



# Work-Family Policy Indicators

**Irene Boeckmann\*, Michelle Budig & Joya Misra**

Sociology Department  
University of Massachusetts-Amherst

*\*authors listed alphabetically*

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following people for their support and advice during the construction of this database:

Marie Evertsson, Anne H. Gauthier, Naomi Gerstel, Janet Gornick, Daniela Grunow, Sebastian Klüsener, Sandra Krapf, Hadas Mandel, Gerda Neyer, Eiko Strader, and the members of the Policy Laboratory at the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock, Germany.

We thankfully acknowledge the financial support of the development of this database by the National Science Foundation Grants #0600926 and #0751505.

Release date: March 2012

### Citation

If you use data from this database, please cite it as follows:

Irene Boeckmann\*, Michelle Budig, & Misra, Joya 2012. The Work-Family Policy Indicators. Sociology Department, University of Massachusetts-Amherst. doi: 10.7275/R5WD3XHS

\* *Note: Authors listed alphabetically.*

Please send comments, suggestions on corrections and modifications to the data set to [iboeckma@soc.umass.edu](mailto:iboeckma@soc.umass.edu).

## Table of Contents

### A. Introduction

- 1. Database Background ..... 1
- 2. Description of Indicators ..... 2

### B. Quantitative Indicators ..... 4

### C. Data Documentation

#### Birth Related and Extended Leave Policies

- 1 Length of paid maternity leave ..... 5
- 2 Maternity leave benefit ..... 10
- 3 Length of parental leave available to women ..... 14
- 4 Parental leave benefit..... 19
- 5 Maximum leave available to women..... 24
- 6 Length of birth related paternity leave..... 27
- 7 Paternity leave benefit..... 31

#### Early Childhood Education and Care

- 8 Percentage of 0 to 2 year old children enrolled in publicly supported early childhood education and care services ..... 34
- 9 Percentage of 3 to 5 year old children enrolled in publicly supported early childhood education and care services ..... 43
- 10 Starting age of compulsory schooling..... 51

#### Regulation of Working Time

- 11 Normal weekly working hours ..... 55
- 12 Predominant mechanism setting normal weekly working hours..... 59

## A. Introduction

### 1. DATABASE BACKGROUND

The Work-Family Policy Indicators consist of 12 country-level indicators for 22 countries across Europe and North America including Australia. We include separate indicators for former East and West Germany due to continuing socio-economic differences between the two regions, which results in 23 country-level cases. The database was originally compiled for Michelle Budig and Joya Misra’s comparative research projects “The Cross-National Effects of Work-Family Policies on the Wage Penalty for Motherhood” examining the relationship between family policies and the impact of motherhood on women’s employment outcomes funded by the National Science Foundation. The indicators cover three policy areas relevant to parents who take care of young children: Rights to take time off work to care for children, early childhood education and care and the regulation of working time.

The indicators are intended to be used together with data from the Luxembourg Income Study Database. With a few exceptions the policy measures are matched to the years corresponding to Luxembourg Income Study wave V data, i.e. years between 1999 and 2001. For some countries the policy data refers to years of earlier or later waves due to research project related data availability in the LIS data sets:

**Countries, time points, and corresponding LIS Wave**

	<b>Country</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>LIS Wave</b>		<b>Country</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>LIS Wave</b>
1	Australia	2000	V	13	Italy	2000	V
2	Austria	2000	V	14	Luxembourg	2000	V
3	Belgium	2000	V	15	Netherlands	1999	V
4	Canada	2000	V	16	Poland	2004	VI
5	Czech Republic	1996	IV	17	Russian Federation	2000	V
6	Finland	2000	V	18	Slovak Republic	1992	IV
7	France	2000	V	19	Spain	2000	V
8	Germany – West	2000	V	20	Sweden	2000	V
9	Germany – East	2000	V	21	Switzerland	1992	III
10	Hungary	1999	V	22	United Kingdom	1999	V
11	Ireland	2000	V	23	United States	2000	V
12	Israel	2001	V				

This database consists of two parts: The quantitative indicators (also available in Excel format), and the contextual information. This document provides a description of each indicator including coding decisions made during the construction of the quantitative indicators, contextual information for each quantitative indicator, and detailed information on data sources. We hope that the contextual data and information on data sources will help to make the construction of our indicators replicable and comprehensible, and point researchers wishing to construct their own policy indicators to available data sources.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF INDICATORS

### Birth Related and Extended Leave Policies

The WFPI include seven indicators capturing parental rights to take time off from employment to take care of children. All leave measures are lagged two years behind the LIS wave year (exceptions are noted in the documentation). Because leave and benefit entitlements may vary by marital status and the number of children, the indicators were constructed assuming partnered women with two children, one under the age of 3 and one between the ages of 3 and 6. We distinguish between (shorter) birth-related maternity/paternity leave and extended parental leave schemes. Only job protected leave is counted in these measures.

1. *Length of birth-related paid maternity leave available to women measured in weeks.* This indicator measures paid leave usually reserved for women and to be taken around the time of birth. In some countries, mothers are prohibited from work for a certain period around the time of birth. Possible eligibility restrictions are noted in the data documentation. Separate eligibility rules may apply to leave entitlements and benefits entitlements during the leave.
2. *Wage replacement rate during maternity leave.* This indicator captures the percentage of past wages that is replaced during maternity leave, frequently by national insurance schemes. This quantitative indicator does not take maximum benefit or earnings ceilings into account, but we include this information in the contextual information if available.
3. *Length of parental leave available to women measured in weeks (not including maternity leave).* This indicator measures the length of parental leave that follows birth-related leave. We record the length of parental leave available to women, i.e. it excludes any entitlements reserved for the mothers' spouse or partner.
4. *Benefits available to women during parental leave.* If benefits come in the form of flat-rate benefits (independent of prior earnings), we recorded the benefit as a percentage of women's median earnings. For leave schemes that provide different levels or kinds of benefits for different portions of the parental leave, we calculated a weighted average (using the number of weeks each type/level of benefit is available).
5. *Maximum length of job protected leave available to women measured in weeks.* The length of parental leave and maternity leave are added if the entitlements are expressed as a duration. If the length of the parental leave is defined by the child's age (e.g. up the child's third birthday) maternity leave is not added, except if there is compulsory pre-natal maternity leave. Any extended leave that is not job protected is not included.
6. *Length of paternity leave in weeks.* Following Moss & Deven (2006)<sup>1</sup>, we define paternity leave as the "short period of leave to be taken immediately after the birth, concurrently with maternity leave" (p. 262). Policy schemes that provide the option to transfer part of the maternity leave to the father if the mother is sick or dies, were not counted as paternity leave. Neither does this paternity leave measure

---

<sup>1</sup> Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 2006. "Leave Policies and Research: A Cross-National Overview." *Marriage & Family Review* 39:255-285.

include parental leave entitlements available to fathers. During the observed time period, only few countries had statutory leave provisions for fathers.

7. *Benefit available during paternity leave.* The benefits may be paid by employers (e.g. Luxembourg, Netherlands) or be national insurance schemes (e.g. Finland, Sweden).

### **Early Childhood Education and Care**

We measure policies related to early childhood education and care using enrollment rates for defined age groups (policy outcome) rather than policy schemes with regard to child care/pre-school education services in the strict sense (such as the right to a place in child care/pre-school for a child of a certain age). Unless otherwise noted, childcare coverage measures capture enrollment in formal (i.e. center-based) publicly supported (e.g. via public provision or public subsidies to private providers):

8. *Percentage of children up to their third birthday enrolled in publicly supported childcare services (formal/center-based, generally excludes childcare in the home of the child or care provided by a childminder even if publicly subsidized)*
9. *Percentage of 3-5 year olds enrolled in publicly supported childcare services (formal/center-based, generally excludes childcare in the home of the child or care provided by a childminder even if publicly subsidized).*
10. *Starting age of mandatory schooling.* This may be the age at which children start primary school or mandatory pre-school.

These enrollment rates have to be read with caution. Data availability and data quality across countries varies considerably for the time points covered in this database. Notably, the quantitative indicators do not capture whether children attend full-time or part-time, and the types of services covered by the data may vary. We aimed at consistently capturing enrollment rates for 0-2 and 3-5 year olds, however due to limited data availability this was not always possible. Likewise, if the number of children enrolled was unavailable, the number of places per 100 children in the targeted age group was used instead (e.g. Luxembourg). The data documentation aims at clarifying what the enrollment figures entail in each country.

### **Working Time Regulation**

These indicators capture normative full-time working hours (rather than actual average working hours) and the dominant mechanism regulating working hours. Working hours may be regulated by statutory regulations (laws) or collective agreements.

11. *Normal weekly hours according to predominant mechanism*
12. *Dominant mechanism regulating working hours*

## B. Quantitative Indicators

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Length of maternity leave (in weeks)	Maternity leave benefit	Length of parental leave (in weeks)	Parental leave benefit	Maximum length of leave available to women (in weeks)	Length of paternity leave (in weeks)	Paternity leave benefit	Enrollment of 0, 1, and 2 year olds in publicly supported formal child care	Enrollment of 3, 4, and 5 year olds in publicly supported formal child care/pre-school	Starting age of compulsory schooling	Normal weekly working hours	Dominant mechanism shaping normal weekly hours
Australia 2001	0	0	52	0	52	0	0	13	41	6	38	AS
Austria 2000	16	100	69	35	85	0	0	8	77	6	39	L+C
Belgium 2000	15	77	13	30	28	1	100	20	99	6	39	L+C
Canada 2000	15	55	10	55	25	0	0	5	53	6	40	L
Czech Republic 1996	28	69	134	24	162	0	0	1	76	6	43	L
Finland 2000	18	66	142	27	161	3	66	24	66	7	38,2	L+C
France 2000	16	84	143	37	159	1	100	22	99	6	39	L
Germany - West 2000	14	100	147	14	161	0	0	5	75	6	37	C
Germany - East 2000	14	100	147	14	161	0	0	34	87	6	39	C
Hungary 1999	24	100	135	54	159	0	0	10	88	6	40	L
Ireland 2000	14	70	0	0	14	0	0	4	56	6	39	C
Israel 2001	12	100	52	0	64	6	100	19	79	5	45	L+C
Italy 2000	22	80	26	30	48	0	0	6	85	6	38	L+C
Luxembourg 2000	16	100	26	89	42	0	100	4	68	4	40	L+C
Netherlands 1999	16	100	0	0	16	0	0	6	68	5	37	L+C
Poland 2004	18	100	155	0	173	0	0	2	39	6	40	L
Russian Fed. 2000	20	100	145	25	165	0	0	21	64	6/7	40	?
Slovak Republic 1992	28	90	127	28	161	0	0	9	78	6	43	L
Spain 2000	16	100	139	0	161	0	100	5	77	6	40	L
Sweden 2000	9	80	77	65	64	2	80	41	86	7	40	L
Switzerland 1992	3	100	0	0	3	0	0	1	35,7	6/7	42	C
United Kingdom 1999	18	44	0	0	18	0	0	1	71	5	38	C
United States 2000	0	0	12	0	12	0	0	6	53	5/6	40	L

## C. Data Documentation

### 1 Length of Paid Maternity Leave in Weeks

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	OECD 2005	There is no universal maternity leave scheme. In 2004 an estimated 39 percent of female employees in Australia could take an average of 7 weeks paid maternity leave, up from 28 per cent in 1997 (O'Neill 2004).	
Austria 2000	ISSA serial	16 weeks compulsory maternity leave (8 weeks before and 8 weeks after birth). Eligibility: covered are employed persons earning ATS 3,740 or more a month, self-employed (except in agriculture), including apprentices. Special systems for public and railway employees and the self-employed in agriculture, trade and industry.	
Belgium 2000	Deven & Nuelant 1999	15 weeks, one week of which must be taken before the birth and 8 weeks after the birth; the remaining 6 weeks can be taken before or after birth.	
Canada 2000	U.S. Social Security Administration 1997, ILO 1994	15 weeks of paid leave. Eligibility: <i>Federal regulation</i> : all female employees, who have completed 6 months of continuous employment with an employer, in industries under federal jurisdiction including interprovincial and international industries. For all other industries, maternity leave is regulated by legislation enacted by the government of the province or territory in which these are based. <i>State regulations</i> : While female employees covered by provincial legislation have similar maternity leave entitlements to those female employees under federal jurisdiction, there are variations between the provinces in the scope of employees included, as well as in the notice periods, employment qualifying periods and extension of leave. Provincial laws cover all female employees in the private and public sectors, with certain exceptions (see ILO 1994).	
Czech Republic 1996	Marksová-Tominová 2003, U.S. Social Security Administration 1997	Women are entitled to a maximum of 28 weeks of maternity leave starting 6-8 weeks before the expected date of the birth. If the woman is still working during this period before the birth, she loses the entitlement for those weeks entirely. In any case, the post birth entitlement is 22 weeks. Eligibility: 279 days of insurance in last 2 years, eligibility continues for 6 months after employment ceases.	



Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Finland 2000	Salmi and Lammi-Tskula 1999, Gauthier & Bortnik 2001	105 working days (including Saturdays), i.e. 17.5 weeks, exclusively for the mother. 5 weeks of this period must be taken before birth, with a further 3 weeks which may be taken before or after. Eligibility: The right to maternal, parental and care leaves is not tied to the length of employment. But individuals taking these leaves have to have been residents in Finland for at least 180 days immediately prior to the birth of the child.	105 days / 6 = 17.5 weeks
France 2000	Moss & Deven 1999, ISSA serial	16-25 weeks (+extra for multiple births). A minimum of 4 weeks must be taken before the birth, with a further 2 weeks (or 4 weeks for a 3rd or subsequent child) which can be taken before or after birth. There is a further 10 weeks after birth (or 18 weeks for a 3rd or later order child). Eligibility: 200 hours of paid employment in the last 3 months	
Germany 2000	Pettinger 1999, U.S. Social Security Administration 1997	14 weeks, 6 weeks before and 8 weeks after birth child. Eligibility: 12 weeks of insurance, or continuous employment relationship from 10th month to 4th month preceding confinement; must be working or excused from work 6 weeks prior to expected confinement.	
Hungary 1999	Lukács & Frey 2003	24 weeks, 4 weeks before and 20 weeks after birth. Eligibility: 180 days of insurance during last 2 years before the birth of the child.	
Ireland 2000	Bettio & Prechal 1998	14 weeks, may be extended to 18 weeks where employee had less than 4 weeks after birth before return to work, but these additional weeks are unpaid.	
Israel 2001	ISSA serial	12 weeks of maternity leave. Eligibility: Employed persons and self-employed over age 18, adoptive parents who adopt a child under age 10; 10 months of insurance in the last 14 months, or 15 months in the last 22 months (6 weeks of leave for women who do not meet eligibility requirements for the 12 week leave, but have been employed/insured for at least 6 months in the preceding 14 months).	
Italy 2000	ISSA serial, Bettio & Prechal 1998	2 months before and 3 months after confinement. Eligibility: employed persons in commerce (except managers), and wage earners in industry and agriculture (ISSA serial); including home workers and domestic employees (Bettio & Prechal 1998).	5 months x 4.3 = 21.5
Luxembourg 2000	ILO 1994, ISSA serial	16 weeks (8 before and 8 after the expected date of confinement, the woman may work during the period of prenatal leave if she has a medical certificate attesting her capacity to work). Eligibility: membership in the fund 6 months in year prior to expected date of childbirth.	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Netherlands 1999	ILO 1994, Moss & Deven 1999	16 weeks, a maximum of 6 weeks can be taken before the birth and a minimum period of 4 weeks must be taken at this time, leaving between 10 and 12 weeks to be taken after the birth (Moss and Deven 1999). Eligibility: Maximum earnings for contribution purposes: 48,175 NLG per year, minimum earnings, 29,000 NLG per year (ISSA serial).	
Poland 2004	ISSA serial, European Commission 2002, Balcerzak-Paradowska et al 2003	The length of the maternity leave is 16 weeks for the 1 <sup>st</sup> child and 18 weeks for subsequent children. For the purpose of this database, we assume that a woman has two children. Therefore the length of maternity leave was recorded as 18 weeks (ISSA serial). At least two weeks have to be taken before the anticipated date of confinement (European Commission 2002). Note: During a short period (January 2001 to January 2002), maternity leave benefits were extended to 26 weeks for the first birth and 36 weeks for subsequent births (Balcerzak-Paradowska et al 2003).	
Russian Federation 2000	The MONEE Project 1999	10 weeks before and 10 weeks after birth. Eligibility: linked to employment.	
Slovak Republic 1992	Slovak CEDAW Country Report 1996, Kotýnková, Kuchařová, and Průša 2003	Benefits are payable for 28 weeks to the mother; in the case of women having given birth to two or more children and caring for at least two, as well as of women not married, widowed, divorced or solitary for other serious reasons and not living in common-law marriage, the payment of benefits is extended to 37 weeks. Benefits are allocated, under conditions specified by law, to women as well as men, in connection with the care of a newborn child. Maternity leave usually starts six weeks before the expected birth of the child. While the law does not oblige a woman to take maternity leave, if she takes time off from work for the birth of a child, the leave must last at least 14 weeks, six of which must follow the child's birth.	
Spain 2000	Moss & Deven 1999, ISSA serial	16 weeks, and 2 weeks extra for multiple births per new born child, from the second onward. At least 6 weeks must be taken after the birth, while the remaining 10 weeks can be taken before or after the birth or divided between before and after the birth (Moss & Deven 1999). Eligibility: 180 days of contribution during the 5 years before child-birth or the official date of adoption (ISSA serial).	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Sweden 2000	Moss & Deven 1999, Försäkringskassan 2010	Since the Swedish Parental Insurance does not distinguish between maternity and parental leave for benefit purposes, we recorded the duration for which women can receive parental leave benefit before the anticipated date of birth, i.e up to 60 days. Women who are unable to continue working for health reasons (strenuous or hazardous work) and cannot be transferred to other tasks by the employer are covered by a pregnancy benefit for 50 days before the expected delivery date. Between 1994 and 2004, around 25 per cent of pregnant women took pre-birth leave for an average of 38 days (Reformerad Försäkring, 2005).	60/7=8,5
Switzerland 1992	Swiss National Council 2002, Hofer 2004	The payment of wages of women who are absent from work because of pregnancy and childbirth is part of employers' general obligation to continue to pay wages to workers who are prevented from working "for personal reasons" due to "no fault of their own" (Code of Obligations). The length of this period is regulated by Cantonal laws and collective agreements and depends on the length of service with the employer. The minimum period is three weeks in the first year of employment with an employer. Note: The 1964 employment law stipulates that women must not work in the 8 weeks following birth, however without guaranteeing wage replacement during this period.	
United Kingdom 1999	ISSA serial, ILO 1994	18 weeks (paid), starting at any time from the 11th week before expected due date, Eligibility: All female employees in the private and public sectors, including public servants.	
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No federal statutory entitlement to paid maternity leave.	

