

オランダやイギリスの親休暇の長さは EU 諸国でも最低の水準にあり、また休暇中の現金支給も制度化されていない。反対に、次元 1 の上端にはノルウェー、スウェーデンが来ている。これらの国は出産休暇や親休暇の期間が相対的に長く、休暇中もかなりの程度の現金給付が親に保障されておられる。例えば、親休暇中の賃金補償率はスウェーデンで約 60%、ノルウェーで 80%になっている。従って、この軸は各国の休暇の水準についての尺度であり、座標軸の上に行くほど出産休暇や親休暇の水準が高くなると考えられる。他方、次元 2 における各国の相対的な位置を見てみると、座標軸の右端にはギリシャ、フィンランドやアイルランドといった国が位置している。反対に、座標軸の左端にはベルギー、フランスが位置している。前節で述べたように、前者の右端の国々は EU 諸国の中でも育児サービスの充実度が相対的に低いのにに対して、後者の左端の国々は充実度が相対的に高くなっている。例えば、育児施設に在籍している 4-5 歳の子どもとの割合で比べてみると、ベルギーやフランスはほぼすべての子どもが育児施設に在籍しているのにに対して、フィンランドでは 4 割にすぎず、ギリシャでは 7 割に留まっている。従って、この軸は育児サービス、別の言い方をすれば、子育てエージェントの外部化の尺度を表しており、座標軸の左に行くほど育児サービス充実度が高くなると考えられる。

この子育て支援政策に基づいた EU と日本の分類は、これまでの提示されてきた福祉国家の分類パターンとはかなり異なったものとなっている。すなわち、Esping-Andersen (1990) は先進諸国間の労働政策に見られる労働力の「非商品化-商品化」のパターンのちがいによって、先進諸国の福祉システムを (1) Liberal (2) Social Democratic (3) Corporatist の 3 つに分類している。これに対しては、既に、ジェンダーの視点から社会労働政策を分類すると、現代の福祉国家は Esping-Andersen のものとは異なった類型に分けられることが指摘されている (Gornick, Meyers & Ross 1998; Siaroff 1994)。例えば、Lewis (1992) は女性労働力の非商品化 (De-commodification) に対する各国の政策の違いから分類を行うと、福祉国家のタイポロジーは (1) Strong male-breadwinner (2) Modified male-breadwinner (3) Weak male-breadwinner に分けられ、Esping-Andersen とは異なることが指摘されている。これと同様に、本分析の結果からも、子育て支援政策の違いによって類型化を行った場合、各国のタイポロジーは Esping-Andersen とは異なっていることがわかる。すなわち、第一に Esping-Andersen の分類では Social Democratic に一括されているノルディック諸国も、子育て支援政策から見るとノルディック諸国内部で違いがあり、スウェーデンとノルウェーは類似しているが、デンマークとフィンランドは前者 2 国とはかなり異なっている。第二に、Corporatist タイプの典型とされているフランスとドイツが子育て支援政策ではかなり違いがあり、前者は後者よりも育児サービスの水準が高くなっている。第三に、ポルトガルやオランダは Esping-Andersen の分類では Liberal タイプになるイギリスと類似度が高くなっている。加えて、本稿の分析結果は Chesnais (1996) の分類ともかなり異なっている。すなわち、

Chesnais は西ヨーロッパ諸国を家族政策の違いによって「Nations of Families」と「Nations of Individuals」の2つに分けている。この分類によれば、前者のグループの国々では「Breadwinner-Father, Homemaker-Mother and Dependent Children」という家族モデルに立脚して、子育てエージェントとしての家族の機能を強める政策を取る傾向がある。他方、後者のグループの国々では一人親家族などの多様な家族形態を認めた上で、子育てと就業の柔軟な結合を促進する政策を行う傾向がある。そして、前者のグループの典型としてドイツとイタリア、後者の典型としてイギリスとスウェーデンをあげている。しかし、図1の類似度の布置を見る限り、イギリスとスウェーデンはかなり遠い位置関係にあり、子育て支援政策から見ると両者が必ずしも同じグループの分類されないことを示している。

4. ブール代数 (Boolean Algebra) による分析

これまで見てきたように、EU や日本の子育てに対する支援は多様に行われている。本節ではこうした子育て支援策の出生率への影響を Qualitative Comparative Analysis(QCA)を用いて分析する。QCAは Charles Ragin によって発展させられ、歴史社会学や比較社会学の研究においてよく用いられている分析手法である⁹⁾。この手法は通常の多変量解析のように変数間の共変関係を吟味するのではなく、二値変数で表したデータに対してブール代数を応用し、ある結果が発生するのに必要とされる条件パターンの特定を行う。このために、まずQCAでは独立変数と従属変数(=結果変数)を1と0の二値変数で表した Truth Table を作成する。そして、この Truth Table に基づいて結果変数が特定の値を取るのに必要とされる独立変数の最低限の組合せをブール代数によって求める。こうした手続きによって、ある特定の結果が発生するために必要な最低限の独立変数の組合せが決定される(Ragin 1987, 1994a, 1994b)。

