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LEAVE POLICIES AND WORK/FAMILY ISSUES IN PORTUGAL: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

3 MAIN TOPICS

1. PUBLIC POLICIES AFFECTING WORK / FAMILY ISSUES IN PORTUGAL

2. CHANGES IN DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS, WOMEN’S EMPLOYMENT, AND FAMILIES’ DIVISION OF LABOUR IN PORTUGAL

3. THE PORTUGUESE “LEAVE MODEL” IN A EUROPEAN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1930s – 1970s</strong></th>
<th><strong>1980s – 1990s</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumption/Principles:</td>
<td>Assumption/Principles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Married women at home</td>
<td>❖ Women work (full-time dual-earner model)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Gender inequality in work and marital roles</td>
<td>❖ Gender equality in work and marital roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Pro-natalist</td>
<td>❖ Commitment to family privacy and autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Stress on one family model (male breadwinner, legal marriage, no divorce)</td>
<td>❖ Stress on diversification of family forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Social welfare/caring in the hands of families and private charity</td>
<td>❖ Universalisation of social protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Incipient social protection system</td>
<td>❖ State assists the family in its caring activities (stress on service provision and balanced combination of responsibilities between State, third sector, market, family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Commitment to horizontal redistribution (support for large families)</td>
<td>❖ Commitment to horizontal and vertical redistribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Developments

2002-2004 Changing principles (one and half earner model?)

- Women work, preferably part-time
- Pro-natalist
- Stress on “traditional” family (married couples with children)
- State support for large families
- Stress on the women’s role in caring activities
- Service provision: not a priority

2005-2006 back to the full-time dual-earner model

- Stress on the expansion of service provision
- Stress on the articulation between reconciliation policies and gender equality
- Emphasis on support for different types of families
Policy Developments affecting work-family issues (1980s-2005)

Three main lines:

1. Building up leave arrangements for parents

- Maternity leave (90 days in 1976, 98 days in 1995, 120 days in 1999, 150 days in 2004). Option: 120 days with full compensation or 150 days at 80%. Except for 6 weeks (mother), leave may be taken by either parent (low level of parental sharing: 0.3%).

- Paternity leave (since 1995): 5 days fully compensated “compulsory” leave (since 2000); Take up rate of 5 day leave: 26% in 2002 and 38% in 2004.

- Time off for working parents with small children: 2 hours leave per day, either parent, when child is under one year; 30 days per year to care for sick children under 10, with replacement pay, increased by one day for every second child and subsequent children; 15 days to care for sick children over 10, with no pay.

- Parental leave: unpaid, 3 months full-time or 12 months part-time (per parent), when children below age 6. Fathers quota: 15 days fully compensated leave to be taken at the end of 150 days. Take up rate of 15 days: 14% in 2002 and 29% in 2004.

- Special childcare leave: unpaid 2 years (one parent); Suspension work contract
Policy Developments affecting work-family issues (1980s-2005)

2. Expansion of Service Provision for families with small children
   - Coverage rate for under 3s: 23% in 2005
   - Coverage rate for 3-5: 78% in 2005 (up from 29% in 1985)
   - All primary schools open until 17.30 (8 hours per day)

3. Increased protection of mothers in the workplace
   - Protection against dismissal (120 days after giving birth, in 2005)
   - Exemption from night work and from working “extra” hours (when children are under 12 months)...

Expected developments (2006-2010)
   - Extension of paid leave (to 180 days), from the second child onwards, dependent on more equal sharing of the maternity leave
   - 100% compensation for fifth month of paid leave
   - Expansion of service provision (coverage rate of 35% for under 3s by 2009, of 90% for 3-5 year olds)
   - Incentives for family friendly policies at the workplace
### MAIN DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS, PORTUGAL 1960-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marriage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage rate</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>5,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divorce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce rate</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertility rate</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births outside marriage (%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHANGES IN WOMEN’S EMPLOYMENT

% Women working full-time in 2001: **84%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By age group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Women working full-time in 2001: **84%**
### Division of Paid Labour (couples with children), 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>One bread-winner</th>
<th>Both full-time</th>
<th>Husband ft Wife pt</th>
<th>Both part-time</th>
<th>Husband pt Wife ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>27,3</td>
<td>40,8</td>
<td>28,3</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>39,7</td>
<td>26,1</td>
<td>32,9</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>49,7</td>
<td>43,7</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>56,3</td>
<td>35,6</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>36,0</td>
<td>45,4</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>55,5</td>
<td>27,1</td>
<td>16,2</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>53,6</td>
<td>31,2</td>
<td>13,0</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>51,2</td>
<td>25,7</td>
<td>23,2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>32,7</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>52,9</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>32,6</td>
<td>38,8</td>
<td>27,7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portugal</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,5</strong></td>
<td><strong>66,5</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,0</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United K.</td>
<td>29,8</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td>40,0</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Eurostat, 2002
Day care arrangements (children aged 1-2), by child’s year of birth (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home with mother</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With relatives</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creche</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanny</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With mother at work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With domestic employee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Survey on Families with children, ICS, 1999
DEFINITION OF THE PORTUGUESE “LEAVE POLICY MODEL”?

The “Early Return to Full Employment” Leave Policy Model

**Characteristics:**

- One main type of leave: a short, very well-paid, gender flexible leave, up to five and a half months;
- Supporting work/family balance during first year child’s life through reduction in working hours (two hours per day, either parent);
- No development of a long paid period of leave emphasizing parental choice during the first three years of the birth;
- Complementary (consecutive) relationship between leave and services: extensive services to support dual-earner employment at an early stage; access to services as leave ends;
- Linkages between gender equality policy and leave policy (over last 10 years);
- High female activity rate (full-time) + predominant model of full-time dual-earner couple;
- Policy priorities at present: increasing extensive services (< 3); extending (slightly) main type of leave; linking extension of leave to more gender equality in sharing of leave.
5 MAIN LEAVE POLICY MODELS:

1) The “one year leave” gender equality orientated policy model

Main Characteristics:

- Approx. 1 year (9 to 13 months) very well paid leave;
- Development of paid parental leave after compulsory maternity leave;
- Strong emphasis on father’s quota of parental leave (Sweden, Iceland) or flexible gender sharing of leave;
- Promoting gender equality in leave policy is high on the agenda;
- High female activity rate, high employment rate for women with children below age 6

Countries: ?? Sweden, Iceland, Denmark, Slovenia and Estonia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Maternity Leave (weeks)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Paternity Leave (weeks) (during mat. leave)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Parental Leave</th>
<th>Total Post-Natal Paid Leave (approx., in weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47,5: 80%; 13:208€/m 12:unpaid 52 Per fam. 8,5 Fth.Q 6 p/parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>39,5</td>
<td>13,5: 80% 26: unpaid Per fam. Per parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>18 (4 before)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32: 100% 8: Unpaid Per fam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>15 (4 before)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13 (2 compulsory)</td>
<td>2:100%; 11: 78%:</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100% Per fam. half p/parent (transferable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2/ day</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100% Per fam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75% (82% 1st month)</td>
<td>2 (3 days compulsory)</td>
<td>3 days: 100%; 7 days: 82%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>671€/m if full-time Per parent (13,5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) The long leave “parental choice orientated” policy model

