plantenga and Remery, 2013; Zabel, 2013).

The third model, *care-sensitive coercion*, contains Norway, Portugal and Slovenia. While this model also emphasises welfare conditionality, there are greater provisions for lone mothers to externalise their caregiving in order that they can meet such conditionality. Pre-primary education services are widespread and available predominantly on a full-time basis. In addition, primary school schedules are either consistent with a forty-hour working week (Portugal) or complemented by widespread out-of-school care services (Norway and Slovenia). So while this model makes few specific provisions for lone mothers' particular circumstances, there is nevertheless widespread support for full-time maternal employment, from which lone mothers benefit.

The fourth lone mother activation model contains Austria and France. This model takes a more encompassing approach towards lone mother activation than the previous three models, in that it recognises both behavioural and structural barriers to employment. Thus, when children start pre-primary education and lone mothers become subject to

compulsory activation, they are not necessarily compelled to take any job as in the other models. Instead, they are permitted to participate in training and other programmes designed to help them secure a better job. Still, this model is labelled *partial activation* to signify that policy is not particularly supportive of lone mothers' participation in full-time, regular jobs. Rather, it supports a part-time worker/carer role. This is evidenced by the fact that despite high enrolment rates in pre-primary education, services tend to be limited to part-time hours only. Furthermore, most primary schools either operate on a half-day basis (Austria) or send children home during their two-hour lunch break (France). Additionally, French schools are shut on Wednesdays, and provision of childcare services to cover this closure is insufficient (Plantenga and Remery, 2013).

The fifth model, *holistic activation*, also relies on a combination of human capital oriented and employment-first measures in order to activate lone mothers. However, childcare policies are more conducive to lone mothers' full-time employment than in the *partial activation* or *weak activation* models. Denmark epitomises this model: 88 per cent of three to five year olds are in full-time childcare and almost all school-age children attend out-of-school services that are complementary to the school day.

The sixth lone mother activation model contains Belgium and Sweden. It is labelled *optional activation* to signify that although formal care services for children of all ages are widespread, conditionality is 'light' by international standards with limited targeted policies for lone parents. In addition, training opportunities to facilitate lone mothers' career progression are generally lacking, and lone mothers in Sweden are likely to face barriers in accessing available training programmes because of their childcare responsibilities. So while there is policy support for maternal activation, policy does not explicitly set out to activate lone mothers.

The final model, *weak activation*, comprises Finland. As in the previous model, policies to address the activation of specifically lone mothers are generally lacking. However, childcare policies are not as activating as in the previous model. The availability of a home-care allowance until children turn three explicitly promotes lone mothers' withdrawal from employment while children are small. Thereafter, policy appears to

promote lone mothers' part-time employment only. Pre-school enrolment rates in Finland continue to lag behind those in other Nordics and many other European countries. Furthermore, just half of first-grade pupils and around one-quarter of second-grade pupils attend out-of-school services, although provision has improved in recent years (Plantenga and Remery, 2013). Moreover, parents can continue to receive a reduced home-care allowance until their youngest child is around nine, provided they do not work longer than part-time (EU, 2016). Overall then, family policies in Finland potentially serve to de-activate mothers.

Discussion of Findings and Implications for the Activation Literature

Since the late-1990s, increased attention within the mainstream welfare state literature to gender issues and 'new social risks', which arise most acutely for women, gives the impression that this literature is now sensitised to the particular situations of women. However, by examining how policies from across a range of fields potentially (de-)activate lone mothers as a 'litmus test' for how welfare states help or hinder the employment of all mothers, this article illuminates a number of surprising results from the perspective of the mainstream activation literature which highlight its gender-blindness.

In particular, the non-membership of most Nordic countries to the 'opportunities for training' set indicates that policies to develop mothers' human capital are not as extensive as predicted by the activation literature and against the common assumption of a single 'women-friendly' and gender-equal Nordic model of welfare (e.g. Gornick and Meyers, 2009). While other studies similarly distance Norway from the human capital development approach (e.g. Lødemel and Trickey, 2000), Sweden's non-membership to this set is more surprising. Yet, as Bonoli (2012) argues, Sweden's attention from the mid-1970s shifted away from training and towards job creation schemes designed to keep unemployment down during the crisis. Since the mid-1990s, pressures to accelerate transitions back into employment, amidst mounting evidence of the ineffectiveness of training programmes, have kept training expenditure low (Andersson and Wärvik, 2012; Bonoli, 2012; OECD, 2015). But Sweden's non-membership to the 'opportunities for

training' set also reflects mothers' disadvantaged access to such training opportunities: of women who wanted to participate in training, 22 per cent could not do so because of family responsibilities; the corresponding figure for men is 15 per cent (Eurostat, 2011). Likewise, despite high training expenditure in Finland, family responsibilities prevent 27 per cent of women from participating in training compared to 17 per cent of men (Eurostat, 2011). These findings support evidence suggesting that the division of domestic and care work remains highly gendered across the Nordics, and might help to explain high rates of gender segregation across Nordic labour markets (e.g. Lister, 2009).