本分析では社会経済に関する独立変数として(1)製造業の一ヶ月の男性平均賃金(購買力平価でドル・ベースに換算したもの)(2)製造業における男性賃金に対する女性賃金の割合(3)25-49歳までの女性就業率、加えて子育て支援政策に関する変数として(4)0-5歳児のうち育児施設に在籍している子どもの割合(5)出産休暇指数(6)親休暇指数の6つの変数を用いた。これらの変数は比率尺度、あるいは間隔尺度で表されているため、QCAを行うために以下の方法で二値データに変換した。すなわち、まず、各変数の値をz得点で標準化し、これを両極20%の水準でウインザライズ(Winsorize)化した。次に、この値に重心ソート法によるクラスター分析を用いて、個々の国を65個(=2⁶+1)のクラスターに割り当て各変数の値を二値変数に変換した¹⁰⁾。こうした求められた二値データでは、各変数の値が相対的に大きい場合には1、小さい場合には0が割り当てられている。他方、従属変数については、まず各国の1997~1999年の3カ年の(期間)合計出生率の平均値を求め、これを各国の出生力水準とした。そして、この出生

力水準の平均値をアイルランドを除いて計算し、個々の国の値がこの平均値よりも大きい場合には 1 を割り当て、小さい場合には 0 を割り当て、これを各国の出生力水準の値とした。

表5はこうして求められた独立変数と従属変数のTruth Tableである。このTruth Tableに対してブール代数による縮約を行うと高い出生率を産出する 3 つの条件パターンが検出された。

表5：EUと日本のTruth Table

Wage	Gap	Employment	Childcare	Parental	Maternity	TFR	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	フランス
1	1	1	1	0	1	1	デンマーク
1	1	1	0	1	1	1	ノルウェー, スウェーデン
1	1	0	1	1	0	1	ベルギー
1	1	0	1	0	1	1	ルクセンブルグ
1	0	1	1	1	0	0	ドイツ
1	0	1	1	0	0	1	イギリス
1	0	1	0	1	1	0	オーストリア
1	0	1	0	0	1	1	オランダ
0	1	1	0	1	0	1	フィンランド
0	1	0	1	0	1	0	イタリア
0	0	1	0	0	1	0	ポルトガル
0	0	0	1	1	1	0	スペイン
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	ギリシャ
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	アイルランド
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	日本

Wage: 男性平均賃金; Gap: 男性賃金に対する女性賃金の割合; Employment: 女性就業率;
Childcare: 0-5歳児のうち育児施設に在籍している子どもの割合; Parental: 出産休暇指数;
Maternity: 親休暇指数; TFR: 出生力水準

(資料)

Eurostat. (2000). European Social Statistics: Labour Force.

Eurostat. (2000). Eurostat Yearbook.

労働省. (1998). 賃金構造基本統計調査.

総務庁. (1998). 就業構造基本調査報告.

まず一番目のパターンは「WAGE+GAP+CHILDCARE」の条件⁽⁴⁾の組合せであり、フランスやベルギーなどの大陸ヨーロッパにみられる (Large Income 型)。すなわち、この組合せでは男性の平均賃金が高く、かつ男女間の賃金格差が小さいので、世帯の所得水準が高くなる傾向がある。そして、こうした社会経済条件に高い水準の育児サービスの供給という条件が加わると出生率が高くなることをこの組合せは意味している。これは、恐らく、相対的に高い収入を背景に積極的に育児サービスを利用することで、「育児と就業」の両立を行うことが可能であるためと考えられる。第二のパターンは「GAP+

EMPLOYMENT+childcare+PARENTAL」の条件の組合せであり、スウェーデンなどのノルディック諸国に見られる（Gender Equity 型）。すなわち、このケースは男女間の賃金格差が小さく、女性就業率も高いために子育ての機会費用が高という社会経済的特徴を持っている。こうした場合には、育児サービスの水準はそれほど高くなくとも、水準の高い親休暇制度が併存すると出生率が高くなることが示されている。これは親休暇が充実しているので、就業を放棄することなく親自身による子どものケアが可能で、かつ、子育ての機会費用も十分に保障されるからであろう。出生率が高くなる第三のパターンは「WGE+gap+EMPLOYMENT+parental」の条件の組合せであり、これはイギリスに代表される(Flexible Employment 型)。この条件を満たす国は男性の平均賃金が高い一方で、女性の賃金水準は低く就業率が高く、パート労働に従事する女性の割合が高いという特徴を持っている⁽¹²⁾。さらに、親休暇の水準も低く、政府による労働市場への規制が弱い傾向がある。したがって、こうした国には柔軟な労働市場が存在しており、パート労働を中心にして、「子育てと就業」の両立を行う傾向が強くと、これが高い出生率をもたらしていると考えられる。