Main Characteristics:

- Long paid leave (up to 2/3 years) after birth of child (following 4 to 10 months well paid leave);
- “Concurrent” relationship between leave and services (intended to support parental choice over the first 3 years of the birth);
- Emphasis on parental choice, but also on gender equality;
- Female activity rates high, but employment rates of women with children < 6 are somewhat lower than those without children < 6

Countries: ?? Finland, France and Norway
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Maternity Leave (weeks)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Paternity Leave (weeks) (during mat. leave)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Parental Leave</th>
<th>Tot. Post Natal Paid Leave (approx., in weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3,5 + 2 bonus (if taken last 2 weeks of Parental leave)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>138,5</td>
<td>Per fam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>16 (24 if &gt; 3rd child) (4 before)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>140 (2 children) 15 (1 child)</td>
<td>513€/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>9 (3 before)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39: 80% 6 Fth: 100% 54: 460€/m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Long leave “mother home-centred” policy model

Main characteristics:

- Long, fairly low paid leave (up to 3 years, following 3-6 months well paid leave);
- Emphasis on maternal home care until child is 3 years old rather than parental choice;
- Low availability of services and low complementarity of leave system and services system (long period of leave as alternative to services);
- Female activities rates medium/high, but very strong difference between employment rates of women with/without children < 6;
- Male breadwinner model still predominant

Countries: ?? Germany, Hungary and Czech Republic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Maternity Leave (weeks)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Paternity Leave (weeks) (during mat. leave)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Parental Leave</th>
<th>Tot. Post-Natal Paid Leave (approx., in weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>108:300€/m (if part-time) (means-tested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>84: 70% 54: 441€/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>28 (6 before)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>No (under discussion)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140: 121€/m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Short leave “part-time mother” policy model

Main Characteristics:

- One main type of leave: maternity leave, short, not very well paid;
- Low availability of services;
- No/low development of paid parental leave;
- Low emphasis on gender equality;
- High female activity rate (high levels of female part-time work); strong differences between employment rates of women with/without children < 6;
- One and a half earner model is predominant

Countries: ?? United Kingdom, Netherlands and Ireland
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Maternity Leave (weeks)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Paternity Leave (weeks) (during mat. leave)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Parental Leave</th>
<th>Total length (weeks)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Who in fam.</th>
<th>Tot. Post-Natal Paid Leave (approx., in weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6: 90%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156/week</td>
<td>26 weeks</td>
<td>26 weeks (max. 4 weeks per year)</td>
<td>Unpaid</td>
<td>Per parent (13)</td>
<td>26 (6 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20: 156€/wk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26: unpaid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22:70%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Unpaid</td>
<td>Per parent (14)</td>
<td>20 (4,5 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 before)</td>
<td>12: unpaid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26 (if full time job)</td>
<td>Tax reduction</td>
<td>Per parent (13)</td>
<td>12 (3 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4 before)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5) Short leave “male breadwinner” policy model

Main Characteristics:

- One main type of leave: maternity, short (4 months), very well paid (100%);
- Low integration of leave system and services system (low availability of services < 3 years);
- No/low development of parental leave;
- Low emphasis on gender equality;
- Fairly low female activity rate;
- Male breadwinner still predominant

Countries: Greece, Spain, Italy (??), Portugal (??)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Maternity Leave (weeks)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Paternity Leave (weeks) (during mat. leave)</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>Parental Leave</th>
<th>Total Post-Natal Paid Leave (approx., in weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total length (weeks)</td>
<td>€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>20 (4 before)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>No (12 if lone father or mother ill)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45 (+ 4.5 extra for fathers who took paternity leave)</td>
<td>45: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>17 (8 before)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unpaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Unpaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>17-21</td>
<td>17:100% 21: 80%</td>
<td>1 (compulsory)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27 (108 special leave)</td>
<td>25: unpaid 2 Father’s Quota: 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Portugal’s “early return to full employment” model does not seem to fit into any of these five models.

- If we take into consideration the characteristics of the “early return to to employment” model, we can see that, in terms of developments in leave policy:
  
  a) Historically, Portugal’s pathway is linked to the Southern European “short leave male breadwinner” model. It is also linked over the last few decade to a “rigid labour market”.

  b) However, there has also been divergence: a stronger promotion of women’s employment and the dual-earner model; and a stronger linkage between leave policies and gender equality policy. These characteristics connect leave policy in Portugal to the “gender equality orientated” policy model.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

karin.wall@ics.ul.pt
DEFINITION OF THE PORTUGUESE “LEAVE POLICY MODEL”?

The “Early Return to Full Employment” Leave Policy Model

Characteristics:

- One main type of leave: a short, very well-paid, gender flexible leave, up to five and a half months;

- Supporting work/family balance during first year child’s life through reduction in working hours (two hours per day, either parent);

- No development of a long paid period of leave emphasizing parental choice during the first three years of the birth;

- Complementary (consecutive) relationship between leave and services: extensive services to support dual-earner employment at an early stage; access to services as leave ends;

- Linkages between gender equality policy and leave policy (over last 10 years);

- High female activity rate (full-time) + predominant model of full-time dual-earner couple;

- Policy priorities at present: increasing extensive services (< 3); extending (slightly) main type of leave; linking extension of leave to more gender equality in sharing of leave
On recent development in leave policy in Finland

Pentti Takala
Introduction

- Preparation in the tripartite working group
  - The labour market organisations and the state negotiated the practical compromise and the main guidelines for the Government’s proposals

- Aims of family leave reform 2007
  - Encourage fathers to participate more in child care
  - Lower leave costs of employers
  - Equalise leave costs of employers between female and male dominated branches
  - Improve women’s position in the labour market
The Government’s proposals (1)

- Increase of the maternity allowance
  - Replacement rate up to 90% of income for the first 56 days
  - Benefits those mothers who don’t receive full pay during the first months of maternity leave – 40% of all mothers

- Increase of the parental allowance for fathers
  - Replacement rate up to 80% of income for the first 50 days of the father’s share of leave
  - No changes for mothers
New parental leave system in Finland

Maternity leave 4 months / Parental leave, ca. 6 months + Fathers’ 2 bonus weeks

- Mother / employer: 90%
- Mother, former benefit level
- Mother or father, part 1, mother or father: former benefit level
- Parental leave, part 2, if father uses it
- Father’s bonus weeks

Average gross compensation rate %

Maternity leave 90%
Maternity leave, no changes
Parental leave, no changes
Parental leave 80% for father, no changes for mother
Fathers’ bonus weeks, 80%