## References

- Balcerzak-Paradowska, Bożena, Agnieszka Chłoń-Domińczak, Irena E. Kotowska, Anna Olejniczuk-Merta, Irena Topińska, and Irena Wóycicka. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 187-114 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Bettio, Francesca and Silvana Prechal. 1998. "Care in Europe. Joint Report of the "Gender and Employment" and "Gender and Law" Groups of Experts." European Commission.
- Deven, Fred and Peter Moss. 2002. "Leave Arrangements for Parents: Overview and Future Outlook." *Community, Work & Family* 5:237.254.
- European Commission. 2002, "MISSCEEC II: Mutual Information System on Social Protection in the Central and Eastern European Countries Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic and Slovenia ", Retrieved 10/10/07, ([http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/misceec/index\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/misceec/index_en.html)).
- Försäkringskassan. 2010, "Parental benefit (Föräldrapenning)", Retrieved 11/10/2010, ([http://www.forsakringskassan.se/irj/go/km/docs/fk\\_publishing/Dokument/Publikationer/Faktablad/Andra\\_sprak/Engelska/foraldrapenning\\_eng.pdf](http://www.forsakringskassan.se/irj/go/km/docs/fk_publishing/Dokument/Publikationer/Faktablad/Andra_sprak/Engelska/foraldrapenning_eng.pdf)).
- Gauthier, Anne H. and Anita Bortnik. 2001, "Documentation Related to: Comparative Maternity, Parental, and Childcare Database. Preliminary version 2 (February 2001)", Retrieved 05/22, 2006 ([www.soci.ualgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation\\_Maternity\\_database\\_v2.doc](http://www.soci.ualgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation_Maternity_database_v2.doc)).
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Hofer, Martina. 2004. "Argumentationen politischer Gruppierungen gegen eine Mutterschaftsversicherung." Fribourg, Switzerland: Lehrstuhl für Sozialarbeit und Sozialpolitik, Universität Fribourg.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). serial, "Social Security Worldwide (SSW)", Retrieved 06/15/2006, (<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm>).
- Kotýnková, Magdalena, Věra Kuchařová, and Ladislav Průša. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in the Czech Republic." Pp. 109-185 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Lukács, Erika and Mária Frey. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 43-108 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Marksová-Tominová, Michaela. 2003. "Gender Assessment of the Impact of EU Accession on the Status of Women and the Labour Market in CEE. National Study: Czech Republic." Karat Coalition, UNIFEM, Prague.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 1999. "Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?" in *Research and Policy Issues in Europe*, vol. 35. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 2005. "Extending Opportunities How Active Social Policy Can Benefit Us All: Giving Children and Parents a Brighter Future." Pp. 65-118.
- Pettinger, Rudolf. 1999. "Parental Leave in Germany." Pp. 123-140 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Salmi, Minna and Johanna Lammi-Tskula. 1999. "Parental Leave in Finland." Pp. 85-121 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Slovak CEDAW Country Report. 1996. "Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Initial Report of State Parties - Slovakia." United Nations, New York.
- Swiss National Council, Commission for Social Security and Health. 2002. "Bericht der Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit des Nationalrats zur Parlamentarischen Initiative zur Revision des Erwerbsersatzgesetzes: Ausweitung der Erwerbsersatzansprüche auf erwerbstätige Mütter."
- The MONEE Project. 1999. "Women in Transition." UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Florence, Italy.
- U.S. Social Security Administration, Office of Policy Data. 1997. "Social Security Programs Throughout the World." U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Division of Program.

## 2 Maternity Leave Benefit

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Kammerman 2005	No benefit on a national level.	
Austria 2000	ISSA serial	100% of earnings for 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after the expected date of childbirth (12 to 16 weeks after childbirth in special cases); maximum earnings for contribution and benefit purposes: ATS 40,800/month (1997).	
Belgium 2000	Deven & Nuelant 1999	Paid at 82% of earnings for active workers for the first 30 days (no earnings ceiling), for unemployed and other eligible persons it is 79.5% of the last salary (cannot be higher than their unemployment benefit, also subject to a ceiling). For the remaining period (31st day – end of the 15th week) it is 75% of earnings up to a certain earnings ceiling for salaried and unemployed.	82% of earnings for 30 days (=4.3 weeks), 75% for 10.7 weeks $[(4.3 \times 82) + (10.7 \times 75)] / 15 = 77$
Canada 2000	U.S. Social Security Administration 1997	The wage replacement rate is 55% of average previous earnings with a maximum benefit of CAN\$413 per week. Benefits are paid by the national government (unemployment insurance), but rights to take leave are established at the provincial level (Gornick and Meyers 2003).	
Czech Republic 1996	ISSA serial	The wage replacement rate in 1994 was 69% with a maximum of CZK186 a day.	
Finland 2000	Salmi & Lammi-Tskula 1999	The wage replacement rate varies according to the level of previous earnings, from 43% to 82% - the higher the previous earnings, the lower the percentage. The average rate is 66%. Persons who were not previously employed are entitled to a minimum allowance of FIM 60 per working day.	
France 2000	Moss & Deven 1999, ISSP serial	84% of earnings (not taxed). Minimum benefit FF47/day, maximum benefit FF457/day (U.S. Social Security Administration 1997).	
Germany 2000	Pettinger 1999, U.S. Social Security Administration 1997	100% of covered earnings; covered are employees with earnings up to DM73,800 per year (U.S. Social Security Administration 1997).	
Hungary 1999	Lukács & Frey 2003	The maternity benefit is an insurance-based benefit, available to women who had 180 insured days in the two years before birth. It covers the 168 day maternity leave period (28 days before and 140 after birth), and replaced 100% of the mother's last earnings until April 1996. Subsequently the replacement rate was reduced to 70% of last earnings. The policy in place prior to 1996 was recorded.	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Ireland 2000	ISSA serial	70% of weekly earnings, the minimum benefit is I£82.30 and the maximum benefit is I£162.80 per week.	
Israel 2001	ISSA serial	100% of average earnings in the previous three months. Eligibility: Employed persons and self-employed over age 18, adoptive parents who adopt a child under age 10. 10 months of insurance in the last 14 months, or 15 months in the last 22 months; partial benefit for women with only 6 months of insurance in the last 14 months.	
Italy 2000	ISSA serial	80% of earnings. The outstanding 20% is ordinarily covered by the employer as stipulated in individual sector labor contract. For certain categories (e.g. public administration) total coverage is guaranteed by the employer (Duman 1990).	
Luxembourg 2000	ILO 1994, ISSA serial		
Netherlands 1999	ILO 1994, Moss & Deven 1999	100% of earnings, up to a maximum level of 310 NLG a day. Unemployed: 100% of earnings with a maximum of the minimum wage (2,350 NLG per month).	
Poland 2004	Balcerzak-Paradowska et al 2003	Benefits amount to 100 percent of the employee's average wage for the three-month period preceding the leave. Maternity benefits for individual farmers are payable for eight weeks. In this case, the amount of benefit is PLN 4 a day (US\$ 1.00).	
Russian Federation 2000	The MONEE Project 1999		
Slovak Republic 1992	Slovak CEDAW Country Report 1996	Maternity benefits form part of health insurance benefits and are allocated, under conditions specified by law, to women as well as men, in connection with care of a newborn child. The amount of benefits, payable from the first day, is 90 per cent of net daily wages.	
Spain 2000	ISSA serial	100% of earnings. Maximum earnings for contribution and benefit purposes: SP 286,650 (SP 300,660 beginning April 1 2007) to SP 384,630 (separate ceilings for each occupational class).	
Sweden 2000	5th Swedish CEDAW Country Report 2000	As of January 1998, benefit amounting to 80 percent of the income of the parent staying at home is payable for 360 of the 450 days that a family is entitled to benefits.	
Switzerland 1992	Joris & Wecker 1998	During the first year of service, wages are paid for 3 weeks by the employer. After one year of service, wages are to be paid for "a reasonably longer period", taking into account the duration of the employment relationship.	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
United Kingdom 1999	UK Department for Work and Pensions 2006	The wage replacement in is 90% for the first 6 weeks. For the rest of the leave a flat rate of £55.70 is paid (for women who fulfill the employment requirements), representing 21.5 per cent of women's median earnings. Maternity Allowance is paid at the higher rate (£55.70) for women who were employed in the qualifying week (15th week before the baby is born) and at a lower rate (£48.35) for women who do not fulfill this requirement.	(6 weeks x 90 + 12 x 21.5)/18 = 44.3 ~ 44 per cent
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No national-level policy of paid maternity leave.	

## References

- Balcerzak-Paradowska, Bożena, Agnieszka Chłoń-Domińczak, Irena E. Kotowska, Anna Olejniczuk-Merta, Irena Topińska, and Irena Wóycicka. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 187-114 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Deven, Fred and Tanja Nuelant. 1999. "Parental leave and career breaks in Belgium." Pp. 141-154 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). serial, "Social Security Worldwide (SSW)", Retrieved 06/15/2006, (<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm>).
- Joris, Elisabeth and Regina Wecker. 1998. "Mutterschaftsregelungen und Arbeit auf Abruf: Historische Beispiele und ihre aktuelle Bedeutung." Pp. 189-222 in *Deregulierung und Chancengleichheit*, edited by E. Bühler, E. Maurer, and S. Syler. Zürich: vdf-Verlag.
- Kammerman, Sheila B. 2005, "The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies", Retrieved 06/10/2006, (<http://www.childpolicy.org/>).
- Lukács, Erika and Mária Frey. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 43-108 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 1999. "Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?" in *Research and Policy Issues in Europe*, vol. 35. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Pettinger, Rudolf. 1999. "Parental Leave in Germany." Pp. 123-140 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Salmi, Minna and Johanna Lammi-Tskula. 1999. "Parental Leave in Finland." Pp. 85-121 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Slovak CEDAW Country Report. 1996. "Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Initial Report of State Parties - Slovakia." United Nations, New York.
- Swedish CEDAW Country Report. 2000. "Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Fifth Periodic Report of State Parties - Sweden." United Nations, New York.
- The MONEE Project. 1999. "Women in Transition." UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Florence, Italy.
- U.S. Social Security Administration, Office of Policy Data. 1997. "Social Security Programs Throughout the World." U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Division of Program.
- UK Department for Work and Pensions. 2006, "Maternity Allowance Background", Retrieved 09/19/06, (<http://www.dwp.gov.uk/asd/asd1/ma/MaternityAllowance.pdf>).



### 3 Length of Parental Leave Available to Women in Weeks

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Mercer Human Resource Consulting 2003, Commonwealth of Australia 1996	The <i>Workplace Relations Act 1996</i> provides for up to 52 weeks of unpaid parental leave for either parent upon the birth or adoption of a child (i.e. the maximum entitlement per family is 52 weeks). The parent must have 12 months of continuous service with the employer. Adoption leave is available only where the child is under 5 years of age. Most State jurisdictions have followed suit with similar legislation. Except for a period of one week at the time of the birth, parents cannot take leave at the same time, since their main purpose is to enable the parent who is on leave to be the child's primary care-giver.	
Austria 2000	Österr. Bundesmin. für Umwelt, Jugend und Familie 1999	Legislation introduced in 1996 reduced the maximum leave for one parent until the child is 18 months old (previously 24 months). The remaining 6 months of leave may only be used by the other parent who has to take at least 3 months of leave ( <i>Strukturanpassungsgesetz 1996, BGBl. Nr. 201/1996</i> , took effect July 1 1996). Note: The labor code continues to guarantee job protected leave up to the child's 2nd birthday for one parent alone. The latter six months are not included in the measure.	(18 months of parental leave x 4.3=77.4 weeks) – 8 weeks of compulsory postnatal leave = 69 weeks
Belgium 2000	Gauthier & Bortnik 2001	Legislation introduced in 1998 entitles each parent to a full time leave of 3 months or a part-time (half-time) leave of up to 6 months. The leave may be taken until the child is 4 years of age.	3 x 4.3 = 12.9 weeks ~ 13 weeks
Canada 2000	OECD 1995, Gauthier and Bortnik 2001, Marshall 2003	The number of weeks of parental leave (10 weeks) refers only to leave provisions under federal jurisdiction. The provisions vary by jurisdiction. Provincial regulations may exceed the federal regulation in terms of the length of leave. Parental leave is provided by most jurisdictions apart from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Yukon (OECD 1995). Note: In December 2000, parental leave was increased to 35 weeks.	
Czech Republic 1996	Kocourková 2002	The leave is available till the child's 3rd birthday.	3 years = 156 weeks – 22 weeks of post-birth maternity leave = 134 weeks

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Finland 2000	Salmi & Lammi-Tskula 1999, Ellingsæter & Leira 2006	The length of the parental leave is 158 days, based on a 6-day working week, this is equivalent to 26 weeks. Since 1997, parents of children under 3 years of age who do not use their entitlement to a place in municipal day care can take home care leave after the end of maternal, paternal and parental leave. Reforms in October 1998 introduced more flexibility. For instance, one period of the home care leave can be taken by one parent while the other parent is on maternity or parental leave. All types of leave, including home care leave are job protected.	36 months x 4.3 = 154.8 – 12.5 weeks of post-birth maternity leave = 142.3 weeks
France 2000	Fagnani 1999	Parental leave (congé parental d'éducation – CPE) can be taken until the youngest child reaches 36 months of age. Eligibility: salaried employees, male or female, who have worked for at least 1 year in the company before the birth of a child, to cease employment totally or to work on a part-time basis (between 16 and 32 hrs per week and the employee is not allowed to work somewhere else), in order to care for a new-born child, irrespective of its birth order. Adoptive parents can also be eligible.	36 months x 4.3 = 154.8 weeks – 12 week of maternity leave (a minimum of 4 out of 16 weeks has to be taken before birth) = 142.8 weeks ~ 143 weeks
Germany 2000	Pettinger 1999	Parental leave until the child's 3rd birthday (36 months), if during this parental leave period another child is born, then a new claim period starts, and the previous parental leave period is terminated. The leave period can be taken entirely by the mother or the father or shared between them: Leave can be alternated between the mother and the father up to 3 times (a regulation intended to enhance participation by fathers in the care of their child). During parental leave, employees may work part time for up to 19 hours a weeks with their employer, or with another employer if their existing employer gives his consent.	36 months x 4.3 = 154.8 weeks – 8 week of maternity leave after the birth of the child = 146.8 ~ 147 weeks