5. 終わりに

EU 諸国や日本では、少子化への対応として子育て支援を様々に展開している。本稿ではこれら国の出産休暇、親休暇、育児サービスの三つに注目して子育て支援策の比較を行い、さらに、こうした支援政策と出生率との関係についてマクロ分析を行った。

本稿の分析から明らかになったことを要約すれば次のようになる。まず第一に各国の子育て支援の水準に関しては、フランス、イタリアの出産休暇指数が大きく出産に対する支援水準が高いのに対して、イギリスや日本の指数の値は小さく支援水準が低い。育児については、イギリス、オランダ、アイルランド、ギリシャで親休暇指数が小さく支援支援の水準が低く、ベルギー、スウェーデン、ノルウェー、フランス、フィンランドで指数が大きく支援水準が高い。さらに、育児サービスについては、ベルギーやフランスで 0～3 歳児の育児施設在籍率が高く、ギリシャ、オランダ、アイルランドの在籍率が低くなっている。他方、4～5 歳児の在籍者割合はスペイン、フランス、ベルギーで高く、フィンランド、ポルトガル、ギリシャでは低くなっている。第二に、子育て支援政策に基づいて各国の布置関係を求めた場合、国家の分類パターンはこれまでの提示されてきたものとは異なっている。既に、Esping-Andersen の福祉国家のタイポロジーについては、別の角度からの類型化が可能であることが指摘されているが、本稿の分析結果でも EU 諸国と日本は Esping-Andersen と違ったパターンで類型が示されている。特に Esping-Andersen では Social Democratic に一括されているノルディック諸国も、子育て支援政策から見るとノルディック諸国内部で違いがあり、また、Corporatist タイプに分類されているフランスとドイツの間もかなりの差異が存在している。第三に子育て支援政策と出生率の関

係については、出生率が相対的に高くなる 3 つのパターンが発見された。すなわち、(1) 高い収入と充実した育児サービス (2) 高い Gender Equity と充実した親休暇 (3) 女性パート労働とミニマム水準の親休暇の 3 タイプの条件の組合せでは、出生率は相対的に高くなる傾向がある。このことは、子育て支援政策はある社会経済条件とうまくマッチした場合には出生率を上昇させる方向に作用するが、支援政策と社会経済条件との間にミスマッチがある場合には、出生促進効果は期待できないことを示唆している。こうした点を考慮すると、日本においても出生率を上昇させるためには、その社会経済条件とマッチした子育て支援策を実施する必要があるだろう。

注

(1) これまでの先進諸国の出生・家族政策と出生パターンに関する研究についての詳しいレビューは福田 (2001) を参照。

(2) Statutory Provision による休暇のみであり、Collective Agreement に基づくものは含まない。

(3) デンマークは製造業の平均女性賃金に対する比率で計算し、フランスは第 1~2 子の休暇期間と第 3 子以上の休暇期間の平均で計算した。

(4) 親休暇の定義については、(ILO 1997) を参照。

(5) Statutory Provision による休暇のみであり、Collective Agreement に基づくものは含まない。

(6) ここでは、ベルギーのキャリア・ブレイク、デンマークとフィンランドの Child Care Leave を含めて計算している。

(7) ここで対象としている育児施設とは、ユネスコの ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education) の 0 レベルのプログラムを行っている施設で、公的な認可を受けたものである。詳しくは OECE (2000) を参照。

(8) 各国の類似度の布置の計算ではベルギーのキャリア・ブレイク、デンマークとフィンランドの Child Care Leave を親休暇に含めている。

(9) この手法の方法論上の問題点については (Markoff 1990) を参照。

(10) ここで行ったクラスタリングの詳しい説明については Ragin (1994c) を参照。

(11) QCA では変数を大文字で表記した場合は、その変数の値が 1、小文字で表記した場合は値が 0 であることを意味している。

(12) 1998 年における女性就業者のうちパート・タイム就業者の占める割合は、オランダが 67.7%、イギリスが 42.3 で EU 諸国の中でも高い値を示している。