Maternity and parental leave, working days

Haataja A., Mattila-Wiro P., 2006
Replacement rate during different periods of parental leave
Present parental allowances and proposed increases during the initial periods (mean, €/month)

- Mothers
  - the present allowance = 1,150 €/month
  - the increased allowance = 1,510 €/month (during the first 56 days of the maternity leave) + 360 €

- Fathers
  - The present allowance = 1,430 €/month
  - The increased allowance = 1,730 €/month (during the first 50 days of the father’s parental leave) + 294 €

- Recipients of minimum payments were excluded.
Debate on the different rate of compensation during parental leave for women and men

- The Ombudsman for Equality
  - The proposal goes against the Act on Equality between Women and Men
  - The principle of positive discrimination is irrelevant: men are not in a weaker position only because they use their right to parental leave less
  - The position of single and adoptive mothers is problematic as well

- The Government
  - Family leaves are intended to support the whole family, and the proposal gives an incentive for fathers to increase their contribution in childcare
  - The Attorney General: the proposed reform will improve the welfare of families, and therefore, it does not go against the constitutional principles on equality
The Government’s proposals (2)

- **Better compensation of leave costs incurred by employers**
  - Those who provide full pay are entitled to a larger reimbursement from the state
  - Employers will be compensated in full for annual leave payments (including social security payments of employers)

- **Timing of the father’s month more flexible**
  - Fathers could save up two last weeks of parental leave and two weeks of bonus leave and use them within 180 days of the previous parental leave period

- **Other proposals**
  - Rights of adoptive parents will be improved (parental leave from 180 days to 200 days)
  - Parental allowance will be paid also to registered same-sex partners
Present law

Maternity leave | Parental leave | Care leave

Reform of family leave

Maternity leave | Parental leave | Care leave

Father’s month
Conclusion

- **Complex structure of family leave**
  - People have difficulties to know their rights of leave and related allowances
  - An extra obstacle for fathers to use more family leaves
  - Detrimental to research and statistical work

- **Problems with the tripartite working groups**
  - Complexity is partly a consequence of the method of preparation that presumes consensus
  - Reforms in small pieces and not user-friendly

- **Unequal benefits**
  - Reform benefits mothers only moderately
  - More attractive for men due to their shorter leaves
○ PARENTAL LEAVE IN SLOVENIA
History of parental leave in Slovenia

- **105** days of maternity leave
- **in 1975** 141 days of childcare leave were added (the total of **246** days, or 387 days if 141 days were taken as a half-time leave)
- **in 1986**: the total leave of **356** days (of which 260 days could be used as 520 days of a half-time leave)
- end of **2001**: 90 days of paternity leave (**446** days alltogether)
Women in the labour market

- Virtually every adult woman in Slovenia is employed (female activity rate, end of 2005: 53.5%; 90.2% for women aged 25-49)
- **Full time** employment
- After the maternity and childcare leave, women return to their full-time jobs
Parental leave


- Maternity leave (105 days)
- Childcare leave (260 days) – (or 520 days, if taken as half-time leave)
- Paternity leave (90 days)
- Adoption leave (120/150 days for the child aged 1-4 / 4-10 years, respectively)

After parental leave, a return to the former job is guaranteed.
Parenthood protection insurance

- In January 2007, two categories of persons will be added to those covered by the parenthood protection insurance:
  - 1) farmers, their household members and other persons who have farming as their only or main activity (profession), if covered by mandatory pension and invalidity insurance, and
  - 2) unemployed persons included in public works.
Since May 2006:

- The maternity leave must start 28 days prior to the foreseen delivery date (without the former possibility to start it 42 days before the delivery date), thus making the leave following the childbirth longer.

In case of medical indication, the pregnant woman may take the sick leave before the maternity leave.
Half of childcare leave is each parent’s own right that may be transferred between parents upon agreement.

If the mother is a student below age of 18, one of the grandparents is allowed to take childcare leave.

Childcare leave is extended by 30 days if – at the birth of a child - parents already bring up at least two children up to age of eight; by 60 days if they bring up three children; and by 90 days if they bring up four or more children.

75 days of childcare leave may be taken till the child’s age of 8 as a full-time or part-time leave, or by days.
Fathers on leave

Fathers are obliged to use at least 15 days of paternity leave till the child’s age of six months (before May 2006: during maternity leave, i.e. till the child’s age of 11 months), while the rest of 75 days can be used until the child's age of three (before May 2006: until the child's age of 8 years).

- childcare leave: 2.3% of fathers in 2004 (up to 1% in the 1990s)
- paternity leave: 72% of fathers in 2004 (15 days); 9% took more days
Wage compensation

- For entitlement to wage compensation, the person must be insured just before the day when the leave starts.
- From 2005, the eligibility to wage compensation during parental leave is also be held by persons who were insured for at least 12 months in the last three years before the start of the individual part of parental leave.
100% of the average monthly gross wage of the entitled person (or the average basis from which the entitled person was paying parental leave contributions) during the 12 months prior to the leave. If the contributions were paid during a period shorter than twelve months, the minimum wage is taken into account for the missing period.

During the first 15 days of the paternity leave, the father is entitled to 100% wage compensation, while for the rest of 75 days he is only paid the social security contributions based on the minimum wage.

- **Minimum**: 55% of the minimum wage
- **Maximum**: 2.5 times the average wage in Slovenia (not applied in the case of maternity leave)
In case of unused childcare and protection leave, there was a possibility to obtain the non-received amount of wage compensation (up to five monthly wage compensations) through

- payment for childcare services,
- payment of the housing rent or
- a housing purchase.

*Abandoned in May 2006 due to complicated implementation*
Possibility of part-time work for one of the parents, with the social security contributions based on the minimum wage being paid from the state budget for the difference to full time employment

- till the child’s age of thee - for those in employment and (since May 2006) also for the self-employed working at least 20 hours per week (including farmers)
- since January 2007: till the younger child’s age of six, if the parent takes care of two children.

Since May 2006: Social security contributions based on the minimum wage paid till the youngest child’s age of ten, if there are four or more children in the family.
Salary substitute has been received by about 85% of all mothers with children up to 11 months of age.