In addition, by incorporating childcare and education policies as indicators of activation effort, the analysis highlights the de-activating potential of Finnish family policies when it comes to mothers. Since the 1980s, Finland has sought to give 'parents' (read: mothers) with children aged below three the 'choice' to stay at home through a home-care allowance. Yet, in practice, real freedom of choice between employment and care is limited by low provision of care services for under-threes. Furthermore, the availability of financial 'top-ups' to supplement the basic home-care allowance rate encourages take up of this allowance, especially when earnings potential is low. However, to do so, many mothers will have to withdraw from employment altogether given that using day-care services precludes entitlement to the allowance (Meagher and Szebehely, 2012). These policy features, in the context of a gender-segregated labour market and gendered parental obligations, give strong incentives and pressures for mothers with very young children to take long and potentially detrimental career breaks (Mahon, 2002; Plantenga and Remery, 2009). Thereafter, a 'flexible care allowance' for parents working part-time or not at all until children turn nine (EU, 2016), in addition to short pre-school and primary school days and only moderate provision of out-of-school care services, do little to encourage mothers' re-integration into full-time employment.

Furthermore, by zooming in on the treatment of specifically lone mothers, the analysis highlights that the employment-first approach typical of Anglo-Saxon states is not imposed in Australia and the United Kingdom on lone mothers as strongly as on other jobseekers. In both countries, lone mothers are exempt from job-search requirements until children start primary school. And once they are deemed work-ready, lone mothers

in the UK can limit their availability to jobs that are compatible with school hours, even if no such jobs are available locally. Similarly, lone mothers in Australia can restrict their job availability to fifteen hours per week and may refuse employment in the absence of suitable or affordable childcare during school holidays. These policy features reflect stronger popular and political resistance in Australia and the UK to the erosion of income support for motherhood than in the US which, as this analysis shows, imposes strict employment-related conditions on lone mothers largely irrespective of their specific needs. This is rooted in historically higher female employment rates and less extensive state supports for maternalism in the US, as well as the stronger influence of conservative and racist discourses which blame various social ills on the supposed welfare dependency of black single mothers (Orloff, 2002).

The analysis also challenges the mainstream activation literature's assumptions that Mediterranean and post-Soviet states are weakly activating or focused only on emphasising the duties and obligations of the unemployed. By treating the active dimensions of childcare and education policies as integrated components of the active welfare state, the analysis suggests that policies in Slovenia and Portugal are actually very supportive of maternal employment. In fact, both of these countries are situated in the same lone mother activation model as Norway on account of their comprehensive childcare policies. Historical policy legacies help to explain these findings. In Portugal, the exodus of men to fight in the colonial wars during the 1960s and 1970s, in a context of revolution and strong economic growth, facilitated women's entry into full-time employment and the expansion of childcare services (Torres, 2006; Tavora, 2012; Rosa et al., 2015). A strong work ethic has surrounded female employment ever since (Moss and Wall, 2007). Meanwhile, the Nordic model has provided the blueprint for Slovenia's childcare policies since the 1980s. Even under communism, Slovenia was more open to Western influence and had greater autonomy over its policymaking than other Soviet states following the Yugoslavia-Soviet split in 1948. The aim of upholding gender equality, pedagogical goals, and the desire to keep female employment high in order to support economic growth have kept childcare policies activating following the transition to a market economy (Korintus and Stropnik, 2009; Formánková and Dobrotić, 2011).

Overall, this article represents a first step towards incorporating gender into comparative scholarship on activation. Placing women at the centre of activation scholarship is important given that the success of the adult-worker model depends on a gender equitable order which both accommodates workers' caregiving responsibilities and enables women to access an independent wage through the market on equal terms to men (Fraser, 2000). To build on this work, future research should likewise pay greater attention to the presence (or absence) of specific provisions within labour market policies which account for women's fertility and caregiving. In addition, it should treat childcare and other policies beyond labour market ones alone which support women's employment as integrated components of the active welfare state. Moreover, as this analysis shows, future research also needs to consider how policies in other fields potentially undermine the activation agenda's employment goals by de-activating women and possibly other groups of jobseekers.