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Hungary 1999	Kocourková 2002	Parental leave until child is 3 years old, up to the second birthday of the child with an earnings-related benefit, subsequently with a flat-rate benefit. (See notes for parental leave benefit for more information).	36 months * 4.3 = 154.8 ~ 155 weeks - 20 weeks post-natal maternity leave = 135 weeks
Ireland 2000	Gauthier & Bortnik 2001	No parental leave scheme available during 1998. Note: At the end of 1998, a parental leave scheme was introduced that entitles both parents to 14 weeks of unpaid leave each.	
Israel 2001	ILO 1994, Goldberg & Raday 1995	A woman who, at the time of going on maternity leave, has worked for the same employer or at the same place of work for not less than 24 consecutive months may take unpaid leave from the 7th week after confinement for a number of months equal to the one-fourth the number of months that she has worked, for a maximum of 12 months.	52 weeks
Italy 2000	ILO 1994, ISSA serial	A female employee is entitled to take 6 months of optional maternity leave after compulsory maternity leave at any time up to her child's 1st birthday.	6 months x 4.3 = 25.8 ~ 26 weeks
Luxembourg 2000	Gauthier & Bortnik 2001, Moss & Deven 1999	Legislation introduced in 1998 entitles each parent to 6 months of full time leave or up to 12 months of part time leave.	6 months x 4.3 = 25.8 ~ 26 weeks
Netherlands 1999	ILO 1994, Moss & Deven 1999	Workers are entitled to work reduced hours (but at least 20 hours a week) for a maximum uninterrupted period of 6 months until the child is four years old. Since this leave cannot be taken full-time, this scheme is not recorded.	
Poland 2004	Balcerzak-Paradowska et al 2003, Pascall & Kwak 2005	Child raising leave may be taken for up to 36 months in order to care for a second child up to age four. For the first child, the length of the leave is 24 months. It may be extended for another 36 months if the child is impaired or chronically ill and requires care, but for no longer than the child's 18th birthday. Guarantees of job retention are extended to all recipients of this leave.	36 months x 4.3 = 154.8 ~ 155 weeks
Russian Federation 2000	Teplova 2007	Parental leave until the child is 36 months old.	36 months x 4.3 = 154.8 - 10 weeks of post-natal maternity leave = 145 weeks

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Slovak Republic 1992	Kocourková 2002	The leave is available till the child's 3rd birthday	36 months x 4.3 = 154.8 – 28 weeks of maternity leave = 126.8 ~ 127 weeks
Spain 2000	Kamerman 2005	Since 1994 there is a right to a parental leave until the child is 3 years of age.	3 years or 154.8 weeks – 16 weeks of maternity leave = 138.8 ~ 139 weeks
Sweden 2000	Näsman 1999, Gauthier & Bortnik 2001, Government Offices of Sweden 2008, Evertsson & Duvander forthcoming	Each parent has 30 days of paid parental leave that cannot be transferred. One parent can take a maximum of 420 days; the family is entitled to a total of 450 days with some form of benefit. These days can be taken until the child is eight years old. Note: Parents are entitled to full-time leave of absence until the child is 18 months old independent of the parental leave benefit entitlement, and furthermore during the period when the parent receives full parental benefit under Chapter 4 of the National Insurance Act (1962:381). If a parent is willing to accept lower benefit levels (e.g. taking 5 benefit days per week instead of 7), the period of paid leave can be stretched out. We report 18 months of leave in our parental/childcare leave measure.	18 months * 4.3 = 77.4 ~ 77 weeks
Switzerland 1992		No parental leave scheme available.	
United Kingdom 1999	Gauthier & Bortnik 2001	No parental leave scheme available. Note: Legislation introduced in 1999 entitles both parents (birth and adoptive) of babies born after December 15th 1999 to an individual unpaid leave of 13 weeks in addition to maternity leave. Leave must be taken before child is five years of age.	
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) entitles either parent to an unpaid leave of 12 weeks.	

## References

- Balcerzak-Paradowska, Bożena, Agnieszka Chłoń-Domińczak, Irena E. Kotowska, Anna Olejniczuk-Merta, Irena Topińska, and Irena Wóycicka. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 187-114 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 1996. "Workplace Relations Act 1996."
- Ellingsæter, Anne Lise and Arnlaug Leira. 2006. "Introduction: Politicising Parenthood in Scandinavia." Pp. 1-24 in *Politicising Parenthood in Scandinavia. Gender Relations in Welfare States*, edited by A. L. Ellingsæter and A. Leira. Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Fagnani, Jeanne. 1999. "Parental Leave in France." Pp. 69-83 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Gauthier, Anne H. and Anita Bortnik. 2001, "Documentation Related to: Comparative Maternity, Parental, and Childcare Database. Preliminary version 2 (February 2001)", Retrieved 05/22, 2006 ([www.soci.ualgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation\\_Maternity\\_database\\_v2.doc](http://www.soci.ualgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation_Maternity_database_v2.doc)).
- Goldberg, Menachem and Frances Raday. 1995. "Topics in Israeli Labour Law." The Harry and Michael Sacher Institute for Legislative Research and Comparative Law, Jerusalem.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Government Offices of Sweden. 2008. "Parental Leave Act 1995:584. Non-official translation." Ministry of Employment.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). serial, "Social Security Worldwide (SSW)", Retrieved 06/15/2006, (<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm>).
- Kammerman, Sheila B. 2005, "The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies", Retrieved 06/10/2006, (<http://www.childpolicy.org/>).
- Kocourková, Jiřina. 2002. "Leave arrangements and childcare services in Central Europe: policies and practices before and after the transition." *Community, Work & Family* 5:301-318.
- Marshall, Katherine. 2003. "Benefiting from extended parental leave." *Perspectives on Labour and Income* 4.
- Mercer Human Resource Consulting. 2003. *Worldwide Benefit & Employment Guidelines*, Edited by A. Nasir. Geneva: Mercer Human Resource Consulting SA.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 1999. "Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?" in *Research and Policy Issues in Europe*, vol. 35. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 1995. "OECD Employment Outlook 1995 Chapter 5: Long-term Leave for Parents in OECD Countries." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.
- Österreichisches Bundesministerium für Umwelt Jugend und Familie. 1999. "Österreichischer Familienbericht." Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Jugend und Familie.
- Pascall, Gillian and Anna Kwak. 2005. *Gender Regimes in Transition in Central and Eastern Europe*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Pettinger, Rudolf. 1999. "Parental Leave in Germany." Pp. 123-140 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Salmi, Minna and Johanna Lammi-Tskula. 1999. "Parental Leave in Finland." Pp. 85-121 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Teplova, Tatyana. 2007. "Welfare State Transformation, Childcare, and Women's Work in Russia." *Social Politics* 14:284-322.

#### 4 Parental Leave Benefit Available to Women

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	OECD 2005	Unpaid leave (national statutory regulation).	
Austria 2000	Thenner 1999	Parents on parental leave receive a flat-rate benefit of 410 EUR per month. This is equivalent to 35% of female net median income (Thenner 1999).	
Belgium 2000	Deven & Nuelant 1999	Parents receive a flat rate benefit of BEF 20,400 per month. This is equivalent to about 30% of women's median income.	$20,400 * 100 / 69,183 = 29.5$ Note: In 1999, women's median earnings were EUR 1715 (Statistics Belgium), this corresponds to BEF69,183, using the annual exchange rate (OECD).
Canada 2000	Gornick and Meyers 2003	Parents receive 55% of previous average insured earnings up to a maximum of CA\$413 (US\$350) per week.	
Czech Republic 1996	Gauthier 1998	Since October 1, 1995 the value of the benefit for parents is defined as the subsistence level times 1.1 for the personal needs of the caring parent. Due to lack of data for 1994, 1996 data is used to calculate the parental leave benefit measure. The parental benefit was CZK 1,989 per month as of 01/01/1996. This represents approx. 24% of women's median wage in 1996. (Value as of 1.10.1995: 1,848 CZK).	$1,989 * 100 / 8,400 = 23.67$ Note: women's median wage in 1996: CZK 8,400 (Czech Statistical Office).
Finland 2000	Salmi & Lammi-Tskula 1999	The wage replacement rate during the 26 weeks of parental leave varies according to the level of previous earnings, from 43% to 82% - the higher the previous earnings, the lower the percentage. The average rate is 66%. Note: During home care leave, parents can receive an allowance paid by the state of FIM 1,500 per month for the 1st child, plus an additional FIM 500 for each child under 3 years old, and a further addition of FIM 300 for each child older than 3 years but under school age (a family with one child aged 0-2 and another aged 3-6 receives FIM 1,800). Home care allowance can only be received if the child under 3 years of age is not attending a local authority child care service. But parents drawing this allowance can be working, if they use private child care arrangements such as a relative or nanny.	$(66 * 26 \text{ weeks} + 18 * 116.3 \text{ weeks}) / 142.3 \text{ weeks} = 26.7 \sim 27$ . Note: women's monthly median earnings in 1998: FIM10,154; flat-rate benefit of FIM1,800 corresponds to 18% of women's median earnings $(1,800 / 10,154 * 100)$ (Source: OECD)

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
France 2000	Fagnani 1999	Parents with at least 2 children can receive the parental leave benefit (Allocation Parentale d'Education) of FF3,045 a month. This corresponds 37% of the women's median wage in 1998.	$3,045 * 100 / 8,271 = 36.8$ Note: women's monthly median earnings in 1998: FF8,271 (Source: OECD)
Germany 2000	Pettinger 1999	For the first 2 years of a child's life, all families are entitled to a benefit payment if the annual family income is below DM100,000 in a 2 parent family or below DM75,000 in a lone parent family during the child's first 6 months, after which the upper income limit is much lower (e.g. DM29,400 for a family with one child). The maximum payment is DM600 a month, which corresponds to 14% of the women's median wage.	$600 * 100 / 4,159 = 14.4$ Note: women's monthly median earnings in 1998: DM4,159 (Source: OECD)
Hungary 1999	Lukács & Frey 2003	There are two kinds of benefits for women who fulfill the employment requirement (180 days in the two years before the birth) during parental leave. The <i>child care fee</i> , which was introduced in the mid-1980s, provides 70% of former earnings for a parent who cares for a child under the age of two at home (between 1996 and 2000 the <i>child care fee</i> did not exist and the flat rate child care allowance was an income-tested social transfer). Subsequently, <i>the child care allowance</i> provides a flat-rate monthly amount which is equal to the minimum old age pension to parents who care for a child up to the age of three years in the home (prior to 1996 for the 1st child: HUF700/month, the second, HUF800/month, and the third and additional children, HUF900/month plus a flat-rate supplementary amount for each claimant. This supplement was raised year after year, so finally there was no significant difference in the amounts received if one cared for one or two children). Benefits in place prior to 1996 were recorded: The flat-rate child care allowance was HUF8,500 in 1995.	84 weeks (2 years - 20 weeks of post-natal maternity leave) at 70% of prior earnings and 52 weeks at a flat-rate benefit of: $8,500 * 100 / 30,900 = 28.3\%$ $(84 * 70 + 52 * 28) / 136 = 53.9\%$ Note: women's monthly median earnings in 1995: HUF30,000 (Source: OECD)
Ireland 2000		No parental leave scheme available.	
Israel 2001	Kamerman 2005	No benefits available	
Italy 2000	Bettio & Prechal 1998	30% replacement rate	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Luxembourg 2000	Moss & Deven 1999, Gornick & Meyers 2003	One parent can opt for a flat-rate benefit payment of LF 60,000 per month (net of tax) for 6 months of full-time leave, with a guarantee of re-employment (parental leave can be paid to one parent); or she/he can opt to receive a flat-rate benefit payment paid over 22 months at LF 16,640 per month, but without guarantee of re-employment (i.e. not tied to parental leave). One parent must take parental leave directly following maternity leave; the other can take leave until child is five years old.	$60,000 * 100 / 67,500 = 88.90 \sim 89\%$ Note: median earnings calculated from LIS 2000 data: median net annual earnings of full-time employed women: LUF814,000, monthly: $810,000 / 12 = 67,500$
Netherlands 1999	ILO 1994	There are no cash benefits for hours not worked during parental leave. However, the minimum guaranteed income ( <i>Sociale Bijstand</i> ) may be paid to mother or single parents whose income is lower than the subsistence income level without them having to seek work until their child reaches 1 years of age. For public servants hours not worked are compensated at the rate of 75% of the normal salary.	
Poland 2004	Balcerzak-Paradowska et al 2003	The benefits are means-tested. The child raising allowance is paid to a person who is on child raising leave and lives in a two-parent household in which per capita income does not exceed PLN 548 a month (US\$133 as of 01/01/01) (the social minimum income in 2001). A single parent may receive the allowance if household per capita income does not exceed PLN 612. The allowance is generally paid over a period of 24 months (36 months for a single parent raising a child and for a person caring for more than one child born at a single birth). In 2001, the child raising allowance amounted to approximately 60 percent of the net minimum wage. A single parent raising a child and persons raising a third or subsequent child are entitled to a higher allowance. Both parents have equal rights to child raising leave and allowance.	recorded as zero
Russian Federation 2000	Teplova & Woolley 2005	While on leave, a parent receives a leave payment of 500 roubles (about \$17) per month until the child reaches 1.5 years (i.e. 18 months - 2.3 months maternity leave = 15.7 months) and 50 roubles (about \$1.7) per month while the child is between 1.5 to 3 years old (i.e. for a period of 18 months). This corresponds to about 25% of women's median earnings.	$(15.7 * 500 + 18 * 50) / 33.7 = 260$ ; $260 * 100 / 1028 = 25.3$ Note: median earnings calculated from LIS data: median net monthly earnings of full-time employed women in 2001 was R1027.75



Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Slovak Republic 1992	Gauthier 1998	The parental benefit of CZK900 per month represents around 30% of female wages in manufacturing as of 1991 (up until 1993, cf. Czechoslovakia).	$900 * 100 / 3266.67 = 27.55$ Note: median earnings calculated from LIS data: median gross earnings of full-time employed women in 1992 SK39,200, monthly median earnings: $SK39,200 / 12 = 3,266.67$
Spain 2000	Bettio & Prechal 1998	No benefit available.	
Sweden 2000	Swedish CEDAW Country Report 2000, Evertsson & Duvander 2010, Moss & Deven 1999	As of January 1998 benefit level is 80% of earnings for 360 days and a flat rate of SEK60 for the remaining 90 days (approx. SEK1,800/month) per family. However, one month of the leave is reserved for the father. For the calculation of the benefit available to the mother, we count 330 days paid at 80% of previous earnings and 90 days with the flat-rate benefit. Note: Parents can use benefit days flexibly and prolong the paid period by accepting lower benefit levels. - The earnings-related benefit is subject to maximum income ceiling of approximately SEK270,000 (US\$28,000) per year. Women who did not work at least 6 months immediately preceding the leave, or in total 12 months in the last two years receive the flat-rate benefit (though this is a small percentage of women).	$[(80 * 330 \text{ days}) + (11 * 90 \text{ days})] / 420 = 65$ Note: The flat-rate benefit paid for 90 days is expressed as a percentage of women's median wage in 1998 (Source: OECD) $(16,501 \text{ SEK per month}) : 1800 * 100 / 16501 = 10.9 \sim 11\%$
Switzerland 1992		No parental leave scheme available.	
United Kingdom 1999	Gauthier & Bortnik 2001	No parental leave scheme available.	
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory benefit available.	