**Parental allowance**

- a lump sum benefit (171 €) received monthly during one year
- granted to persons who are not eligible for the insurance-based wage compensation during the parental leave
LEAVE DEVELOPMENTS IN GREECE

Evi Hatzivarnava Kazassi
Institute of Social Protection and Solidarity
Athens, Greece
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THE CONTEXT

- Women’s activity and employment rates
- Self-employment, small business, black economy sector, seasonal employment
- Demographic concern
- Large families - constitutional protection
- Care policies
- Strong gender division in care
# FEMALE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY (15-64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU (25 countries)</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Female Activity (15-64) According to Age and Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000 (Q1)</th>
<th>2005 (Q1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 child 0-14</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children 0-14</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ children 0-14</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child 0-2</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children, the youngest 0-2</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ children, the youngest 0-2</td>
<td><strong>46.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child 3-5</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children, the youngest 3-5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ children, the youngest 3-5</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELF EMPLOYED AS % OF TOTALLY EMPLOYED, 2005
(excluding farming, public administration and finance sectors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>males</th>
<th>females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(highest in Europe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25 countries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BLACK ECONOMY SECTOR

- Estimated:
  Non declared employment: 17-20% (one in three are immigrants)
“FLEXIBLE” WORKING RELATIONS

- 8-9% seasonal work contracts
- 6-7% time limited contracts
- 4-5% part-time contracts
DEMOGRAPHIC CONCERN

Fertility rate: 1.27 in 2002

Policy concern and response:
- Definition of large family from 4+ children to 3+ children (but disputes)
- Special incentives for families with 3+ children
LARGE FAMILIES

- Strong profile, constitutional protection
- Preferential treatment in policy
CARE POLICIES

- **For pre-school children**: public childcare facilities but not enough places for all, limited places for children below 2,5 (parents pay according to income)

- **For school children**: after school care but not everywhere, free

- **For elderly and disabled**: home-based support, but not everywhere, free
FAMILY CARE
Economically active (25-49) that do not seek work according to the reasons for not seeking work (000) (2005, Q4)
LEAVE IN PUBLIC/PRIVATE SECTORS

Basic common legislation but each sector can develop on that

- Public sector: Code of civil servants

- Private sector: Collective agreements between employees and employers. General National Agreement securing the minimum standards of all collective agreements
TWO DIFFERENT SECTORS, TWO DIFFERENT POLICIES

PUBLIC SECTOR
- More generous leave policy
- Leave provision not subject to employer’s agreement

PRIVATE SECTOR
- Less generous leave policy
- Way of provision of some leaves: subject to employer’s agreement
**LEAVE PROVISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR</th>
<th>PRIVATE SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternity leave:</strong> 5 months, paid</td>
<td><strong>Maternity leave:</strong> 17 weeks, paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childcare leave:</strong> reduced hours of work until the child turns 4 or 9 months continuously off work provided the total number of hours off work is the same, paid</td>
<td><strong>Paternity leave:</strong> 2 days, paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental leave:</strong> up to 2 years, until the child turns 6, unpaid</td>
<td><strong>Childcare leave:</strong> reduced hours of work each day for up to 18 months or, if parent/employer agree, taken in one (around 3 ¾ months) or more blocks of time provided the total number of hours off work is the same, paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parental leave:</strong> 3 ½ months for each parent, until the child turns 3 ½, unpaid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEAVE PROVISION

PUBLIC SECTOR

Leave for visiting children’s school: 4 days per year, paid

Leave for parents of children with disability: a) Reduced hours of work (one hour) per day, paid
b) For parents of children needing regular transfusion or therapy: 22 days per year, paid

PRIVATE SECTOR

Leave for visiting children’s school: 4 days per year, paid

Leave for parents of children with disability: a) Reduced hours of work (one hour) per day, unpaid (only in companies with 50+ employees and until child turns 16) b) For parents of children needing regular transfusion: 10 days per year, paid

Leave for single parents: 6 days per year, paid for widows/ers or unmarried parents and 8 days per year if parents of 3+ children

Leave for children’s illness: From 6-12 days per year depending on number of children, unpaid
# TYPES OF LEAVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare leave</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for visiting children’s school</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for parents of children with disability</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for single parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for children’s illness</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LENGTH OF LEAVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>17 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare leave</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3 ¾ months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>3 ½ months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for visiting children’s school</td>
<td>1 hour per day</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for parents of children with disability</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for single parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for children’s illness</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-12 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Private sector:

- 6-8 days
- 6-12 days
## LENGTH OF LEAVES

### PRIVATE SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>maternity leave</th>
<th>childcare leave</th>
<th>parental leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td></td>
<td>paid</td>
<td>non paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>3,75 months</td>
<td>3,50 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC SECTOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>maternity leave</th>
<th>childcare leave</th>
<th>parental leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td></td>
<td>paid</td>
<td>non paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Flexibility of Leave Provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>When leave starts</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Childcare leave</td>
<td>Reduced hours of daily work or in one or more blocks of time</td>
<td>Reduced hours of daily work or in one or more blocks of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Parental leave</td>
<td>May be taken in blocks of time</td>
<td>May be taken in blocks of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Leave for visiting children’s school</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Leave for parents of children with disability</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Leave for single parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Leave for children’s illness</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONDITIONS FOR LEAVE PROVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare leave</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Employer must agree on way of provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Up to a total of 8% of total number of employees each year; Employer must agree on way of provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for visiting children’s school</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for parents of children with disability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Only applied in enterprises with 50+ employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for single parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for children’s illness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Private sector
- Public sector
## PAYMENT OF LEAVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare leave</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for visiting children’s school</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for parents of children with disability</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for single parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for children’s illness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ELIGIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leaves</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>mother or father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternity leave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mother or father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare leave</td>
<td>mother and father</td>
<td>mother and father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mother and father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for visiting children’s school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mother or father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for parents of children with disability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mother or father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for single parents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mother or father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for children’s illness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>mother and father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Private sector leaves typically apply to employees in the private sector, whereas public sector leaves are more common in state or government organizations. The criteria for eligibility may vary depending on the specific policies of each organization.
Consequences - Private Sector

Employers:
- The issue of who/how replaces the employee - who pays the cost

Parents:
- Loss of income (if leave not paid)
- Feeling of insecurity (about job position, career prospects)

Reservations about employing mothers?

Low take up
Consequences—Public Sector

**Employers:**
- The issue of who/how replaces the employee
- No effect on employability of mothers

**Parents:**
- Loss of income (if leave not paid)
- Low take-up of non paid leaves
TWO DIFFERENT SECTORS, TWO DIFFERENT PRACTICES

PUBLIC SECTOR
- Higher take up
- Take up according to parents’ needs

PRIVATE SECTOR
- Lower take up
- Take up according to employers’ (and parents’) needs
However.....

No data are available on take-up of leave in general, amongst mothers and fathers and in the various sectors of the economy.
TRENDS

- More types of leaves
- Greater length
- More flexibility in their use
- More are paid
- Introduction of paternity leave
Developments over time - Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Law 1483:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Parental leave, leave for visiting children’s school, leave for care of children with disability, leave for children’s illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Maternity leave extended to 14 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Maternity leave extended to 15 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Paternity leave (1 day)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Maternity leave extended to 16 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Childcare leave more flexible, right for father (if not used by mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Parental leave facilitated (from 3 to 3 ½ months, until the child turns 3 instead of 2 ½, for enterprises with 50+ instead of 100+ employees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Developments over time - Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Parental leave: Abolition of condition of size of enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Extension of maternity leave to 17 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Extension of paternity leave to 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Extension of leave for children’s illness to 12 days (instead of 10) for parents of 3+ children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Childcare leave for adoptive parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Leave for single parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Alternative way of provision of childcare leave: instead of reduced daily working hours, it can be granted in block(s) of time of equivalent time value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Women that obtain a child through surrogate motherhood have the right to all leaves that relate to the care of the child, while both mothers have rights to reduced hours of work (childcare leave)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presently discussed—Private Sector

- **Payment of parental leave**
  The payment by the Family Benefits Fund of the daily wage of an unskilled worker to employees that receive parental leave as well as the payment of social insurance contributions.

