NTU Dept of Sociology - CEFC Taipei
International Workshop on "Gender and Public Policies"
「性別與公共政策」工作坊
National Taiwan University, April 23, 2009

Gender and Citizenship in Care Policies: a European Comparison

Jacqueline Heinen
Professeur emeritus of sociology
University Versailles St-Quentin-en-Yvelines

Summary

Family policies and in particular care policies, historically related to measures of social protection adopted since the 19th century in the fields of the family, demography, health or education, have developed parallel to the generalization of professional activity of women. They constitute an essential dimension of the welfare state in the industrialized countries, especially since the Second World War. Their configuration varies along a number of factors – economical, cultural, religious or political – but everywhere they have a gendered dimension and women assume most of the informal work linked to the private sphere. Hence these policies do contribute to the upholding of gender inequalities, as investigations lead in Western and in Eastern Europe do show.

For reasons of space, this paper will focus more specifically on childcare. In Western Europe there is an increase of public spending through various measures (parental and paternity leaves, cash money and tax deductions for childcare, funding of crèches and kindergartens) but at the same time 'free choice' solutions are encouraged which mean that an important part of costs and responsibilities are de facto put on the shoulders of the parents and more specifically on those of women. Such a contradictory process does not help calling into question the existing gender balance. In Eastern Europe, the withdrawal of the state after the implosion of the communist system brought a drastic reduction of social spending as well as the dismantling of most collective services of childcare. Although big changes occurred in the social and political life over the last fifteen years and despite a strong process of differentiation among the various Eastern European countries, the divide between public and private concerning the family life remains quite strong. It is a common feature which shapes gender relations all over the region.

These trends are reinforced by recent changes within the European Union's institutions where the insistence on human capital and on the necessity to favor flexibility in employment goes hand in hand with a tendency to minimize sex inequalities in the name of the diversity of discriminations – race, handicap, etc. – contrary to the 1990's when the gender dimension had a central visibility.

Historically related to measures of social protection taken as of the 19th century in the fields of family, demography, health or education, the policies of care constitute an essential dimension of the Welfare state in industrialized countries, especially since the Second world

war. In connection with the social changes which occurred since the middle of the 60' (decline of the birth rate, drop of the marriages, progression of the divorces), they took a particular rise with the generalization of women's professional and continuous activity and with the socialization of the reproductive work concerning early childhood and the care of elderly, sick or disabled people, etc .

However, welfare takes various forms. From the system of universal and egalitarian type which prevails in the Nordic countries, until that, based on the concept of assistance that historically characterized Great Britain, there are multiple models of welfare, with significant variations. These variations depend just as well on the weight of the market and the extension of the lucrative services, as on involvement of families in all matters relating to reproduction, and on the taking into account or not of gender in the adopted plans of action.

The whole of work integrating the gender dimension which consists in bringing out the place occupied by women in the management of the social (whether in the public or private sphere), exerted an undeniable influence on the apprehension of the State among theorists hitherto little sensitive to the gender issue and it has contributed to the formation of new concepts, such as those of care or caring of dependant people (Knijn, Ungerson 1997). This dimension has been at the heart of a genuine renewal of approaches regarding welfare (Lewis 1998 and 2006). From the initial importance given to unpaid work to seize the nature of social policies, attention has shifted over the last decades to the consequences of the process of housework and care work regarding the labor in charge of this kind of paid activities – female and in particular immigrant labor in vast majority (Cox 2006; Kofman *et al*. 2000; Ungerson, Yeandle 2007).

On the whole, these analysis present a contrasted picture. They reveal that the development of the welfare contributed to increase women's power in society, insofar as they seized the opportunity to speak on issues affecting them directly – this was the case especially in the Nordic countries (Bergqvist 1999; Siim 2000; Leira 1992 and 2002). But this process remains very uneven across countries and depends on the type of regime in force.

