

Maternal and Paternal Employment across the Life Course

MICHAELA KREYENFELD

Abstract

This essay provides a condensed summary of major findings in trends in maternal and paternal employment patterns. Key theoretical concepts (such as cultural approaches, welfare state approaches, preference theory, economic approaches, and life course theory) are briefly summarized. The increase in maternal employment rates in most European countries, and the extent to which this increase has been related to growth in part-time and marginal employment, are also discussed. In studying the dynamics of the employment behavior of mothers, empirical researchers have mainly looked at the amount of time it takes for women to return to work after childbirth. While these studies often capture only a snapshot of the life course—namely, the period between childbirth and labor market reentry—new approaches (so-called sequence analyses) that map the lifetime employment patterns of women have been developed. The analysis of the employment patterns of fathers is an emerging field of research as well. However, little is known so far about how fatherhood affects men’s lifetime employment patterns, and how paternal employment varies in different cultural and social policy contexts.

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, most industrialized countries have witnessed significant increases in women’s educational and labor market participation levels. Women have reached parity in terms of formal education, and in some countries women are now more likely than men to receive a high school degree. Women no longer retreat from the labor market after they marry, and they return to the labor market more quickly after having a child than they did in previous decades (OECD, 2011, 2012). The traditional “male breadwinner–female housewife model” seems to have vanished from the scene, both as a household arrangement as well as an ideal to strive for. In tandem with these changes, we have witnessed radical shifts in attitudes about maternal employment and men’s engagement in housework and childrearing. Opinion polls regularly show that attitudes about mothers’

employment have become more liberal (Scott, 1999). There is also general agreement that the image of fatherhood has undergone radical changes, with men now being expected by society to become “involved fathers” (Coltrane, 2009; Goldscheider, Bernhardt, & Lappegård, 2014; Hobson & Fahlén, 2009; Yeung, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, & Hofferth, 2001). These behavioral and attitudinal changes have been buttressed by an array of family-friendly policies, such as the expansion of public day care, and the introduction of parental leave regulations that help parents to combine work and family life.

Despite these significant behavioral, attitudinal, and policy changes, male and female employment patterns have not converged. While men have continued to strive for full-time employment, the increase in women’s employment rates in most countries has largely been attributable to growth in marginal and part-time employment. Against this background, Hochschild and Machung (1989) concluded that the gender revolution has “stalled.” In a similar vein, Esping-Andersen (1999, 2009) has diagnosed an “incomplete revolution.”

This essay summarizes key empirical findings on developments in the employment patterns of men and women with children. Variations in parental employment patterns across different strata of the population, between countries, and over time are discussed. In addition, the study looks at the methodological challenges associated with mapping the employment patterns of mothers and fathers across the life course. Furthermore, the roles played by cultural norms and social policies in shaping employment patterns are examined.

FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH

Comparative welfare state research has highlighted the importance of the policy context for understanding differences between countries in women’s employment patterns. The work of Gøsta Esping-Andersen has been central to this area of research. Esping-Andersen generated a typology of welfare states in which countries are distinguished by their degree of *de-familialization*; that is, by the extent to which a country’s social policies “free” women from care obligations (Esping-Andersen, 1999). His typology includes three different clusters:

- The social democratic welfare states (Nordic countries of Europe) which “free” women from childrearing tasks by supporting the compatibility of childrearing and employment through for example, the provision of public day care.

- The conservative corporatist welfare states (Continental Europe) where public day care is scarce and social policy regulations (such as tax laws) favor the male breadwinner–female housekeeper model.
- The liberal welfare states (with the United Kingdom being the only European country that is grouped into this category) where little public day care is available. Whether parents are able to combine work and family life is subject to market forces (i.e., private day care arrangements).

