

Locating parenting-related leaves in gender and welfare state analysis

Rossella Ciccía

<a> *Introduction*

The gendering of welfare state regimes in the 1990s put inequalities in the gendered division of labour squarely in the field of comparative welfare state analysis (Daly, 2000; Lewis, 1992; O'Connor, 1993; Orloff, 1993; Sainsbury, 1994). By focusing on the structure of women's entitlement to social rights and the social organization of care, this scholarship showed that gender relations and welfare states are mutually constitutive. A lively debate ensued about how to best capture cross-national differences in the organization of welfare states and their implication for women's emancipation. Over time we have observed a shift in the scope of analyses from the whole of the welfare state and associated notions of citizenship to particular policy fields and even single policy instruments.

Against this backdrop, parenting leaves are ideally placed to study the gender norms underpinning welfare states. By drawing clear boundaries around familial, paternal and maternal responsibilities, leave entitlements make explicit ideas about the ideal setting of care and who should provide it, while differences in levels of financial compensation reflect its value for societies. Nonetheless, parental leave policies are complex and not completely coherent entities and embody multiple gender norms as well as goals (Ciccía & Verloo, 2012). The way they are designed also reflects the views of policymakers about the relative importance of the social groups targeted, which can create potential trade-offs between aims affecting children, mothers and fathers as well as between parents with different socio-economic backgrounds, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity or citizenship. Finally, their potential to seed new ideas about gender roles is ultimately dependent on the design of other related policy instruments (e.g. childcare services) and the configuration of adjacent policy fields (e.g. labour market regulations, taxation and pension provisions) (Ciccía, 2017).

The aim of this chapter is to locate the analysis of parenting leaves within the comparative study of gender and welfare state research. Its scope is limited to scholarship that is concerned with gender relations and identifying cross-national models. The chapter groups studies in three approaches based on the level of analysis they adopt: the macro level of the welfare state, the meso level of the policy field and the level of policy instruments. In reviewing each of these approaches, the chapter asks the following questions: Which frameworks/concepts are used for the purpose of comparison? How (if at all) are parenting leaves considered? How is their role in reinforcing/transforming gender relations conceived? What kind of women and men are considered?

This overview critically appraises these three sets of literature and shows that, as research on leave progressively developed and became more sophisticated, it still remained based on an undifferentiated notion of woman and narrowly focused on issues relating to motherhood and parenthood. The chapter

concludes by making a case for greater integration between different levels of analysis and consideration of intersectionality and the pervasiveness of care needs along the life course in the analysis of leave policies.

 Gendered welfare regimes: the macro level of the welfare state

The regime concept has a long history in feminist analysis of the welfare state. Starting from the observation that social provisions based on paid employment resulted in better entitlements and benefit levels for men, feminist scholars in the 1980s and 1990s stressed the need to incorporate the gender division of labour in the family to make women visible in the analysis of the welfare states. A central question concerned how care work was treated for the purpose of social insurance (Lewis, 1992; Orloff, 1993; Sainsbury, 1994). These studies showed a strongly normative and emancipatory thrust, debating various principle of gender equality and how they could be translated in social rights advancing women's emancipation.

The emphasis of these studies was on differences in the way citizenship and associated notions of social rights were designed so as to reinforce or transform the traditional division of roles between men as earners and women as carers (Sainsbury, 1996). A particular point of debate revolved around the best way forward for improving women's outcomes, which was reflected in the diversity of conceptual frameworks used to gender welfare regime analysis (Ciccia & Sainsbury, 2018). Among them, the concept of *defamilialization* has had a particularly long-lasting influence on the development of the field, albeit as we will see with some modifications and alterations along the way. Ruth Lister (1997) formulated defamilialization as a way to bring attention to the existence of relations of dependence within the family, particularly in relation to care provisioning and access to financial resources. Within this framework, the focus is on the extent to which welfare states shape gender relations by making social rights dependent on one's status within the family. In this view, Lister used defamilialization as synonymous of individualization or the ability to make claims on the state independently of one's family status. Jane Lewis's (1992, 1997a) formulation of different models of division of labour further distinguished family-based entitlements depending on whether they were granted to women as wives, mothers or workers, making explicit the variety of gender ideologies endorsed by different welfare regimes. These range from the traditional male breadwinner family to the more recently identified adult-worker and dual earner-dual carer models (Crompton, 1999; Fraser, 1994; Gornick & Meyers, 2009; Lewis & Giullari, 2005; Lister, 1997; Sainsbury, 1994)

As the discussion above shows, these works shared in the prominence afforded to different principles of entitlement as an important mechanism through which welfare states patterned gender relations. A particular contribution of feminist analyses was to add unpaid care work alongside other traditional principles such as need, employment and citizenship previously identified. Nonetheless, entitlements

based on citizenship (or residence), rather than care, were generally considered to have the strongest defamilialization potential, and to produce a superior form of social rights for women that neutralized the discriminating influence of marriage and motherhood (Lister, 1997; Sainsbury, 1996). Several of these studies viewed social rights based on caregiving as problematic since, where they exist, they are often poor and perpetuate rather than lessen women's dependence from men (Lewis, 1997a; Orloff, 1993)¹.