- **Replacement**
  The development through the Employment and Training Fund of actions so that working women are replaced by unemployed people during maternity leave.
Developments over time—Public Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>- Parental leave, leave for visiting children’s school, leave for care of children with disability, leave for children’s illness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1997 | - Introduction of a 1-month paid leave to adoptive mothers  
     - Unpaid leave for disabled children changed to paid |
| 1999 | - Extension of maternity leave to 5 months (instead of 4)  
     - Extension of paid leave to adoptive mothers to 3 months  
     - Alternative way of provision of childcare leave: instead of reduced daily working hours, it can be granted in 9 consecutive months  
     - Parental leave extended to 2 years |
Presently discussed—Public Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childcare leave</th>
<th>Fathers eligible too</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be extended by 6 months (if taken as reduced daily working hours) or by 1 month (if taken in a block of time) for single parents and parents with disability or by 3 months taken in a block of time in cases of the birth of a third child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental leave</th>
<th>To be paid for 3 months for parents with 3+ children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
German Parental Leave Reforms

Wolfgang Erler
anakonde

Daniel Erler
pme Familienservice GmbH
Parental Leave Introduction in 1986

- First introduction of paid leave periods for both parents
- 307€ unconditional flat rate for first 6 months - then means tested
- Initial 8 months paid leave was subsequently raised to 24, unpaid leave to 36 months

*the family policy innovation of the 1980s*

- Concrete acknowledgement of child rearing’s social and economic value
- Possible involvement of both parents

**HOWEVER**

- Clearly intended to provide incentives for mothers to stay at home
- Maintained a male breadwinner logic
- Criticised for wanting to ‘relegate women to the kitchen’

Tuesday, 25 September 2007
Parental Leave Reform in 2001

- during 1990s leave entitlements remained largely unchanged
- 1998 government turnover → major parental leave reform
- More flexibility:
  - 300€ for 24 months or 450€ for 12 months
  - 12 months unpaid leave can be spread over 8 years
  - Parents can take leave simultaneously
  - Up to 30 hours of part-time work possible
- Aim to raise the flexibility for working parents and facilitate labour market attachment
- HOWEVER: Benefit levels actually decreased and there were little incentives for fathers to take leave

_normal policy adaptation_ rather than fundamental shift

- Growing relevance of demographic and economic arguments in the political debate
- Tentative departure from three phased female life course model

Tuesday, 25 September 2007
Parental Leave Overhaul (2007)

- Reform announced by red-green government in 2005 but implemented by succeeding grand coalition of SPD/CDU
- Clearly inspired by Swedish parental leave model
- Main features:
  - 12 months leave at 67% of prior wage (min 300€ / max 1800€)
  - 2 additional months if taken by the father (partner months)
  - Alternatively 24+4 at 33.5% prior wage (min 150€ / max 900€)
  - Low income support (below 1000€)
- Wage replacement, partner months and shorter leave periods have the explicit aim to:
  - Reduce length of female labour market exit (opportunity costs)
  - Facilitate fathers' leave take up

We are witnessing a family policy paradigm shift

→ Goal is no longer to maintain a male breadwinner/homemaker model but to facilitate female employment at least on part-time basis

Yet: considerable criticism from the left and social conservatives ➔ fragile
Subject/stakeholders of the reform project

- A top-down reform, designed within the inner circles of the Social Democratic government (no grassroots pressure within the parties or the public)

- Not really taken serious by opponents and the media

- Pushed through within the conservative-led “big coalition” treaty of November 2005 by the old and the new family ministers, backed by the new chancellor and consented by the leading circles of both parties

- Clear support from the business community for demographic reasons and feared lack of well-trained women in the workforce – but no positive campaigning
Controversial Issues before introduction of the reform law in September 2006

- Fathers’ Quota (2 months) heavily opposed in the media and within the rows of the Christian democrats

- „Self-determination“ of couples/parents on their private division of labour

- Compromise: adding the two father-quota months to the overall duration of paid leave
Controversial Issues - 2 -

→ income replacement at 68% of earnings up to 1800 € instead of flat rate payment of 307 € said to be socially unjust (children of the well-off being higher valued than children of low-income families)

→ reaction and compromise: a flat rate of 300 € for all recipients without market income before birth and growing percentage of income replacement for low incomes below 1000 €
Shorter period of allowance said to *FORCE* mothers of young children back to the labour market instead of giving them freedom of choice.

Male breadwinner model said to be extinguished by dual earner model: heavy opposition from young male Christian democrats.

Reaction and compromise: choice option installed for a reduced budget version of 24 +4 months.
The new minister of family affairs - welcome target of envious projections

→ Daughter of a christian-democratic State Prime Minister, with five children
→ „Attractive, blond, long haired“
→ Seven children, never housewife, after university degree working as a doctor and medical researcher
→ A provoking personality for different lifestyle types:
   → Male breadwinner families, men and housewives
   → DINKIES and career women
→ Middle-class and low-income people due to her message “It's easy and fun to have many children“
New paradigm: demography and fertility arguments as a basis of family policy

→ In postwar Germany, demographic arguments were taboo due to German history (Nazi context of “dying people”, pro-natalistic campaigning and at the same time mass murder of Jews and population in occupied Eastern Europe)

→ First introduced into political discourse by the former social democratic family minister
Unresolved: The childcare gap

- A serious childcare gap for under 3 – difficult to match for families after 14 months when parental allowance runs out

- New study of German Youth Institute DJI shows the amount of the gap (500,000 places for under three-year-old kids missing)
Thank You!
Parental leave and social inequality

Jeanne Fagnani (CNRS) and Danielle Boyer (CNAF)
Access to parental leave and social inequality

- Income-replacement: flat-rate benefit or earning-related?
  - Sweden, 80% of previous salaries
  - France, low flat-rate benefit

- Income threshold => Consequences

- Eligibility critéria => Consequences
PARENTAL LEAVE BENEFIT IN FRANCE (2006)

- 522 Euros per month if the parent does not work
- 397 Euros if the parent works part-time (less or equal to half-time)
- 300 Euros if the parent works between 50 and 80 per cent of full-time
Parents with only one child in France: Restrictions on Eligibility