Esping-Andersen's typology has been refined, that is, by grouping the Mediterranean countries into a separate category, frequently labeled as the "rudimentary welfare state" (Pierson, 1998). Furthermore, alternative concepts have been generated by feminist sociologists, such as Jane Lewis (1992), who criticized that the gender dimension of care work has not fully been conceptualized in most of the early work of Esping-Andersen. Welfare state typologies are based on the premise that social policies evolve path dependently, that is, a country's social policy context is expected to evolve step by step. Furthermore, welfare state typologies rely on the assumption that the social policy context of a country can be meaningfully categorized into different clusters, and that these clusters are associated with women's employment patterns and gender role behavior.

Cultural approaches highlight the role of societal norms in guiding the employment behavior of men and women. Not economic constraints or social policies, but societal norms regarding the "appropriate" behavior of mothers and fathers are expected to be the key determinants of country-specific employment patterns. These societal norms include, for example, attitudes towards the employment of mothers of young children, the usage of public care and the acceptability of parental leave usage among men. Cultural approaches differ in how they see the interplay of social policies, economic constraints and cultural contexts. Some scholars, such as Duncan, Edwards, Reynolds, & Alldred, 2003, have argued that economic constraints and social policy regulations are "subordinate" and "secondary" for understanding behavioral choices. Others, such as Pfau-Effinger (2012), have asserted that social policies tend to reflect the prevalent norms and attitudes in a society. More nuanced approaches have studied the interplay of social policies and cultural contexts (Kremer, 2007). This type of research seeks to answer several questions: for example, under what conditions do cultural concepts influence policy making, and under what circumstances are social policies unlikely to change despite significant attitudinal shifts in a society?

A concept that stands apart from the above-mentioned approaches is the "preference theory" developed by Hakim (2000, 2004, 2007). The core idea of Hakim's framework is that there is individual heterogeneity in the lifestyle

preferences of women. She argued that women's employment choices are determined not by societal norms or institutional constraints, but by individual preferences. Hakim identified three clusters of lifestyle preferences among women: adaptive, work-centered, and home-centered. She asserted that work-centered women will continue to be a minority group, and they will be outnumbered by adaptive women. Adaptive women give equal priority to work and family goals, and attempt to resolve the family-work conflict by opting for part-time employment. Hakim further argued that there is a homogeneous preference structure for men, who uniformly strive for full-time employment. According to this concept, gender differences in lifetime employment patterns are genuinely predetermined by the different preference structures of men and women. Hakim's concept has sparked a lively debate. One of the main criticisms has been that preference theory does not elaborate on the evolution of preferences, and disregards that preferences and employment patterns may be adjusted over the life course (Hobson & Fahlén, 2009, p. 218). Hakim has furthermore been accused of ignoring the normative and structural constraints that women and men are exposed to when they make employment decisions (McRae, 2003). Another criticism has been that Hakim assumes that women have a heterogeneous preference structure, and that men make up a homogeneous cluster of individuals who uniformly strive for full-time employment. Despite these criticisms, the lively debate about Hakim's concept may be indicative of a weakness in previous approaches, which did not adequately address differences in employment patterns across a population.

Economic approaches tend to focus on individual variations in employment behavior. According to these approaches, a person's human capital endowment, particularly his or her educational attainment, explain his or her employment choices (Mincer, 1974). While the classical economic approach viewed employment decisions as individual choices, the New Household Economics approach noted that employment decisions are made within a household context (Schultz, 1974). A standard hypothesis that can be derived from this framework is that the person with the highest expected wage rate will work, while the person with the lowest market wage will take care of the children. In principle, the theory leaves open the question of whether the woman or the man will be responsible for the housework and childcare. However, in the seminal work "Treatise on the Family," the noble prize winner Gary Becker (1993, pp. 37–38) argued that a gendered division of labor eventually emerges because women "*have a heavy biological commitment to the production and feeding of children*" while men "*have been less biologically committed to the care of children.*" This concept is at the center of an ongoing discussion among sociologists in which economists have been accused of making simplistic assumptions, and of ignoring

the culturally embedded nature of employment decisions (Brines, 1994; Duncan & Edwards, 1997; Duncan *et al.*, 2003). Economists themselves have challenged the assumption of New Home Economics that all households have a joint utility function; that is, that they have the same interests (Ott, 1995). Nevertheless, economic approaches have continued to influence micro-level research in the fields of economics, sociology, and demography; particularly because they provide testable hypotheses on the roles played by education and policy changes in employment behavior.