This research tradition needs to be celebrated because of its many contributions which deeply changed the very notion of the welfare state (Orloff & Palier, 2009), but it also showed some limitations. Feminist analyses spanned many different fields including pensions, taxation, social assistance and social insurance but, paralleling mainstream analysis, they also privileged the investigation of cash transfers over services. Thus, while care was a central concern (Daly, 2002; Knijn & Ungerson, 1997; Leira, 1992; Mahon, 1997), feminist analyses of welfare regimes tended to focus on the extent to which caring roles granted access to income-maintenance programmes. The way states organize and set up a social infrastructure to support the giving and receiving of care remained marginal in these analyses. A further limitation of this research is that it left unquestioned the supposed unity of women's interests and rather adopted an undifferentiated notion of woman as its point of reference². This led for instance to neglect the racialized and homonormative basis of the institution of citizenship and the ways social rights based on 'motherhood' were precluded to large groups of women who did not fit in the ideal of a white male breadwinner family model (Boris, 1995; Williams, 1995). For those women, immigration laws and residency requirements worked to curtail access to the social rights attached to motherhood, while state control over their reproductive choices limited their very possibility to become mothers (Roberts, 1995; Ross, 2017). As written by Marilyn Lake (1995, p. 124) "feminist maternalist politics could be complicit in colonialist and racist policies, just as the construction of ideal womanhood colluded in nationalist and imperialist projects".

How are parenting leaves considered in this scholarship? Despite all the emphasis on unpaid labour and caregiving activities, the analysis of care policies – including parenting leaves – is not central to this research. This early scholarship was criticized for its "lack of adequate attention to what may be called "caring regimes"; in other words, policies that have constituted women's unpaid work" (Lewis, 1997a, p. 169; see also Jenson, 1997 and Leira, 1992). Analyses of childcare policies remained at a very high level of abstraction with little attention to specific dimensions and features, mostly pointing at the

¹ This view was particularly prominent among scholars that considered full economic independence and access to (male) employment-related social rights as the way forward to improve women's outcomes (Orloff, 1993). However, there were also others that emphasized the need to provide women with independent access to benefits on the basis of the unpaid work they do in the home (Fraser, 1994; Knijn & Kremer, 1997). Neither perspective fully excluded the other, and differences between them were often more a matter of degrees of attention paid to each of those aspects.

² Poverty, especially in the form of lone motherhood represents one of the few exceptions to this trend (Hobson, 1994; Lewis, 1997b). However, this focus was meant to be emblematic (of the way that states dealt with mothers in the absence of a breadwinner) rather than differentiating.

significance of childcare services for facilitating mothers' labour market participation (Lewis, 1997a; O'Connor et al., 1999; Orloff, 1993). Moreover, studies held ambiguous views of parenting leaves because of the potential negative consequences they entail in terms of foregone income, career advancement and segregation in low-status occupations, and tended to view publicly funded childcare services as more clearly 'women-friendly' (Lewis, 1992, 1997a; Orloff, 1993). This position also reflected the limited development of leave policies at the time, with many countries offering only maternity leave. It was only later when leave policy initiatives by national and supranational organizations grew exponentially, that studies started to pay attention to the details of policy design and the potential of (some) parenting leaves to transform unequal gender relations came to be recognized.

<c> (Child)Care regimes: the meso level of the policy field

The concept of care regimes represents the starting point of the second body of research analysed here. Compared to the earlier welfare regime literature, these studies took a narrower perspective aimed at identifying cross-national models of family policies, particularly those dealing with care (Bettio & Plantenga, 2004; Leitner, 2003; Saraceno, 2011, 2016; Saraceno & Keck, 2010). Its focus is on the different ways that welfare states draw boundaries between private and public responsibilities for caregiving. The range of questions addressed by this literature include: How is care delivered and organized in societies? Who provides and finances care?