## References

- Balcerzak-Paradowska, Bożena, Agnieszka Chłoń-Domińczak, Irena E. Kotowska, Anna Olejniczuk-Merta, Irena Topińska, and Irena Wóycicka. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 187-114 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Bettio, Francesca and Silvana Prechal. 1998. "Care in Europe. Joint Report of the "Gender and Employment" and "Gender and Law" Groups of Experts." European Commission.
- Deven, Fred and Tanja Nuelant. 1999. "Parental leave and career breaks in Belgium." Pp. 141-154 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Evertsson, Marie and Ann-Zofie Duvander. forthcoming. "Parental Leave— Possibility or Trap? Does Family Leave Length Effect Swedish Women's Labour Market Opportunities?" *European Sociological Review*.
- Fagnani, Jeanne. 1999. "Parental Leave in France." Pp. 69-83 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Gauthier, Anne H. 1998. "Support for Child Allowances and Parental Leave." Pp. 218-239 in *Population, Family, and Welfare: A Comparative Survey of European Attitudes*, edited by R. Palomba and H. Moors. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gauthier, Anne H. and Anita Bortnik. 2001, "Documentation Related to: Comparative Maternity, Parental, and Childcare Database. Preliminary version 2 (February 2001)", Retrieved 05/22, 2006 ([www.soci.ucalgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation\\_Maternity\\_database\\_v2.doc](http://www.soci.ucalgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation_Maternity_database_v2.doc)).
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Kamerman, Sheila B. 2005, "The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies", Retrieved 06/10/2006, (<http://www.childpolicy.org/>).
- Lukács, Erika and Mária Frey. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 43-108 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 1999. "Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?" in *Research and Policy Issues in Europe*, vol. 35. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 2005. "Extending Opportunities How Active Social Policy Can Benefit Us All: Giving Children and Parents a Brighter Future." Pp. 65-118.
- Pettinger, Rudolf. 1999. "Parental Leave in Germany." Pp. 123-140 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Salmi, Minna and Johanna Lammi-Tskula. 1999. "Parental Leave in Finland." Pp. 85-121 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Swedish CEDAW Country Report. 2000. "Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Fifth Periodic Report of State Parties - Sweden." United Nations, New York.
- Teplova, Tatyana and Frances Woolley. 2005. "Balancing Work and Care in the Post-Soviet Russian Labor Market." Ottawa, Canada: School of Public Policy and Administration & Department of Economics, Carleton University.
- Thenner, Monika. 1999. "Parental Leave in Austria." Pp. 155-171 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.

## 5 Maximum Leave Available to Women (Maternity and Parental Leave) in Weeks

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Mercer Human Resource Consulting 2003, Commonwealth of Australia 1996		
Austria 2000	Österr. Bundesmin. für Umwelt, Jugend und Familie 1999, European Commission 1998	Parental leave until the child is 18 months old plus 8 weeks of compulsory pre-natal maternity leave.	$18 \times 4.3 = 77.4$ weeks + 8 weeks = 85.4 weeks
Belgium 2000	Deven and Nuelant 1999	15 weeks of maternity leave plus 3 months of parental leave	15 weeks + $3 \times 4.3 = 27.9$
Canada 2000	OECD 1995, Gauthier and Bortnik 2001	15 weeks of maternity leave plus 10 weeks of parental leave	$15 + 10 = 25$ weeks
Czech Republic 1996	Kocourková 2002	Parental leave is available till the child's 3rd birthday plus 6 weeks of pre-natal maternity leave.	6 weeks prior to birth + 156 weeks after birth = 162 weeks
Finland 2000	Salmi & Lammi-Tskula 1999	5 weeks of maternity leave before birth, parental and home care leave until the child is 3 years old	5 weeks prior to birth + 156 weeks after birth = 161 weeks
France 2000	Fagnani 1999	Parental leave until the child's third birth day plus 4 weeks of compulsory pre-natal maternity leave.	$36 \text{ months} \times 4.3 + 4 = 158.8$
Germany 2000	Pettinger 1999	Parental leave until the child's third birth day plus 6 weeks of compulsory pre-natal maternity leave.	$36 \text{ months} \times 4.3 + 6 = 160.8$
Hungary 1999	Lukács & Frey 2003	Parental leave until the child's third birth day plus 4 weeks of compulsory pre-natal maternity leave.	$36 \text{ months} \times 4.3 + 4 = 158.8$
Ireland 2000	Bettio & Prechal 1998	14 weeks of maternity leave, no parental leave.	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Israel 2001	ISSA serial, ILO 1994, Goldberg & Raday 1995	52 weeks of parental leave (maximum) plus 12 weeks of maternity leave	$52 + 12 = 64$
Italy 2000	ISSA serial, ILO 1994, Bettio & Prechal 1998	6 months of optional maternity leave after compulsory maternity leave at any time up to her child's 1st birthday plus 5 months of maternity leave	$26 + 21.5 = 47.5$
Luxembourg 2000	ILO 1994	16 weeks of maternity leave plus 6 months of parental leave	$16 + 26 = 42$ weeks
Netherlands 1999	Moss & Deven 1999	16 weeks of maternity leave, no full-time parental leave scheme	
Poland 2004	Balcerzak-Paradowska et al 2003, European Commission 2002	36 months of parental leave to care for a child up to age 4 plus 18 weeks of maternity leave for mothers of two children.	$154.8 + 18 = 172.8$ ~ 173 weeks
Russian Federation 2000	Teplova 2007, The MONEE Project 1999	Parental leave until the child's third birth day plus 10 weeks of pre-natal maternity leave	$154.8 + 10 = 164.8$
Slovak Republic 1992	Slovak CEDAW Country Report 1996, Kotýnková, Kuchařová, and Průša 2003	Parental leave until the child's third birth day plus 6 weeks of compulsory pre-natal maternity leave.	$36 \text{ months} * 4.3 + 6 = 160.8$
Spain 2000	Moss & Deven 1999, ISSA serial, Kamerman 2005	Parental leave until the child's third birth day plus 6 weeks of compulsory pre-natal maternity leave.	$36 \text{ months} * 4.3 + 6 = 160.8$
Sweden 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	One parent can take a maximum of 420 days with some kind of benefit.	
Switzerland 1992	ILO 1994	3 weeks of paid leave in the case of pregnancy/child birth	
United Kingdom 1999	ILO 1994, ISSA serial	18 weeks maternity leave	
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	12 weeks of unpaid leave (1993 Family and Medical Leave Act)	

## References

- Balcerzak-Paradowska, Bożena, Agnieszka Chłoń-Domińczak, Irena E. Kotowska, Anna Olejniczuk-Merta, Irena Topińska, and Irena Wóycicka. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 187-114 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Bettio, Francesca and Silvana Prechal. 1998. "Care in Europe. Joint Report of the "Gender and Employment" and "Gender and Law" Groups of Experts." European Commission.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 1996. "Workplace Relations Act 1996."
- Deven, Fred and Tanja Nuelant. 1999. "Parental leave and career breaks in Belgium." Pp. 141-154 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- European Commission. 1998. "Care in Europe: Joint Report of the "Gender and Employment" and the "Gender and Law" Groups of Experts."
- . 2002, "MISSCEEC II: Mutual Information System on Social Protection in the Central and Eastern European Countries Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic and Slovenia ", Retrieved
- Fagnani, Jeanne. 1999. "Parental Leave in France." Pp. 69-83 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Gauthier, Anne H. and Anita Bortnik. 2001, "Documentation Related to: Comparative Maternity, Parental, and Childcare Database. Preliminary version 2 (February 2001)", Retrieved 05/22, 2006 ([www.soci.ualgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation\\_Maternity\\_database\\_v2.doc](http://www.soci.ualgary.ca/FYPP/images/DOCUMENTS/Documentation_Maternity_database_v2.doc)).
- Goldberg, Menachem and Frances Raday. 1995. "Topics in Israeli Labour Law." The Harry and Michael Sacher Institute for Legislative Research and Comparative Law, Jerusalem.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). serial, "Social Security Worldwide (SSW)", Retrieved 06/15/2006, (<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm>).
- Kamerman, Sheila B. 2005, "The Clearinghouse on International Developments in Child, Youth and Family Policies", Retrieved 06/10/2006, (<http://www.childpolicy.org/>).
- Kocourková, Jiřina. 2002. "Leave arrangements and childcare services in Central Europe: policies and practices before and after the transition." *Community, Work & Family* 5:301-318.
- Kotýnková, Magdalena, Věra Kuchařová, and Ladislav Průša. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in the Czech Republic." Pp. 109-185 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Lukács, Erika and Mária Frey. 2003. "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary." Pp. 43-108 in *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, edited by E. Fultz, M. Ruck, and S. Steinhilber. Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Mercer Human Resource Consulting. 2003. *Worldwide Benefit & Employment Guidelines*, Edited by A. Nasir. Geneva: Mercer Human Resource Consulting SA.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 1999. "Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?" in *Research and Policy Issues in Europe*, vol. 35. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 1995. "OECD Employment Outlook 1995 Chapter 5: Long-term Leave for Parents in OECD Countries." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.
- Österreichisches Bundesministerium für Umwelt Jugend und Familie. 1999. "Österreichischer Familienbericht." Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Jugend und Familie.
- Pettinger, Rudolf. 1999. "Parental Leave in Germany." Pp. 123-140 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Salmi, Minna and Johanna Lammi-Tskula. 1999. "Parental Leave in Finland." Pp. 85-121 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Slovak CEDAW Country Report. 1996. "Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Initial Report of State Parties - Slovakia." United Nations, New York.
- Teplova, Tatyana. 2007. "Welfare State Transformation, Childcare, and Women's Work in Russia." *Social Politics* 14:284-322.
- The MONEE Project. 1999. "Women in Transition." UNICEF International Child Development Centre, Florence, Italy.

## 6 Paid Paternity Leave Available to Men (Birth-related Leave)

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Commonwealth of Australia 1996	Fathers are entitled to take one week of unpaid "short paternity leave" at the time of the birth at the same time as the mother (the rest of parental leave cannot be taken at the same time). Eligibility: One year of service with the employer.	
Austria 2000	Deven & Moss 2005	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Belgium 2000	ILO 1994	3 days chosen by the father, within the 12 days after the date of the birth of a child of whom the worker has been legally recognized as the father (paid by the employer). In the public service, 4 paid working days. If the father works part-time, leave is reduced proportionately. These days are counted as full service.	3 days/5=0.6 weeks
Canada 2000	Deven & Moss 2002	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Czech Republic 1996	Moss & O'Brien 2005	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Finland 2000	Salmi & Lammi-Tskula 1999, ILO 1994	Fathers are entitled to take 6 to 12 days of leave at any time during the maternity leave period (this period is deducted from parental leave, ILO 1994). Moreover, since 1991 fathers have an extra 6 days paternity leave (not counted as part of the parental leave period), which can be taken during either the maternity or parental leave periods and at the same time as the mother is on leave; it can also be taken on a day by day basis.	
France 2000	Bauer & Penet 2005	Father can take 3 days of leave at the time of the birth (regulated in the Labor Code). Since January 2002, fathers are entitled to an additional 11 days (18 days for multiple births) including Saturday and Sunday.	3 days/5=0.6 weeks
Germany 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Hungary 1999	Moss & Deven 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Ireland 2000	Moss & Deven 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Israel 2001	National Insurance Institute of Israel 2010, Halperin-Kaddari 2004	The amendment in 1997 to the Employment of Women Law allows the couple (defined in this law as a married couple only) to decide who takes the second half of the maternity leave, but no less than 21 consecutive days. Eligibility: Insurance contributions were paid from his salary as a salaried employee, or he made insurance contributions from his income as a self-employed worker for 10 out of the 14 months or 15 out of the 22 months that preceded the day he stops working due to the start of paternity leave. The partner's written consent is required. Take-up: From 1997 through 2000 the percentage of requests by men remained around one third of a percent of all requests for maternity/paternity leave.	
Italy 2000	Moss & Deven 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Luxembourg 2000	Grand-Duché de Luxembourg 1979	Two days at the time of birth.	2 days/5=0.4
Netherlands 1999	Rostgaard & Fridberg 1998	No statutory paternity leave scheme, but an emergency leave ( <i>Calamiteitenverlof</i> ) offers short-term leave (must be negotiated with employer).	
Poland 2004	Rostgaard 2004	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Russian Federation 2000	Rostgaard 2004	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Slovak Republic 1992	Rostgaard 2004	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Spain 2000	ILO 1994, Valiente 1996, Spanish CEDAW Country Report 1996	Two days at the birth of a child, paid by the employer. Since 1989, if both parents perform waged work, the father may take up to four of the final weeks of the leave (in this case the mother must return to work). This portion of the leave was increased to 10 weeks in 1999. Take-up: In the mid-1990s, the percentage of requests for maternity/paternity leave by men was below 0.5%.	2 days/5=0.4 weeks
Sweden 2000	Haas & Hwang 1999	10 days of the 'temporary parental leave' can be taken within the first 2 months (60 days) after childbirth or adoption by fathers. These "daddy days" ( <i>pappadagar</i> ) are intended to enable fathers to spend time with the family or care for children while mothers are in hospital following childbirth.	
Switzerland 1992	Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit 2007	No statutory paternity leave scheme. The Civil Code (Obligationenrecht Art. 329) entitles private sector employees to some time off which includes time off around the birth of a child.	
United Kingdom 1999	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory paternity leave scheme. In 2003, fathers became entitled to 2 weeks of paternity leave, paid at the same rate as maternity pay.	

---

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	

---



## References

- Bauer, Denise and Sophie Penet. 2005. "Le congé de paternité." Pp. 1-12 in *Etudes et Résultats*, vol. 442, edited by DREES: Ministère de l'Emploi, de la cohésion sociale et du logement, ministère de la Santé et des solidarités.
- Bettio, Francesca and Silvana Prechal. 1998. "Care in Europe. Joint Report of the "Gender and Employment" and "Gender and Law" Groups of Experts." European Commission.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 1996. "Workplace Relations Act 1996."
- Deven, Fred and Peter Moss. 2002. "Leave Arrangements for Parents: Overview and Future Outlook." *Community, Work & Family* 5:237.254.
- . 2005. "Leave Policies and Research. Reviews and Country Notes."
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. 1979. "Recueil de législation." *Memorial. Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg* 77.
- Haas, Linda and Philip Hwang. 1999. "Parental Leave in Sweden." Pp. 45-68 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Halperin-Kaddari, Ruth. 2004. *Women in Israel: a state of their own*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). serial, "Social Security Worldwide (SSW)", Retrieved 06/15/2006, (<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm>).
- Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit. 2007. "Bericht der Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit vom 8. November 2007 - Motion Nationalrat (Nordmann). Vaterschaftsurlaub." Ständerat, Bern.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 2006. "Leave Policies and Research: A Cross-National Overview." *Marriage & Family Review* 39:255-285.
- Moss, Peter and Margaret O'Brien. 2005. "International Review of Leave Policies and Related Research 2006." Department of Trade and Industry, London.
- . 2006. "International Review of Leave Policies and Related Research 2006." Department of Trade and Industry, London.
- Näsman, Elisabet. 1999. "Work-Family Arrangements in Sweden: Family Strategies." Pp. 131-149 in *Work-Family Arrangements in Europe*, edited by L. den Dulk, A. von Doorne-Huiskes, and J. Schippers. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- National Insurance Institute of Israel. 2010. "Maternity Allowance - Paternity allowance for the father", Retrieved 09/21/2010, (<http://www.btl.gov.il/English%20Homepage/Benefits/Maternity%20Insurance/Maternity%20Allowance/Pages/Paternity.aspx>).
- Rostgaard, Tine. 2004. "Family Support Policy in Central and Eastern Europe - A Decade and a Half of Transition, Early Childhood and Family Policy Series No. 8." UNESCO, Copenhagen.
- Rostgaard, Tine and Torben Fridberg. 1998. *Caring for Children and Older People - A Comparison of European Policies and Practices*. Copenhagen: The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Salmi, Minna and Johanna Lammi-Tskula. 1999. "Parental Leave in Finland." Pp. 85-121 in *Parental Leave: Progress or Pitfall?*, vol. 35, edited by P. Moss and F. Deven. The Hague/Brussels: NIDI/CBGS Publications.
- Spanish CEDAW Country Report. 1996. "Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Third Periodic Report of State Parties - Spain." United Nations, New York.
- Valiente, Celia. 1996. "Changing Gender Roles and Family - Employment Strategies in Spain." in *Comparing Families and Family Policies in Europe*, edited by L. Hantrais and M.-T. Letablier. Leicestershire: The Cross-National Research Group, European Research Centre, Loughborough University.