However, the social policy literature must also take a broader perspective that moves beyond the focus on women as simply mothers. Women's labour market position continues to be undermined by gendered discrimination in the workplace and society at large that goes beyond the disadvantages stemming from childbearing and caregiving. For example, the 'Heidi versus Howard' experiment demonstrates how unconscious bias continues to undermine women's labour market position. The experiment is based on a case study chronicling how Heidi Roizen became a successful venture capitalist. Among a group of students, half was given Heidi's real-life story to read, while the other half was given the exact same story but with Heidi's name changed to Howard. The students were then asked about their impressions of Heidi and Howard. While they rated Heidi and Howard equally in terms of success, they thought Howard was likeable whereas Heidi seemed selfish and not "the type of person you would want to hire or work for". Hence, because Howard matched the stereotypical expectations of men as providers, decisive and driven, he was liked. But because Heidi violated the stereotype of women as caregivers, sensitive and communal, she was disliked. This bias continues to be at the root of why women are held and hold themselves back (Sandberg, 2013: 39-40). Future research must therefore become more aware of broader causes of gender inequality

beyond motherhood and care in order to develop a more sophisticated critique of the activation agenda and social policy literature more widely.

¹The analysis focuses on lone parents who require childcare to cover all or part of their working week. This is seemingly the case for most lone parents since, on average, 59 per cent of lone parents across the EU have children under twelve (Eurostat, 2015).

² Shared parenting, whereby children spend roughly equal amounts of time living with each parent post-separation, has become more common (OECD, 2011). However, internationally, only around 7-15 per cent of care arrangements are shared (Skinner et al., 2007). Hence mothers retain exclusive or majority custody most of the time.

³ ‘Training’ encompasses all institutional, workplace or other training programmes and apprenticeships for persons who are unemployed, seeking employment, or at risk of involuntary job loss.

⁴In the Czech Republic, lone mothers are entitled to 147 weeks of maternity and parental leave combined compared to 138 weeks for partnered mothers. However, this difference does not impact on the Czech Republic’s positioning in relation to the ‘activating childcare policies’ set.

⁵Of women in employment, just 3 per cent in Bulgaria, 7 per cent in Slovakia and 8 per cent in Latvia work part-time (EU, 2016).

References

- Akgunduz YE and Plantenga J (2013) Labour Market Effects of Parental Leave in Europe. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 37(4): 845-862.
- Andersson E and Wärvik G-B (2012) Swedish Adult Education in Transition? *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education* 18(1): 90-103.
- Andersson G and Philipov D (2002) Life-Table Representations of Family Dynamics in Sweden, Hungary, and 14 Other FFS Countries: A Project of Descriptions of Demographic Behaviour. *Demographic Research* 7(4): 67-144.
- Barbier J-C and Ludwig-Mayerhofer W (2004) The Many Worlds of Activation. *European Societies* 6(4): 423-436.
- Blank RM and Haskins R (2001) *The New World of Welfare*. Washington: Brookings Institution.
- Bonoli G (2005) The Politics of the New Social Policies: Providing Coverage against New Social Risks in Mature Welfare States. *Policy and Politics* 33(3): 431-449.
- Bonoli G (2012) Active Labour Market Policy and Social Investment. In: Morel N, et al. (eds) *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State?* Bristol: Policy Press, pp.181-204.
- Bonoli G (2013) *The Origins of Active Social Policy: Labour Market and Childcare Policies in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: OUP.
- Chłoń-Domińczak A and Lis M (2013) *Does Gender Matter for Lifelong Learning Activity?* NEUJOBS Working Paper no. D16.2A, September. Warsaw: IBS.
- Chzhen Y and Bradshaw J (2012) Lone Parents, Poverty and Policy in the European Union. *Journal of European Social Policy* 22(5): 487-506.
- Ciccia R and Bleijenbergh I (2014) After the Male Breadwinner Model? Childcare Services and the Division of Labour in European Countries. *Social Politics* 21(1): 50-79.
- Daly M (2011) What Adult Worker Model? A Critical Look at Recent Social Policy Reform in Europe from a Gender and Family Perspective. *Social Politics* 18(1): 1-23.
- Duvander A-Z and Ellingsæter AL (2016) Cash for Childcare Schemes in the Nordic Welfare States. *European Societies* 18(1): 70-90.
- Eichhorst W, Kaufmann O, Konle-Seidl R and Reinhard H-J (2008) Bringing the Jobless into Work? In: Eichhorst W, et al. (eds) *Bringing the Jobless into Work?* Berlin: Springer, pp.1-16.
- EU (2016) Country Profiles. Available at: http://europa.eu/epic/countries/index_en.htm (accessed 6 May 2016).