Because of due time, I will center my talk on the topic of early childhood, tackling the question under several angles. I will start by examining the role of the European Union (EU) in the approaches developed and their impact on citizenship. I will then scrutinize recent changes in relationship between Welfare state and care policies. And finally, I will refer to the results of several cross-analysis on early childhood that focuses on the impact of the arrangements made regarding the respective roles of men and women in Western European society. In doing so, I will refer in particular to a collective book recently published,

Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe, which covers nine countries (Lister *et al*. 2007).

1. Weight of the European Union and change of paradigm

For a long time, Member States of the EU have considered social policies as a hunting ground under their sole responsibility, and it was not until the Amsterdam Treaty in 1998, that some social problems were addressed in a document of this type. Nevertheless, one of the points which had been the object of lengthy discussions between the European Commission and the Council of Ministers before that date was precisely the issue of parental leave which gave place to the first EU collective negotiation under the Maastricht social protocol.

Admittedly, the texts adopted by the EU generally concerned recommendations ('soft' policies) and not directives ('hard' policies implying an injunction and sanctions in the event of non-observance). This consequently limited their impact on the policies of the member States. However, EU guidelines often in advance on the national legislations, have weighed on the noticed evolutions, in particular in the countries of Southern Europe where they provided an incentive to set up plans of action and mechanisms almost non-existent in the field of care. However, for a decade or so, one notes a change of paradigm in the social model presented by European officials as essential in the modernization process to cover the new risks associated with the transformations and the globalisation of the economy (Jenson, Saint Martin's day 2006; Jenson 2008). The compensatory logic aiming at protecting from the repercussions of unemployment, retirement or illness, still partially in force when the Lisbon Treaty was ratified by the European Council in 2000, was replaced by a logic of activation of the workforce. This orientation does nothing but repeat with some delay the line already displayed in OECD texts of the mid-1990s and in those of the British 'third way'. The emphasis is on the human capital, and in particular on the future of the children, bringing more attention on the future than on the present. As it arises from the mid-term review of the Lisbon strategy, the rhetoric relates on the need to adapt to a changing labor market, on the importance of life-long learning and on the phases of transition of the life course.

Consequently, the emphasis on education in general and pre-school education in particular took a new importance: quotas were set regarding pre-school facilities and the related expenditure is presented as a profitable investment for the future (European commission 2006). The concern of profitable investment is consistent with the demographic concerns resulting from the ageing of the population and the costs of the retirement scheme, along with the decline in births in the majority in most Western countries.

However this shift in priorities is having an impact regarding gender inequalities. During the 1990', the leading bodies of the EU showed an increased concern about this question – both through the creation of specific bodies or through directives or (more often) recommendations dealing with this topic, often leaning on the Nordic experience (European commission 1999 and 2000). These guidelines were often used as lever to encourage gender equality in the South. Today, in the name of 'diversity', one witnesses on the other hand a dynamics which amounts to diluting the issue of gender in programmes dealing with various types of discriminations (ethnic, racial, relating to handicaps, etc). It loses the visibility it had in previous programs where it was based on a binary comparison between the situation of men and women (Heinen 2003). Maria Stratigaki (2008) speaks of a reversal of trend as from 2006 regarding the place assigned to gender equality since the Rome Treaty of 1957. In her eyes, this is an illustration of the resistances of the decision makers to include gender equality in the Charter of Fundamental Rights and in the Constitutional Treaty.

In recent texts of the EU, women are seen first of all as potential to meet the needs of activation of the workforce, in view of the objectives set by the Lisbon Treaty of 2007 regarding full employment, quality of the labor productivity and social cohesion. The importance attached to women's involvement in the labor market gave place to recommendations to remove family policies that encourage them to retreat from the labor market (parental leave addressing the least qualified female labor, for example). But while the main focus of many texts of the 2000s by the European Commission relates to education, the gender inequalities in this area (in particular as regards occupational opportunities) are now absent from the analysis. Of course, new machineries have been introduced recently, including the Gender Pact of 2006, the European Institute for Gender Equality and the annual report on equality between women and men to the European Council. But this goes hand in hand with a lesser concern in the directives and recommendations vis-à-vis *de facto gender* inequalities in various fields (Lombardo, Meier, 2008). As Jenson (2008) underlines it, the emphasis on the issue of education may explain the lesser concern for discriminations since in this field girls do better than boys. However, as decades of feminist analysis have showed, gender inequality does not result from an inadequate preparation, a poor education or a lack of ambition of women or girls, but from systemic and structural blocking as regards equal opportunity, whether due to direct or indirect mechanisms of discrimination.