The abovementioned approaches focus on behavior across countries or across different strata of the population. Life course sociology additionally conceptualizes employment choices as life course decisions (Elder, 1985; Mortimer & Shanahan, 2003). These approaches, for example, highlight the fact that prior life course experiences (such as unemployment at labor market entry) may influence employment patterns in later life. Furthermore, these approaches focus on “interdependencies” across the life course, which implies that decisions in the employment career may be influenced by experiences in other domains of the life course (e.g., Budig, 2003). Sociological life course approaches also stress that welfare state policies may structure lifetime employment patterns and the sequences of life course events (Mayer, 2009; Mayer & Schoepflin, 1989). For example, parental leave policies will impact the duration it takes that women or men interrupt their employment, which will also show up in different employment patterns across the life course.

KEY EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

There is a large body of empirical research that deals with women’s employment behavior and attitudes toward maternal work. Many of these empirical studies have addressed variations in employment patterns across countries (e.g., Scott, 1999; van der Lippe & van Dijk, 2002). These studies have consistently shown that while women’s employment rates have increased in most industrialized countries over time, substantial country variations persist. In many countries, the increase in female employment rates has been mainly due to an influx of women working marginally or part-time only (Blossfeld & Hofmeister, 2006; Haas, Steiber, Hartel, & Wallace, 2006; Hakim, 2000; Lewis, Campbell, & Huerta, 2008; OECD, 2011; Thévenon & Horko, 2009). The share of mothers in full-time employment has increased in only a few countries, such as the United States and the Nordic countries of Europe. In other countries, such as Germany, there has been an increase in the share of mothers working part-time, but this growth has been offset by a reduction in the share of mothers in full-time employment (Konietzka & Kreyenfeld, 2010; Thévenon & Horko, 2009).

Table 1
Employment Rates in Selected European Countries in the Year
2011, Men and Women Aged 20–49 with Children

	Employment Rate		% Part-time Employed	
	Females	Males	Females	Males
Belgium	73.2	88.7	45.6	5.8
Bulgaria	67.6	77.3	2.3	1.8
Croatia	65.3	77.3	4.8	3.3
Czech Republic	67.6	93.4	10.3	0.9
Denmark	82.5	91.5	28.7	4.6
Germany	72.3	92.3	64.0	6.1
Ireland	59.9	75.9	39.0	10.0
Greece	50.9	79.6	13.4	4.5
Spain	57.0	74.7	31.2	6.8
France	73.0	88.9	36.2	4.5
Italy	53.6	84.0	39.5	5.8
Hungary	61.2	81.9	9.9	2.9
The Netherlands	76.6	93.4	85.6	13.8
Austria	78.2	92.7	62.3	6.2
Poland	68.8	87.4	9.3	2.3
Portugal	73.3	82.5	10.5	4.9
Romania	66.5	83.4	7.9	7.4
Slovenia	80.4	90.6	9.1	3.2
Slovakia	63.8	86.0	6.0	2.7
Finland	73.1	90.3	13.9	2.9
Sweden	82.7	92.9	37.5	7.8
United Kingdom	68.3	88.8	53.0	7.1

Source: Eurostat 2013 (data extract “Ifst_hhptety” and “Ifst_hheredy” 26-5-2014)

Note: The distinction between full-time and part-time work is based on self-reported classification. Exceptions are the Netherlands, Iceland and Norway where part-time is defined as 35 hours or less.

As can be depicted from Table 1, employment rates of mothers vary radically between European countries. In some countries, such as Sweden, Slovenia, and Denmark, female and male employment rates have almost reached parity. In other countries, particularly in Greece and Italy, large differences prevail. Most remarkable are the strong variations in the share of fathers and mothers working part-time. Paternal part-time employment is rare across Europe, with the exception of the Netherlands which is renowned for its flexible working-time regulations. Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom are the countries with the highest share of part-time employment mothers. More than half of all employed mothers work on a part-time basis in these countries. Nordic countries show an intermediate level in respect to maternal part-time employment. In the post-socialist countries, part-time employment is comparatively uncommon.