- Eurostat (2011) Adult Education Survey. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/microdata/adult-education-survey> (accessed 6 April 2016).
- Fagnani J (1998) Recent Changes in Family Policy in France: Political Trade-Offs and Economic Constraints. In: Drew E, et al. (eds) *Women, Work and the Family in Europe*. London: Routledge, pp.58-65.
- Finn D and Gloster R (2010) *Lone Parent Obligations*. DWP Research Report no. 632, London: DWP.
- Fiss PC (2009) Case Studies and the Configurational Analysis of Organizational Phenomena. In: Byrne D and Ragin CC (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Case-Based Methods*. London: Sage, pp.415-431.
- Formánková L and Dobrotić I (2011) Mothers or Institutions? How Women Work and Care in Slovenia and the Czech Republic. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 19(3): 409-427.
- Fraser N (2000) After the Family Wage. In: Hobson B (ed) *Gender and Citizenship in Transition*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp.1-32.
- George AL and Bennett A (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT.
- Gornick JC and Meyers MK (2003) *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gornick JC and Meyers MK (2004) Welfare Regimes in Relation to Paid Work and Care. In: Zollinger Giele J and Holst E (eds) *Changing Life Patterns in Western Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp.45-67.
- Gornick JC and Meyers MK (2009) Institutions That Support Gender Egalitarianism in Parenthood and Employment. In: Gornick JC and Meyers MK (eds) *Gender Equality: Transforming Family Divisions of Labour*. New York: Verso, pp.3-64.
- Gornick JC, Meyers MK and Ross KE (1997) Supporting the Employment of Mothers: Policy Variation across Fourteen Welfare States. *Journal of European Social Policy* 7(1): 45-70.
- Grimshaw D and Rubery J (2015) *The Motherhood Pay Gap*. Geneva: ILO.
- Häusermann S (2006) Different Paths of Family Policy Modernisation in Continental Welfare States. In: *Annual Conference of the Swiss Political Science Association*, Balsthal, 2-3 November.

- Haux T (2013) Lone Parents and Activation – Towards a Typology of Approaches. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy* 29(2): 122-133.
- Hobson B (1990) No Exit, No Voice: Women's Economic Dependency and the Welfare State. *Acta Sociologica* 33(3): 235-250.
- Hobson B (1994) Solo Mothers, Social Policy Regimes and the Logics of Gender. In: Sainsbury D (ed) *Gendering Welfare States*. London: Sage, pp.170-187.
- Hudson J and Kühner S (2009) Towards Productive Welfare? A Comparative Analysis of 23 OECD Countries. *Journal of European Social Policy* 19(1): 34-46.
- Hudson J and Kühner S (2010) Beyond the Dependent Variable Problem: The Methodological Challenges of Capturing Productive and Protective Dimensions of Social Policy. *Social Policy and Society* 9(2): 167-179.
- Javornik J (2012) *State Socialism: Dismantling the Male-Breadwinner Family Model in Central and Eastern Europe*. Welfare Studies Working Paper no. 14/2012, Umeå: Umeå University.
- Jenson J (2015) The Fading Goal of Gender Equality: Three Policy Directions That Underpin the Resilience of Gendered Socio-Economic Inequalities. *Social Politics* 22(4): 539-560.
- Keck W and Saraceno C (2013) The Impact of Different Social-Policy Frameworks on Social Inequalities among Women in the EU. *Social Politics* 20(3): 297-328.
- Knijff T, Martin C and Millar J (2007) Activation as a Framework for Social Policies Towards Lone Parents: Is There a Continental Specificity? *Social Policy & Administration* 41(6): 638-652.
- Korintus M and Stropnik N (2009) Hungary and Slovenia: Long Leave or Short? . In: Kamerman SB and Moss P (eds) *The Politics of Parental Leave Policies*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp.135-157.
- Kvist J (1999) Welfare Reform in the Nordic Countries in the 1990s: Using Fuzzy-Set Theory to Assess Conformity to Ideal Types. *Journal of European Social Policy* 9(3): 231-252.
- Kvist J (2007) Fuzzy Set Ideal Type Analysis. *Journal of Business Research* 60(5): 474-481.
- Langenbucher K (2015) *How Demanding Are Eligibility Criteria for Unemployment Benefits?* OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Paper no. 166, Paris: OECD.
- Leitner S (2003) Varieties of Familialism. *European Societies* 5(4): 353-375.
- Lewis J (2001) The Decline of the Male Breadwinner Model. *Social Politics* 8(2): 152-169.

