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Gaps still exist, but increased participation

How about the type/quality?

Women more likely to be low-paid and/or atypically employed, lack of prospects... – labour market Outsiders

(e.g., Chou et al. 2017; ILO 2019; Levanon, England and Allison 2009; Schwander and Häusermann 2013)

How are the family policies associated with the women’s higher likelihood of being Outsiders?
Family Policy and women’s employment

Family Policy important in examining gender (in)equality in the labour market

- Care responsibilities (esp. of children) major cause of career interruptions and income loss (e.g., Budig and England 2001)
- Interact with gender norms in the society (e.g., Pfau-Effinger 2017)
  - Shapes certain labour market patterns of couples (Korpi et al 2013)
  - Statistical discrimination (e.g., Anker 1997)

Work-family balance policies (Budig et al 2016; Misra et al 2011)

1) Work-reducing policies for mothers (e.g., maternity leave)
2) Work-reducing policies for fathers (e.g., paternity leave)
3) Work-facilitating policies (e.g., public childcare services)
**Intended outcomes**

- Increased mothers’ employment rate (see review in Hegewisch and Gornick 2011)
- Reduced motherhood penalty (Andersen 2018; Budig et al 2016; Gornick 1999; Lefebvre and Merrigan 2008; Misra et al 2011)
  (- Reduced statistical discrimination against women, changing gender norms)

**Un-intended outcomes**

- Length of (effective) leave matters – *Family Policy Trade-offs?*
  - Moderate length (parental leave) → reducing motherhood penalty (Budig et al 2016; Misra et al 2011)
  - Short leave → inactivity of mothers; long leave → unemployment of mothers (Morosow 2019)

- Welfare State Paradox (e.g., Mandel and Semyonov 2006)
  - Generous family policy may create “female-type” jobs limited from reaching the top (e.g., public sector care jobs)
  - Still benefits lower-end jobs (Korpi et al 2013)

**Women’s relative likelihood of being Outsiders – Mitigate? (intended) Enhance? (unintended)**
Gendered labour market patterns

- **Insider-Outsider divide** (e.g., Emmenegger et al 2012, Palier & Thelen 2010)
  - Insiders: protected ‘core’ workers
  - Outsiders: flexibilised ‘periphery’; deviating from the security of Insiders

- **Gendered Labour Market Patterns**
  - Women’s overrepresentation in the Outsider jobs (Schwander and Häusermann 2013)
  - Different Outsider risks by women and men
    (Biegert 2014; Booth, Francesconi and Frank 2002; Gash and McGinnity 2007)
Research Question

How does family policy impact/shape the *gendered labour market patterns*?

*Do countries with more “generous” family policy show less women in the Outsider jobs?*
Data and Methodology

Methodology

- Two-level Multi-level random slopes modeling (random slopes for gender)

Data

- Individual Level: European Working Conditions Survey 2015 (EWCS)
  - 30 countries: EU28 (of 2015) + Norway and Switzerland

Dependent Variables: *being Outsider(s)*

- Outsider, Typical Outsider, Dead-end Insider and Subjective Outsider (ref: Insider)
- 4 dichotomous variables derived from Latent Class Analysis
- using 5 indicators of labour market Outsiders:
  - part-time work, insecure employment, low income, subjective insecurity, lack of job prospects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outsiders</th>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>Secure employment</th>
<th>Feeling secure</th>
<th>Decent income</th>
<th>Relatively high prospects of advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insiders</td>
<td>58.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Outsiders</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Outsiders</td>
<td>15.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead-end Insiders</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data and Methodology**
4 Data and Methodology

Gender (0=man, 1=woman)

National level context variables
- Family policy expenditure (per GDP) (2015)
- work-reducing family policy (leave policies)
  → effective maternity, parental and paternity leave (duration*benefit) (2009);
  daddy quota (2009); total paid leave available for mothers, fathers (2015)
- work-facilitating family policy (public childcare service)
  → all and full-time coverage of childcare services under age 3 (2009 and 2015)

Individual level control variables
- age, education level, whether or not they live with a partner, whether or not they are breadwinners,
  parental status, occupational skills, public/private firm, industrial sector, whether or not they have unions
  in workplace, firm size, recent decrease in workforce
Results: Gendered labour market patterns

- **Gendered labouer mark et patterns**
- **69.75%**
- **42.18%**
- **12.67%**
- **18.08%**
- **8.89%**
- **36.14%**
- **8.68%**
- **3.60%**

**Insiders**
- **33.09%**
- **6.01%**
- **4.22%**
- **4.12%**

**Typical Outsiders**
- **22.17%**
- **9.50%**
- **4.22%**
- **1.89%**

**Dead-end Insiders**
- **4.22%**
- **4.22%**
- **4.22%**
- **4.22%**
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**Men**
- **33.09%**
- **6.01%**
- **4.22%**
- **4.12%**

**Women**
- **22.17%**
- **9.50%**
- **4.22%**
- **1.89%**

**Mid-aged/Mothers**
- **33.09%**
- **6.01%**
- **4.22%**
- **4.12%**

**Young workers**
- **22.17%**
- **9.50%**
- **4.22%**
- **4.12%**
Results: Multi-level Analysis: individual level

Women’s higher likelihood of being Outsiders (all)

Significance of the random slopes coefficient is presented as: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.1
Results: Multi-level Analysis: individual level

Women’s higher likelihood of being Typical Outsiders

Significance of the random slopes coefficient is presented as: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.1.
Results: Multi-level Analysis: individual level

Women’s higher likelihood of being Dead-end Insiders

Significance of the random slopes coefficient is presented as: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.1
**Women’s higher likelihood of being Subjective Outsiders**

Significance of the random slopes coefficient is presented as: ***p<0.001, **p<0.01, *p<0.05, +p<0.1
5 Results: Multi-level Analysis: family policy expenditure

Do countries with more generous family policy show less women in the Outsider jobs?
Do countries with more generous family policy show less women in the Outsider jobs?
5 Results: Multi-level Analysis: work-reducing policies

Typical Outsider

Subjective Outsider
“Generous” family policy has been associated with women’s higher likelihood of being Outsiders

Where they are likely to remain employed, they are in dead-end jobs

Childcare services not significantly associated

Longer effective parental and paternity leave $\rightarrow$ less Typical Outsiders, especially women
  - Not getting any jobs (for mothers)
  - less typical Outsider jobs (insecure employment)
  - Changing gender norms and reduced statistical discrimination? (paternity leave)

Longer effective parental and paternity leave $\rightarrow$ more subjective insecurity for women
  - Career breaks? Stigma?
### Discussion and Conclusion: Policy Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unintended? unexpected? Where are we heading?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies that can change gender norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase fathers’ role in care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making work-family balance a norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short working hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All carer model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender gap in the quality of jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motherhood is crucial, but gender-equality policies need to look beyond it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-valuation of “feminine” work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Family policy is important, but we need more emphasis on the quality of jobs**
- **Dead-end jobs only option for work-family balance?**
  - Inclusion into Outsider jobs
- **Policies not disrupting existing gender norms may only enhance it**
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