Anneli Anttonen and Jorma Sipilä's (1996) analysis of European models of social care services for children and the elderly is one of the earliest works in this tradition. Despite relying on limited information, this work has been instrumental in highlighting the importance of social services, and establishing the notion of care regimes as a distinct construct. Several works followed in its track, identifying ideal typical models to cluster countries based on the extent to which caring obligations were constructed as a responsibility of the state (i.e. a social right) or the family, and later of the market and community sectors as well as the increased reliance on global care chains for the provision of care (Bettio et al., 2006; Bettio & Plantenga, 2004; Brennan et al., 2012; Evers et al., 2005; Hochschild, 2000). The first analyses of care regimes included policies concerning both child and elder care, but over time the study of these different areas has taken different paths.

The care-related rights of working parents including benefits and services have become a particular focus of this research. A number of studies were influential in establishing familism (or familization) as the conceptual framework for comparative childcare policy research (Leitner, 2003; Saraceno, 2011; Saraceno & Keck, 2010). Leitner's work is emblematic of many of the features of this approach. She redefines the concept of familism to focus on the extent to which welfare states rely on and support families in caring for children. Based on the distinction between familizing and defamilizing policy instruments and the way they combine in different national settings, she thus

proceeded to identify four distinct varieties of familialism: explicit, implicit, optional and defamilialism. Contrasting this definition to the earlier conceptualization of familialization used in feminist welfare regime literature (Lister, 1997) shows that the concept has undergone substantial transformations. First, it is no longer applied at the macro level of the welfare state and the structure of social rights, but used to refer both to particular policy instruments and combination of instruments. These instruments are limited to the field of family policies, and especially childcare policies. Secondly, while earlier literature conceived familialization as a pole of a continuum that had as its opposite end individualization (of social rights' entitlements), now the concept becomes multidimensional (varieties) and its opposite becomes defamilialization (relieving families of caring responsibility). Thirdly, the focus on women and gender inequality becomes more implicit than in earlier works, and indeed Leitner needs to draw in a further distinction between gendering and degendering policies to make gender inequalities in the division of labour explicit in the analysis of family policies.

How are parenting leaves considered in this scholarship? Leitner views them as the main policies to support the caring function of the family with respect to childcare. A weakness of this approach is that it considers parenting leaves as familialistic policies without considering that differences in their design – for instance their length, level of pay or the structure of parental leave entitlements – significantly alter both their goals and outcomes³. For instance, there is considerable empirical evidence showing that very long leaves have negative effect on mothers' labour market participation, while leave of moderate length contribute to retain women in employment (Budig et al., 2012; Pettit & Hook, 2005). The strength of the approach lies instead in placing parenting leave within a broader framework of policy configurations. This perspective recognizes that the outcomes of parenting leaves (but also their assumed goals and uses) are shaped in conjunction with other instruments composing the policy package addressing childcare needs (Saraceno, 2011). This represents a significant departure from previous approaches combining parenting leaves and childcare services in additive measures (Gornick & Meyers, 2003; Mandel & Semyonov, 2005). Leitner's four variety of familialisms – or Saraceno and Keck's (2010) three-fold typology – represent an effort to theorize and provide meaning to this relationship. Thus parenting leaves are conceived as producing optimal outcomes for women only when they are combined with the extensive provision of childcare services as in the optional familialism model represented by some Scandinavian countries, Belgium and France. By providing parents with a choice of instruments to support childcare, "only in the optional familialism is the family's right to care not equated with the family's obligation to care" (Leitner, 2003: 359). This model represents an effort to overcome the long-standing tension in the literature between the desire to value and enable care and empower women so that they are not forced or morally obliged to care. At the same time, this model conceals the ambiguity inherent in the liberal notion of choice which has often been used politically as

³ Leitner (2003) considers these aspects when analysing gendered and degendered variations within the varieties of familialism but this is not one of the constitutive elements of her typology.

a discursive device to support conservative family values and reforms (Brennan, 2007; Ellingsaeter, 2007; Lewis & Campbell, 2007). It also neglects the difficulties of making judgments about choice from the analysis of policy institutions without further consideration of the way women's choices are differently shaped by socio-economic conditions, cultural norms and preferences, policy feedback as well as the details of policy implementation, labour market and workplace functioning (Ciccia & Lombardo, 2019; Ellingsæter et al., 2017; Hobson, 2013; Lauri et al., 2020; Lewis, 2006).