What is at stake here, once again, it is the gendered dimension of citizenship. With the risk to remain purely formal, the concept of citizenship can not disregard the substantial inequalities which persist in the social and domestic fields, as in the economic and political

fields. Now the family plays a decisive role concerning gender differences in the definition and practice of citizenship. It is in it that the economic and social dependence of women is embedded historically, in direct connection with the care of dependants (children, elderly, disabled, etc.) – a dimension which took an increased importance with the crisis of the welfare and disengagement of the State. The assignment of women to domestic tasks is at the origin of the discriminations that they encounter in most of the areas. And that is expressed in the very nature of rights such as the maternity/parental leave, or the leave of care for sick child. These rights are generally presented as individual rights of women, whereas they are rights addressing others through them - in this case, the right to education or health of the dependant child.

For this very reason, in the light of the changes operated in the EU rhetoric and guidelines, it is important to consider the changes occurred at national level in social policies and in care policies in particular.

2. Welfare state and care policies

Deep transformations occurred over the three last decades with regard to women's economic independence: the traditional family model of the male breadwinner and the woman in charge of the home is no longer relevant in any industrially developed country. This implies an extension of measures releasing women from at least some of the educational and domestic tasks, as it has been stressed by many EU documents since the Amsterdam Treaty signed in 1997, and especially in the years 2000. However, a comparison of national cases reveals the existence of contradictory movements: on the one hand, the taking into account of these social transformations resulted in the creation of new services and benefits concerning early childhood and the elderly; on the other hand, the joint pressure of budget deficits and the neo-liberal trends led to the questioning of a number of social gains resulting from welfare as it had developed in the post-war period. Within the framework of full employment which prevailed then, the guidelines underlying the adoption of social rights tended to rely on principles of solidarity and equality. Today, the universalist values are losing ground and give way to much more individualistic concepts, often presented under the label of ` free choice'. This goes hand in hand with the extension of individual forms of childcare that meet to some extent the aspirations of parents wishing to have solutions which meet better their needs. And it has the advantage, in the eyes of the politicians confronted with insoluble budget problems,

to reduce public expenditure in the field of care since the cost of individual modes of care may be up to half lower than that of the collective structures.

Now such measures, whatever their level of funding usually increase more than they decrease the men/women differences as for their respective involvement in early childhood and in the care of seniors (Jenson 2008). It is proven today that the development of collective services, jointly with individual measures of childcare, promotes the increase of birth – a comparison in Europe between the Nordic countries and France, on the one hand, and the countries of the South and East on the other shows it quite clearly (Heinen 2006). But it remains to be seen what the figures of population growth do hide in terms of gender relations since the good performance of France (which is now at the lead of the European countries) cannot mask the gender inequalities regarding care, as they are much deeper in France than in the Nordic countries (Jenson, Sineau 1998).

The role of the State is thus far from neutral, as is shown by detailed comparative analysis of care or caring policies developed over these last decades (Leira 2002). Very often, the State helped maintain, or even increase gender inequalities through measures such as: care leave defined as maternal before being declared parental; part-time work “reserved” for women; legislations encouraging the creation of low qualified and low paid jobs, predominantly female and most frequently occupied by foreign women (Leira 2002; Vielle 2001). In France, for example, the amount of money devoted to collective services in the budget of childcare fell by half from 1994 to 2001 (16 to 8%), whereas the percentage devoted to individual forms of care increased at the same time from 78 to 84% (Morel 2007). And similar trends are observed in countries like Belgium, Finland or Norway (Jenson, Saint Martin's day 2006). The weight of public policies thus appears determining in the way they shape the practices of both companies and individuals. In particular, the changes noted with regard to childcare services do not have the same impact depending on the sex of the person concerned. Everywhere, indeed, the share of female work remains dominant in the family sphere – either as employees in the public or private sector, or as partners and mothers. Everywhere, women provide the bulk of informal work related to educational and domestic activities.