- **ELIGIBLE PARENTS:** those who have worked for the two years preceding the birth (unemployed periods not included)

- **OUTCOME:** parents lacking a stable job or unemployed before the birth are excluded
Parents with 2 children on parental leave in France: breakdown according to the income level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Full-time leave TOTAL = 100%</th>
<th>Part-time leave TOTAL = 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low income</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High income</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high income</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CREDOC, 2005
Leave policies in the Czech Republic: the current issues

Jiřina Kocourková

Charles University, Faculty of Science, Department of demography and geodemography, Prague
Motives for improvements in parental leave system

- **In the 1990s**
  - To release women from labour market
  - Well-being of children

- **Recently**
  - pronatalist motives
Maternity leave

- 28 weeks (since 1987)
- 69% of gross daily wage (since 1993)
- Father could take maternity leave instead of mother only under exceptional circumstances
Parental leave

- Equal conditions for both parents were introduced since 2001
- Mother or father can take leave until the child’s 3rd birthday
- Inconsistency in law related to parental leave and parental benefit: parental benefit is granted until the child’s 4th birthday
- Parental benefit is a flat rate: in 2006 around €120 per month which is 20% of average gross wage
Recent changes in use of parental leave

- Since 2004 parents can work, full time or part time while receiving parental benefit.
- Since 2001 parents can place a child under 3 years in a childcare facility for up to 5 days a month without losing parental benefit.
- Since 2006 parents can place a 3 year old child in kindergarten for up to 4 hours each day without losing benefit.
Family policy concept approved in 2005

- Confirmation of the direction introduced in the 1990s: rejection of de-familialist policies and emphasis on family responsibility in childcare
- As regards parental leave arrangements preference is given to well-being of children
- Modesty as regards the state support of childcare facilities for children younger than 3 years
Approved improvements in parental leave system since 2007

- Measures were prepared and approved within the election campaign in 2005-2006

- 1. the level of parental benefit will be doubled, thus it will make up 40% of the average gross wage

- 2. farther will be able to take maternity leave instead of mother from the 7th week after the birth of the child
The current questions in research activities and political debate

1. How to involve farthers in childcare and family duties.

2. How to make parental leave system more flexible

3. Is there public demand for childcare facilities?
Farthers on parental leave

- In 2005 research was centred on the question „Why it is not attractive for men to stay at home with small child“
  - Financial situation
  - Opinion that childcare is preferable for women

- Negligible share of men on parental leave:
  - 2001 0,8%
  - 2005 1,5%

- In 2006 there is a medial campaign aimed to appreciate farther who have taken parental leave
Three – speed parental leave

1. to keep the current length of parental leave

2. to reduce the length of parental leave to 3 years together with the increase of parental benefit by 25%

3. to extend maternity leave together with an increase in financial compensation but at the same time to reduce parental leave to 1,5 year
Conclusion

- Parental leave arrangements support women to stay at home rather than support them to reconcile work and childcare.

- So far parental leave arrangements have failed to involve fathers in the childcare.
A review of work/family policies

Dr. Hanne Groenendijk
Policy advisor
Ministry of Social Affairs & Employment
The review of w/f-policies

- what?
- why?
- how?

- some results
- (surplus) value?
A policy review: what?

- evaluation of related policies aimed at a specific societal problem
- problem, justification of government intervention
- goals, instruments, budget
- use, effects
- assessment of effectiveness and efficiency
A policy review: why?

- parliament demands policy rationality & accountability
- monitoring and evaluation of policies mandatory
- did policies help to solve problem?
- in an efficient way?
The review of w/f policies

- **Pro’s:**
  - state-of-the-art report
  - stressing importance of w/f policies
  - possibility for reflection: changes, adjustments, lacuna’s?
  - changing goals?
- **Fears:**
  - budget cut down
  - cancelling instruments
The review of w/f-policies: how?

- evaluation of leave / child care policies
- key figures (use)
  - empirical studies (needs & preferences)
  - international comparative effect studies
- more criteria for assessment i.e: freedom of choice, flexibility, comprehensiveness
- appraisal by two experts
- interdepartmental consultation
The review of w/f-policies: some results

- limited use of leave facilities: lacking ‘sense of entitlement’; need for social innovation
- longer parental leave might be positive for labour participation women
- no leave for informal care / chronically ill

- childcare: accessible, satisfactory quality
- preference for child care at home / parents
- lower incomes: misperception of costs & quality
The review of w/f-policies: what next?

- in view of elections (11.22): no proposals, no scenario’s, no dilemma’s
- sent to parliament in September
- untill now: no discussion, not on agenda
The review of w/f-policies: some dilemma’s

- leave ~ labour participation?
- responsibility government ~ employer / employee?
- individual rights to leave ~ family rights?
- subsidies for children of working parents ~ all parents?
- higher subsidies childcare ~ better image childcare
The review of w/f-policies: surplus value?

- political programs: extended parental leave, free childcare, less financial support for one-earner families
- empirical basis for new ideas and their design
- more rationality, effectiveness & efficiency of w/f policies
Self-definition and self-presentation and the transgression of gender norms: the case of «at-home» dads

Lisbon Seminar
November 2006
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Theoretical references

- **Grounded Theory** (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)
- **Phenomenology** (Schütz, 1975, 1976, 1982; Schütz & Luckmann, 1973, 1989) and **social constructionism** (Berger & Luckmann, 1996)
  
  Gender is a social construction
  Gender refers to typifications orienting the perception of the world of everyday life (Delphy, 2001)

- **Socio-anthropology of masculinities**
  
  Multiple masculinities and feminities (Kimmel, 2000; Connell, 1987, 1999, 2002)
Population

- 21 fathers living in Belgium, at-home to take care of their child(ren) during at least 6 months at full-time, with a professionally active female partner
- Varied socio-economic and demographic profiles but majority of highly educated fathers, with 2 or more children, the youngest being younger than 1 year of age, aged 25-40, living with a partner with a good employment position
### Determinants of fathers’ decision to become primary caregivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values in terms of childrearing, gender roles, time and quality of life</th>
<th>Work-related factors: Father’s and mother’s working conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-family balance-related factors</td>
<td>Calculation of benefits and costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the partner</td>
<td>Childhood socialization and attitude towards one’s own parents’ investment in childcare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Costs of gender norms’ transgression

○ = subjective accounts of reactions to at-home fatherhood.

