

# AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT  
to article in**

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (AUGUST:639–660)

Care in Context: Men's Unpaid Work in 20 Countries, 1965–2003

Jennifer L. Hook  
*Pennsylvania State University*

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT**  
to article in  
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (AUGUST:639–660)

**Table S1.** Technical Details of MTUS Surveys

Survey	Code	Collector	Format <sup>1</sup>	Minutes <sup>2</sup>	Level <sup>3</sup>	Day <sup>2,4</sup>	Months <sup>5</sup>	Response <sup>6</sup>	Version
Austria									
1992	AA	Austrian Bureau of Statistics	Left-behind	15	House	1	March & Sept	47	5.5.2
Australia									
1974	AS	Australian Bureau of Statistics	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Autumn	63	5.0.1
1992	AS	Australian Bureau of Statistics	Left-behind	5	House	2	4 seasons	83	5.5.1
Belgium									
1966	BE	Free University of Brussels <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Feb to March	60	5.0.1
Bulgaria									
1988	BU	Central Statistical Office	Recall	open	House	1	12	.	5.0.1
Canada									
1971	CN	Dalhousie University	Left-behind	open	House	1	Oct to May	72	5.5.2
1981	CN	Statistics Canada	Recall	open	Ind	1	Sept to Nov	46	5.5.2
1986	CN	Statistics Canada	Recall	open	Ind	1	Oct to Dec	80	5.5.2
1992	CN	Statistics Canada	Recall	open	Ind	1	12	77	5.5.2
1998	CN	Statistics Canada	Recall	open	Ind	1	12	78	5.5.2
Czechoslov.									
1965	CZ	Polytechnical Institute, Prague <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Nov to Dec	100	5.0.1
Denmark									
1987	DN	Statistics Denmark	Left-behind	15	Ind	1	Jan to March	73	5.0.1
Finland									
1987	FI	Statistics Finland	Left-behind	10	Ind	2	12	74	5.5.1
France									
1966	FR	Nat'l Inst. for Stat. and Econ. Studies	Left-behind	open	Ind	1		90	5.0.1
1974	FR	Nat'l Inst. for Stat. and Econ. Studies	Left-behind	5	Ind	1	12	66	5.0.1
1998	FR	Nat'l Inst. for Stat. and Econ. Studies <sup>8</sup>	Left-behind	10	House	1	12	88	5.5.2
Germany (E)									
1966	EG	Institute of Economics, Berlin <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Sept to Oct	90	5.0.1
Germany (W)									
1965	GE	Institute for Social Research <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	May/June & Sept/Oct	80	5.0.1
1992	GE	Federal Statistical Office	Left-behind	5	House	2	4 seasons	Quota	5.5.2
Hungary									
1965	HU	Hungarian Academy of Sciences <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Oct	95	5.0.1
1977	HU	Central Statistical Office	Recall	open	Ind	1 <sup>9</sup>	Autumn	96	5.0.1

*(continued)*

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT**  
to article in  
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (AUGUST:639–660)

**Table S1. Continued**

Survey	Code	Collector	Format <sup>1</sup>	Minutes <sup>2</sup>	Level <sup>3</sup>	Day <sup>2,4</sup>	Months <sup>5</sup>	Response <sup>6</sup>	Version
Italy									
1989	IT	National Institute of Statistics	Left-behind	open	House	1 <sup>10</sup>	12	70	5.5.2
Netherlands									
1975	NL	Social & Cultural Planning Bureau	Left-behind	15	Ind	7	Oct	76	5.5.2
1980	NL	Social & Cultural Planning Bureau	Left-behind	15	Ind	7	Oct	54	5.5.2
1985	NL	Social & Cultural Planning Bureau	Left-behind	15	Ind	7	Oct	54	5.5.2
1990	NL	Social & Cultural Planning Bureau	Left-behind	15	Ind	7	Oct	49	5.5.2
1995	NL	Social & Cultural Planning Bureau	Left-behind	15	Ind	7	Oct	20	5.5.2
2000	NL	Social & Cultural Planning Bureau <sup>8</sup>	Left-behind	15	Ind	7	Oct	25	5.5.2
Norway									
1980	NO	Central Bureau of Statistics	Left-behind	15	Ind	2	12	58	5.0.1
1990	NO	Central Bureau of Statistics	Left-behind	15	Ind	2	12	64	5.5.2
2000	NO	Central Bureau of Statistics <sup>8</sup>	Left-behind	10	House	2	12	50	5.5.2
Poland									
1965	PL	Polish Academy of Sciences <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Nov	95	5.0.1
Sweden									
1990	SW	Central Bureau of Statistics <sup>8</sup>	Left-behind	10	Ind	2	Sept to May	75	5.5.1
2001	SW	Central Bureau of Statistics <sup>8</sup>	Left-behind	10	Ind	2	12	50	5.5.2
UK									
1974	UK	British Broadcasting Corporation	Left-behind	30	House	7	Aug, Sept, & Feb	60	5.5.2
1987	UK	Economic and Social Research Council	Left-behind	15	House	7	July	70	5.5.2
1995	UK	Inst. for Social and Economic Research	Recall	15	Ind	1	May	62	5.5.2
2000	UK	Ipsos-RSL Ltd./Office for Nat'l Statistics <sup>8</sup>	Left-behind	10	House	2	12	45	5.5.2
US									
1965	US	Survey Research Center, U Michigan <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	House	1	Nov to May	74	5.5.2
1975	US	Survey Research Center, U Michigan	Left-behind	open	Ind	1 <sup>9</sup>	Oct to Dec	72	5.5.2
1985	US	Survey Research Center, U Michigan	Both	open	House	1	12	56	5.5.2
1998	US	Survey Research Center, U Maryland	Recall	open	Ind	1	12	56	5.5.2
2003	US	Bureau of Labor Statistics	Recall	open	Ind	1	12	57	5.5.2
Yugoslavia									
1965	YU	Institute of Sociology, Belgrade <sup>7</sup>	Left-behind	open	Ind	1	Oct to Dec	97	5.0.1