- Lewis J and Hobson B (1997) Introduction. In: Lewis J (ed) *Lone Mothers in European Welfare Regimes*. London: Jessica Kingsley, pp.1-20.
- Lister R (2009) Nordic Nirvana? Gender, Citizenship, and Social Justice in the Nordic Welfare States. *Social Politics* 16(2): 242-278.
- Lødemel I and Trickey H (2000) *An Offer You Can't Refuse: Workfare in International Perspective*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Mahon R (2002) Child Care: Toward What Kind of "Social Europe"? *Social Politics* 9(3): 343-379.
- Marchal S and Van Mechelen N (2015) A New Kid in Town? Active Inclusion Elements in European Minimum Income Schemes. *Social Policy and Administration*. Epub ahead of print 16 November 2015. 10.1111/spol.12177.
- Marcus J and Peter F (2015) *Maternal Labour Supply and All-Day Primary Schools in Germany*. DIW Roundup no. 76, Berlin: DIW.
- Meagher G and Szebehely M (2012) Equality in the Social Service State: Nordic Childcare Models in Comparative Perspective. In: Kvist J, et al. (eds) *Changing Social Equality: The Nordic Welfare Model in the 21st Century*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp.89-117.
- Mills M, Präg P, Tsang F, Begall K, Derbyshire J, Kohle L, Miani C and Hoorens S (2014) *Use of Childcare in the EU Member States and Progress Towards the Barcelona Targets*. Short Statistical Report no. 1, Cambridge: RAND.
- Morel N, Palier B and Palme J (2012) *Towards a Social Investment Welfare State?* Bristol: Policy Press.
- Moss P and Wall K (2007) *International Review of Leave Policies and Related Research 2007*. Employment Relations Research Series Report no. 80, London: Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform.
- Nickell S and Layard R (1999) Labour Market Institutions and Economic Performance. *Handbook of Labour Economics* 3(C): 3029-3084.
- OECD (2003) *OECD Employment Outlook*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2007) *Babies and Bosses*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2011) *Doing Better for Families*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2015) *Back to Work: Sweden Improving the Re-Employment Prospects of Displaced Workers*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2016) OECD Family Database. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/social/family/database.htm> (accessed 25 January 2016).

- Orloff AS (1993) Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship. *American Sociological Review* 58(3): 303-328.
- Orloff AS (2002) Explaining US Welfare Reform: Power, Gender, Race and the US Policy Legacy. *Critical Social Policy* 22(1): 96-118.
- Orloff AS (2009) Gendering the Comparative Analysis of Welfare States: An Unfinished Agenda. *Sociological Theory* 27(3): 317-343.
- Peck J and Theodore N (2001) Exporting Workfare/Importing Welfare-to-Work: Exploring the Politics of Third Way Policy Transfer. *Political Geography* 20(4): 427-460.
- Pettit B and Hook J (2005) The Structure of Women's Employment in Comparative Perspective. *Social Forces* 84(2): 779-801.
- Plantenga J and Remery C (2009) *The Provision of Childcare Services*. Luxembourg: EC.
- Plantenga J and Remery C (2013) *Childcare Services for School-Age Children*. Luxembourg: EU.
- Ragin C (2008) *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. London: University of Chicago.
- Ragin CC and Sonnett J (2005) Between Complexity and Parsimony: Limited Diversity, Counterfactual Cases, and Comparative Analysis. In: Kropp S and Minkenberg M (eds) *Vergleichen in Der Politikwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, pp.180-198.
- Rosa R, Lorga C and Lyonette C (2015) Marriage and Gender Inequality: Work–Family Arrangements of Portuguese and British Highly Qualified Women. *Community, Work & Family*. Epub ahead of print 11 June 2015. 10.1080/13668803.2015.1040738.
- Rowlingson K and Millar J (2002) Lone Parents, Poverty and Work: Policy Approaches and Lessons from Abroad. *Benefits* 10(3): 207-213.
- Sandberg S (2013) *Lean In*. London: WH Allen.
- Seefeldt KS and Castelli T (2009) *Low-Income Women's Experiences with Food Programs, Food Spending, and Food-Related Hardships*. Contractor and Cooperator Report no. 57, Washington: USDA's ERS.
- Serrano Pascual A (2007) Activation Regimes in Europe: A Clustering Exercise. In: Serrano Pascual A and Magnusson L (eds) *Reshaping Welfare States and Activation Regimes in Europe*. Brussels: Peter Lang, pp.275-317.
- Skevik A (2005) Women's Citizenship in the Time of Activation: The Case of Lone Mothers in "Needs-Based" Welfare States. *Social Politics* 12(1): 42-66.