Many of the micro-level studies on female employment have looked at the amount of time it takes for mothers to return to work after having a child. These studies have repeatedly found that less educated women are less likely to be employed when they have a child, and that those who are employed tend to take longer to return to work than more highly educated women. The role of policies, particularly changes in parental leave durations, has also been a key issue in studies on women's patterns in returning to work after childbirth (Gangl & Ziefle, 2009; Ondrich, Spieß, & Yang, 1996).

While the employment behavior of mothers has attracted considerable attention, there is far less research on the employment behavior of fathers. Empirical studies have investigated the behavior of fathers mainly in terms of the division of household labor and the involvement of fathers in childrearing tasks (Cabrera & Tamis-LeMonda, 2013; Finch, 2006; Garcia-Mainar, Molina, & Montuenga, 2011; Hook, 2006, 2012; Hook & Wolfe, 2012; Sayer & Gornick, 2012; Smith & Williams, 2007). While these studies confirmed that women continue to be responsible for the lion's share of childrearing tasks, they have also provided evidence of real changes in behavior among men. Time-use surveys have shown that men have increased their engagement in childrearing over time (Dommermutha & Kitterda, 2009). However, it is less clear whether fathers have really been willing to sacrifice time at work to care for their children, or whether the model of the "involved father" has mainly been practiced on the weekends (Hook & Wolfe, 2012; Yeung *et al.*, 2001). Most of the studies that have addressed fathers' employment choices have been based on data from Scandinavian countries, where there have been significant increases over time in parental leave uptake rates among men (Bygren & Duvander, 2006; Haas, Allard, & Hwang, 2002). However, in other countries as well, the introduction of an income-related parental leave benefit and a "paternity quota" (a parental leave benefit that is reserved for fathers) has been associated with significant increases in parental leave usage among men (Geisler & Kreyenfeld, 2011). Whether these policy changes and the related increases in parental leave uptake among men have initiated long-term changes in the care activities performed by fathers is, however, a question that has so far been unexplored.

CUTTING-EDGE RESEARCH

Most of the very early work on maternal employment patterns was based on cross-sectional data. Since the development of event history methods in the 1980s, researchers have increasingly used longitudinal data to investigate female employment patterns. Event history methods have allowed researchers to adopt a dynamic view of employment patterns when studying the amount of time it takes for women return to work after having a child

(Gangl & Ziefle, 2009; Ondrich *et al.*, 1996). However, the scope of this type of research has remained limited. Most studies have analyzed only a snapshot of the life course, namely, the duration between childbirth and labor market reentry. The complexity of women's work patterns, including transitions between full- and part-time employment and to different work arrangements over the life course, cannot be satisfactorily conceptualized using these approaches. Recent studies based on sequence analysis have tried to overcome these limitations by taking a comprehensive view of the employment patterns of women over the life course. Instead of focusing on a single event (such as the return to work after childbirth), sequence analysis employs for example, graphical means to map employment patterns across the entire life course (e.g., Simonson, Gordo, & Titova, 2011).

While many studies have examined maternal employment patterns, both across countries and across the life course, so far there have been few attempts to use longitudinal data to investigate the impact of having children on the lifetime employment patterns of fathers (exceptions are e.g., the studies by Eggebeen & Knoester, 2001; Keizer, Dykstra, & Poortman, 2010; Knoester & Eggebeen, 2006). Cross-sectional data show that fathers work longer hours than childless men (Dommermutha & Kitterda, 2009; Koslowski, 2011). This may indicate that men increase their employment activity after they have become fathers, but it may also indicate that childless men display different behavioral patterns than men with children. In order to sort out the causal influence that children have on paternal behavior, it is necessary to study the employment patterns of fathers over the life course. Studies of this kind are still rare, but they are important for understanding paternal behavior. The few existing longitudinal studies have suggested that cross-sectional studies have radically overestimated the work commitments of fathers. While men, unlike women, do not appear to reduce their working hours after having children, there is also no evidence that fatherhood results in radical increases in working hours (Knoester & Eggebeen, 2006). The development of employment among fathers over the life course and the responsiveness of these employment patterns to policy and normative contexts remain important topics for future research.

