13th LPR annual seminar Madrid, Spain, 29-30th September 2016

Elderly care and leave policy in Spain

Jesús Rogero-García & Cristina García-Sainz Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Research project: The social use of leave in Spain. Main researcher: Gerardo Meil.

1. INTRODUCTION

- "Caregiver leaves", to guarantee workers' rights to care for dependent family members.
- Less developed than leaves for children.
- 1980: To care for "physically or mentally disabled" persons.
- 1999:
 - One-year leave of absence to care for a family member who is...
 - Unable to care for him/herself,
 - up to the second degree of kinship, and
 - engages in no remunerated activity.
 - Eligibles: employees with at least one year in a company.
- 2007: Two-years of part or full-time leave, guaranteed 100% social security coverage during the first year. Still not remunerated.

2. OBJECTIVES

- 1. To determine the rate of leave-taking to care for adults in Spain (2012).
- 2. To identify the reasons associated with a more frequent use of leaves.

3. CONTEXT

- A greater demand for family caregiving expected for the next decades.
- In 2007, 79 % of dependent Spaniards received care exclusively from family members; EU-27 average was 59 %. 7 % of dependent people had access to public service coverage.
- Leaves could address family caregiving and provide wellbeing, but...
- Leaves could also widen the gaps between men and women on the labor market.
- No studies for the case of Spain.

4. FACTORS CONDITIONING THE USE OF CAREGIVER LEAVES

- 1. Legislation (leave design).
 - Elegibility (situation of the employee).
 - Degree of kindship.
 - Remuneration.
 - Guarantee of post-leave employment.
- 2. Labor market situation.
 - Level of uncertainty.
 - Working conditions.
- 3. Cultural factors (gender norms). 89 % of caregiver leaves taken by women in 2012.
- 4. Family circumstances.
 - Adults degree of dependence.
 - Relationship.
 - Family support network.

5. METHODOLOGY

Survey: "Survey on the use of caregivers leave in Spain 2012". Retrospective, cross-sectional.

Dependent variable:

- 1. Identification of potential users of leaves, affirmative answer to: "Have you cared for (or are you presently caring for) a dependent person with an accident-related or other disability on a regular and unpaid basis in the last 12 years?", and "Did you engage or are you engaging in paid work at the same time?"
- 2. Reasons for taking / not taking caregiver leaves.

Independent variables:

- 1. Work-related factors (at the time of the interview): type of contract, sector.
- 2. Gender.
- 3. Family factors and context of care: kinship with the dependent person, degree of dependence, primary caregiver, years of caregiving, frequency of care.

Limitations:

- 1. Small size of the sample of leave-takers.
- 2. Caregivers up to 60 years.
- 3. Changes in work situation.
- 4. Problems caused by memory.

6. RESULTS

Table 1. Characteristics of caregiver leaves

| | Use among caregivers (%) | n | Ν |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----|
| Reduction of working hours | 2.4 | 22 | 896 |
| Leave of absence | 0.8 | 7 | 896 |
| Total | 3.2 | 29 | 896 |
| | Mean | St. Dev | Ν |
| Hourly reduction per day | 2.8 | 1.1 | 21 |
| Duration of part-time work (years) | 2.9 | 3.4 | 16 |
| Duration of leave of absence (years) | 0.5 | 0.4 | 5 |
| Caregiver age | 46.4 | 10.1 | 29 |
| Dependent person's age | 70.4 | 17.2 | 21 |

| | % | n | N | $\chi^2 P$ value |
|-----------------------------------|-----|----|-----|------------------|
| Caregiver sex | | | | 0.001 |
| Male | 1.5 | 7 | 477 | |
| Female | 5.3 | 22 | 419 | |
| Caregiver marital status | | | | 0.003 |
| Partnered | 3.1 | 17 | 553 | |
| Single | 9.6 | 9 | 94 | |
| Degree of disability | | | | 0.000 |
| Mild or moderate | 2.4 | 8 | 339 | |
| Severe | 4.9 | 16 | 326 | |
| Primary caregiver | | | | 0.000 |
| Yes | 6.7 | 22 | 328 | |
| No | 1.2 | 7 | 569 | |
| Support from other family members | | | | 0.025 |
| No | 5.8 | 11 | 190 | |
| Yes | 2.5 | 18 | 706 | |
| Living with dependent person | | | | 0.002 |
| Yes | 5.2 | 24 | 461 | |
| No | 1.5 | 5 | 342 | |

Table 2. Percentage of caregiver leave users over total caregivers, 1999 to 2012

Note: none of the following variables was found to be significant at level 0.1: "duration of caregiving", "support from non-family members", "kinship", "caregiver age", "caregiver level of education", "type of present employment contract", "sector of present employment", "existence of children", "town/city size".