Many subsequent studies have continued to use the idea of varieties of familialism to analyse public provisions of childcare. This approach has produced a great number of typologies – and several new types – becoming the dominant approach in comparative empirical analyses. The focus of studies has over time expanded to regions beyond Western Europe to include countries from Eastern Europe (Javornik, 2014; Szelewa & Polakowski, 2008), East Asia (An & Peng, 2016; Saraceno, 2016) and Latin America (Blofield & Franzoni, 2015). Methodologically, several works used configurational methods to analyse the relationship between policy instruments. Those most commonly included are parenting leaves and childcare services, while child benefits and tax breaks received less systematic attention. These studies also addressed some of the shortcomings of earlier analyses of childcare regimes, particularly in paying greater attention to the characteristics of parenting leaves. These developments demonstrate both the centrality of care and the family for contemporary welfare state development, and the ability of the concept of familialization/defamilialization to travel to different contexts. Nonetheless, the focus on identifying an ever increasing number of types of familialism (or familialization) and the proliferation of new labels for similar models has hindered further conceptual development, and the moment might have come to reassess the concept and consolidate knowledge.

Compared to feminist scholarship on welfare regimes, studies of care regimes have given new centrality to social services and the ways in which the financing and provision of care are organised. The analysis of parenting leaves is central to this research but is placed in a broader framework of childcare policies, particularly those at the interface between work and family life. A few authors also try to relate care regimes to broader institutional configurations relating to the regulation of migration (Williams 2012) and employment (Simonazzi, 2009). Nonetheless, this research has lost some of the original focus of earlier scholarship on broader questions about social citizenship as well as its normative thrust in debating different principle of inequality. The dominance of the concept of varieties of familialism/defamilialization has even more narrowly focused the field to issues relating to motherhood and parenthood. Within this scope condition, limited attention is paid to access to childcare provisions for immigrant mothers (Sainsbury, 2019) or the different meaning that the very issue of work-life balance assumes for working class women on precarious employment, with low wages and scarce working hours (Warren, 2015). Thus, care regime research works with a narrower but still

undifferentiated conception of women which mostly relates to native, middle class mothers in employment⁴.

<d> **Parental leave models: the level of policy instruments**

The final group of studies analysed focuses on the characteristics of parenting leave policies (Bruning & Plantenga, 1999; Ciccia & Verloo, 2012; Dearing, 2016; Dobrotic & Blum, 2020; Javornik & Kurowska, 2017; Ray et al., 2010). Starting from the observation that parenting leaves vary dramatically over time and across countries, these studies focus on unpacking the complexity of policy design and identifying the core features of different models. However, this scholarship also returns to earlier debates about social rights – from which it borrows much of its vocabulary – and explicit concerns with gender equality.

A strength of this approach is in its attention to the fine details of policy design and measurement issues. A particular contribution of these studies lies in the elaboration of several methodological innovations to systematically analyse the intricate rules about eligibility, entitlement, financing, coverage, generosity and flexibility of leave rights. The main distinctions between the different approaches concern: 1) the way information about several characteristics of leave design is aggregated; and 2) the reliance on empirical or ideal types to characterize national models. In particular, we can distinguish two dominant approaches based on whether they rank countries using a multidimensional index built with linear aggregation rules (Ray et al., 2010) or define the relationship between policy dimensions as non-linear and use ideal-typical models to characterize national leave policies (Ciccia & Verloo, 2012; Dobrotic & Blum, 2020)⁵.

Ray et al.'s (2010) analysis of parenting leaves in 21 countries is emblematic of the first approach. The study focuses on developing aggregate indices of the generosity and gender equalitarian nature of parenting leaves. Generosity is calculated by weighting the length of available leave by the wage replacement rate. Gender equality is instead measured through an additive index measuring the distribution of entitlements that can be used solely by the mother, the father or jointly by either parent. The relationship between these dimensions is conceptualized in a linear fashion and measured through a correlation coefficient showing a modest association. However, this approach fails to differentiate and provide interpretation to those countries falling in the remaining groupings (gender equal/non-generous and non-gender equal/generous). Studies that adopt a more configurational logic take instead a different approach which relies on all possible (or relevant) combinations of selected dimensions to define different models (Ciccia, 2017). For instance, Dobrotic and Blum (2020) identify four ideal types based on the way different forms of entitlement (citizenship/work) and eligibility (universal/selective) are

⁴ Blofield and Franzoni (2015) are among the few to consider the differential implications of childcare regimes along class and gender divisions.

⁵ The combination of linear aggregation rules and ideal typical benchmarks is also used but less common (Dearing, 2016)

combined in parenting leave design, in this way making explicit qualitative differences in the ways policy design shapes access to leave rights across social groups. Contrary to the idea of a one-to-one correspondence between dimensions implicit in many analyses, this approach makes clear that the definition of parenting leave models is a matter of substantial interpretation of all different combinations of characteristics.