KEY ISSUES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Welfare state research has provided a powerful and useful conceptual framework for understanding country variations in maternal employment patterns and gender roles. It has shown that social policies play a pivotal role in variations in female employment, and it has served as a handy concept for comparative research. However, this categorization of policy contexts has increasingly been challenged as oversimplified, paying too little attention to

the differences between countries of the same clusters (Arts & Gelissen, 2002). Furthermore, the idea of the path-dependent development of welfare states is being challenged by recent family policy reforms. The “Swedish-style” parental leave system, which had previously typified the social democratic welfare states, has recently been introduced into classical conservative welfare state regimes such as Germany. Policy reforms of this kind expose the limitations of welfare state typologies, and call for the development of new concepts that can help us better understand the relationship between institutional contexts and parental employment patterns.

Most of the comparative studies on maternal employment have focused on Western European countries. In this literature, it is frequently asserted that the “dual worker model” will gradually replace more traditional arrangements. The fact that mothers regularly worked full-time under socialist regimes is hardly mentioned in most of the comparative literature. Since the demise of the socialist systems, a gradual decline in full-time employment rates among mothers has been observed in many of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (Pascall & Manning, 2000; Schmitt & Trappe, 2010). This development constitutes a deviation from patterns found in Western countries, where maternal employment rates have uniformly increased over time. It shows that the pendulum may swing backwards toward more traditional behavioral patterns. How this retraditionalization is related to changing social policy contexts, economic constraints, and deeply rooted normative concepts is an important question that needs to be explored further in future research.

In the past, fathers’ employment choices have often been conceptualized as representing a tension between being a “provider” and an “involved father” (Kaufman & Uhlenberg, 2000). This dichotomy has been challenged by recent empirical evidence, which shows that the correlation between being an involved father and the number of working hours is much looser than initially expected (Koslowski, 2011; Pailhé & Solaz, 2008). We still know very little about the choices men make as they try to balance work and family demands (Hobson & Fahlén, 2009). Likewise, there is very little cross-national research on how social policies affect fathers’ employment strategies.

In recent years, most governments have introduced initiatives to support parental employment by expanding public day care for children. Some governments have adopted “proactive” policies, such as the paternity quota, to influence fathers’ behavior more directly (O’Brien, 2009). At the same time, benefits that favored the male breadwinner model have been curtailed in some countries (Annesley, 2007). Other countries have retained their measures that favor the traditional male breadwinner–female housekeeper model. Researchers have claimed that these “half-hearted” reforms may

result in polarized behavior among women. While highly educated women may take advantage of new policies designed to make it easier to combine work and family, less educated women may be less responsive to these policy measures. As a result, maternal employment patterns may become increasingly bifurcated (Konietzka & Kreyenfeld, 2010; Thévenon & Horko, 2009). The worsening of the labor market prospects of less educated women may be aggravating this pattern. Responding adequately to this growing divide in maternal employment patterns will be an important challenge for policy makers in the coming years (Daly, 2011).

SUMMARY

It is generally accepted that maternal employment rates have increased in developed countries in recent years, and that this trend has not been accompanied by similar changes in paternal behavior. While women moved into the labor market in large numbers, no equivalent shifts in men's employment rates were recorded. Furthermore, a closer examination of maternal employment rates reveals that this increase was mainly attributable to growth in rates of part-time and marginal employment. Thus, predictions that men's and women's employment patterns and working hours would eventually converge have not yet been realized. However, the conclusion that the gender revolution has been "incomplete" (Esping-Andersen, 2009) or has "stalled" (Hochschild & Machung, 1989) may be premature. There is consistent empirical evidence that societal expectations of "involved" fatherhood have undergone radical changes over time (Coltrane, 2009; Hobson & Fahlén, 2009; Yeung *et al.*, 2001). While it is true that these normative claims do not appear to have resulted in a significant reduction in working hours among fathers, we should acknowledge that we currently know very little about how fatherhood affects men's employment choices, and about the family-work tensions experienced by men.