- Skinner C, Bradshaw J and Davidson J (2007) *Child Support Policy: An International Perspective*. DWP Research Report no. 405, Leeds: CDS.
- Strell M and Duncan S (2001) Lone Motherhood, Ideal Type Care Regimes and the Case of Austria. *Journal of European Social Policy* 11(2): 149-164.
- Szelewa D and Polakowski MP (2008) Who Cares? Changing Patterns of Childcare in Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy* 18(2): 115-131.
- Tavora I (2012) The Southern European Social Model: Familialism and the High Rates of Female Employment in Portugal. *Journal of European Social Policy* 22(1): 63-76.
- Torres AC (2006) Work and Family in Portugal. In: Rossi G (ed) *Reconciling Family and Work: New Challenges for Social Policies in Europe*. Milan: Franco Angeli, pp.9-36.
- Vis B (2007) States of Welfare or States of Workfare? Welfare State Restructuring in 16 Capitalist Democracies, 1985-2002. *Policy & Politics* 35(1): 105-122.
- Wall K, Pappamikaail L, Leitao M, Marinho S and Deven F (2009) *Family Policy in Council of Europe Member States*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Westlund J (2007) Increased Parental Choice Can Lead to Reduced Gender Equality. *NIKK Magasin* 2(2007): 8-11.
- Zabel C (2013) Does Activation Increase Lone Mothers' Employment Chances? *Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 33(7/8): 453-473.

Appendix 1. Data sources.

Table A1. Sets and indicators for the fuzzy-set ideal type analysis with data sources.

Set	Indicators	Source(s)
Opportunities for training	Spending on training per person unemployed as a percentage of GDP per person employed, 2013	https://www.oecd.org/std/labour-stats/HUR-June14.pdf ; http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database ; https://stats.oecd.org/ ; Data for the United Kingdom are for 2011 and for France are for 2012
	Percentage of women who wanted to participate in education/training in the last year did not do so because of family responsibilities, 2011	Data for Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States: http://www.oecd.org/site/piaac/publicdataandanalysis.htm ; Data for all other countries: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/microdata/adult-education-survey
Strict conditionality	Index of the work-related conditions attached to unemployment benefits for lone mothers, 2014	<u>Criteria to determine when lone mothers are subject to compulsory activation:</u> http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/21699763.2013.818566?journalCode=rjcs21 ; http://www.centrumvoorsociaalbeleid.be/sites/default/files/CSB%20Working%20Paper%2011%2005_April%202011.pdf ; http://eprints.port.ac.uk/6319/1/6.PDF <u>All other items on the index:</u> Data for the United States: http://www.michigan.gov/uia/0,4680,7-118-26899---,00.html ; Data for all other countries: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jrxtk1zw8f2-en
Activating childcare policies	Index of the extent to which childcare services, parental leave policies and the scheduling of primary education support maternal employment, latest years of available data	<u>Parental leave policies and costs of childcare</u> http://www.oecd.org/els/family/database.htm <u>Enrolment rates: 0-5 year olds</u> Data for Australia: http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/DetailsPage/4402.0June%202014?OpenDocument ; Data for the United States: https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p70-135.pdf ; http://www.oecd.org/els/family/database.htm ; Data for all other countries: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/income-and-living-conditions/data/database <u>Length of the school week:</u>

Data for Australia, Finland, and the United States: <https://www.oecd.org/els/emp/4343133.pdf>;

Data for all other countries: http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130910_egge_out_of_school_en.pdf

Enrolment rates: out-of-school services

Data for Australia, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States:

<http://www.oecd.org/els/family/database.htm>; Data for all other countries:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/files/documents/130910_egge_out_of_school_en.pdf

Appendix 2: Coding framework for the ‘strict conditionality’ set.

Table A2. Coding framework for the ‘strict conditionality’ set based on a lone mother receiving unemployment benefits.