The use of country rankings for cross-national comparisons of leave policies show some clear limitations. Given the focus on existing cases, the results of the analysis depend very much on the characteristics of the empirical cases investigated and the inclusion/exclusion of cases with extreme values. To illustrate this point, let us consider the index of gender equality of parenting leaves. The highest scores are found in three Nordic countries (Sweden, Finland, Norway) and Greece (14-12 points). These countries offer gender equal leaves. However, countries such as the US and Italy, which are well-known for their meagre leave provisions, score almost as high (10-9 points). This begs the question of how gender equality is defined. Since the index is mainly based on the distribution of entitlements regardless of the overall level of provisions, regulations granting equally generous leaves to mothers and fathers are almost as gender equal as those granting equally poor entitlements. More fundamentally, a common problem with additive indices is that it remains unclear on which basis the boundaries between the high, medium and low categories are defined. Are countries supposed to be gender equal because they score above average or just on the basis of their scoring similarly to the Nordics? What if those countries did not exist? Greece would then become the benchmark for gender equality.

A weakness of country rankings is that the definition of an optimal leave design for gender equality – or another concept of interest – depends on the characteristics of the set of cases analysed and the presence of cases with extreme values. The use of ideal types to characterize national models of parenting leaves avoids this shortcoming. Here, the optimum is not limited by empirical realities but can span in the realm of utopias and normative ideals. For instance, Ciccio and Verloo (2012) translate Fraser's universal caregiver ideal into an ideal of design of parenting leave policies which would promote the transformation of gender roles in both paid and unpaid work. This ideal is nowhere to be seen, still the model can be used as a yardstick to assess national leave provisions across dimensions relevant for gender.

From a conceptual view point, several frameworks have been used as organizing principles underlying different leave models – including equal opportunities, capabilities, and inclusiveness of social rights – but gender equality and the potential of leave policies to exacerbate or rather lessen inequalities in the gender division of labour is a central concern of this scholarship (Ciccio & Verloo, 2012; Dearing, 2016; Koslowski, 2021; Ray et al., 2010). A particular contribution of these works is to have highlighted how the characteristics of parenting leave design can work both as a structure of material incentives and a symbolic mean to seed new ideas and practices of motherhood. In particular, and given the recent trend towards the expansion of paternity leave rights, they have shed new light on

norms concerning fatherhood and the place of men in the provision of care (Brandth & Kvande, 1998; Hobson, 2002). In this view, this research draws heavily in terms of dimensions and debates from earlier feminist scholarship on welfare regimes and women's emancipation but applies it to a much more delimited domain of analysis.

The single focus on parenting leaves allows these researchers to delve in detailed analyses of their features, paying attention to the minutia of policy design and the way small differences can produce significant consequences on gender relations. However, this narrow focus also leads to some weaknesses of the approach. Parents experience parenting leaves and make choices about their preferred care arrangements based on the whole package of childcare instruments available to them. Therefore, the analysis of parenting leave policies in isolation of other welfare arrangements risks to misinterpret the likely outcomes as well as the intended goals of particular leave designs. It follows that similar leave policies can uphold very different gender norms depending on the wider policy context (Ciccia, 2017). As an example, let us consider the presence of incentives for men to share more equally leave entitlements (e.g. highly paid, reasonably long father's quotas). These measures have often been considered the hallmark of gender egalitarianism. However, such policies without an extensive supply of affordable childcare services might well end up strengthening the re-familiarization of care. An outcome which can hardly be considered as promoting gender and social equality. It is only by considering the broader configuration of policies - and structures - in which parenting leaves are embedded that we are able to capture the full meaning of differences in leave models (Ciccia, 2017).

Given the nature of parenting leave policies as a measure targeting parents in employment, this research is also narrowly focused on an undifferentiated notion of working mothers. However, recently leave studies have started to pay greater attention to class-related characteristics. Ray et al. (2010) are among the first to draw attention to the implications of benefits ceilings for parents at different points of the income distribution, but it is only in more recent studies that we see greater attention to these aspects (Javornik & Kurowska, 2017). Dobrotic and Blum (2020) propose the concept of inclusiveness to analyse the degree to which leave rights are accessible to all parents irrespective of their occupation, employment history or citizenship status. This concept brings in particular attention to the mismatch between welfare states still very much built around standard employment relations, and the diversification and precarization of work arrangements typical of post-industrial economies (Blum & Dobrotic, 2021; Dobrotic & Blum, 2020). While all these works offer important conceptual innovations, they remain focused on class-based characteristics, and several other important sources of differentiation between women are still absent. The scope of this research also does not easily allow to address broader questions about welfare arrangements and gender relations which fall beyond the domain of early childcare arrangement and work-life balance.