| | % | n |
|--|------|----|
| To spend more time with the family | 71.0 | 21 |
| To avoid placing the person in a home | 55.0 | 16 |
| To palliate the unavailability of public resources | 43.2 | 13 |
| To avoid overburdening other family members | 37.1 | 11 |
| To avoid paying for a caregiver or home | 28.1 | 8 |
| To reduce work-induced stress or fatigue | 20.0 | 6 |

Table 3. Reasons for taking a caregiver leave

| Tuble in Reabons for not requesting a caregiter reate (inarripre) | % | n |
|--|------|-----|
| Support from partner or other family members | 60.7 | 378 |
| Compatible working hours | 44.2 | 275 |
| Excessive loss of income | 39.3 | 240 |
| Inconceivability at place of work | 21.5 | 133 |
| Adverse impact on job security | 19.2 | 100 |
| Adverse impact on career | 13.8 | 72 |
| Dependent person's attendance at day centre | 12.4 | 77 |
| Preference to devote more time to work | 6.8 | 42 |
| Requests for such leaves frowned upon | 6.4 | 40 |

Table 4. Reasons for not requesting a caregiver leave (multiple response)

| | Model 1. Excessive loss | | Model 2. Adverse impact | | Model 3. Support from | |
|--|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------|
| | of income | | on job security | | partner or other family | |
| | | | | | members | |
| | P value | OR | P value | OR | P value | OR |
| Years caring for the person (ref.: 2 or | 0.048 | | 0.237 | | 0.734 | |
| under) | | | | | | |
| 2-6 years | 0.757 | 0.927 | 0.149 | 1.651 | 0.818 | 1.057 |
| Over 6 | 0.051 | 1.648 | 0.118 | 1.814 | 0.442 | 1.220 |
| Frequency of care (ref.: every day or | 0.400 | 0.809 | 0.374 | 0.725 | 0.623 | 1.134 |
| nearly every day) Less frequently | | | | | | |
| Degree of dependence (ref.: mild) | 0.029 | | 0.088 | | 0.282 | |
| Moderate | 0.003 | 2.896 | 0.021 | 3.951 | 0.499 | 0.798 |
| Severe | 0.028 | 2.131 | 0.049 | 3.198 | 0.632 | 1.166 |
| Initially mild/moderate. later moderate/severe | 0.025 | 2.184 | 0.197 | 2.198 | 0.358 | 1.357 |
| Primary caregiver (ref.: Yes) | 0.026 | | 0.738 | | 0.000 | |
| No | 0.047 | 0.561 | 0.437 | 1.360 | 0.011 | 2.008 |
| Respondent and other(s) | 0.646 | 1.119 | 0.603 | 1.205 | 0.000 | 3.632 |
| Kinship (ref.: father/mother) | 0.015 | | 0.875 | | 0.099 | |
| Father-/mother-in-law | 0.923 | 0.972 | 0.762 | 1.125 | 0.246 | 1.443 |
| Other | 0.004 | 0.449 | 0.755 | 0.893 | 0.131 | 0.676 |
| Contract type (ref.: permanent) | 0.046 | | 0.028 | | 0.020 | |
| Temporary | 0.115 | 1.951 | 0.009 | 5.668 | 0.741 | 0.864 |
| Non wage-earner | 0.079 | 0.467 | 0.586 | 0.525 | 0.005 | 0.330 |
| Sector (ref.: public) Private | 0.509 | 1.148 | 0.000 | 3.129 | 0.050 | 1.520 |
| Sex (ref.: male) | 0.028 | 1.582 | 0.941 | 0.978 | 0.286 | 0.799 |
| Constant | 0.000 | 0.264 | 0.000 | 0.021 | 0.422 | 0.754 |
| Coefficients | Chi-squared=47.551. | | Chi-squared=37.532. | | Chi-squared=55.663. | |
| | p<0.000. Nagelkerke's | | p<0.001. Nagelkerke's | | p<0.000. Nagelkerke's R ² | |
| | $R^2 = 0.129. 		 R^2 = 0.143.$ | | | = 0.148. | | |
| | N: 501. | | N: 448. | | N: 508. | |

Table 5. Logit regression model for the likelihood of wielding different reasons for not taking a caregiver leave

Persons with the most intense and long-lasting caregiving burden were more likely not to request leaves for reasons of income loss or job security.

Job insecurity was more cited among **temporary** and **private sector employees**.

Family support was an important reason to not take leave.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- Use of leave rises when there is...
 - An intense demand of care (severe dependence).
 - A weak support network (primary or sole caregivers).
- Main barriers:
 - Lack of compensation for the loss of income.
 - Anticipation of adverse effects in careers.
- Caregivers leaves are scantly used in Spain compare to leave for childcare. WHY?
 - Unpredictability of the onset of dependence.
 - Different social norms and satisfaction.
 - Less publicity and development.

This presentation is based on:

Rogero-García, J., & García-Sainz, C. (2016). Caregiver Leave-Taking in Spain: Rate, Motivations, and Barriers. *Journal of aging & social policy*, 28(2), 98-112.

Thank you!

jesus.rogero@uam.es