## 7 Benefit Available to Men During Paternity Leave

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Commonwealth of Australia 1996	No statutory paid paternity leave scheme.	
Austria 2000	Deven & Moss 2005	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Belgium 2000	ILO 1994	100% of earnings paid by the employer.	
Canada 2000	Deven & Moss 2002	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Czech Republic 1996	Moss & O'Brien 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Finland 2000	Bettio & Prechal 1998	During the leave fathers receive parenthood allowance. The replacement rate is about 66%. The amount of allowance depends on the earned income of the recipient as assessed by the taxation authorities. Persons with no previous earnings are also entitled to a basic allowance.	
France 2000	Bauer & Penet 2005	3 days paid at 100% by the employer. Note: Since 2002, fathers receive an allowance during the additional 11 days of paternity leave paid by Caisse Nationale des Allocations Familiales (CNAF).	
Germany 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Hungary 1999	Moss & Deven 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Ireland 2000	Moss & Deven 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Israel 2001	ISSA serial	The husband of a woman who has given birth and is entitled to maternity allowance, may replace her in her maternity leave and receive maternity allowance instead of her.	
Italy 2000	Moss & Deven 2006	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Luxembourg 2000	Grand-Duché de Luxembourg 1979	100% of earnings paid by the employer.	
Netherlands 1999	Rostgaard & Fridberg 1998	No statutory paternity leave scheme. Wage replacement during <i>Calamiteitenverlof</i> must be negotiated with employer.	
Poland 2004	Rostgaard 2004	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Russian Federation 2000	Rostgaard 2004	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
Slovak Republic 1992	Rostgaard 2004	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	

<b>Country &amp; LIS Wave Year</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Calculations</b>
Spain 2000	ILO 1994, Valiente 1996	2 days paid by the employer; wage replacement for the 4 weeks of maternity leave by Social Security system: 100% up to an earnings ceiling.	
Sweden 2000	Näsman 1999, Gornick & Meyers 2003	80% of earnings.	
Switzerland 1992	Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit 2007	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
United Kingdom 1999	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	No statutory paternity leave scheme.	

## References

- Bauer, Denise and Sophie Penet. 2005. "Le congé de paternité." Pp. 1-12 in *Etudes et Résultats*, vol. 442, edited by DREES: Ministère de l'Emploi, de la cohésion sociale et du logement, ministère de la Santé et des solidarités.
- Bettio, Francesca and Silvana Prechal. 1998. "Care in Europe. Joint Report of the "Gender and Employment" and "Gender and Law" Groups of Experts." European Commission.
- Commonwealth of Australia. 1996. "Workplace Relations Act 1996."
- Deven, Fred and Peter Moss. 2002. "Leave Arrangements for Parents: Overview and Future Outlook." *Community, Work & Family* 5:237.254.
- . 2005. "Leave Policies and Research. Reviews and Country Notes. CBGS - Werkdocument 3." Pp. 170.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. 1979. "Recueil de législation." *Memorial. Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg* 77.
- International Labour Organization. 1994. "Maternity and Work: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 13: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- International Social Security Association (ISSA). serial, "Social Security Worldwide (SSW)", Retrieved 06/15/2006, (<http://www.issa.int/engl/homef.htm>).
- Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit. 2007. "Bericht der Kommission für soziale Sicherheit und Gesundheit vom 8. November 2007 - Motion Nationalrat (Nordmann). Vaterschaftsurlaub." Ständerat, Bern.
- Moss, Peter and Fred Deven. 2006. "Leave Policies and Research: A Cross-National Overview." *Marriage & Family Review* 39:255-285.
- Moss, Peter and Margaret O'Brien. 2006. "International Review of Leave Policies and Related Research 2006." Department of Trade and Industry, London.
- Näsman, Elisabet. 1999. "Work-Family Arrangements in Sweden: Family Strategies." Pp. 131-149 in *Work-Family Arrangements in Europe*, edited by L. den Dulk, A. von Doorne-Huiskes, and J. Schippers. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Rostgaard, Tine. 2004. "Family Support Policy in Central and Eastern Europe - A Decade and a Half of Transition, Early Childhood and Family Policy Series No. 8." UNESCO, Copenhagen.
- Rostgaard, Tine and Torben Fridberg. 1998. *Caring for Children and Older People - A Comparison of European Policies and Practices*. Copenhagen: The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Valiente, Celia. 1996. "Changing Gender Roles and Family - Employment Strategies in Spain." in *Comparing Families and Family Policies in Europe*, edited by L. Hantrais and M.-T. Letablier. Leicestershire: The Cross-National Research Group, European Research Centre, Loughborough University..

## 8 Enrollment of 0, 1, and 2 Year Old Children in Publicly Supported Formal Childcare

*Note: The first mentioned source is the source of the enrollment data.*

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Australian Bureau of Statistics 2002, Press & Hayes 2000, OECD 2010	2002	Estimate of children aged 0-2 years in formal childcare (by authors). For Australia, it is hard to parcel out publicly supported provision, since financing heavily relies on demand-side subsidies to parents but also supply-side subsidies. Press & Hayes (2000) note: "The provision of ECEC facilities occurs through a mixture of public, non-government not-for-profit, private for-profit, and private not-for-profit organizations. Most centre-based long day care is provided by the private sector (73%), although most other ECEC services are provided by State Governments, local government and the non-profit sector." A decade later, an OECD (2010) report notes that 75% of the early childcare provision is run by for-profit organizations and the rest by public or non-profit. For-profit providers can be publicly supported through demand-side subsidies to parents (OECD 2010). -- Formal day care includes: before/after school care, long day care centers, family day care, occasional care centers, preschools, other formal care (Childcare Australia 2002). Data collected from users, supplement to Labor Force Survey.	Making a rough estimate, subtracting 70% of children who attend long day care centers from all children who use formal care. Ages 0, 1, 2 - Note: This assumes that children are evenly enrolled across for-profit and public/non-profit long day care providers.
Austria 2000	Statistik Austria 2001, country expert	2000	Enrollment of 0-2 year olds in formal childcare. Since the providers from which Statistik Austria is collecting the data are those who fulfill certain criteria, they virtually all receive some form of public funding. Since the data is collected from providers, there may be some children who are counted twice if they are enrolled in two different facilities. However, according to Statistics Austria, the number of children for which this problem occurs should be marginal.	Children 0-2: includes children born between September 1997 and October 2000, data collection: October 15th, 2000
Belgium 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	ca. 2000	Children between the ages of 3 and 30 months enrolled in publicly supported care; 30% of the age group are in care but only 20% in subsidized care; from age 30 months and older 85% of children are in subsidized care, so the estimate of 20% (for children aged 3 months to 2.5 years) is likely underestimating the coverage for all under 3 year olds.	

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Canada 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	ca. 1998	Children aged 1 and 2 enrolled in publicly supported childcare; only few children under the age of 1 are in publicly supported care, the coverage for the whole age group of under 3 year olds may be lower.	
Czech Republic 1996	Kocourková 2002, OECD 2001	1997	Children aged 0-2 enrolled in nurseries as a percentage of the age group. The number of public crèches covering about 20% of children in 1989 has fallen to 67 crèches under the auspices of the Ministry of Health, covering about 1,900 children in 2000 (i.e. 0.7 percent of 0-2 year old children) (OECD 2001).	
Finland 2000	NOSOSCO 2009, Eurostat 2004, OECD 2001	2000	Care and early education is almost entirely funded through tax levied by the State and local authorities. Income related fees are charged for days care services. Fees may be adjusted for part-time care and are usually cared for 11 months of the year, which means that the family's month of holiday is free of charge, even if day-care is available year-round. Since 1990, children under three years of age have the right to a place in municipal day care. Private care accounts for about 5% of day-care services.	The raw numbers taken from NOSOSCO (2009) converted into percentages using population data from Eurostat.
France 2000	Leprince 2003	2001	Children younger than 3 years of age in publicly funded pre-schools (2-3 year olds) and crèches (this figure excludes children cared for by an <i>assistante maternelle</i> (registered child minder) which are also publicly supported. Information on child care services in France is not easily accessible. Data is collected by the different government agencies responsible for the oversight of different types of care services or educational institutions. Leprince (2003) consolidates statistical information from the Bulletin mensuel de statistiques published by the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) (January 2001), the Direction de la Recherche, des Études, de l'Évaluation et des Statistiques (DREES) and the Caisse nationale des Allocations familiales.	There are an estimated 203,000 places in crèches. On average each of these places is used by 1.2 children, i.e. an estimated 243,600 children are cared for in crèches.
Germany 2000	Kreyenfeld 2008	2000	Children aged 0, 1, and 2 in crèches ( <i>Kinderkrippe</i> ) and kindergarten or <i>Hort</i> (usually for school-aged children, but some are mixed age) as a percentage of the age group.	Using Kreyenfeld's estimates for single age groups based on the German Microcensus and population data from the Statistisches Bundesamt, enrollment rates were recalculated for 0-2 year olds.

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Hungary 1999	Hungarian Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor 2004, Korintus 2008	1999/2000	Children enrolled in nurseries ( <i>bölcsőde</i> ) as a percentage of the 0-2 year olds age group (Ministry of Employment and Labor 2004). The overwhelming majority of nurseries are publicly funded: "The ratio of private (non-profit and for profit) providers is about 5%" (Korintus 2008:47). After 1989, the number of nursery places have dropped by about 60%; the responsibility for service provision for young children was decentralized: both nurseries and kindergartens are under the responsibility of local governments. Only about 15-20% of settlements have nurseries, concentrated in urban areas. The central government finances services through county and local authorities. The main form of non-family care services for children under the age of 3 are nurseries; some children are cared for in family day care, however this form of care is only slowly developing. Usual opening hours are from 6 in the morning to six in the evening, with children receiving four meals a day (Korintus 2008)	
Ireland 2000	Irish Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform (2002)	1999/2000	Number of 0, 1 and 2 year old children enrolled in community based childcare facilities as a percentage of the age group. This figure is based on data from the National Childcare Census 1999/2000, which collected data from group-based childcare providers including day-care facilities and services for pre-school aged children and for school-going children outside of school hours (e.g. pre-schools, day care centers, crèches, playgroups, and after-school groups). This figure excludes privately run facilities that are financed to 96.5% on parental fees, as well as childminders which were not included in the data collection. The Childcare Census data is based on 85% of the childcare facilities (effective response rate). Note that only 17.4% of community based facilities are considered "full-day care services," defined as the "provision of a structured day care service for children for more than 3.5 hours per day" (p. 29, footnote 29).	Figure calculated from data presented in table 4.1.3 on page 43 of the National Childcare Census Report.

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Israel 2001	Central Bureau of Statistics 2002	2000/01	Number of 2 year olds enrolled in municipal and public kindergartens as a percentage of the 2 year old age group. The Central Bureau of Statistics annually publishes data on children in kindergartens (incl. day nurseries) in private and municipal/public facilities for 2, 3, 4 and 5 year olds separate for Hebrew and Arab education. Coverage in the Arab education system is much lower (2.3%) compared to the Hebrew education system (26.2%). Since 0 and 1 year old children are less likely to be enrolled in childcare, this figure probably overestimates the coverage for the 0 to 2 age group.	Based on the Statistical Abstract of Israel 2002 the population proportions of 2 year olds were as follows in 2001: Arab population 29.3%, Jewish and other population 70.6% (other comprises Christians, Druze, and unclassified people which make up 7.1% of the population). The figure was calculated as follows: $2.3 \times 293 + 26.2 \times 706$
Italy 2000	Instituto degli Innocenti 2002, Eurostat 2004, OECD 2001	2000	Number of children enrolled in public crèches ( <i>asili nido</i> ) and integrated educational services as a percentage of the 0 to 2 year old age group. This figure is based on a census of all public day care services in Italy catering to children below age 3 in Italy in September 2000. <i>Asili nido</i> are usually open full day during 10 to 11 months out of the year. - Not included in this figure are places in private services, even though in the year 2000 41.6% of private crèches had access to public funds (Eurostat 2004). The Instituto degli Innocenti (2002) report estimates that about 20% of crèches are run by private bodies.	The number of enrolled children are taken from table 4 (p. 42) and table 11 (p. 63); population data from Eurostat.
Luxembourg 2000	Statec Luxembourg 2003, Le Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg 1998, 1999	2002	Number of places in accredited crèches ( <i>crèches conventionnées</i> ) catering to 0 to 4 year olds as a percentage of the 0 to 4 year old age group. Accredited crèches have to conform to a number of standards relating to adult-child ratios, education of the staff, infrastructure, opening hours, and fees charged to parents. They receive public funds to pay for salaries, infrastructure, and running cost. In accredited crèches, parents pay fees according to their income.	Population data taken from Statec Luxembourg.
Netherlands 1999	SGBO 2002, Ministry of Health, Welfare & Sport 2000, Turksema 2000	1999	Number of 0, 1, 2, and 3 year olds in publicly supported formal day care (estimate). The total enrollment rate for this age group in 1999 was 18.8% Formal childcare coverage in the Netherlands for very young children was one of the lowest in Europe until the 1990s. With a number of Stimulative Measures, the Dutch government supported the creation of day-care centers/school-age child care and childminder coordinating offices. This led to an increase of the enrollment rate of 0 to 4 year olds from 4.6% in 1989 to 22.5% in 2001. The Stimulative	In 1999, 58.7% of the occupied formal day-care capacity was paid for by employers, 14% were fully paid for by parents and 27% were publicly financed (capacity = maximum number of children that can be cared for given the infrastructure and staff at any one point). Based on these figures, the



Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
			Measures included a tri-partite responsibility for childcare: government, employers, and parents. Over the course of the 1990s the share of childcare provision paid for by employers increased to 58% in 2001. - These enrollment figures do not include children in playgroups, which are used by over half of 2-4 year olds. While formal day-care centers are open on average for 10 hours a day (part-time centers are open for 5 hours a day) each weekday, playgroups open for 2.5 to 4 hours a day, on 2 or 3 days a week.	percentage of children aged 0, 1, 2, and 3 years in publicly supported childcare is estimated to be 5%. Population data from Eurostat.
Poland 2004	Central Statistical Office 2005, Plangenga & Remery 2009, Heinen & Wator 2006	2004/05	Number of children in nurseries, and nursery wards up to age 3. Survey data from the EU-SILC (2005, in Plantenga & Remery 2009) that almost all of this provision is full-time, i.e. 30 hours per week or more. Heinen & Wator (2006) note that after 1989 early childhood education and care was decentralized. The responsibility the provision and financing of child care centers fell to the territorial communities. Due to lack of resources, child care centers were either closed, or revenue was increased by raising parental fees. No data on private child care centers available (Heinen & Wator 2006, footnote 36).	
Russian Federation 2000	UNICEF 2011, Teplova 2007	2000/01	Number of children aged 0, 1, and 2 in all types of child care establishments. The data does not distinguish between private and public provision. In the post-soviet period since 1991, the number of childcare place has decreased. The responsibility for childcare was shifted onto families and formal childcare was decentralized (responsibility of municipalities). However, the role of the private sector in formal childcare provision remains marginal (Teplova 2007).	
Slovak Republic 1992	UNICEF 1993	1992	Number of 0, 1 and 2 year olds children enrolled in crèches as a percentage of the age group, data for 1990. The data does not distinguish between public and private provision, however the role of private day care for children was not significant. In the early 1990s, parents paid mainly for meals only.	