○ Calls-to-order in daily interactions:
  ● Childcare is a female prerogative
  ● Men “ought to work and provide for their families”
  ● At-home dads are not “masculine”

○ Gendered public spaces

○ Gendered social networks
Strategies to maintain a positive self-image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transgression:</th>
<th>Assumed</th>
<th>Circumscribed</th>
<th>Mediated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Definition/ Self-Presentation</td>
<td>Capacity to distance oneself from critics Paid work no more central Living in accordance with values Self-image: more modern, more free, with better quality of life than others</td>
<td>Link with work maintained Multi-facetted identities Conformity to other masculine norms</td>
<td>Strategic management of self-presentation in interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to the term « at-home dad »</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Ambiguity Rejection</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A phenomenological approach to masculinities

- Refers to the establishment of the conditions of possibility and plausibility of self-definition as a « masculine » individual who assumes « feminine » tasks

- Requires to find in one’s own vision of the world the elements demonstrating:
  - Men’s capacity to take care of a child
  - One’s own masculinity
When masculinity and feminity are viewed by individuals as two separate sub-universes of meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gendered self-definition</th>
<th>« Traveller » category</th>
<th>Criteria for mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>The cross-border</td>
<td>Gender difference maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative masculinity</td>
<td>The member of a «national minority »</td>
<td>Common features with feminity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgyny</td>
<td>The holder of a « double nationality»</td>
<td>Equal inscription in masculinity and feminity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminity</td>
<td>The immigrant</td>
<td>Integration to feminity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy implications

- Relation of women and men’s employment position in the family
- Which status?
- Importance of cultural and spatial barriers to men’s involvement in childcare
- Challenges to gender identity – importance of encouraging alternative definitions of masculinity and feminity at a normative level
Theoretical implications: New definition of gender identity

- Masculine and/or feminine self-definition and self-presentation is the dynamic result of a tension between
  - the norms that are assigned in the social stock of knowledge to males (for masculinities) and females (for feminities) contributing to a typified comprehension of the world and orienting practices
  - and personal elements of identity through which individuals give meaning to their practices and can, in a reflexive process, question the link between masculinities/feminities, assigned norms and biological sex.
The Parental Benefit Act was passed in 2004

- A new type of family benefit scheme for new parents

- Benefit is dependent on previous earnings – covers the opportunity cost of having children
Historic view

○ SU: full compulsory employment of men and women:
  - Advanced childcare
  - Maternity and childcare leave
  - Since 1980s employment protected childcare leave for 3 years
  - Having children supported and socially accepted

○ After gaining independence (1991):
  - Female employment rate dropped dramatically; today close to 60%,
  - Part time 7.5% with small children; 14% without children
  - Many policy measures were abandoned; long low paid childcare leave remained
Births

- Stable high birth rate through the second half of the 20 century – between 1.9 - 2.1

- Births went up during years of gaining independence and fell down after it
  TBR 1988 – 2.26 1998 – 1.28

- Low level until 2004
- Low birth rate became a national concern
Total fertility rate and number of births 1970-2005

Source: Statistics Estonia
Policy reaction

- Salary compensation aimed to increase the birth rate through stopping postponement of giving birth

- No gender equality issues under discussion

- Benefit available for mothers only until the child reaches 6 months of age.
Parental Benefit scheme

- Paid at 100% of an average monthly income of a previous calendar year; upper limit set at 3 average wages

- Benefit rate for the parents who did not work 141 Eur in 2004; flat rate childcare benefit 45 Eur

- Benefit is paid at minimum wage for those who worked during previous calendar year but calculated benefit would be less; 10-20% more than benefit rate
Parental Benefit - duration

- Paid initially during 225 days: maternity benefit + parental benefit = 365 days of wage compensation
- 11 months if mother non-working

- Since 2006 payment was prolonged for 90 additional days (455 days of wage compensation at 100%)
- 14 months if mother non-working
Parental benefit

- Working is permitted
  - If salary exceeds benefit rate the benefit is reduced according to a special formula
  - If salary exceeds 5 time benefit rate, the benefit is not paid
  - 3-4% continue working working

- Speed premium
  - If the next child is born within 2 and half years, the former benefit is paid, if higher
Research on impacts

- **Research questions:**
  - Whether the benefit has affected the number of births
  - Whether there is a different impact on women of different socio-economic status

- **Combined data sources:**
  - Medical Birth Register for births and socio-economic status of mother
  - Labour Force Survey
  - Pension Insurance Register for amount of benefit, number of children, previous income

- The overall fertility rate has changed slightly.
- Increase in first, second and third births.
- Women with higher education have increasingly more children.
- The fertility behaviour of unemployed women has not changed.
- However, all these trends started earlier and cannot therefore be attributed to parental benefit.
Research - first results

- Higher paid women give more births than before the parental benefit scheme.
- The change is especially explicit in case of second and third births.
- Can it be argued that parental benefit has an impact on employed women to have second and third child?
Thank you!
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Spanish developments in national leave policies and research

Anna Escobedo & Lara Navarro
Dpt of Sociology, Univ. Autònoma of Barcelona (UAB)
Annual Meeting of the Expert Network on Leave Policies and Research
Lisboa, November 10th 2006
1. **New education law (May 2006):**
   - the 0-3 is again considered early education in the national framework regulation, still no funding commitment, coverage aiming at 33% (regional competence, diversity and plurality, no link with parental leave)

2. **New law on dependency (Oct 2006) for all citizens & residents, now under reglamentary development which means universal care services and provisions for dependants**
   - initial exclusion of the under 3s → after Parliamentary debate the under 3s are included by means of a 13th additional disposition, which foresees a specific regulation
   - new mechanism for the professionalisation of informal carers (in case no public services available, with wage and social security protection, no link to leave arrangements).

3. **Leave developments are now located in a project of law on Gender Equality presented by the Government at the Parliament (Oct 06)**
   - From the perspective of the child only 8 days of paternity leave (8+2) are added to the 16 weeks of paid maternity leave (high policy discourse on fathers, citizen initiative has started to ask for 6 months of maternity leave) paid by the Social Security
   - Responsibility on companies to develop gender equality plans (but most employees in small an medium companies)
   - The topic of precarious employment is not tackled by this reform (one third of employees are casual, most immigrants have been regulated in 2005, i.e. given residence and working permits, and labour law is promoting more stability). For ex. Unemployed and fix term are excluded from some benefits.

4. **Tax policy** is not altered from the perspective of families with children (tax payers and employed mothers with under 3’s, receive more deductions than poor families or parents on PL, most tax benefits are for housing access to first property)
2006 Policy developments: innovation in the public sector and regional level

- In the logics of promoting employers and company developments, the central State has initiated a plan for state public employees (PLAN CONCILIA, December 2005)
  - 10 days of paternity leave
  - Many measures of flexibility
  - Leave for adult care

- New Catalan Law (Jun06) on reconciliation in the public sector (about 240,000 employees)
  - One month of paternity leave at the end of maternity leave (besides 5 days at childbirth)
  - One year of one third of paid working time reduction after maternity leave
  - 80% earnings for one third of working time reduction (60% for half) in case children under 6 or seriously handicapped relatives
Politics of Leave Policies in Spain

1. **New family law (Jul 2005):** family diversity and new types of parenthood are now considered equal and integrated in social policy regulation (i.e. homosexual marriage and parenthood).