Admittedly, the economic dependence of women against men is increasingly criticized and the figure of the father, as a person who should share as well the education of the children, has become visible elsewhere than in the Nordic countries for about ten years. In France, in particular, the share of the father in the care has been encouraged since 2001 – although in a very timid way. But the dependence of men to women within the family is generally ignored

or treated as a negligible point. We are still far from a conception of social relations which should emphasize the interdependence of individuals – as defined by Norbert Elias – which would give equal importance to the activities conducted in private and in public life. No wonder, therefore, that the issue of childcare and care for the elderly remains secondary in the eyes of politicians – mainly men in most countries.

Moreover, differences *between women* are increased: the reduction of state expenditure does not have the same implications depending on their education level, their wages, the social category to which they belong or national or ethnic origin. In all countries, it is noted that they are very unequally struck by the impact of liberal policies and the privatization process affecting many tasks of care. The lack of collective solutions at reasonable costs affects much more less qualified and poorly paid women, while female graduates, wishing to remain in the labor, are able to use the work of other women issued of the most disadvantaged categories to take care of their children or to perform depreciated domestic tasks (often through informal jobs). Various recent studies bring to light the increasing trend, in most Western European countries, to call upon women from poor countries in Africa, Latin America, Southeast Asia or Eastern Europe and report on the poor working conditions of this overexploited workforce (Anderson 2000; Lutz 2002; Williams, Gavanas 2008).

To conclude these considerations on the relationship between general tendencies of welfare and care policies, it is important to stress that it would be wrong to think that the opposition between traditional representations that the mother stays at home to care for young children (in particular those under three) and the more progressive ideas on the allocation of the domestic and family tasks between the two parents overlaps necessarily right/left divisions on the political scene. Neither are policies tending to privatize childcare the prerogative of conservative parties. In Sweden, it is a right-wing government dominated by the liberals that passed the law obliging the communes to ensure a place in collective facilities to any child of more than one year, just as the amendment of the law on parental leave introducing the 'father months' in order to encourage men to invest themselves in the care of toddlers from birth. *A contrario*, it is under the socialist presidency of François Mitterrand that the benefit of child care at home was promoted (a measure aimed primarily at privileged social groups) and that local communities were encouraged to develop innovating approaches involving the private sector.

3. Childcare in Western Europe: a gendered citizenship

The diversity of situations as regards social rights, which are an important part of the definition of citizenship, led us – in a collective book published in 2007 by a group of European researches to whom I belong and who have worked together for about twenty years – to mobilize the concept of care regimes to account for these differences. The analysis, focused on the link between care and citizenship from a gender perspective, is based on the comparison between nine countries of Western Europe – with insights into the main features that characterize the situation in Eastern Europe (Lister *et al.* 2007; Heinen 2004). The concept of care regimes refers to that of welfare regimes developed by Esping-Andersen (1990), while transforming it to integrate the dimension of the care which is precisely absent of the concept as initially defined by this author. The book intends to highlight the variety of configurations observed: the regimes differ according to the role played by the State in adopting this or that type of public care policies and according to the importance retained by the informal family sector in the care of dependant people. The most distinct care regimes are, on the one hand, the state regime of the Nordic countries, which are characterized by significant funding of the State and the existence of a highly developed network of collective structures and, on the other hand, the family regime of Southern Europe whose main features are the large share of responsibility of the private sphere and the shortage of services. Between the two are the countries belonging to intermediate care regimes according to the relationship between private and public, in various fields. No country, either in Northern or in Southern Europe, shows a 'pure' profile, and it is more difficult today than fifteen years ago to establish clear distinctions between the various regimes.