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Spain 2000	Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte 1999/2000, Baizan 2009, Valiente 2002, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación y Calidad des Systema Educativo 2004	1999/2000	Number of 0, 1, and 2 year old children enrolled in publicly supported formal child care ( <i>centros públicos</i> and <i>centros privados concertados</i> ) as a percentage of the age group. In the school year 1999/2000, 67% of students enrolled in public <i>educación infantil</i> (childcare and pre-school for children up to school age). An additional 13% attended private centers that receive government subsidies ( <i>centros privados concertados</i> ). Subsidized child care centers are subject to the same rules and regulations as public centers including fees (no charge, except meals and extracurricular activities) (Valiente 2002). Parental fees in the private sector tend to be higher compared to the public sector. Typical opening hours of public day care centers are 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. (sometimes 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.). Private centers tend to have longer opening hours (7 a.m. to 8 p.m.) (Baizan 2009).	The number of 0, 1, and 2 year olds in public and private subsidized care was estimated based on the proportion of students in these types of centers in <i>educación infantil</i> : 39% of children in <i>private educación infantil</i> attend a subsidized center. Population data from Eurostat.
Sweden 2000	NOSOSCO 2009, OECD 2001	2000	Number of 0, 1 and 2 year old children enrolled in publicly financed day-care and in day-care institutions. Children younger than age 1 are not entitled to a place in day-care and almost all children in this age group are looked after by their parents on parental leave at home. Since no statistics are available for this age group the enrollment rate was calculated assuming that no children younger than 1 were enrolled.	The raw numbers taken from NOSOSCO (2009) converted into percentages using population data from Eurostat.
Switzerland 1992	Eidg. Kommission für Frauenfragen 1992	early 1990s	Estimated percentage of 0 to 2 year olds in formal publicly supported childcare. There are no country-level estimates of the number of under 3 year olds children or places available for this age group for the early 1990s. In general, estimates for the whole country are hard to come by due to uneven data collection across Cantons. An estimated 1.6 – 1.8% of all preschool children in the German speaking part of the country had a place in non-family daycare. Places for children under the age of 3 were particularly scarce.	

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
United Kingdom 1999	Department of Education and Employment 1999, Bertram & Pascal 2000, Penn 2007, National Audit Office 2004, Moss, Owen & Statham 1998	1999	Number of children on the register of day nurseries provided by or paid for by the Local Authorities as a percentage of the 0, 1, 2, and 3 year old population (England only; 84% of the UK population lives in England). Day nurseries provide care for children younger than five years of age for the length of the adult working day. The figure does not include childminders and playgroups. - Situation at the end of the 1990s: The provision of formal childcare for children younger than 3 years of age is fragmented and there is great shortage of affordable places. Publicly funded/supported childcare is targets children "in need." In 1998, the Labour Government introduced its National Childcare Strategy that seeks to increase the accessibility, quality and affordability of early childhood education and care. - Note: England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland collects and publishes data on early childhood education and care separately. These data can be incompatible (Moss, Owen & Statham 1998). Consolidated figures could not be located, therefore figures for England only were used.	Data taken from table 8 on page 20 (Department of Education and Employment 1999); population data from Eurostat.
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	ca. 2000	Only few children under age of 1 are in publicly financed care; 6% of children aged 1 and 2 years enrolled in publicly financed care. Since 0 year olds are not included, this may overestimating the coverage for 0-2 year olds.	

## References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2002. "Child Care Australia." Pp. pp. 48. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Baizán, Pau. 2009. "Regional Child Care Availability and Fertility Decisions in Spain." *Demographic Research* 21:803-842.
- Bertram, Tony and Christine Pascal. 2000. "The OECD Thematic Review of Early Education and Care: Background Report for the United Kingdom." Centre for Research in Early Childhood, University College Worcester.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 2002. "Statistical Abstract of Israel."
- Department for Education and Employment. 1999. "Statistics of Education. Children's Day Care Facilities at 31 March 1999, England." Pp. pp. 35.
- Eidgenössische Kommission für Frauenfragen. 1992. "Familienexterne Kinderbetreuung. Teil II: Hintergründe." EKF, Bern.
- Eurostat. 2004. "Development of a Methodology for the Collection of Harmonised Statistics on Childcare." European Commission, Brussels.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Gouvernement du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. 1998. "Loi du 8 septembre 1998 réglant les relations entre l'Etat et les organismes oeuvrant dans les domaines social, familial et thérapeutique." Pp. 1600-1604, vol. 82, edited by M. d. I. F. e. d. I. Jeunesse: MEMORIAL Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, Service Central de Législation.
- . 1999. "Gestinnaires de Structures d'Accueil sans Hébergement Pour Enfants. Règlement grand-ducal du 28 janvier 1999." Pp. 118-124, vol. 7, edited by M. d. I. Famille: MEMORIAL Journal Officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, Service Central de Législation.
- Heinen, Jacqueline and Monika Wator. 2006. "Child Care in Poland before, during, and after the Transition: Still a Women's Business." *Social Politics* 13:189-216.
- Hungarian Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour. 2004. "National Action Plan for Employment." Budapest, Hungary.
- Instituto Nacional de Evaluación y Calidad des Systema Educativo. 2004. "Sistema estatal de indicadores de la educación." Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- Istituto degli Innocenti. 2002. "I Servizi Educativi per la Prima Infanzia. Indagine sui nidi d'infanzia e sui servizi educativi 0-3 anni integrativi al nido al 30 settembre 2000." *Quaderni del Centro nazionale di documentazione e analisi per l'infanzia e l'adolescenza* 21:pp. 282.
- Kocourková, Jiřina. 2002. "Leave arrangements and childcare services in Central Europe: policies and practices before and after the transition." *Community, Work & Family* 5:301-318.
- Korintus, Marta. 2008. "Early Childhood Education and Care in Hungary: Challenges and Recent Developments." *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy* 2:43-52.
- Kreyenfeld, Michaela. 2008. "Soziale Ungleichheit und Kinderbetreuung - Eine Analyse der sozialen und ökonomischen Determinanten der Nutzung von Kindertageseinrichtungen." Pp. 103-127 in *Bildung als Privileg. Erklärungen und Befunde zu den Ursachen der Bildungsungleichheit*, edited by R. Becker and W. Lauterbach. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Leprince, Frédérique. 2003. "L'accueil des jeunes enfants en France: Etat des lieux et pistes d'amélioration." Haut Conseil de la population et de la famille, République Française.
- Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. 1999/2000. "Estadística de la Educación. Las cifras de la educación en España. Curso 1998-1999 (Edición 2001)."
- Ministry of Health Welfare & Sport. 2000. "Dutch Background Report on the OECD Project "Thematic Review of Early Childhood Education and Care Policy"." The Hague: Ministry of Health, Welfare & Sport, Youth Policy Department.
- Moss, Peter, Charlie Owen, and June Statham. 1998. "Informing Ourselves about Early Childhood Services." *Children & Society* 12:263-274.
- National Audit Office. 2004. "Early Years. Progress in developing high quality childcare and early education accessible to all. Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General. HC 268 Session 2003-2004: 27 February 2004." The Stationary Office, London.
- NOSOSCO. 2009. "Social Protection in the Nordic Countries. Scope, expenditure and financing 2007/2008." Copenhagen: Nordic Social-Statistical Committee.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 2001. "Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD, Paris.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. 2010. "Combined Country Responses on Financing ECEC Services", Retrieved 02/28/12, (<http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/displaydocumentpdf?cote=EDU/EDPC/ECEC/RD%282010%297&doclanguage=en>).
- Penn, Helen. 2007. "Childcare Market Management: How the United Kingdom Government has reshaped its Role in Developing Early Childhood Education and Care." *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood* 8:192-207.
- Plantenga, Janneke and Chantal Remery. 2009. "Parental Leave in the Netherlands. CESifo DICE Report 2/2009." Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Munich.
- Press, Frances and Alan Hayes. 2000. "OECD Thematic Review of Early Childhood Education and Care Policy. Australian Background Report." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD, Paris.
- SGBO Onderzoeks- en Adviesbureau van de Vereniging van Nederlandse Gemeenten BV. 2002. "Kinderopvang in gemeenten de monitor over 2001." The Hague, Netherlands.
- Statec Luxembourg. 2003. "Recueil de statistique par commune 2003." Luxembourg.
- Statistik Austria. 2001. "Kindertagesheimstatistik." Bundesministerium für Gesundheit, Familie und Jugend, Wien.
- Teplova, Tatyana. 2007. "Welfare State Transformation, Childcare, and Women's Work in Russia." *Social Politics* 14:284-322.

Turksema, Rudolf Willem. 2000. "The Supply of Daycare." Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands.

UNICEF. 2011, "TransMONEE Database", Retrieved 01/30/12, (<http://www.transmonee.org/>).

UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. 1993. "Public Policy and Social Conditions (MONEE Project, Regional Monitoring Report no. 1)." UNICEF Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, Florence.

Valiente, Celia. 2002. "The Value of an Educational Emphasis: Child Care and Restructuring in Spain since 1975." Pp. 57-70 in *Child Care Policy at the Crossroads. Gender and Welfare State Restructuring*, edited by S. Michel and R. Mahon. New York: Routledge.

## 9 Enrollment of 3, 4, and 5 Year Old Children in Publicly Supported Formal Childcare/Pre-School

*Note: The first mentioned source is the source of the enrollment data.*

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Australia 2001	Australian Bureau of Statistics 2002	2002	Estimate of children aged 3-5 years in formal childcare (by authors). For more information see documentation for 0-2 year olds.	Making a rough estimate, subtracting 70% of children who attend long day care centers from all children who use formal care. Ages 3, 4, 5 - Note: This assumes that children are evenly enrolled across for-profit and public/non-profit long day care providers.
Austria 2000	Statistik Austria 2001	2000	Enrollment of 3-5 year olds in formal childcare. Since the providers from which Statistik Austria is collecting the data are those who fulfill certain criteria, they virtually all receive some form of public funding.	Children 3,4,5: includes children born between September 1994 and September 1997, data collection: October 15th, 2000
Belgium 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	ca. 2000	Children aged 3, 4 and 5 in publicly supported childcare as a percentage of the age group.	
Canada 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	ca. 1998	Based on estimates that approximately 5% of Canadian children are in subsidized arrangements and 48% of 3-5 year olds are in preprimary programs.	
Czech Republic 1996	UNICEF TransMONEE Database 2008, UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE) 2006, Kocourková 2002	1996	Number of 3-5 year old children enrolled in kindergarten as a percentage of age group. This data does not distinguish between privately and publicly funded kindergartens. However, in 1995/96, most kindergartens were run by municipalities (97.6%), followed by private schools (1.9%), church-run schools (0.2%), and state-run schools (0.3%). Still, parents can be asked to pay a maximum of 50% of the running (not educational) costs covered by the community, with the exception of the pre-school year that must be accessible to all free of charge. Due to a drop in fertility rates in the 1990s enrollment rates at the pre-school level remained relatively stable, despite a decrease in the number of available pre-school places.	

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Finland 2000	NOSOCOS 2009, Eurostat 2004, OECD 2001b	2000	Share of children served in publicly supported care, ages 3,4,5 years (54% of this age group attend generally full-time, another 12% part-time). Since 1996, all children below school age have the right to a place in day care provided by the local authorities. Virtually all formal child care is publicly supported.	
France 2000	Leprince 2003, Gornick & Meyers 2003	2001	Virtually all children aged 3, 4 and 5 attend pre-school ( <i>écolle maternelle</i> ), only a small minority, 10,400 (less than 1%) attend <i>jardin d'enfants</i> . Around 27 percent of these children are cared for by publicly supported services in addition to <i>écolle maternelle</i> .	
Germany 2000	Kreyenfeld 2008	2000	Children aged 3, 4, and 5 in <i>crèches (Kinderkrippe)</i> , kindergarten or <i>Hort</i> (usually for school-aged children, but some are mixed age) as a percentage of the age group.	Using Kreyenfeld's estimates for single age groups based on the German Microcensus and population data from the Statistisches Bundesamt, enrollment rates were recalculated for 3-5 year olds.
Hungary 1999	Ministry of Employment and Labor 2004, Korintus 2008, UNICEF 1999	1999/ 2000	Percentage of 3 to 6 year old children enrolled in kindergarten (Ministry of Employment of Labor 2004). Kindergarten is compulsory for children aged five and schooling age in Hungary is six. After 1989, the number of kindergarten places did not drop as dramatically compared to nursery places, and dropping birthrates contributed to continued high pre-school enrollment rates (Korintus 2008). A majority of kindergarten places are publicly financed. "In 1997, registered private kindergarten enrollments made up 2 percent of total enrollments" (UNICEF 1999: 56). Kindergartens provide full-time care with usual opening hours from 6 in the morning to 6 in the evening (Korintus 2008).	

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Ireland 2000	Irish Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform (2002), Irish Department of Education and Skills (2000)	1999/2000	Number children aged 3, 4, 5 attending community-based childcare (see information on enrollment of 0 to 2 year olds), plus the number of children attending <i>junior</i> and <i>senior infant classes</i> (mainly 4 and 5 year olds) in primary schools (primary schools are overwhelmingly public schools) as a percentage of the age group. While compulsory schooling starts at age 6, primary schools provide education for 4 and 5 year olds in <i>junior</i> and <i>senior infant classes</i> . The data from the Department of Education and Skills does not distinguish between public and private primary schools. However, the number of private primary school provision is negligible. In 2000, only 1.2 percent of primary school students attended private schools (OECD Education Database).	Population data taken from the National Childcare Census Report (table 4.1.3, p. 43)
Israel 2001	Central Bureau of Statistics 2002	2001	3-5 year old children in municipal and public kindergartens as a percentage of the age group: Hebrew education 87%; Arab education: 58%. The average enrollment weighted by the size of the population group is 78.9%.	
Italy 2000	Istat - Statistiche della Scuola materna ed elementare in Eurostat 2002, OECD 2001a, OECD 2001b, OECD 2006	1998/99	Number of children enrolled in public and confessional pre-schools ( <i>Scuola materna</i> ) as a percentage of the 3, 4, and 5 year old population. Confessional pre-schools receive funds from the regions and charge modest fees. Attendance is free in public pre-schools (except meals). 71 percent of pre-schools are under the auspices of the Ministry of Education or municipalities, 18 percent are run by religious organizations, and the rest by other private organizations (frequently) non-profit. Children aged 3 and older are entitled to a place in pre-school ( <i>scuola materna</i> ) although in some locations, the number of available places is not sufficient to cover demand.	The data was taken from Eurostat (2002), page 221, table 2. The share of confessional pre-school provision of the total private provision was extrapolated from previous years.



Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Luxembourg 2000	Statec Luxembourg, Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de la Formation Professionnelle 2005, 2009	2000/2001	Number of children aged 3 to 5 years of age enrolled in public pre-schools ( <i>éducation précoce</i> targeting 3 year olds, <i>éducation préscolaire</i> targeting 4 and 5 year olds). Since 1992, pre-school attendance is mandatory starting age 4 (Règlement grand-ducal du 2 septembre 1992). Since 1998, communities are encouraged to offer pre-school education for 3-year olds.	Only the total number of students attending <i>éducation précoce</i> and <i>préscolaire</i> could be obtained for the year 2000/2001. An estimate of the number of student aged 3, 4 and 5 in public pre-schools was made using information from 2003/2004: In that year, 97.5% of children in <i>éducation précoce</i> were 3 year old; 97.9% of children in <i>éducation préscolaire</i> were 4 and 5 year old. The number of places in private pre-schools ( <i>précoce</i> & <i>préscolaire</i> ) is limited. In 2003/2004, 97.6% of places in <i>éducation précoce</i> were public and 92% of places in <i>éducation préscolaire</i> . Population data for 2001 from Statec Luxembourg.
Netherlands 1999	Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport 2000, SGB0 2002, Gornick & Meyers 2003	1999	Primary education is compulsory starting age 5, with 98% of 4 year olds attending as well. Primary education in both government run and confessional schools is publicly financed.	Following Gornick & Meyers 2003, we use the average enrollment of 0 to 3 year olds in publicly funded day-care (see notes on enrollment rates for the 0-2 age group) to estimate the number of 3 year olds in childcare. Population data from Eurostat.
Poland 2004	Central Statistical Office 2005, Heinen & Wator 2006	2002	Number of children 3, 4, and 5 years of age enrolled in pre-school education. Private provision is limited: An estimated 5 percent of all children in care or school attend private nursery schools. While the number of private services is increasing, the parental fees are unaffordable for families with limited means, notably lone mothers. - In 2003, pre-school attendance for 6-year olds became mandatory. This led to decreased availability of places for 3 and 4 year olds.	Population data from Eurostat.