参考文献

Barmby, T. & Cigno, A. (1990) 'A Sequential Probability Model of Fertility

- Patterns', *Journal of Population Economics* 3, pp. 31–51.
- Bettio, F. & Prechal, S. (1998) *Care in Europe*, Brussel: European Commission.
- Blau, D. M. & Robins, P. K. (1989) 'Fertility, Employment, and Child-Care Cost', *Demography* 26, pp. 287–300.
- Chesnais, J. C. (1996) 'Fertility, Family and Social Policy in Contemporary Western Europe', *Population and Development Review* 22, pp. 729–739.
- Clauwaert, S. & Harger, S. (2000) *Analysis of the Implementation of the Parental Leave Directive in the EU Member States*, Brussel: European Trade Union Institute.
- Commission of the European Communities. (1999) *Report from the Commission: On the Implementation of Council Directive 92/85/ECC of 19 October 1992 on the Introduction of measures to Encourage Improvements in the Health and Safety at Work of Pregnant Workers and Workers Who have recently Given Birth or Are Breastfeeding*, Brussel: European Commission.
- Council of Europe. (2000) *Recent Demographic Developments in Europe*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- European Commission. (1999) *Demographic Statistics*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Eurostat (2000a) *European Social Statistics: Labour Force 1999*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Eurostat (2000b) *Eurostat Yearbook 2000: A Statistical Eye on Europe*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- EURYDICE (2000) *Key Data on Education in Europe: 1999/2000 Edition*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Gauthier, A. H. (1993) 'Towards Renewed Fears of Population and Family Decline', *European Journal of Population* 9, pp. 143–168.
- Gauthier, A. H. & Hatzius, J. (1997) 'Family Benefits and Fertility: An Econometric Analysis', *Population Studies* 51, pp. 295–306.
- Gornick, J. C., Meyers, M. K. & Ross, K. E. (1998) 'Public Policies and the Employment of Mothers: A Cross-National Study', *Social Science Quarterly* 79, pp. 35–54.

- Hantrais, L. (1996) *Social Policy in the European Union, (2nd ed)*, London: Macmillan.
- Hantrais, L. (1997) 'Exploring Relationships between Social Policy and Changing Family Forms within the European Union', *European Journal of Population* 13, pp. 339–379.
- Hantrais, L. & Letablier, M. T. (1996) *Families and Family Policies in Europe*, London: Longman.
- Hecht, J. & Leridon, H. (1993) 'Fertility Policies: a Limited Influence?', in D. Noin & R. Woods (eds.) *The Changing Population of Europe*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 62–75.
- ILO (1997) 'Perspective', *International Labour Review* 136, pp. 109–128.
- ILO (2000) *Yearbook of Labour Statistics*, Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Kravdal, Ø. (1996) 'How the Local Supply of Day-care Centers Influences Fertility in Norway: A Parity-specific Approach', *Population Research and Policy Review* 15, pp. 201–218.
- Lewis, J. (1992) 'Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy* 2, pp. 159–173.
- Lutz, W. (1999) 'Will Europe be Short of Children?', *Family Observer* 1, pp. 8–16.
- Markoff, J. (1990) 'A Comparative Method: Reflections on Charles Ragin's Innovations in Comparative Analysis', *Historical Methods* 23, pp. 177–181.
- Moss, P. & Deven, F.(eds.) (1999) *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, Brussel: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- OECD (2000) *Education at a Glance: OECD Database 2000*, Paris: OECD.
- Ragin, C. C. (1987) *The Comparative Method: Moving beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ragin, C. C. (1994a) *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*, Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Ragin, C. C. (1994b) 'Introduction to Qualitative Comparative Analysis', in T. Janoski & A. M. Hicks (eds.) *The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 299–319.
- Ragin, C. C. (1994c) 'A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Pension System', in T. Janoski & A. M. Hicks (eds.) *The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 320–345.
- Ragin, C. C. & Zaret, D. R. (1983) 'Theory and Method in Comparative Research: Two Strategies', *Social Forces* 61, pp. 731–754.

- Rostgaard, T. & Fridberg, T. (1998) *Caring for Children and Older People: A Comparison of European Policies and Practices*, Copenhagen: The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Rønsen, M. (1998) *Fertility and Public Policies: Evidence from Norway and Finland*, Oslo: Statistics Norway.
- Rønsen, M. (1999) 'Assessing the Impact of Parental Leave: Effects on Fertility and Female Employment', in P. Moss & F. Deven (eds.) *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, Brussel: NIDI/CBGS Publications, pp. 193-225.
- Siaroff, A. (1994) 'Work, Welfare and Gender Equality: A New Typology', in D. Sainsbury (ed.) *Gendering Welfare States*, London: SAGE Publications, pp. 82-100.
- 国立社会保障・人口問題研究所 (2000) *人口統計資料集*, 東京: 国立社会保障・人口問題研究所.
- 総務庁 (1998) '就業構造基本調査報告', 東京: 総務庁統計局.
- 福田亘孝 (2001) '先進諸国における出生・家族政策と出生力', *武蔵野女子大学現代社会学部紀要* 2, pp. 109-120.
- 労働省 (1998) *賃金構造基本統計調査*, 東京: 労働法令協会.
- 労働省 (1999a) *改正男女雇用機会均等法のあらまし*, 東京: 労働省.
- 労働省 (1999b) *平成 11 年度女性雇用管理基本調査*, 東京: 労働省.
- 労働省 (2000) *育児・介護休業法のあらまし*, 東京: 労働省.