The book covers the following nine countries: Germany, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Great Britain, Norway, Netherlands and Sweden. For a long time, the education of young children was considered as the sole responsibility of parents - *de facto* mothers. However, at different speeds according to the countries, various forms of care external to the family were gradually installed since the 60-70', like parents' rights – defined, according to the cases, as individual rights or family rights. More recently, these rights were presented as children's rights (Finland, however, is the only country which defines them as individual rights of the child). This process has speeded up in all Western Europe during the 90' – even if the responsibility for childcare remains primarily assigned to parents.

The reforms introduced in recent decades include both parental leave, care services and/or to benefits covering part of the costs of care at home or outside the home. As already

noted, these various measures have different or even opposite implications concerning the social and family logic they induce: whereas the creation of collective services involves a ‘de-familialization' and a ‘de-commodification process in the sense of Esping-Andersen (in other words: it outsources tasks while imposing part of the costs on the community), the parental leave has an opposite effect since it defers the load on the family, while the care benefits play in a direction or in another, depending on their use (cover part of the external costs of care or remunerate the relative who takes care of the child at home). The systems established in the nine countries differ quite a lot in all three cases and confirm the persistence of still distinct care regimes in North and South.

Concerning the leaves, the duration of the maternity leave ranges from 14 to 52 weeks; there exists or not a paternity leave (which can range from 2 to 42 days); and both the duration of the parental leave (8 to 36 months), and its remuneration vary broadly. Except for the Nordic countries where the compensation can reach 80,or even 100% of the last wage, the parental leave is most often not paid or covered by limited lump sums according to family income (300 to 500 €). The concept of parental leave covers thus extremely different realities according to its terms: as a matter of fact, the situation is quite different when the person stops her working for a short period – 12 to 18 months – and gets an income of substitution close to the wage earned before, or when she gets a lump-sum, generally very low, without any link with her former wage and stops working during three years or more. And the implications are not the same ones either in terms of gender relations: the first scenario *might* promote equality between men and women, whereas the second tends to increase the dependence of those concerned (almost always women) vis-à-vis their spouse. The perceived benefit is then analogous to a maternal wage and is likely to have very negative consequences, in the long term, for the career of the woman concerned. As far as they are concerned, the effects on the socialization of children are also very different.

There is however an attenuation of differences in the use of parental leave during the 90s and an increased willingness – on the symbolic level at least – to promote the figure of the father as responsible also for the care of children. This is evidenced by the introduction of a paternity leave where it did not exist and by the adoption of the principle of a non-transferable period of parental leave of the father to the mother, which is an effective incentive to go in this direction, as the experiences in Sweden and Norway show. Having said that, new legislation on care leaves did not lead to major changes in the division of labor between men

and women. Even in Nordic countries, mothers continue to use a much greater length of leave than men and often resume work part time, unlike their spouses.

In the field of child care services, taking into account only those who have a more or less high public funding, there are first of all important differences depending on the age of children involved. In all countries, most children receive a preschool education, albeit on a longer or shorter duration before the age of entry to compulsory education. However, arrangements for children under three years (not to mention the less than two years) are much more disparate since they accommodate, according to the cases, less than 20% to over 60% of children in this category of age – with however notable changes in recent years in Spain and Germany. In addition, the degree of care is not at all the same when it is full-time as in Nordic countries and France or part-time as in Germany, the Netherlands and Great Britain. "Universal access" to preschool structures is thus far from meaning that all needs are covered. If it were the case, all working parents would have a right to quality services at affordable prices, including evenings and weekends.