<e> Conclusions and avenues for future research

This chapter has located the analysis of leave policy across thirty years of development of comparative gender and welfare state research. It divided scholarship in three groups based on their focus on either the whole of the welfare state, the policy field or single instruments. Table 1 summarizes the main characteristics of the three approaches.

Table 1 about here

The analysis presented here shows that while classical studies of welfare regimes did not consider parenting leaves, their salience increased as attention shifted toward the analysis of care regimes and care policy instruments. This shift was also partly driven by care policy developments and the intensification of the pace and scope of reform activities across many regions of the world, including the expansion of leave instruments and the growing complexity of their design. As leave came to the fore, views on their potential effects on gender relations also shifted. The initial diffidence towards parenting leaves as promoting a lower status citizenship for women were replaced by the greater attention to differences in their design, and the way particular features could promote the transformation of gender relations by, for instance, engaging fathers in childcare.

Despite the richness of leave research over the last decades, we cannot understand the implications of parenting leaves without placing them within the broader context of policy configurations and welfare arrangements (Ciccia, 2017). Each of this level represents an important piece of the puzzle for understanding state influence on gender relations. Analyses of leave instruments are necessary to make sense of the intricateness and multidimensionality of leave policy design. Analysis of care regimes are instead needed to account for policy interaction, countervailing as well as reinforcing effects between parenting leaves and other elements of the care policy package. Analysis of welfare regimes are fundamental to think about the way care policy instruments connect to broader structures and arrangements such as the employment and migration regimes. Therefore, there is a need for greater integration of these three levels of analysis in future research on leave policies.

This chapter also showed that all three approaches relied on an undifferentiated notion of woman which left unchallenged the idea of the supposed homogeneity of issues affecting women as well the uniformity of policy effects across sub-groups of the population. Recent development in leave research have started to address this issue by for instance incorporating the intersection of gender with class-based inequalities (Dobrotic and Blum, 2020; 2021; Javornik & Kurowska, 2017). Nonetheless, future research needs to go further in problematizing this aspect by, for instance, incorporating a higher number of characteristics as well recognizing the different nature that parenting-related issues assume for individuals located at different ‘junctions’ of social inequalities. The incorporation of race/ethnicity

and sexual orientation in leave research appears particularly urgent because of the long history of and lasting interference of states over the reproductive choices of these groups (Ferree, 2021; Price, 2018; but see also Kaufman et al. in this volume) and the presence of restrictions in their access to childcare supports (Evertsson et al. 2020; Sainsbury, 2019). A greater attention to these differences would also contribute to expand the single focus of much leave research on motherhood and parenthood by for instance analysing leave provisions available around other critical moments of the life course (e.g. sickness, elder-care and bereavement), as well as recognizing that the need of resources and time for care – including self-care – represents a constitutive element of the life of every individual (see also Baird et al. in this volume).

Table 1: Main characteristics of three approaches

| Approach | Gendered welfare regimes | (Child) care regimes | Leave models |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Scope | The whole of the welfare state, especially cash transfer programmes | Family policies | Only parenting leaves |
| Focus | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Citizenship and the principle of entitlements to social rights · Gender equality, women's emancipation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Division of care responsibilities between state, family and market | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Dimensionality and characteristics of leaves |
| Main conceptual frameworks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Familialization | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Varieties of familialism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Gender equality · Gender division of labour |
| Analysis of leave policies | No | Leaves are a core element of broader care packages | Dimensionality and characteristics of leaves |
| Effects of leave on gender relations | Ambiguous | Variable depending on other elements of childcare policies | Variable depending on policy design |
| View of women | Undifferentiated | Mothers | Mothers, with some consideration of class-based differences |

