

## Family Policy Database, Version 2 (2003)

The Family Policy Database, Version 2 (2003) contains five files:

- the detailed policy data are presented in three Excel workbooks,
- a set of composite indexes is presented in a fourth Excel workbook, and
- the reference list is in a PDF file

### The Policy Data workbooks:

<b>Family Leave Policies</b>	
FL. Table 1	Family Leave - Maternity and Parental Leave Provisions, Approximately 2000
FL. Table 2	Leave for Family Reasons; Example: "Sick Child" Provisions, Approximately 2000
FL. Table 3	Provisions for Fathers: Paternity Leave and Incentives for Take-Up of Parental Leave, Approximately 2000
FL. Table 4	Family Leave Financing, Late 1990s
FL. Table 5	Maternity and Parental Leave Expenditures, per employed woman (2000US\$ PPP-Adjusted), 1998
<b>Working Time Regulations</b>	
WT. Table 1	Establishment of Normal Working Hours, Approximately 2000
WT. Table 2	Measures that Encourage Development of Voluntary Part-Time Employment and Improvement of the Quality of Part-Time Work, Approximately 2000
WT. Table 3	Measures Influencing Employment During Nonstandard Hours (Evenings, Nights, Weekends), Approximately 2000
WT. Table 4	Regulation of Annual Paid Vacation Time, Approximately 2000

<b>Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC)</b>	
CC. Table 1.	Institutional Arrangements and Entitlements for Publicly Supported Early Childhood Education and Care, Approximately 2000
CC. Table 2	Enrollment in Publicly Supported Early Childhood Education and Care, Approximately 2000
CC. Table 3	Government Mechanisms for Financing Early Childhood Education and Care, Approximately 2000
CC. Table 4	Co-Payment Policies and Estimated Share of ECEC Costs Assumed by Government, Approximately 2000
CC. Table 5	Distribution of Parental Child Care Costs in France and the United States, Families with Employed Mother, US and France, Late 1990s
CC. Table 6	Public Spending on Early Childhood Education and Care, per Child (2000 US\$ PPP-Adjusted), Middle 1990s
CC. Table 7	ECEC Quality Regulations, Approximately 2000
CC. Table 8	ECEC Staff Compensation, Approximately 2000
CC. Table 9	Hours and Days of Supervised Care, Approximately 2000

**The index workbook:**

<b>Policy Indexes</b>	
IN. Table 1	Raw Data for Indexes
IN. Table 2	Policy Indexes

The indexes were constructed as follows (see Gornick and Meyers 2003, for more detail):

1) We converted the policy data presented in the detailed policy data tables to 22 indicators. We entered quantified data (e.g., ECEC enrollment rates) numerically and we coded qualitative data (e.g., ECEC quality) into categories (e.g., high, medium, low.)

We included all of our major policy measures, with the exception of those that regulate part-time work, as implementation of most of those measures remains ongoing.

For all 22 policy indicators, coded data correspond to the data in the policy tables, with one exception. Because the current regulated work week in France (35 hours) was implemented so recently, we used the value that was current in France in the late 1990s.

The 22 indicators include (with units):

<b>ECEC</b>	
v1	guaranteed slot for some children 0-1-2 (yes, no)
v2	enrollment in public care < age 1(% of age group)
v3	enrollment in public care age 1-2 (% of age group)
v4	cost to parents if children in public care age 1-2 (% of total cost)
v5	enrollment in public care age 3-4-5 (% of age group)
v6	cost to parents if children in public care age 3-4-5 (% of total cost)
v7	typical hours age 3-4-5 (full-day, mixed, part-day)
v8	enrollment age 6 (if compulsory school at 7) (% of age group)
v9	quality (low, medium, high)
v10	tax relief for ECEC (yes, no)
<b>School Scheduling</b>	
v11	starting age (age)
v12	hours per day (hours)

v13	days per year (days)
v14	continuity of school day (yes, no, sometimes)
<b>Family Leave</b>	
v15	weeks of full-pay available to mothers (weeks)
v16	paid paternity leave (yes, no)
v17	gender equality scale / incentives for fathers (see below)
v18	some paid leave after 3rd birthday (yes, no)
v19	paid sick child leave (yes, no)
v20	expenditures on leave (2000 \$US/employed woman)
<b>Working Time</b>	
v21	normal weekly hours (hours)
v22	normal vacation time (days)

**The raw data on these 22 indicators is presented in IN. Table 1.**

2) We converted all qualitative values to quantitative values (e.g., high, medium, low were coded as 1.0, .66, and .33.) We then re-scaled all indicators such that a higher value signified more policy support. For example, cost to parents if children are in public care was converted to cost to government (for children in public care), with a higher value signifying more government support. School starting age and normal weekly work hours were converted such that higher values signify an earlier starting age and shorter weekly work hours.

3) We re-scaled all indicators so that their values ranged from 0-1. We did that using one of the following methods: using the original value if it was a percentage (e.g., enrollment rates), dividing by the observed maximum (e.g., weekly school hours), or dividing by the theoretical maximum (e.g., the gender equality scale).

4) We created seven sub-indexes by combining the individual indicators. We weighted some items based on our expectation of the share of the families affected by individual components. The subindexes were constructed as follows.

sA	ECEC age 0-2	$v1 + [.33*v2] + [.66*v3] + v4 + v9 +$
----	--------------	--

		$ [.25*v10]$
sB	Family leave age 0-2	$ v15 + v16 + v17 + v19 + v20$
sC	ECEC age 3-4-5	$ v5 + v6 + [1.5*v7] + v9 + [.25*v10]$
sD	Family leave age 3-4-5	$ v17+v18+v19$
sE	Family leave age 6+	$ v19$
sF	School schedules	$ [.10*v8] + [.10*v11] + v12 + v13 + v14$
sG	Working time	$ v21 + v22$

We then re-scaled these subindexes to 0-1 by dividing by the observed maximum.

5) We converted the subindexes into Indexes A, B, and C as follows:

Index A	all policies that affect families with children aged 0-5 = $ sA + sB + sC + sD + sG$
Index B	all policies that affect families with children aged 6+ = $ sE + sF + sG$ (weighted to give school schedules [sF] 50 percent)
Index C	all policies that affect families with children = $ sA + sB + sC + sD + sE + sF + sG$

We then re-scaled Indexes A, B, and C to 0-1 by dividing by the theoretical maximum (5, 3, and 7, respectively). **These index values are presented in IN. Table 2.**

Finally, note that variable v17 presents a gender equality in paid family leave scale. It was constructed as follows:

We assigned countries one point on the gender equality scale if they have any paid paternity leave, two points if fathers have non-transferable parental leave rights (either use or lose portions of share-able leave or individual entitlements) and up to three additional points depending on wage replacement (three points if benefits are wage-related and at 80 percent or higher, two points if benefits are wage-related but at less than 80 percent, and one point if benefits are paid but only at a flat rate).