The meaning of benefits in cash (which sometimes take the form of tax deductions) for its part is more ambiguous in that they can both facilitate access to external services (private, public or in the voluntary sector), or encourage the hiring of a care person at home or encourage one of the parents – the mother most often – to provide care herself. These benefits – which often go hand in hand with the right to extend the leave (unpaid) beyond the time limit, as is the case in Finland, France and Norway – are based on the principle that everyone has the right to care for her/his own children and has resources to do so, or to entrust that task to others, regardless of her/his situation on the labor market. The initial motivation is similar to the minimum income for all. But it turns out that, given the low level of compensation, the vast majority of recipients of grants for home care are women with low education and low wages – this is true for both mothers themselves or people hired for this purpose. The sexual division of labor is thus consolidated, as are the divisions of class and ethnicity.

In conclusion of this point, beyond the differences across regimes, we can say that in Western Europe, especially since the 1990s, the rights of parents of young children have been consolidated and that efforts have been made to meet the diversification of needs, even if the process in this direction are at different stages: extension in some cases, reorganization in others. The trend has been to increase the size of public support for early childhood. But the measures have contradictory implications as they contribute, in some cases, to outsource

needs, while in others they focus the load on the parents concerned. Some former differences between regimes prevailing in various countries are reduced. In Spain, for example, the proportion of working mothers has increased dramatically, resulting in the introduction of hitherto almost non-existent childcare outside the family (Tobio 2005; Tobio, Diaz Gorfinkiel 2007) while in Nordic countries, the benefits granted for home care are moving towards a re-familialisation of these tasks. However, other inequities arise, particularly in connection with the growing importance of migrant labor in the activities of care (UNRISD 2005; Williams 2001). Class inequalities are exacerbated in the case of lack of services or when the care allowance is at a very low level. In terms of citizenship, there are therefore important differences between the definition of rights and the reality, according to whether the emphasis, in the policies adopted, is laid on the right of women to work or on the right of men to care. The new model of citizen-parent that mothers and fathers should both jointly combine paid work and work of care is still far from being a reality. And the new rhetoric of EU guidelines that tend to dilute the issue of gender in dealing with it as an inequality among others have ceased to play a role of incentive so that Western European states do seriously consider the issue of sex discrimination, not in theory but in practice.

* * * * *

What precedes pages highlight changes occurred in Western Europe in recent decades. They are characterized on the one hand by a stronger public dimension in the financing of childcare and on the other hand by a tendency to favor solutions of so-called ‘free choice’ which in fact defer part of the costs and responsibilities on parents, and especially on women. Therefore it is a contradictory process which is not really capable to challenge the existing gender relations, especially since the changes identified in the dominant paradigm of EU concerning social protection do not plead in favor of upheavals on this subject, quite to the contrary. The emphasis on human capital in most recent EU texts which, in the name of globalization and flexible labor market, foster individualized measures in the area of social and care policies in particular can not encourage true changes in gender relations. Even though these guidelines do not prejudge how they will be transcribed in the national legislature (and even less in practice), they overlap the trends observed in many countries concerning the 'free choice' solutions.

This brings us back to the gender dimension of care and the importance of conceiving personal services (here, those for children) as key elements in the construction of the

individual. This raises the problem of how to promote such recognition, especially for men to involve as much as women in care work. In this sense, the debate on child care facilities cannot but promote awareness, both on the role of government regarding the enhancement of work in this field and the material means made available as the need to overcome the gender differences that characterize the relationship between public and private sphere. This is the price to be paid so that men and women become equal citizens in fact.

Bibliography

Anderson, Bridget (2000). *Doing the Dirty Work*. London: Zed Press.

Bergqvist Christina *et al*. (1999). *Equal Democracies ? Gender and Politics in the Nordic Countries*. Oslo. Scandinavian University Press.

Cox Rosie (2006). *The Servant Problem: Domestic Employment in a Global Economy*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Esping-Andersen Gosta (1990). *The Three World of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

European Commission (1999). *Recueil sur l'égalité de traitement entre les femmes et les hommes dans l'Union européenne,* Bruxelles.

____ (2000). *Vers une stratégie-cadre communautaire en matière d'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes (2001-2005),* Bruxelles.