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
Russian Federation 2000	UNICEF 2011, Teplova 2007	2000/01	Number of children in preschool as a percentage of 3, 4, 5, and 6 year olds. The data does not distinguish between private and public provision. In the post-soviet period since 1991, the number of childcare place has decreased. The responsibility for childcare was shifted onto families and formal childcare was decentralized (responsibility of municipalities). However, the role of the private sector in formal childcare provision remains marginal (Teplova 2008).	
Slovak Republic 1992	UNICEF 1999	1999	Number of 3-5 year old children enrolled in kindergarten as a percentage of age group; data for 1993. This data does not distinguish between publicly and privately funded facilities.	
Spain 2000	Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte 1999/2000, Baizan 2009, Instituto Nacional de Evaluación y Calidad des Systema Educativo 2004, Eurostat 2004	2000	Number of 3, 4, and 5 year old children in public and publicly subsidized pre-schools as a percentage of the age group. Government run and government supported provision dominates the pre-school sector: 65% of children in this age group attended a publicly run center. Pre-schools have the same opening hours as compulsory primary schools: 9 a.m. to noon and 3 to 5 p.m.	The number of 3, 4, and 5 year olds in public and private subsidized care was estimated based on the proportion of students in these types of centers in <i>educación infantil</i> : 39% of children in <i>private educación infantil</i> attend a subsidized center. Population data from Eurostat.
Sweden 2000	NOSOSCO 2009	2000	Children aged 3-5 in day-care institutions and publicly financed day-care as a percentage of the age group.	
Switzerland 1992	OECD Educational Database, Statistik Schweiz 2005, Stamm 2009	1992	Pre-primary enrollment and the ages of children who attend, varies across Cantons. Pre-school education in kindergartens is predominantly organized by communes. The figure likely underestimates coverage, since crèches are not included. Data from 1992 shows that the enrollment of 3 year olds was very low (7,4%), but that enrollment increased with age (25% of 4 year olds and 76% of 5 year olds were enrolled in kindergarten).	

Country & LIS Wave	Sources	Year of data	Notes	Calculations
United Kingdom 1999	Department for Education & Skills 2004, Department for Education and Employment 2000, Bertram & Pascal 2000, Eurostat 2004		Number of 3 and 4 year old children attending free <i>nursery education</i> in all maintained, private, voluntary and independent providers, and the number of 5 year olds who attend publicly funded primary schools as a percentage of the 3, 4, and 5 year old population in England. In September 1998, provision of pre-school education for 4 year olds was made mandatory. Targets were set to provide pre-school education for 3-year olds as well. School attendance for 5 year olds in England and Wales is mandatory (for details see school starting age indicator). Not included in this figure are children enrolled in childcare services, the vast majority of which is privately funded. <i>Nursery education</i> is part-time. Sessions usually run for two to two and a half hours in the morning and afternoon during the school year, with some nursery schools offering all day attendance. Primary schools are usually open from 9 a.m. to noon and 1 to 3.30 p.m.	The number of 3 and 4 year olds attending free nursery education is taken from table 4 (in Department for Education & Skills 2004), the number of 5 year olds in publicly funded primary schools is estimated based on the percentage of 5-10 year olds attending maintained schools (94%) (table 8 on page 28 (Department for Education and Employment 2000); population data from Eurostat
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	ca. 2000	Children aged 3, 4, 5 years; based on estimates of approximately 6% of U.S. children in subsidized arrangements and 47% of 3-5 year olds in pre-k or kindergarten.	

## References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2002. "Child Care Australia." Pp. pp. 48. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Baizán, Pau. 2009. "Regional Child Care Availability and Fertility Decisions in Spain." *Demographic Research* 21:803-842.
- Bertram, Tony and Christine Pascal. 2000. "The OECD Thematic Review of Early Education and Care: Background Report for the United Kingdom." Centre for Research in Early Childhood, University College Worcester.
- Central Bureau of Statistics. 2002. "Statistical Abstract of Israel."
- Central Statistical Office. 2005. "Concise Statistical Yearbook of Poland."
- Department for Education. 2000. "Statistics of Education. Schools in England 2000." The Stationary Office, London.
- Department for Education and Skills. 2004. "Provision for Children under Five Years of Age in England: January 2004 (Final)." Department for Education and Skills, London, UK.
- Eurostat. 2002. "Feasibility study on the availability of comparable child care statistics in the European Union." European Commission, Brussels.
- . 2004. "Development of a Methodology for the Collection of Harmonised Statistics on Childcare." European Commission, Brussels.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Heinen, Jacqueline and Monika Wator. 2006. "Child Care in Poland before, during, and after the Transition: Still a Women's Business." *Social Politics* 13:189–216.
- Hungarian Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour. 2004. "National Action Plan for Employment." Budapest, Hungary.
- Instituto Nacional de Evaluación y Calidad des Systema Educativo. 2004. "Sistema estatal de indicadores de la educación." Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.
- Irish Department of Education and Skills. 2000, "Education Statistics. Primary Level Education Statistics. Primary Pupils (Number) by Year, School Programme and Age", Retrieved 01/22/12, (<http://www.cso.ie/px/des/database/des/des.asp>).
- Irish Department of Justice Equality and Law Reform. 2002, "National Childcare Census Report. Baseline Data 1999-2000", Retrieved 01/22/12, (<http://www.dcy.gov.ie/documents/publications/NationalChildcareCensusReport.pdf>).
- Kocourková, Jiřina. 2002. "Leave arrangements and childcare services in Central Europe: policies and practices before and after the transition." *Community, Work & Family* 5:301-318.
- Korintus, Marta. 2008. "Early Childhood Education and Care in Hungary: Challenges and Recent Developments." *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy* 2:43-52.
- Kreyenfeld, Michaela. 2008. "Soziale Ungleichheit und Kinderbetreuung - Eine Analyse der sozialen und ökonomischen Determinanten der Nutzung von Kindertageseinrichtungen." Pp. 103-127 in *Bildung als Privileg. Erklärungen und Befunde zu den Ursachen der Bildungsungleichheit*, edited by R. Becker and W. Lauterbach. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Leprince, Frédérique. 2003. "L'accueil des jeunes enfants en France: Etat des lieux et pistes d'amélioration." Haut Conseil de la population et de la famille, République Française.
- Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle. 2005. "Éducation préscolaire, Enseignement primaire et spécial, Éducation différenciée." Service de coordination de la recherche et de l'innovation pédagogiques et technologiques. Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle, Luxembourg.
- . 2009. "L'Éducation au Luxembourg 2009." Le Gouvernement Du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg. Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle,, Luxembourg.
- Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte. 1999/2000. "Estadística de la Educación. Las cifras de la educación en España. Curso 1998-1999 (Edición 2001)."
- Ministry of Health Welfare & Sport. 2000. "Dutch Background Report on the OECD Project "Thematic Review of Early Childhood Education and Care Policy"." The Hague: Ministry of Health, Welfare & Sport, Youth Policy Department.
- NOSOSCO. 2009. "Social Protection in the Nordic Countries. Scope, expenditure and financing 2007/2008." Copenhagen: Nordic Social-Statistical Committee.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 2001a. "Early Childhood Education and Care Policy in Italy." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.
- . 2001b. "Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD, Paris.
- . 2006. "Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care Policy." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD, Paris.
- . serial. "Education Database. Students enrolled by age." OECD.
- SGBO Onderzoeks- en Adviesbureau van de Vereniging van Nederlandse Gemeenten BV. 2002. "Kinderopvang in gemeenten de monitor over 2001." The Hague, Netherlands.
- Stamm, Margrit. 2009. "Frühkindliche Bildung in der Schweiz. Eine Grundlagenstudie im Auftrag der Schweizer UNESCO-Kommission." edited by V. Reinwand, K. Burger, K. Schmid, M. Viehhauser, and V. Muheim. Fribourg: Departement für Erziehungswissenschaften, Universität Fribourg, Schweiz.
- Statistik Austria. 2001. "Kindertagesheimstatistik." Bundesministerium für Gesundheit, Familie und Jugend, Wien.
- Statistik Schweiz. 2005. "Vorschulbesuchsquote (öffentliche und private, subventionierte Einrichtungen), 1980-2005." Bundesamt für Statistik, Neuchâtel, Switzerland.
- Teplova, Tatyana. 2007. "Welfare State Transformation, Childcare, and Women's Work in Russia." *Social Politics* 14:284-322.
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE). 2006. "Czech Republic: Early Childhood Care and Education (ECEC) Programmes. Country profile prepared for the

Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2007. *Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education.* Geneva: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

UNICEF. 1999. *Women in Transition.* Florence, Italy: UNICEF International Child Development Centre.

—. 2008, "TransMONEE Database", Retrieved 15/10/10, (<http://www.transmonee.org/>).

—. 2011, "TransMONEE Database", Retrieved 01/30/12, (<http://www.transmonee.org/>).

## 10 Starting Age of Compulsory Schooling

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
Australia 2001	OECD 2001, Press & Hayes 2000	Compulsory schooling in Australia starts at age 6. Attendance in the year before compulsory schooling ranges from 80.4 percent in Western Australia to 96.3 percent in Queensland. Children attend preschool/kindergarten 10-12 hours a week.
Austria 2000	Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture 2004	Schooling is mandatory beginning on September 1st after the child's sixth birthday. Most children start attending pre-school at an earlier age. In 2002/03, 88.4% of all 4-year olds and 93.6% of 5-year olds were in institutional early education and care.
Belgium 2000	Eurydice 2000, Oberhuemer & Ulich 1997	Compulsory schooling in Belgium starts at age 6. Since 1965, 2,5 year old children can attend pre-schools ( <i>écolle maternelle, kleuterschool, Kindergarten</i> ). And attendance rates are high. In 1991/92, 99% of 4 and 5 year olds attended preschools.
Canada 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	In Canada, compulsory education starts at age 6 but most children attend at age 5.
Czech Republic 1996	Amadio 2000, UNESCO International Bureau of Education 2006	Compulsory schooling starts at age 6. In 1999, an estimated 92.2% of 5-year-olds were attending kindergartens.
Finland 2000	Brock and Tulasiewicz 2000	The Comprehensive School Act (1983) stipulates compulsory schooling for a period of 10 years, starting in the year in which children turn seven. Pre-school education emphasizes the idea of lowering the threshold to school access. Attendance is voluntary, but about 65% of all six-year olds attended in 1996.
France 2000	Ditch, Barnes, Bradshaw & Kilkey 1998, Oberhuemer & Ulich 1997	The compulsory school age is 6, however almost all children attend from age 3 (99% of 3 year olds and 100% of 4 and 5 year olds).
Germany 2000	Ditch, Barnes, Bradshaw & Kilkey 1998; Spiess, Kreyenfeld & Wagner 2003; Rostgaard & Fridberg 1998	Compulsory school age is 6. Since 1996, municipalities are required to offer a place in day care for all children aged 3 to school-age (the law was applied flexibly for the first 3 years). However, most of these place are part-time (usually for a few hours in the morning) in the Western part of the country.
Hungary 1999	Amadio 2000, Le Métais 2003	Children enter primary school at the age of 6, although starting school education is flexible and adjusted to the development of children. All five-year-olds must attend kindergarten for up to four hours per day.

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
Ireland 2000	Le Métais 2003, INCA 2003	Compulsory education begins at age six. Children do not have to attend school until the start of the term following their 6th birthday. Over 50 per cent of four-year-olds and almost all five-year-olds attend publicly-funded infant classes in primary schools.
Israel 2001	UNESCO International Bureau of Education 2004, 2006	Primary school starts at age 6. However, the Compulsory Education Law (1949) stipulates compulsory education for children starting age 5 (compulsory kindergarten).
Italy 2000	UNESCO International Bureau of Education 2004, OECD 2001	Primary education is compulsory starting age 6. In 1999, 97.6 percent of 5 year olds were enrolled in pre-primary education.
Luxembourg 2000	Oberhuemer & Ulich 1997, Eurydice 2009	In 1992, nursery schooling was made obligatory for 4 year olds (children who reach the age of 4 before the 1st of September of the year). Although the official school-entry age (primary school) is still 6 years, compulsory schooling in effect begins at the age of 4. The main difference is that non-attendance during the 2 years of preprimary schooling is not considered a legal offence, as it is during the primary school years. The number of places in pre-primary classes are not sufficient to satisfy demand.
Netherlands 1999	Marlow-Ferguson 2002, Eurydice 2000, INCA 2003	In 1985, the Primary Education Act required compulsory schooling to begin at 5 years of age (on the first day of the month which follows the child's 5th birthday). In practice, however, most children in the Netherlands go to school from the age of four.
Poland 2004	EURORAI 2005, Heinen & Wator 2006	Compulsory primary education starts at age 7. Pre-primary education also includes the one-year of preparation for primary education which is compulsory for six-year-old children since 2003.
Russian Federation 2000	WENR 2007	Compulsory education begins at age six or seven. Prior to 1984, schooling began at the age of seven. As many parents still believe seven to be an appropriate age for children to start formal schooling, they are free to choose whether they want their child to enter the education system at the age of six or seven.
Slovak Republic 1992	UNESCO International Bureau of Education 2004	Compulsory schooling starts at age 6.
Spain 2000	Eurydice 2000, Oberhuemer & Ulich 1997	Compulsory schooling starts at age 6. With the educational reform of 1990 (Ley de Ordenación General del Sistema Educativo LOGSE), pre-school education became part of the education system as <i>educación infantil</i> . Virtually all 5 year olds attend pre-primary education.
Sweden 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003, OECD 2001	Even though compulsory education starts at age 7, virtually all 6 year olds were enrolled in pre-school education in 1999.
Switzerland 1992	INCA 2003	Children who have reached the age of 6 by 30th of June are eligible for compulsory education.

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
United Kingdom 1999	Eurydice 2000, Bertram & Pascal 2000	In England and Wales, children reach compulsory school age on one of three designated dates following their 5th birthday: 31 August, 31 December and 31 March. However, they are not normally required to begin school before the start of the next school term. Many children begin school at four in nursery schools or classes, or in reception classes in primary schools. Compulsory education starts at age 4 in Northern Ireland. In Scotland, children born between March and August must start school in the year in which they turn 5.
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	In the United States, the starting age of compulsory education is determined by the states; in most states compulsory education begins at age 5 or 6; only in two states at age 8.



## References

- Amadio, Massimo. 2000. "World Data on Education. A Guide to the Structure of National Education Systems." Paris: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Bureau of Education.
- Brock, Colin and Witold Tulasiewicz. 2000. *Education in a Single Europe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ditch, John, Helen Barnes, Jonathan Bradshaw, and Majella Kilkey. 1998. *A Synthesis of National Family Policies 1996*. Bruxelles: University of York. Social Policy Research Unit. European Observatory on National Family Policies.
- EURORAI. 2005. "EURORAI-Seminar on the audit of schools Karlsruhe, Report on the Situation in Poland." European Organisation of Regional External Public Finance Audit Institutions, Valencia, Spain.
- Eurydice. 2000. "Key Data on Education in Europe." Luxembourg: European Commission.
- . 2009. "Key Data on Education in Europe." Luxembourg: European Commission.
- Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture. 2004. "Austrian Background Report on the OECD Project "Starting Strong"." Wien: Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Heinen, Jacqueline and Monika Wator. 2006. "Child Care in Poland before, during, and after the Transition: Still a Women's Business." *Social Politics* 13:189–216.
- International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Archive INCA. 2003, "International Trends in Primary Education" *INCA Thematic Study No. 9*, Retrieved 04/25/07, (<http://www.inca.org.uk/>).
- Le Métais, Joanna. 2003. "International Trends in Primary Education. INCA Thematic Study No. 9." London: International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Archive.
- Marlow-Ferguson, Rebecca. 2002. *World Education Encyclopedia. A Survey of Educational Systems Worldwide*. Detroit: Gale Group.
- Oberhuemer, Pamela and Michaela Ulich. 1997. *Working with Young Children in Europe*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 2001. "Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD, Paris.
- Press, Frances and Alan Hayes. 2000. "OECD Thematic Review of Early Childhood Education and Care Policy. Australian Background Report." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD, Paris.
- Rostgaard, Tine and Torben Fridberg. 1998. *Caring for Children and Older People - A Comparison of European Policies and Practices*. Copenhagen: The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Spiess, Katharina, Michaela Kreyenfeld, and Gert G. Wagner. 2003. "A Forgotten Issue: Distributional Effects of Day Care Subsidies in Germany." *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal* 11:159-175.
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education. 2004. "World Data on Education, Web Edition." UNESCO, Geneva, Switzerland.
- . 2006. "Israel Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) programmes, Country profile prepared for the Education for All Global monitoring Report 2007 - Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education." UNESCO.
- UNESCO International Bureau of Education (IBE). 2006. "Czech Republic: Early Childhood Care and Education (ECEC) Programmes. Country profile prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2007. Strong Foundations: Early Childhood Care and Education." Geneva: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- World Education Education News & Reviews. 2007, "WENR Archives", Retrieved 04/20/07, (<http://www.wes.org/ewenr/wenrarchive/>).