第2章

ヨーロッパ諸国における働く親たちをめぐる家族政策

(研究協力者:アン・ゴルティエおよびアニタ・ボルティニック)

European Family Policies and Working Parents

(Anne H el ene Gauthier & Anita Bortnik)

要旨

(訳 釜野さおり)

本論では、1880年以降、家族政策がどのように発展してきたかを検討し、ヨーロッパにおける家族に対する政府のサポートの長い歴史の理解につなげることを目的とする。特に、主たる転換となった時点を記述し、国間で政策が似通ったり異なったりしていくプロセスを記述することである。働く親を支援する国家の対策として、母親・両親休業、育児休業、保育施設の3タイプをあげることができる。

分析の結果、国家による支援の目的やその内容は大きな変化を遂げてきたことが示された。例えば、後期に見られる国家による介入とは異なり、初期の国家の支援は、貧困や乳幼児死亡率への対策といったような人道的な動機によるものであった。これらは、女性の就労の促進や男女平等の徹底を目的としたものではない。さらに、初期の政府介入は、家族のための総合的な手当やサービスではなくパッチワーク的な性質を持っており、最も貧困の家族や、あるカテゴリーの労働者を支援するためのものであった。それとは対照的に、後の政策はすべての家族をカバーするものへと拡張されていった。

さらに、本稿における分析では、全体的に、働く親を支援する方向に進んできたことが示された。詳細をみると、4つの分岐点を確認された。第二次世界大戦直後の東西の分岐を導いたもの、1960年代と北欧モデルの出現、1989年以降の共産体制の終結と東ヨーロッパにおける国家支援の削減、1998年以降のヨーロッパ連合加盟国家による国家支援の拡張である。これらの分岐点の存在は、制度は歴史的にみても比較的安定しているとの主張に反しているだけでなく、1990年前半にみられた家族政策モデル間の違いが不鮮明であることもあらわしている。特に、近年では男女平等および仕事と家庭の両立をめざした国際的にも似通った国家による家族支援のモデルの出現がみられる。

European Family Policies and Working Parents

A Report for the Ministry of Health and Welfare, Health Science
Research Grants, Research on Policy Planning and Evaluation:
Comparative Study of Low Fertility and Family Policy in
Developed Countries

March 31, 2001

Anne H el ene Gauthier and Anita Bortnik¹

¹ Both from the University of Calgary. Queries should be addressed to: Anne H. Gauthier, Department of Sociology, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4, fax: 403-282-9298, email: gauthier@ucalgary.ca

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the developments in family policies since the late 1880s, and aims at shedding light on the long history of governmental support for families in Europe. In particular, the paper aims at documenting the main transition points and at examining the succession of converging and diverging trends across countries. Three main types of state support for working parents are examined: maternity/parental leave, childcare leave, and childcare facilities.

Results suggest that the nature and objective of state support have changed substantially over time. For instance, unlike later interventions, the earlier forms of state support for families were driven mainly by humanitarian motives, namely poverty and child mortality. They did not aim at encouraging the participation of women in the labor force, and were not driven by a commitment to gender equality. Furthermore, the early governmental interventions were mainly piecemeal ones, in that they were not part of a comprehensive package of benefits and services for families, and tended to be restricted to the poorest families and/or certain categories of workers. In contrast, the later policies extended the coverage of policies to all families following a principle of universalism.

Our analysis also suggests a systematic trend towards the provision of ever more supportive provisions for working parents. A closer analysis reveals however four major discontinuities: the immediate post World War II period, which led to a sharp East/West divergence; the 1960s and the emergence of the Nordic model; the end of the communist regimes from 1989 and the subsequent decrease in state support for families in Eastern Europe; and the post-1998 period with its major expansion of state support for families among European Union member states. Not only have these discontinuities gone counter to claims that institutions tend to be relatively stable over time, they have also considerably blurred the lines between the models of family policies observed in the early 1990s. In particular, the experience of the very recent years has suggested the emergence of a cross-nationally uniform model of state support for families, strongly driven by objectives of gender equality and aimed at reconciling work and family life.