Item	Sub-items	Score	Description
Item 1: Criteria to determine when lone mothers are subject to employment requirements	Employment tests for lone mothers	1	No employment test for lone mothers
		2	Caseworkers decide whether to impose employment requirements according to individual circumstances
		3	Lone mothers are automatically subject to employment requirements once their youngest child starts primary education
		4	Lone mothers are automatically subject to employment requirements once their youngest child starts pre-primary education
		5	All lone mothers are subject to compulsory activation with few, if any, exceptions
Item 2: Strictness of demands on availability during participation in activation	Job availability during activation	1	Participation in activation programmes does not require job availability
		2	Participation in some activation programmes requires job availability
		3	Participation in most activation programmes requires job availability
		4	Lone mothers should always be available for employment but are not required to actively seek employment
		5	Lone mothers are expected to actively seek employment
	Demands on occupational mobility	1	Lone mothers can refuse jobs in other occupations/with lower wages indefinitely
		2	Lone mothers can refuse jobs in other occupations/with lower wages for >6 months
		3	Lone mothers can refuse jobs in other occupations/with lower wages for ≤6 months
		4	Qualifications or other factors are taken into account
		5	Lone mothers must accept all job offers
	Demands on geographical mobility ¹	1	No demands on geographical mobility
		2	Lone mothers must accept a daily commute of up to 2 hours
		3	Lone mothers must accept a daily commute of up to 3-4 hours
		4	Lone mothers must accept a daily commute of >4 hours
		5	Lone mothers must be willing to move
	Number of ‘other valid reasons’ for refusing jobs ²	1	5 or more reasons
		2	-
		3	3-4 reasons
		4	-
		5	≤2 reasons

Item 3: Job-search requirement and monitoring	Frequency of job-search monitoring	1	No checks of job-search activity
		2	Job-search activity can be checked upon request
		3	Infrequent checks of job-search activity (less than once every 3 months)
		4	Regular checks of job-search activity (at least once every 1-3 months)
		5	Lone mothers must often prove job-search activity (at least once every 1-2 weeks)
	Documentation of job-search activities	1	No formal requirement
		2	Lone mothers must regularly affirm they have undertaken some actions towards finding employment
		3	Lone mothers must regularly affirm the specific actions they have undertaken towards finding employment
		4	Lone mothers must regularly supply details of employers with whom they have had contact
		5	Lone mothers must regularly produce declarations from employers confirming they have applied for a job
Severity of sanctions	Sanctions for refusing job offers ³	1	0-4 weeks
		2	5-9 weeks
		3	10-14 weeks
		4	>14 weeks
		5	Lone mothers lose eligibility to benefits
	Sanctions for refusing participation in activation measures ³	1	0-4 weeks
		2	5-9 weeks
		3	10-14 weeks
		4	>14 weeks
		5	Lone mothers lose eligibility to benefits

Notes: ¹Where demands on occupational mobility are subject to change over the duration of the unemployment period countries' scores are based on the lowest expected commute time. For example, the Netherlands expects the long-term unemployed to accept a daily commute of up to three hours; however, jobseekers can refuse jobs with a daily commute of more than two hours during the first six months of unemployment. Therefore, the Netherlands scores 2 on this sub-indicator. ²Following Langenbucher (2015), 'other valid reasons' are grouped into the following types: i) family or personal reasons (e.g. caring responsibilities, lack of child care, etc.); ii) poor health or disability; iii) other working arrangements of the job (e.g. part-time, temporary contract, anti-social working hours, etc.); iv) moral or religious reasons; and v) job is to replace workers on strike or lockout or working conditions do not comply with a relevant local/sectorial collective agreement. ³Average of sanctions for first-time and repeated infringements.

Appendix 3. Coding framework for the ‘activating childcare policies’ set.

Table A3. Coding framework for the ‘activating childcare policies’ set.

Item	Sub-items	Score	Description
Item 1: Policies for mothers with 0-2 year olds	(i) Duration of paid leave available to mothers	1	No statutory right to paid leave
		2	<30 weeks OR >156 weeks
		3	105-156 weeks
		4	53-104 weeks
		5	30-52 weeks
	(ii) Average payment rate across the total duration of paid leave available to mothers ¹	1	0-20 per cent of previous earnings
		2	21-36 per cent of previous earnings
		3	37-53 per cent of previous earnings
		4	54-69 per cent of previous earnings
		5	70-100 per cent of previous earnings
	(iii) Enrolment rates in formal childcare services among 0-2 year olds	1	0-15 per cent
		2	16-21 per cent
		3	22-26 per cent
		4	27-32 per cent
		5	33-100 per cent
Item 2: Policies for mothers with 3-5 year olds	(iv) Full-time equivalent enrolment rates in formal childcare services among 3-5 year olds ²	1	0-70 per cent
		2	71-76 per cent
		3	77-83 per cent
		4	84-89 per cent
		5	90-100 per cent
Item 3: Policies for mothers with school-age children	(v) Length and continuity of the primary school week ³	1	<30 hours
		2	30-39 hours with children routinely sent home for lunch
		3	30-39 hours a week with half/full weekdays off
		4	Continuous 30-39 school week
		5	Continuous school week operating for ≥40 hours
	(vi) Enrolment rates in out-of-school services ⁴	1	0-10 per cent
		2	11-33 per cent
		3	34-57 per cent
		4	58-80 per cent
		5	81-100 per cent