## 11 Normal Weekly Working Hours

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
Australia 2001	ILO 1995, Campbell 2002	Although there is no generally applicable federal law on normal hours of work, the federal commission, through award determinations, has established 38 hours per week as the broad norm. At the state level, state commissions have tended to follow the standard established by the federal commission. However, Campbell (2002) notes that actual average weekly hours have increased steadily since the 1980s from around 38 to around 41 hours a week for full-time employees. Moreover, this increase seems mainly due to increasing unpaid overtime.
Austria 2000	EIRO 2000, Bundesgesetzblatt für die Republik Österreich 1975, EIRO 2009	Average collectively agreed normal weekly hours in 1999. In 1975, normal working hours were set to 40 hours a week and 8 hours a day with a maximum of 50 hours a week and 10 hours a day. The collectively agreed normal working hours vary between 38.5 and 39 weekly hours. This has been quite stable over time.
Belgium 2000	EIRO 2000, Gornick & Meyers 2003	The figure refers to the statutory working week set by the intersectoral collective agreement (which fell from 40 in 1998 to 39 in 1999). In 2002, the collectively agreed-upon weekly working time varied from 25 to 38 hours.
Canada 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	Normal weekly working hours vary across jurisdictions, between 40 to 48 hours, with fewer than half of the workers in 40-hour jurisdictions.
Czech Republic 1996	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic 1992	The Labor Code of 1992, set normal weekly hours at 43 with a maximum of 9.5 hours per day.
Finland 2000	EIRO 2000, Gornick & Meyers 2003	The figure represents average collectively agreed normal weekly hours in 1998 (Statistics Finland structure of earnings statistics, cited in EIRO 1999). Normal statutory weekly working hours are set at 40, which can be reduced by collective bargaining agreements.
France 2000	ILO 1995, EIRO 1998	Before the 1998 and 2000 "Aubry Laws" normal weekly working hours were set at 39. From January 1st 2000, statutory weekly working hours were reduced to 35 for companies with 20 or more employees and from January 1 2002 for smaller companies (defines the threshold for the calculation of overtime). The law does not address the consequences for earnings, but left these questions to collective bargaining.
Germany 2000	WSI-Tarifarchiv 2009	Figures for East and West Germany for the year 2000.
Hungary 1999	OECD 1998	Statutory normal weekly hours set at 40.

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
Ireland 2000	EIRO 2000, Government of Ireland 1997, OECD 1998	The "Organization of Working Time Act, 1997 stipulates that "An employer shall not permit an employee to work, in each period of 7 days, more than an average of 48 hours" over a period of 4 months or in certain cases also longer. However, collectively agreed normal working hours tend to be lower (vary between 38-40 weekly hours).
Israel 2001	Government of Israel 1993	The Hours of Work and Rest Law, 1993 stipulates that a "working week shall not exceed forty-five working hours." Under certain circumstances and with the approval of the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs collective agreements can exceed the statutory limit.
Italy 2000	EIRO 1998, 2007	In 1997, the so-called "Treu package" reduced "normal" weekly working hours from 48 to 40. However, the maximum daily working hours remained at 8 regular hours plus 2 hours of overtime. Collectively agreed weekly working hours varied between 36 and 40, with an average of 38.
Luxembourg 2000	EIRO 2000, 1999	In February 1999, the National Action Plan on employment set normal weekly working hours at 40 (average that may not be exceeded over a period of 4 weeks). The maximum allowed weekly hours remained at 48. Average collectively agreed weekly hours in 1999 were identical with the statutory limit.
Netherlands 1999	Gornick & Meyers 2003, EIRO 2009	Legislation set a maximum of 48 weekly hours, but does not regulate normal weekly working time. Collectively agreed normal weekly hours (37 per week) have been stable over a long period of time.
Poland 2004	EIRO 2009	According to chapter 6 of the Labor Code the official normal working time is 40 per week.
Russian Federation 2000	Scharf 1999	The labor code sets the normal working time at 40 hours per week. In principle, overtime is only allowed in exceptional cases and subject to the agreement of trade union representatives.
Slovak Republic 1992	Czech and Slovak Federal Republic 1992	The Labor Code of 1992, set normal weekly hours at 43 with a maximum of 9.5 hours per day.
Spain 2000	EIRO 2000	The statutory threshold above which overtime is due is 40, average collectively agreed hours are lower (38.6 in 1999), however average actual hours worked exceed collectively agreed hours.
Sweden 2000	Swedish Government 1982, EIRO 2000, 2002	The Working Hours Act of 1982 sets regular working hours at 40 hours a week and maximum hours at 48 hours per employee over a four-week period or 50 hours over a calendar month.

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
Switzerland 1992	Swiss Initial ICESCR Report 1996, Swiss Federal Statistical Office	Weekly hours of work are regulated in the Labor Act. The latter sets maximum hours; shorter hours may be set by collective agreements. The maximum legal working week is set at 45 hours for workers employed in industrial enterprises and for office workers, technical staff and other salaried employees, including the sales personnel of large retail enterprises. For other workers the maximum working week is 50 hours (Labor Act, Article 9). Average usual hours (at the enterprise level) varied between 41 and 43.8 weekly hours across industries, with an average of 42 weekly hours. (Because information of average collectively agreed hours could not be obtained, usual hours at the enterprise-level [ <i>betriebsübliche Arbeitszeit</i> ] are recorded).
United Kingdom 1999	Government of the United Kingdom 1998, EIRO 2009, 2000	The Working Time Regulations 1998 (coming into force October 1st 1998) stipulate a maximum working week of 48 hours following the EU Working Time Directive (93/104/EC). However, large numbers of managerial and professional workers are exempt and the limit can be exceeded if employer and employee agree in writing. The UK is the only EU country that has applied an exception to the maximum working hours limit. Average collectively agreed working hours in 1999 were 38.4 hours a week.
United States 2000	United States Department of Labor 2010, Gornick & Meyers 2003	The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, sets the threshold above which overtime pay is due at 40 hours a week. However, about 27 percent of full-time workers are exempt. 86 percent of full-time employees in medium and large establishments work forty hours a week or more.

## References

- Bundesgesetzblatt für die Republik Österreich. 1975. "Änderung des Arbeitszeitgesetzes." Verlagspostamt Wien.
- Campbell, Iain. 2002. "Extended Working Hours in Australia." *Labour & Industry* 13:91-110.
- Czechoslovak Federative Republic. 1992. "Zákoník Práce (č. 451) (Labor Code, no. 451)." Zbírka Zákonů České a Slovenské Federativní Republiky Částka 89.
- EIRO. 1998a, "France: 35-hour working week law adopted", Retrieved 02/20/2007, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/1998/06/feature/fr9806113f.html>).
- . 1998b, "Working hours still a controversial issue in Italy", Retrieved 06/11/2007, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/1998/11/feature/it9811238f.html>).
- . 1999, "Luxembourg: New Provisions Introduced on the Organization of Working Time", Retrieved 06/11/2007, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/1999/03/feature/lu9903197f.html>).
- . 2000, "Working time developments - annual update 1999", Retrieved 11/02/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2000/02/update/tn0002402u.html>).
- . 2002, "Working time developments - annual update 2001", Retrieved 04/27/2007, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2002/02/update/tn0202103u.html>).
- . 2007. "Italy - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- . 2009a, "Austria: Industrial Relations Profile", Retrieved 10/04/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/country/austria.pdf>).
- . 2009b. "Netherlands - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- . 2009c. "Poland - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- . 2009d. "United Kingdom - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Government of Ireland. 1997. "Irish Statute Book. Organization of Working Time Act, 1997." vol. Number 20 of 1997: Office of the Attorney General.
- Government of Israel. 1993. "Hours of Work and Rest Law."
- Government of the United Kingdom. 1998. "The Working Time Regulations 1998." <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1998/1833/contents/made>.
- International Labour Organization. 1995. "Working Time Around the World: Conditions of Work Digest." vol. 14: Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 1998. "OECD Employment Outlook 1998 Chapter 5: Working hours: latest trends and policy initiatives." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, Paris.
- Republika, Česká a Slovenská Federativní. 1992. "Zákoník Práce." *Sbírka zákonů č. 451/1992 Částka 89*.
- Scharf, Alexander. 1999. *Das Arbeitsrecht der Russischen Föderation und der Republik Belarus*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Swedish Government. 1982. "Working Hours Act (non-official translation)." Stockholm: Government Offices of Sweden.
- Swiss Initial ICESCR Report. 1996. "Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights." United Nations, Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, New York.
- United States Department of Labor. 2010. "The Fair Labor Standards Act 1938." WSI-Tarifarchiv. 2009. "Wochen- und Jahresarbeitszeit 1990 bis 2009 (in Stunden)." Hans Böckler Stiftung.

## 12 Primary Mechanism Regulating Working Time

Country & LIS Wave Year	Sources	Notes
Australia 2001	Heiler 1998, Campbell 2002	Historically, Australia relied on state and federal awards for the regulation of working time, i.e. a system of "compulsory conciliation and arbitration, characterized by permanent and independent quasi-judicial tribunals and by legally binding awards that had been arbitrated or certified by these tribunals" (Campbell 2002:100). This system never provided regulation for the whole workforce (limited coverage of awards, exceptions within awards), however by the end of the 20th century, only about 30 to 40 percent of the workforce was covered by awards, whereas they used to apply to about 70 to 80 percent (Bertelsmann Reform Monitor serial).
Austria 2000	EIRO 2009	Union bargaining is restricted to the private sector; the coverage rate of collective agreements is very high (between 98 and 99 percent).
Belgium 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	The mechanism determining working time is a combination of collective agreements and labor law.
Canada 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	The primary mechanism is national and provincial labor laws. Collective bargaining only covers 35 percent of full-time jobs.
Czech Republic 1996	ILO 1997, EIRO 2002	Estimated union coverage in 1995 was at 55 percent. After 1990, union membership declined in all Central and Eastern European countries due to a shift from mandatory to voluntary membership. In the Czech Republic, the enterprise is the dominant level of bargaining, contributing to an uneven coverage.
Finland 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003, EIRO 2009	The mechanism determining working time is a combination of collective agreements and labor law. Collective bargaining coverage is and has been high (90%) more or less since the 1990s. Since 1971, collective agreements that apply to their field of economic activity are also binding for employers that are not collectively organized. Collective bargaining possible in both the private and public sector.
France 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	Working time is primarily regulated by law.
Germany 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003, EIRO 2009	Primarily collective agreements. The law sets a maximum of 45 hours that may not be exceeded, but not normal weekly working hours. Collective bargaining coverage was 76% in West Germany and 63% in the East. There is no legal mechanism to extend collective agreements beyond the bargaining parties.
Hungary 1999	EIRO 2003	Collective agreements usually adopt the statutory normal working time, even though the law allows for reductions of working time by collective agreement. However, in practice this is rarely done.

<b>Country &amp; LIS Wave Year</b>	<b>Sources</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Ireland 2000	OECD 1998	For some time now, collectively agreed normal weekly hours have been set at 39.
Israel 2001	Cohen et al 2007	Union coverage was at 56 percent of wage and salaried workers in 2000. Information on the role of working time in union bargaining: NA.
Italy 2000	EIRO 2007	Collective bargaining coverage is estimated at 80 percent in the year 2000, with variation between industries.
Luxembourg 2000	EIRO 2003	Threshold above which overtime is due (normal weekly hours) is set by legislation.
Netherlands 1999	Gornick & Meyers 2003	Working time is regulated by a combination of collective agreements and labor law.
Poland 2004	EIRO 2009	Collective agreements usually follow the working time regulations of the Labor Code.
Russian Federation 2000		Primary mechanism regulating working time could not be determined, statutory normal weekly hours recorded.
Slovak Republic 1992	Venn 2009, EIRO 2002	It is difficult to determine the situation in the early 1990s, shortly after the transition in 1989 and the establishment of the Slovak Republic at the beginning of 1993. Collective agreements seem to follow legal provisions to a large extent.
Spain 2000	EIRO 1999, 2000	Collective agreements in Spain are generally applicable and therefore affect a large number of workers. However, according to EIRO (1999) their real effect is questionable: it is difficult to apply the agreements reached in sectoral bargaining in a production structure dominated by small and medium-sized enterprises and precarious employment. Actual average weekly working hours of full-time workers (40.4) were closer to the statutory weekly hours.
Sweden 2000	EIRO 2000	Statutory weekly hours are usually followed in collective agreements, with exceptions for some white collar groups.
Switzerland 1992	Swiss Initial ICESCR Report 1996	Normal working hours are regulated either by collective agreement or in individual work contracts.
United Kingdom 1999	EIRO 2003, 2009	Normal weekly hours are set in collective agreements (in the private sector predominantly at the company or plant level and in the public sector some sectoral level agreements).
United States 2000	Gornick & Meyers 2003	Working time is regulated primarily by national laws and some state laws. Only 15 percent of workers are covered by collective bargaining.

## References

- Campbell, Iain. 2002. "Extended Working Hours in Australia." *Labour & Industry* 13:91-110.
- Cohen, Yinon, Yitchak Haberfeld, Tali Kristal, and Guy Mundlak. 2007. "The State of Organized Labor in Israel." *Journal of Labor Research* 28:255-273.
- EIRO. 1999, "1999 Annual Review for Spain", Retrieved 10/05/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/1999/12/feature/es9912100f.htm>).
- . 2000, "Working time developments - annual update 1999", Retrieved 11/02/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2000/02/update/tn0002402u.htm>).
- . 2002a, "Industrial relations in the EU Member States and candidate countries", Retrieved 10/05/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2002/07/feature/tn0207104f.htm>).
- . 2002b, "Slovak Republic: Collective Bargaining Procedures, Structures and Scope", Retrieved 10/05/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2002/10/feature/sk0210102f.htm>).
- . 2003a, "Overtime in Europe", Retrieved 04/27/2007, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2003/02/study/tn0302101s.html>).
- . 2003b, "Working time developments - annual update 2002", Retrieved 04/27/2007, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2003/03/update/tn0303103u.html>).
- . 2007. "Italy - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- . 2009a, "Austria: Industrial Relations Profile", Retrieved 10/04/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/country/austria.pdf>).
- . 2009b. "Finland - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- . 2009c, "Germany: Industrial Relations Profile", Retrieved 10/04/2010, (<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/country/germany.pdf>).
- . 2009d. "Poland - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- . 2009e. "United Kingdom - Industrial Relations Profile." european industrial relations observatory on-line.
- Gornick, Janet C. and Marcia K. Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Heiler, Kathryn. 1998. "The "Petty Pilfering of Minutes" or what has happened to the length of the working day in Australia?" *International Journal of Manpower* 19:266-280.
- International Labour Organization. 1997. "World Labour Report 1997-98. Industrial Relations, Democracy, and Social Stability." International Labour Organization. Labour Law and Labour Administration Department (DIALOGUE)
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development OECD. 1998. "OECD Employment Outlook 1998 Chapter 5: Working hours: latest trends and policy initiatives." Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, Paris.
- Swiss Initial ICESCR Report. 1996. "Implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights." United Nations, Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, New York.
- Venn, Danielle. 2009. "Legislation, collective bargaining and enforcement: Updating the OECD Employment Indicators." Paris: OECD Directorate for Employment, Labor and Social Affairs.