2. **Regional diversity:** The dual earner model has become majority in families with children (under 16, and still more under 5) (Census, 2001), with high regional diversity (the 2 extremes in Catalonia and Extremadura & Andalucia). This has a general impact, but also very concrete in early education coverage.

3. **The gender equality discourse,** which means basically women into the labour market: promoting early return to work of mothers after maternity leave (16 weeks, tax incentive mother loses if she takes the unpaid parental leave) (no so many active policies for young women).

4. **Emerging discourse on involving fathers in caring children** by means of using leaves and reconciliation flexibility measures (but no adding many resources, first case of dismissal of a father in the mass media).

5. **Emerging discourse and law on the role of companies and employers** (public employees are much benefited by this logic, and big competitive companies but most are in small and medium companies, and still many self-employed in Spain).

6. **Low visibility of children under 3s in state policies and public expenditure** (no funding commitment in early education for the 0-3 while improving 3-6; no significant funding improvement for leave arrangements –except that coverage increases as effect of maternal employment; initial exclusion of the under 3’s from the new dependency law, tax relief instead of cash benefits except in Catalonia and very poor one-wage families).

7. **Still no articulation between leave policies and early education and care** or with the new figure of paid informal carer for the elderly. **No visibility of informal childcare costs.**

8. **To Social Security Institution is inspired by preventing fraud and efficiency in management** (as a result the unemployed have limited right to maternity leave or sick leave) and has just initiated a new approach to research and evaluation (new fund for social protection research initiated in 2005/06), also the big reform on universal coverage of social services for dependants.

9. **Although regulation effort of the new government for immigrants,** Spain is still a country with high degree of informal economy and undeclared / informal work, also in childcare home arrangements.

10. **The most important divide in Spain is between insiders / outsiders** (Public / private; citizens / no citizens).
Research under way (2006/07)

2 Research projects funded by the Spanish Social Protection Research Fund and by the Catalan Government

- Data and indicators (exploring children perspectives)
- Policy evaluation from the perspective of users and families
- Regional developments
- Implementation of measures in different occupational profiles and public organisations (teachers, public administration, security public workers, health care) in Catalonia
- Cost-benefit analysis and interrelations with education and health (health risk prevention)
- Identifying the logics of the various policy actors
- Qualitative research at couple level
- Dissemination of international research and developments for Spanish audiences and in Spanish language (Web)
The measures implemented in the Catalan public sector since mid 2002 are being highly used amongst women and men. We are testing that male use of leave/family friendly measures can be very high in a specific Spanish context if they work as individual rights (i.e. in that case when the female partner does not work in the public sector), there is no loss of earnings, measures are flexible, and employment is well protected (as it is in the Generalitat of Catalonia administration). We are also researching on costs and benefits from the perspective of the employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2006 (preliminary data)</th>
<th>Catalan general public administration and services</th>
<th>Teachers in the Catalan public sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% male employees</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male users of the paid one third working time reduction for the under 1s</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male users of working time reduction for children 1 to 6 (or handicapped) (earnings reduction, but less than proportional)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male users of the whole various flexible measures</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parental leave and return to work in Australia: mothers’ perceptions of changes in career opportunities

Gillian Whitehouse
School of Political Science and International Studies
University of Queensland
(g.whitehouse@uq.edu.au)
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The Parental Leave in Australia survey was distributed to the Infant Cohort of the Longitudinal Study of Australian Children (LSAC) in 2005. The Infant Cohort is a random sample of infants born between March 2003 and February 2004 which in effect provides a sample of their parents/families.

The cohort includes 5107 families recruited from a sampling frame provided by Medicare Australia. The initial response rate in recruiting this cohort was 64% (all tables in this presentation are weighted to account for non-response bias).

The response rate to the Parental Leave in Australia survey was 70%. It was conducted in conjunction with Wave 1.5 of LSAC.

The dataset has information 3568 families, most of which are couple families with valid responses on the employment patterns and leave usage of mothers and fathers. Statistical estimates in this presentation are based on sub-populations within this group.
Leave taking patterns with the birth of child – setting the Australian context

- No universal paid maternity/paternity leave in Australia, public servants and employees of some private companies have access to paid maternity leave (up to 14 weeks in the public sector, typically around 6 weeks in private companies with paid parental leave policies).
- Statutory ‘parental leave’ provision is for 52 weeks unpaid leave available to the child’s ‘primary carer’ (may be shared by mother and her partner).
- *Parental Leave in Australia* survey data show that among mothers of babies born March 2003-Feb 2004 who were employed in the 12 months prior to the birth:
  - 34% took some paid maternity leave, for an average duration of 11 weeks (Among this group, 17% took their pay at half-rate to double their length of leave, a practice more common among first time mothers).
  - 53% took some unpaid maternity leave, for an average duration of 35 weeks;
  - 69% took combinations of paid and unpaid maternity and/or other forms of leave, with the longest average duration among different combinations around 51 weeks;
  - 27% took no leave (the majority of these exited the labour market with the birth of the child).
Research questions

Within this context:

- Do women return to work earlier than they’d like?
- Are they making significant changes to their employment status on return to work?
- Are these changes, and the length of leave taken, associated with reduced career opportunities or earnings?

Informed by:
- Debates in literature over optimal length and type of leave
- Conflicting empirical findings on the impact of leave taking on women’s careers and factors that influence ‘penalties’ on return
Table 1: Timing of return to work after the birth of child, mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004 who were employed in the 12 months prior to the birth, Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Cumulative percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 up to 6 months</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 up to 9 months</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 up to 12 months</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 up to 15 months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not return within 15 months</td>
<td>38*</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td></td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Percent returning earlier than they would have liked, mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004 who returned to work within 15 months, Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of return to work</th>
<th>Up to 3 months</th>
<th>3 up to 6 months</th>
<th>6 up to 9 months</th>
<th>9 up to 12 months</th>
<th>12 up to 15 months</th>
<th>Total returning within 15 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% returning earlier than they wanted to</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>�43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Changes in employer or occupation after the birth of a child, mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004 who returned to work after the birth, Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Employment</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the same employer and in the same job as before</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the same employer but in a different job</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a different employer but in same occupation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With a different employer in a different occupation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued in self-employment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed to self-employment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Changes between full-time and part-time work, mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004 who returned to work after the birth, Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working hours during pregnancy</th>
<th>Working hours on return</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>All (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 (1892)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Changes in permanency of employment contract, mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004 who returned to work after the birth, Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanency of contract during pregnancy</th>
<th>Permanency of contract on return</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>All (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>Fixed-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 (1213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 (298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-term</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100 (1590)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Perceptions of career opportunities on return to work by changes in employer and occupation; mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004, Australia.
Figure 2: Perceptions of career opportunities on return to work by changes in working hours and permanency; mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004, Australia
Figure 3: Perceptions of career opportunities on return to work by length of leave taken; mothers of children born March 2003-February 2004, Australia