Notes: ¹Average payment rate is the percentage of previous earnings replaced by maternity and/or parental leave over the total duration of paid leave entitlements for a lone mother on average national earnings. Where maternity and parental leave are paid at different rates, a weighted average is used based on the length of each leave. ²Full-time equivalent enrolment rates avoid the distortion of a country having high enrolment but for limited hours only: (percentage of children in childcare*average weekly hours of attendance)/40. ³Where the length of the school day varies by region, as in many Central and Eastern European and Continental countries, the dominant time structure is used. ⁴The age of children and type of service covered vary cross-nationally. Country-specific details are available from the author upon request.

Appendix 4. Results of the sensitivity analyses.

Table A4 gives an overview of the impact of a selection of alternative indicators and qualitative breakpoints on welfare states' membership status to each set.

I performed six sensitivity analyses in total. The first two concern the 'opportunities for training' set. The first sensitivity analysis tests the impact of a higher upper qualitative breakpoint in measuring spending on training to reflect when spending on activation policies per unemployed person peaked in Sweden during the early-1990s and reached around 60 per cent of national output per person employment. Thus, assuming that training commanded at least its 'equal share' (i.e. one-fifth) of Sweden's total activation budget (Hudson and Kühner, 2010), I test an increase in the upper qualitative breakpoint from 5 to 12 per cent. The mid-point accordingly increases from 3 to 6.5 per cent.

The second sensitivity analysis tests the impact of basing membership to the 'opportunities for training' set on training expenditure alone, since expenditure data is most commonly used to assess the extent of activation.

The third sensitivity analysis tests the impact of operationalising the 'strict conditionality' by the conditions attached to social assistance instead of unemployment benefits. This is to reflect that not all lone mothers may necessarily be able to meet the minimum employment record and/or earnings requirements to qualify for unemployment insurance within a given country.

The final three sensitivity analyses concern the 'activating childcare policies' set. I test the impacts of: (i) using an alternative coding framework for enrolment rates of 3-5 year olds in formal care services based on Kvist (1999) and Szelewa and Polakowski (2008); (ii) defining 'full-time' childcare as 30 rather than 40 hours; and (iii) double-weighting childcare policies for mothers with school-age children as in Gornick et al.'s (1997) index of maternal employment support.

Table A4. Shifts in fuzzy-set membership by variations on the calibration of indicators.

Set	Original indicators	Main variations on original indicator/calibration	Countries who enter the set	Countries who exit the set
Opportunities for training	Spending on training per unemployed individual as a percentage of GDP per potential worker	Alternative thresholds for spending on training: 12 per cent for fully in; 6.5 per cent for neither in nor out; and 1 per cent for fully out	None	France
	Percentage of women who wanted to participate in education/training in the last 12 months but did not do so because of family responsibilities	Measured by spending on training only	Finland; Germany	None
Strict conditionality	Index of the work-related conditions attached to unemployment benefits for lone mothers	Index of the work-related conditions attached to social assistance for lone mothers ¹	Belgium	Austria; France; Germany; Netherlands; UK
Activating childcare policies	Index of the extent to which childcare services, parental leave provisions and the scheduling of primary education support maternal employment	Alternative coding framework for enrolment rates of 3-5 year olds: 1: 0-19 per cent; 2: 20-39 per cent; 3: 40-59 per cent; 4: 60-79 per cent; 5: 80-100 per cent	Czech Republic; Finland; France; Germany; Italy; Lithuania; Netherlands; Poland; Slovakia; Spain; <i>UK is neither in nor out</i>	None
		'Full-time' enrolment defined as 30 rather than 40 hours	Czech Republic; Finland; France; Germany; Italy; Latvia; Lithuania; Spain	None
		Double-weighting childcare policies for mothers with school-age children	None	None

Notes: ¹Data are unavailable for Australia, Denmark, Italy, Norway, Spain and Sweden.

Source: Own calculations.