Past research has been greatly limited by small sample sizes. Because the numbers of fathers who work part-time or who take parental leave have been rather low, the share of "involved fathers" has been too small in social science surveys to conduct a meaningful analysis. So far, studies on fathers' employment choices and their parental leave uptake rates have mainly been conducted in Scandinavian countries, where large-scale register data exist. As the number of fathers taking leave or reducing their working hours in other European countries grows, opportunities to conduct studies on employment among fathers over the life course should increase in the coming years.

REFERENCES

- Annesley, C. (2007). Lisbon and social Europe: towards a European 'adult worker model' welfare system. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 17, 195–205.
- Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12, 137–158.
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blossfeld, H.-P., & Hofmeister, H. (2006). *Globalization, uncertainty and women's careers: An international comparison*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 652–688.
- Budig, M. J. (2003). Are women's employment and fertility histories interdependent? An examination of causal order using event history analysis. *Social Science Research*, 32, 376–401.
- Bygren, M., & Duvander, A.-Z. (2006). Parents' workplace situation and fathers' parental leave use. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68, 363–372.
- Cabrera, N. J., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (Eds.) (2013). *Handbook of father involvement*. New York, NY and London, England: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Coltrane, S. (2009). Fatherhood, gender and work-family policies. In J. C. Gornick, M. K. Meyers & E. O. Wright (Eds.), *Gender equality: Transforming family divisions of labor* (pp. 385–409). London, England: Verso.
- Daly, M. (2011). What adult worker model? A critical look at recent social policy reform in Europe from a gender and family perspective. *Social Politics*, 18, 1–23.
- Dommermutha, L., & Kitterda, R. H. (2009). Fathers' employment in a father-friendly welfare state: does fatherhood affect men's working hours? *Community, Work & Family*, 12, 417–436.
- Duncan, S., & Edwards, R. (1997). Lone mothers and paid work - Rational economic man or gendered moral rationalities? *Feminist Economics*, 3, 29–61.
- Duncan, S., Edwards, R., Reynolds, T., & Alldred, P. (2003). Motherhood, paid work and partnering: values and theories. *Work, Employment and Society*, 17, 309–330.
- Eggebeen, D. J., & Knoester, C. (2001). Does fatherhood matter for men? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 381–393.
- Elder, G. H., Jr., (1985). Perspectives on the life course. In Elder Jr., & H. Glen (Eds.), *Life course dynamics. Trajectories and transitions, 1968–1980* (pp. 23–49). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2009). *The incomplete revolution. Adapting to women's new roles*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Finch, N. (2006). Gender equity and time use: How do mothers and fathers spend their time? In J. Bradshaw & A. Hatland (Eds.), *Social policy, employment and family change in comparative perspective* (pp. 255–281). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