INTRODUCTION

The objective of reconciliation of work and family life has been a prominent item on the agenda of European governments in recent years. The adoption of the '*Resolution on the balanced participation of women and men in family and working life*' by the European Union Council in 2000, and the introduction of parental leave schemes in several countries in the late 1990s are examples of actions aimed at better supporting working parents. The theme is however not new. For more than 100 years, European families have benefited from governmental support in the form of maternity leave schemes and other services for mothers and children. The nature, motives, and level of this governmental support have however varied substantially over time and across countries. While in recent years, state support for working parents has been driven by a commitment to gender equality, in earlier times it was instead driven by pronatalist and health considerations. These changes over time in the development of state support for working mothers, and their related inter-country differences, are important to take into consideration in order to understand the current provisions in state support for working parents. The approach adopted here is therefore a historical one. Through an analysis of the developments in family policies since the late 1880s, we aim at shedding light on the long history of governmental support for families in Europe. In particular, we aim at documenting the main transition points and at examining the succession of converging and diverging trends across countries.

The paper is divided into five main sections. In Section 1, we examine the historical developments in family policies in Europe prior to 1945. We focus on policies directly or indirectly targeted at women and children, and point to some early differences between countries. These early policies are significant as they paved the way for further developments. In Section 2, we examine the period ranging from the immediate post-war years until 1975. This period was characterized by a major divergence in the state support for working mothers in Eastern and Western Europe, the former aiming at encouraging women to work and have

children, the latter modeled after a traditional gender division of labor. Section 3 analyzes the period from 1975 to 1998: a period marked by a major transition in the nature of state support for working mothers in Western Europe. The new policies acknowledged the presence of women in the labor force and gave increasing attention to the objective of gender equality. In Section 4, we discuss the very recent trends since 1998: a period marked by numerous significant changes, especially within member states of the European Union. Section 5 concludes the paper.

It should be noted that the following discussion is focused on state support for working parents. It omits cash benefits for families, such as family allowances and tax relief for children, as well as services for families, such as health care and education. While these benefits are key components of governmental support for families, they had to be excluded for reasons of space. Readers interested in these topics, from a comparative perspective, are referred to Gauthier (1996, 1999), Baker (1995), and Kamerman and Kahn (1997).

1. PRE-1945 DEVELOPMENTS²

At the end of the 19th century and early 20th century, at a time when the rapidly developing industrial sector provided mothers and children with employment opportunities, public and governmental opinion was divided as to the ideal role of women. While some people sought the recognition of women's right to work and demanded equality between men and women, others valued motherhood as a profession, or aimed at providing women with a genuine choice between paid employment and housework (Gauthier, 1996). The policies introduced from the 1880s reflected this ambivalence. While some policies, such as the 'marriage bars', explicitly forbid married women from taking up paid employment,³ others acknowledged the

² This section draws heavily from Gauthier (1996). The reader is suggested to refer to this work for more details of the countries' regulations and policies.

³ Such 'marriage bars' were found in several countries, including Britain, Germany, and Spain (Gauthier, 1996).

need to protect women who were forced to take up paid employment for financial reasons. Beyond disagreement as to the ideal role of women, it is however the high levels of poverty, as well as the high levels of infant and child mortality, that rallied governments around the need to support families. The wish to reduce poverty and child mortality was one of the main motives for the adoption of policies that allowed women to take time off work immediately before and after childbirth, and for the introduction of health and welfare services to mothers and children.

Starting with Germany, in 1883, numerous countries introduced protective measures for pregnant and nursing mothers. In most cases, the coverage of these early schemes was however restricted to some specific categories of workers, and the schemes were often unpaid or paid at a very level. These early schemes were not satisfactory. For if they potentially improved children's health prospects, by allowing women to take time off work, they also deprived families from a precious source of income. This issue was addressed by the International Labor Office (ILO) in its first Maternity Protection Convention adopted in 1919. The Convention included provisions for twelve weeks of leave before and after childbirth, as well as cash benefits 'sufficient for the full and healthy maintenance of the mother and child'.⁴ During the following decades, countries were to diverge considerably in terms of their level of financial support for working mothers. As can be seen in Table 1, by 1939, all European countries, but Albania, Belarus, Croatia, and Slovenia, had introduced a maternity leave scheme. The scheme provided women with 4 to 12 weeks of leave, and benefits proportional to wages were paid in a majority of countries.

[Table 1 here]

⁴ The on-line text of the convention may be found on the ILO web site: <http://www.ilo.org>.