____ (2006). *Equity and Efficiency in European Training Systems* COM (2006) 481 Final.

Heinen Jacqueline (2003). « L'Union européenne face aux inégalités sociales de genre ». *Contretemps* n° 9.

____ (2004). « Genre et politiques familiales » In Bard C., Baudelot C., Mossuz-Lavau J. eds., *Quand les femmes s'en mêlent. Genre et politique*. Paris, La Martinière,

____ (2006). "Clashes and ordeals of women's citizenship in Central and Eastern Europe". In Lukic J., Regulska J and D. Zavirsek, *Women and Citizenship in Central and East Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Jenson Jane (1986). « Gender and reproduction: Or babies and the state ». *Studies in Political Economy*, n° 20.

____ (2001). "D'un régime de citoyenneté à un autre: la rémunération des soins". *Travail, genre et sociétés* n° 6.

Jenson Jane (2008). « Writing Women Out, Folding Gender In: The European Unons 'Modernises' Social Policy". *International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, vol 15, n° 2.

Jenson Jane, Saint-Martin Denis (2006). « Building blocks for a new social architecture : the LEGO paradigm of an active society". *Policy and Politics* vol. 34 (3).

Jenson Jane, Sineau Mariette (eds.) (2001). *Who Cares. Women's Work, Childcare and Welfare State*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Knijn Trudie, Ungerson Clare (eds) (1997). « Gender and Care Work in Welfare States ». Numéro spécial de *Social Politics. International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, vol. 4, n° 3. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Kofman Elisabeth *et al*. (2000) *Gender and International Migration in Europe: Employment, Welfare and Politics*. London: Routledge.

Leira Arnlaug (1992). *Welfare State and Working Mothers. he Scandinavian Experience*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

____ (2002). *Working Parents and the Welfare State: Family change and Policy Reform in Scandinavia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis Jane (1998). *Gender, Social Care and Welfare State Restructuring in Europe*. London. Ashgate.

____ (ed) (2006). *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Lister Ruth *et al.*(2007). *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Lombardo Emanuela, Meier Petra (2008). "Framing Gender Equality in the European Union Political Discourse". *Social Politics. International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, vol. 15, n° 1.

Lutz Helma (2002) 'At your service madam! The globalization of domestic service'. *Feminist Review*, vol. 70.

Morel Nathalie (2007). "From Subsidiarity to 'Free Choice': Child- and Elder-care Policy Reforms in France, Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands". *Social Policy and Administration*, vol 41, n° 6.

Siim Birte (2000). *Gender and Citizenship. Politics and Agency in France, Britain, and Denmark*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Stratigaki Maria (2008). « La politique du recul. De l'intégration de l'égalité 'des sexes' à l'intégration de l'égalité 'pour tous' ». *Cahiers du Genre* n° 44.

Tobio Constanza (2005). *Madres que Trabajan: Dilemas y Estrategias*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Tobío, Constanza, Gorfinkiel Díaz Jimena (2007) 'New gendered relationships in Spain: 'the other' Iin the care triangle', International Journal of Iberian Studies, vol 20, no 1.

Ungerson Claire, Yeandle Sue (eds) (2007). *Cash for Care in Developed Welfare States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

UNRISD (2005). *Gender Equality: Striving for Justice in an Unequal World*. Geneva: UN Publications.

Vielle Pascale (2001). *La sécurité sociale et le coût indirect des responsabilités familiales. Une approche de genre*. Bruxelles. Bruylant.

Williams Fiona (2001). « Trends in women's employment, domestic service and female migration in Europe ». Communication au colloque *Solidarity between the sexes and generations.* Amsterdam 28-29.6.2001.

Williams Fiona and Anna Gavanas (2008) 'The Intersection of Child Care Regimes and Migration Regimes: A Three–Country Study'. In Helen Lutz (ed), *Migration and Domestic Work: a European Perspective on a Global Theme*, London: Routledge