- Gangl, M., & Ziefle, A. (2009). Motherhood, labor force behavior, and women's careers: An empirical assessment of the wage penalty for motherhood in Britain, Germany, and the United States. *Demography*, 46, 341–369.
- Garcia-Mainar, I., Molina, J. A., & Montuenga, V. (2011). Gender differences in child-care: Time location in five European countries. *Feminist Economics*, 17, 119–150.
- Geisler, E., & Kreyenfeld, M. (2011). Against all odds: Fathers' use of parental leave in Germany. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 21, 88–99.
- Goldscheider, F., Bernhardt, E., & Lappegård, T. (2014). Studies of men's involvement in the family. Part 1: Introduction. *Journal of Family Issues*, 35, 879–890.
- Haas, B., Steiber, N., Hartel, M., & Wallace, C. (2006). Household employment patterns in an enlarged European Union. *Work, Employment and Society*, 20, 751–771.
- Haas, L., Allard, K., & Hwang, P. (2002). The impact of organizational culture on men's use of parental leave in Sweden. *Community, Work & Family*, 5, 319–342.
- Hakim, C. (2000). *Work-lifestyle choice in the 21st century: Preference theory*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hakim, C. (2004). *Key issues in women's work: Female diversity and the polarisation of women's employment*. London, England: Glasshouse Press.
- Hakim, C. (2007). The politics of female diversity in the 21st century. In J. Browne (Ed.), *The future of gender* (pp. 191–227). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson, B., & Fahlén, S. (2009). Competing scenarios for European fathers: Applying Sen's capabilities and agency framework to work-family balance. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 624, 214–233.
- Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (1989). *The second shift. Working parents and the revolution at home*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Hook, J. L. (2006). Care in context: Men's unpaid work in 20 countries, 1965–2003. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 639–660.
- Hook, J. L. (2012). Working on the weekend: Fathers' time with family in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74, 631–642.
- Hook, J. L., & Wolfe, C. M. (2012). New Fathers? Residential fathers' time with children in four countries. *Journal of Family Issues*, 33, 415–450.
- Kaufman, G., & Uhlenberg, P. (2000). The influence of parenthood on the work effort of married men and women. *Social Forces*, 78, 931–949.
- Keizer, R., Dykstra, P. A., & Poortman, A.-R. (2010). Life outcomes of childless men and fathers. *European Sociological Review*, 26, 1–15.
- Knoester, C., & Eggebeen, D. J. (2006). The effects of the transition to parenthood and subsequent children on men's well-being and social participation. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27, 1532–1560.
- Konietzka, D., & Kreyenfeld, M. (2010). The growing educational divide in mothers' employment: an investigation based on the German micro-censuses 1976–2004. *Work, Employment and Society*, 24, 260–278.
- Koslowski, A. S. (2011). Working fathers in Europe: Earning and caring. *European Sociological Review*, 27, 230–245.
- Kremer, M. (2007). *How welfare states care: Culture, gender and parenting in Europe*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: University Press.

- Lewis, J. (1992). Gender and the development of welfare regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2, 159–173.
- Lewis, J., Campbell, M., & Huerta, C. (2008). Patterns of paid and unpaid work in Western Europe: Gender, commodification, preferences and the implications for policy. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18, 21–37.
- Mayer, K. U. (2009). New directions in life course research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 413–433.
- Mayer, K. U., & Schoepflin, U. (1989). The state and the life course. *Annual Reviews of Sociology*, 15, 187–209.
- McRae, S. (2003). Choice and constraints in mothers' employment careers: McRae replies to Hakim. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 54, 585–592.
- Mincer, J. (1974). *Schooling, experience, and earnings*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Mortimer, J. T., & Shanahan, M. J. (Eds.) (2003). *Handbook of the life course*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.
- O'Brien, M. (2009). Fathers, parental leave policies, and infant quality of life: International perspectives and policy impact. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 624, 234–254.
- OECD (2011). *Cooking and caring, building and repairing: Unpaid work around the world* (Society at a Glance 2011: OECD Social Indicators).
- OECD (2012). *Closing the gender gap: Act now*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing.
- Ondrich, J., Spieß, C. K., & Yang, Q. (1996). Barefoot and in a German Kitchen: Federal parental leave and benefit policy and the return to work after childbirth in Germany. *Journal of Population Economics*, 9, 247–266.
- Ott, N. (1995). Fertility and division of work in the family. A game theoretic model of household decisions. In E. Kuiper & J. Sap (Eds.), *Out of the margin* (pp. 80–99). London, England: Routledge.
- Pailhé, A., & Solaz, A. (2008). Time with children: Do fathers and mothers replace each other when one parent is unemployed? *European Journal of Population*, 24, 211–236.
- Pascall, G., & Manning, N. (2000). Gender and social policy: Comparing welfare states in central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 10, 240–266.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2012). Women's employment in the institutional and cultural context. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 32, 530–543.
- Pierson, C. (1998). Contemporary studies to welfare state development. *Political Studies*, XLVI, 777–794.
- Sayer, L. C., & Gornick, J. C. (2012). Cross-national variation in the influence of employment hours on child care time. *European Sociological Review*, 28, 421–442.
- Schmitt, C., & Trappe, H. (Eds.) (2010). *Gender relations in central and eastern Europe - Change or continuity?* Opladen, Germany: Barbara Budrich.
- Schultz, T. W. (1974). *Economics of the family. Marriage, children, and human capital*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, J. (1999). European attitudes towards maternal employment. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 19, 144–177.