In addition to maternity leave schemes, in the early decades of the 20th century most European countries also provided families with some cash benefits and services. These included medical assistance, food, welfare services, and cash support. In most cases, these services were restricted to the poorest families. Provisions for childcare were also limited. In most cases, public childcare facilities were restricted to the poorest or abandoned children, and aimed at protecting children from 'accident and vagrancy' (Delhaxhe, 1989: 24). In some countries, however, the public provision of childcare facilities and nurseries reflected a belief in the benefits of early education and was therefore not confined to the poorest families. Influenced by the writing of Froebel (1782-1852), governments in Belgium, France, and Germany, adopted at a very early stage regulations and standards concerning early education programs and institutions. For example, in Belgium the government published in 1880 the first regulation concerning the standards for institutions taking care of children from 3 to 6 years old.⁵ In fact, the belief in the benefits of early education continues today to justify the provision of extensive public childcare facilities in countries such as France, Belgium, and Italy. We will come back to this point later.

These early developments, spanning from the late 19th century to World War II are important for at least two reasons. First, they clearly demonstrate that state support for working mothers preceded the modern welfare states. Second, these early developments also suggest remarkable similarities across countries, if not in the levels of support, at least in the trends. In all countries, maternity leave schemes and protection for pregnant workers were introduced during the last decades of the 19th century and the early decades of the 20th century.

2. THE 1945 – 1975 PERIOD

⁵ During World War II, day nurseries were set up in several other countries, including Britain. They were however rapidly closed after the war (Cohen, 1988).

The immediate post-war period was marked by a strong divergence between the family policies pursued in Eastern Europe, and those pursued in the West. While Eastern European countries encouraged and supported female labor force participation, the policies developed in Western Europe instead assumed a traditional division of labor within families with fathers as breadwinners and mothers as housewives. As will be seen later, it is only in recent years that the gap separating Eastern and Western European family policies has gradually been reduced.

In Western Europe, a large number of women who had worked in wartime industries, lost their job with the return to peace, or voluntarily returned home. This trend was observable in most countries despite the principle of non-discrimination against women adopted by the ILO in 1944.⁶ Reports from the United States and Britain confirmed that not only a larger proportion of women than men were laid-off between 1945 and 1946, it was also more difficult for women than men to find new jobs (ILO, 1946). The emergent welfare states in Western Europe were therefore modeled according to a very traditional gender division of labor. Widely publicized views about the importance of the mother-child relationship further contributed to this traditional pattern.⁷ What is important to stress here is that even in the early 1960s, traditional views about the role of women still persisted in Western Europe. For instance, in its reply to a survey carried out by the ILO in the early 1960s, the Irish government stated that: 'social and economic policy should primarily be designed to ensure that women with family responsibilities will not be obliged to engage in employment to the detriment of their duties and responsibilities in the home' (ILO, 1964: 6). A similar view was expressed by the British government. And although governments in other countries, such as Finland and Sweden, expressed a less traditional view, the overall attitude was that the presence of the mother at home when very young children were present was most desirable (Gauthier 1996).

⁶ The on-line text of the declaration may be found on the ILO web site: <http://www.ilo.org>

⁷ See for example the work of John Bowlby, especially his *Child Care and the Growth of Love* (1953).

The situation in *Eastern Europe* was completely different. Following the aftermath of the Second World War, a massive reconstruction effort was needed. In fact, governments in Eastern Europe faced two challenges: reconstructing the infrastructure, and replenishing the countries demographically. Women were essential to meet both challenges. The family policies that were adopted in the immediate post-war period had therefore a dual aim: they aimed at encouraging women to join the labor force and at encouraging them to bear children. As a result, extensive provisions for working mothers were introduced and extended, including maternity leave schemes, optional childcare leave, extensive childcare facilities, as well as various other cash and in-kind benefits. Obviously, very strong socialist and pronatalist ideologies were behind these policies, and thus, contrasted with the more traditional ideology observed in Western Europe.⁸ The divergence is unmistakable. By 1960, women in Eastern European countries benefited from a longer maternity leave than women in Western Europe, and received during their leave cash benefits representing a higher percentage of their earnings. Furthermore, while extensive and highly subsidized childcare facilities were found in Eastern Europe, such facilities were still very limited in Western Europe.

In Western Europe, Sweden stood, however, as an exception. As of 1960, Sweden was still *lagging behind other countries in terms of its support for working mothers*. The Swedish government had adopted its first compulsory maternity leave scheme in 1955 providing a 3-month leave with flat rate benefits. The scheme fell below those in force in most other countries. In 1963, however, and in view of severe labor force shortages, the government extended the maternity leave scheme to 6 months and introduced cash benefits equal to 60 percent of women's previous gross earnings. This was a major change: one that placed Sweden ahead of most other countries. The most remarkable reform then came in 1974 when Sweden increased the maternity leave cash benefits to 90 percent of earnings, and furthermore

transformed the maternity leave into a parental leave. For the first time in Europe, fathers were entitled to share the 'maternity leave'. The adoption of this new policy was significant as it introduced an element of gender equality in Sweden's family policy, and this, well before any other governments. Finland also introduced major reforms to its maternity leave scheme during this period, and took the lead with Sweden in providing parents with the most extensive maternity/parental leave provision. These developments are important since Sweden and Finland were to maintain their leading positions during the following decades.