References

- An, M. Y., & Peng, I. (2016). Diverging Paths? A Comparative Look at Childcare Policies in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan. *Social Policy & Administration*, 50(5), 540–558.
- Anttonen, A., & Sipilä, J. (1996). European social care services: Is it possible to identify models? *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(2), 87–100.
- Bettio, F., & Plantenga, J. (2004). Comparing care regimes in Europe. *Feminist Economics*, 10(1), 85–113.
- Bettio, F., Simonazzi, A., & Villa, P. (2006). Change in care regimes and female migration: The ‘care drain’ in the Mediterranean. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16(3), 271.
- Blofield, M., & Franzoni, J. M. (2015). Maternalism, Co-responsibility, and Social Equity: A Typology of Work–Family Policies. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 22(1), 38–59.
- Boris, E. (1995). The Racialized Gendered State: Constructions of Citizenship in the United States. *Social Politics*, 2(2), 160–180.
- Brennan, D. (2007). Babies, Budgets, and Birthrates: Work/Family Policy in Australia 1996–2006. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 14(1), 31–57.
- Brennan, D., Cass, B., Himmelweit, S., & Szebehely, M. (2012). The marketisation of care: Rationales and consequences in Nordic and liberal care regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 22(4), 377–391.
- Budig, M. J., Misra, J., & Boeckmann, I. (2012). The Motherhood Penalty in Cross-National Perspective: The Importance of Work–Family Policies and Cultural Attitudes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 19(2), 163–193.
- Bruning, G. and Plantenga, J. (1999). Parental Leave and Equal Opportunities: Experiences in Eight European Countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9(3): 195–209.
- Ciccia, R. (2017). A two-step approach for the analysis of hybrids in comparative social policy analysis: A nuanced typology of childcare between policies and regimes. *Quality & Quantity*, 51(6), 2761–2780.

- Ciccia, R., & Lombardo, E. (2019). Care policies in practice: How discourse matters for policy implementation. *Policy and Society*, 38(4), 537–553.
- Ciccia, R., & Sainsbury, D. (2018). Gendering welfare state analysis: Tensions between care and paid work. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1(1–2), 93–109.
- Ciccia, R., & Verloo, M. (2012). Parental leave regulations and the persistence of the male breadwinner model: Using fuzzy-set ideal type analysis to assess gender equality in an enlarged Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 22(5), 507–528.
- Crompton, R. (ed.) (1999) *Restructuring Gender Relations and Employment: The Decline of the Male Breadwinner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daly, M. (2002). Care as a Good for Social Policy. *Journal of Social Policy*, 31(02), 251–270.
- Daly, M. E. (2000). *The gender division of welfare: The impact of the British and German welfare states*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellingsaeter, A. L. (2007). ‘Old’ and ‘new’ politics of time to care: Three Norwegian reforms. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 17(1), 49.
- Ellingsæter, A. L., Kitterød, R. H., & Lyngstad, J. (2017). Universalising Childcare, Changing Mothers’ Attitudes: Policy Feedback in Norway. *Journal of Social Policy*, 46(1), 149–173.
- Evers, A., Lewis, J., & Riedel, B. (2005). Developing child-care provision in England and Germany: Problems of governance. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(3), 195–209.
- Evertsson, M., E. Jaspers, and Y. Moberg (2020), ‘Parentalization of same-sex couples: Family formation and leave rights in five northern European countries’, in R. Nieuwenhuis and W. van Lancker (eds), *The Palgrave Handbook of Family Policy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. (pp. 397–428).
- Dobrotić, I., & Blum, S. (2020). Inclusiveness of Parental-Leave Benefits in Twenty-One European Countries: Measuring Social and Gender Inequalities in Leave Eligibility. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 27(3), 588–614.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Polity Press.
- Ferree, M. M. (2021). Democracy and Demography: Intersectional Dimensions of German Politics. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 28 (3), 532–555.

- Fraser, N. (1994). After the family wage: Gender equity and the welfare state. *Political Theory*, 22(4), 591–618.
- Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). Families that work: Policies for reconciling parenthood and employment. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (Eds.). (2009). Gender equality: Transforming family divisions of labor. Verso.
- Hobson, B. (1994). Solo mothers, social policy regimes, and the logics of gender. In D. Sainsbury (Ed.), *Gendering Welfare States*.
- Hobson, B. M. (2002). Making men into fathers: Men, masculinities, and the social politics of fatherhood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson, B. (Ed.). (2013). *Worklife Balance: The Agency and Capabilities Gap*. Oxford University Press.
- Hochschild, A. (2000). Global care chains and emotional surplus value. In T. Giddens & W. Hutton (Eds.), *On the edge: Globalization and the new millennium*. (pp. 130–146). Sage.
- Javornik, J. (2014). Measuring state de-familialism: Contesting post-socialist exceptionalism. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 24(3), 240–257.
- Javornik, J., & Kurowska, A. (2017). Work and Care Opportunities under Different Parental Leave Systems: Gender and Class Inequalities in Northern Europe. *Social Policy & Administration*, 51(4), 617–637.
- Jenson, J. (1997). Who cares? Gender and welfare regimes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 4(2), 182.
- Knijn, T., & Kremer, M. (1997). Gender and the Caring Dimension of Welfare States: Toward Inclusive Citizenship. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 4(3), 328–361.
- Knijn, T., & Ungerson, C. (1997). Introduction: Care Work and Gender in Welfare Regimes. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 4(3), 323–327.
- Koslowski, A. (2021). Capturing the Gender Gap in the Scope of Parenting Related Leave Policies Across Nations. *Social Inclusion*, 9(2), 250–261.