- Simonson, J., Gordo, L. R., & Titova, N. (2011). Changing employment patterns of women in Germany: How do baby boomers differ from older cohorts? A comparison using sequence analysis. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 16, 65–82.
- Smith, A. J., & Williams, D. R. (2007). Father-friendly legislation and paternal time across Western Europe. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 9, 175–192.
- Thévenon, O., & Horko, K. (2009). Increased women's labour force participation in Europe: Progress in the work-life balance or polarization of behaviours? *Population (English Edition)*, 64, 235–272.
- Van der Lippe, T., & Van Dijk, L. (2002). Comparative research on women's employment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 221–241.
- Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 136–154.

MICHAELA KREYENFELD SHORT BIOGRAPHY

Michaela Kreyenfeld is head of the Research Group “Life Course, Social Policy and the Family” at the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research in Rostock (www.demogr.mpg.de) and Professor of Sociology at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin (<http://www.hertie-school.org/>). She was a visiting scholar at the Center for Policy Research at Syracuse University (<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/cpr.aspx>), the European Centre for Analysis in the Social Sciences (ECASS) (<https://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/archives/ecass>), the Department of Social Policy and Social Work at York University (<http://www.york.ac.uk/spsw/>) and Stockholm University (<http://www.su.se/english/>). Michaela Kreyenfeld is a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Family Research* (<http://www.zeitschrift-fuer-familienforschung.de/english/mission.html>) and the journal *Comparative Population Studies* (<http://www.comparativepopulationstudies.de/index.php/CPoS>). Her research activities focus on various themes of family sociology, such as maternal and paternal employment, economic determinants of fertility dynamics, determinants of nonmarital childbearing, and the evolution and economic performance of stepfamilies. Most of her research work has been based on longitudinal data from Germany and other European countries.

RELATED ESSAYS

- Terror Management Theory (*Psychology*), Alisabeth Ayars *et al.*
- Misinformation and How to Correct It (*Psychology*), John Cook *et al.*
- Controlling the Influence of Stereotypes on One's Thoughts (*Psychology*), Patrick S. Forscher and Patricia G. Devine
- Setting One's Mind on Action: Planning Out Goal Striving in Advance (*Psychology*), Peter M. Gollwitzer

- Lifecourse and Aging (*Anthropology*), Haim Hazan
Regulatory Focus Theory (*Psychology*), E. Tory Higgins
Multitasking (*Communications & Media*), Matthew Irwin and Zheng Wang
Herd Behavior (*Psychology*), Tatsuya Kameda and Reid Hastie
Childhood (*Anthropology*), Karen L. Kramer
Positive Development among Diverse Youth (*Psychology*), Richard M. Lerner
et al.
Cognitive Bias Modification in Mental (*Psychology*), Meg M. Reuland *et al.*
Regulation of Emotions Under Stress (*Psychology*), Amanda J. Shallcross
et al.
Effortful Control (*Psychology*), Tracy L. Spinrad and Nancy Eisenberg
Leadership (*Anthropology*), Adrienne Tecza and Dominic Johnson
Creativity in Teams (*Psychology*), Leigh L. Thompson and Elizabeth Ruth
Wilson
Emotion Regulation (*Psychology*), Preee Zarolia *et al.*