By the early 1970s, three distinct models of family policies were therefore in place: the Eastern European model, providing extensive support for working mothers, and premised on socialist and pronatalist ideologies, a Western European model providing limited support for working mothers and premised on a traditional male breadwinner ideology, and a Nordic model, providing extensive support for working parents (as opposed to working mothers) and premised on the objective of gender equality. As will be seen in the next section, the Swedish model was precursor of a general model of family policy, driven by an objective of gender equality, which would dominate Western Europe by the 1990s.

3. THE 1975-1998 PERIOD

The post-1975 period was characterized by major changes in the economic, political, and demographic environment of families including a series of economic recessions, the plummeting of birth rates, the increasing instability of families, the massive entry of women on the labor market in Western Europe, including mothers with young children, the adoption of several international treaties and declaration aimed at gender equality⁹, and the fall of the

⁸ In the immediate post-World War II period, only France maintained a pronatalist ideology.

⁹ This includes the '*Declaration on Equality of Opportunity and Treatment for Women Workers*' adopted by the ILO in 1975, the '*Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*' adopted by the United Nations in 1979, and the '*Directive on the implementation of the*

Berlin wall in 1989. All of these changes challenged the existing systems of state support for families, and called for significant reforms. And all contributed to giving a new direction to the countries' family policy.

In Western Europe, the 1975-98 period saw the gradual emergence of so-called family-friendly policies. With the exception of Britain (see below), state support for working parents was significantly increased including the extension of maternity leave provisions, the introduction of parental leave and childcare leave, the expansion of state-supported childcare facilities, and the introduction of various measures aimed at making workplaces more family-friendly. The expansion was however very unequal across countries. For instance, following the model established by Sweden in the 1960s, the Nordic countries significantly increased their support for working parents and emerged as a distinct cluster of countries.

Maternity/parental leave were expanded to reach levels exceeding those provided in other countries, and childcare facilities were rapidly expanded. While in 1970, expenditures on childcare in Sweden represented only 15 percent of the total expenditures on families and children, they had reached 40 percent ten years later.¹⁰ By 1982 in Sweden they were more than 120,000 places in day-care centers, covering about 17 percent of all pre-school age children (Flora, 1986-7). As correctly pointed out by Leira (1993), differences exist between the Nordic countries' family policies. But contrasted with the other Western European countries, Nordic countries tend to form a distinct cluster.

At the other end of the spectrum, Britain was very reluctant to provide more extensive support for working parents. Under the Conservative governments (1979-97) of Margaret Thatcher, and subsequently John Major, no major changes were brought to the maternity leave schemes and the provision for childcare. Britain was in fact opposed to the European Commission

principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions' adopted by the European Union in 1976.

¹⁰ Authors' calculations based on data from the Yearbook of Nordic Statistics.

'1992 Child Care Recommendation' arguing that the introduction of a childcare leave would imposed too great a burden on employers (Gauthier 1996). As will be seen in the next section, it is only under the Labour government of Tony Blair (1997--) that major changes were introduced.

In contrast to the Western European expansion of state support for families, Eastern Europe witnessed major retrenchments from the end of the 1980s. The transition to market economy led to a massive reduction in state subsidies and state programs. This retrenchment is most obvious with respect to childcare facilities with the large-scale closure of nurseries. In the Czech Republic, while 14 percent of the 0 to 2 years old were enrolled in day nurseries in 1989, the comparable figure was 4 percent in 1992 (Fajth and Zimakova, 1997). Similarly, in Ukraine the enrollment rate of infants aged 0 to 2 years old was reduced from 28 percent in 1989 to 14 percent in 1993. In this context, childcare leave schemes became a way of easing excess labor market supplies (by allowing women to withdraw from the labor force) (Fajth and Zimakova, 1997). For instance, Romania introduced its first childcare leave scheme in 1990 --- at a time of economic restructuring and high unemployment. What was an instrument promoting the reconciliation of work and family responsibilities, childcare leave, in Eastern Europe, has now become an instrument that subsidizes women to stay at home.

As a result of these divergent trends, distinct models of family policies had been identified by scholars by the mid-1990s. Gauthier (1996), for instance, distinguished the Nordic model, based on principles of gender equality, the German model, based on more conservative notions of a traditional division of labor between men and women, the French model, driven by pronatalist objectives, and the British model, driven by a non-interventionist policy. Singh (1998), Sainsbury (1994), and various other authors have suggested variants of this typology. What is important to stress here is that while the assumption behind these typologies is that these models were deeply rooted in the countries cultural, political, and ideological traditions, the experience of the last years has proved otherwise...