- Lake, M. (1995). Introduction. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 2(2), 123–126.
- Lauri, T., Pöder, K., & Ciccia, R. (2020). Pathways to gender equality: A configurational analysis of childcare instruments and outcomes in 21 European countries. *Social Policy & Administration*, 54(5), 646–665.
- Leira, A. (2002). *Working parents and the welfare state: Family change and policy reform in Scandinavia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leitner, S. (2003). The caring function of the family: Belgium in comparative perspective. *Social Policy*, 13, 15.
- Lewis, J. (2002). Gender and welfare state change. *European Societies*, 4(4), 331–357.
- Lewis, J. (1992). Gender and the development of welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2(3), 159–173.
- Lewis, J. (1997a). Gender and welfare regimes: Further thoughts. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 4(2), 160.
- Lewis, J. (1997b). *Lone mothers in European welfare regimes: Shifting policy logics*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lewis, J., & Campbell, M. (2007). UK Work/Family Balance Policies and Gender Equality, 1997–2005. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 14(1), 4–30.
- Lewis, J. & Giullari, S. (2005). The adult worker model family, gender equality and care: The search for new policy principles and the possibilities and problems of a capabilities approach. *Economy and Society*, 34(1), 76–104.
- Lister, R. (1997). *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. MacMillan Press.
- Mahon, R. (1997). Child Care in Canada and Sweden: Policy and Politics. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 4(3), 382–418.
- Mandel, H., & Semyonov, M. (2005). Family policies, wage structures, and gender gaps: Sources of earnings inequality in 20 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 949–967.

- O'Connor, J. S., Orloff, A. S., & Shaver, S. (1999). *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism, and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and the United States*. Cambridge University Press.
- Orloff, A. S. (1993). Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review*, 58(3), 303–328.
- Orloff, Ann Shola. (2009). Gendering the Comparative Analysis of Welfare States: An Unfinished Agenda*. *Sociological Theory*, 27(3), 317–343.
- Orloff, A. S., & Palier, B. (2009). The Power of Gender Perspectives: Feminist Influence on Policy Paradigms, Social Science, and Social Politics. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 16(4), 405–412.
- Pettit, B., & Hook, J. (2005). The structure of women's employment in comparative perspective. *Social Forces*, 84(2), 779–801.
- Price, K. (2018). Queering reproductive justice in the Trump era: a note on political intersectionality, *Politics & Gender*, 14(4): 581–601.
- Roberts, D. E. (1995). Race, Gender, and the Value of Mothers' Work. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 2(2), 195–207.
- Ray, R., Gornick, J. C., & Schmitt, J. (2010). Who Cares? Assessing Generosity and Gender Equality in Parental Leave Policy Designs in 21 Countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20(3), 196–216.
- Ross, L. J. (2017). Reproductive Justice as Intersectional Feminist Activism. *Souls*, 19(3), 286–314.
- Sainsbury, D. (1994). *Gendering welfare states*. Sage.
- Sainsbury, D. (1996). *Gender, equality, and welfare states*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sainsbury, D. (2019). Policy constructions, immigrants' social rights and gender: The case of Swedish childcare policies. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 29(2), 213–227.
- Saraceno, C. (2011). Childcare needs and childcare policies: A multidimensional issue. *Current Sociology*, 59(1), 78.

- Saraceno, C. (2016). Varieties of familialism: Comparing four southern European and East Asian welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 26(4), 314–326.
- Saraceno, Chiara, & Keck, W. (2010). Can we identify intergenerational policy regimes in Europe? *European Societies*, 12(5), 675–696.
- Simonazzi, A. (2009). Care Regimes and National Employment Models. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 33(2), 211–232.
- Szelewa, D., & Polakowski, M. P. (2008). Who cares? Changing patterns of childcare in Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18(2), 115–131.
- Warren, T. (2015). Work–life balance/imbalance: The dominance of the middle class and the neglect of the working class. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(4), 691–717.
- Williams, F. (1995). Race/ethnicity, gender, and class in welfare states: A framework for comparative analysis. *Social Politics*, 2(2), 127–159.
- Williams, F. (2012). Converging variations in migrant care work in Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 22 (4), 363-376.