Notes: Gauthier, Smeeding, and Furstenberg (2004); Fisher (2004); Gauthier et al. (2003).

<sup>1</sup> In “Left-behind” diaries respondents are given a blank diary to fill-in during the course of a day. In “Recall” diaries respondents are asked to recall their activities on the previous day. Studies show great similarity between the two methods, with recall diaries typically showing 5 to 10% fewer diary entries, which may affect reports of short-duration activities (Harvey 1993).

<sup>2</sup> Discussions of non-comparability resulting from these differences appear under the “Data” section.

<sup>3</sup> “Ind” indicates an individual-level survey and “House” indicates a household-level survey. Possible dependence is not addressed in household-level surveys because so few households include two or more men aged 20 to 59.

<sup>4</sup> I include only the first day of two-day surveys (with the exception of Norway 1980 because there is no variable to distinguish repeated days). A control variable is included to capture distinctive aspects of the seven-day diaries included as a week average, and the day-of-the-week variable is coded to Wednesday.

**ONLINE SUPPLEMENT**  
to article in  
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 2006, VOL. 71 (AUGUST:639–660)

<sup>5</sup> The period of data collection varied from one to twelve months. This affects comparability if men's unpaid work varies seasonally. Studies show that estimates from autumn are most similar to 12-month averages (Harvey 1993). The studies conducted in only one season are typically conducted in autumn, contributing to comparability. There are two exceptions – the UK 1987 (July) and the UK 1995 (May) – that require caution.

<sup>6</sup> Response rates varied across the studies. Nonrandom nonresponse can lead to biased coefficients and variance estimates. I use appropriate weighting procedures as provided by MTUS. Recent studies of survey nonresponse in opinion research have found a limited effect of variation in nonresponse on substantive conclusions drawn from various surveys (Langer 2003).

<sup>7</sup> These studies were part of the Multinational Comparative Time-Budget Research Project, which followed standardized guidelines for data-collection.

<sup>8</sup> These studies were part of the Harmonised European Time-use Studies (HETUS) project, which followed standardized guidelines for data-collection.

<sup>9</sup> Each respondent was interviewed four times, once each season, but only the diaries from Wave 1 are included in the MTUS data.

<sup>10</sup> All weekdays are coded the same in this survey, thus all weekdays are coded as Wednesdays in the analyses (differences between other weekdays and Wednesdays are not statistically significant).

## REFERENCES

- Fisher, Kimberly. 2004. "Technical Details of Time Use Studies." Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, England. Retrieved March 1, 2005 (<http://iserwww.essex.ac.uk/misoc/timeuse/information/technical>).
- Gauthier, Anne Helene, Timothy M. Smeeding, and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. 2004. "Do We Invest Less Time in Children? Trends in Parental Time in Selected Industrialized Countries since the 1960s." Working Paper Series No. 64, Center for Policy Research, University of Syracuse, Syracuse, NY.
- Harvey, Andrew S. 1993. "Guidelines for Time Use Data Collection." *Social Indicators Research* 30:197–228.
- Langer, Gary. 2003. "About Response Rates: Some Unresolved Questions." *Public Perspective* 14(3):16–18.

**TABLE S2.** SENSITIVITY ANALYSES

**Table S2a.** Multi-level Models Predicting Men's Unpaid Work Time (minutes), Investigating Model Specifications

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	$\beta$	SE	$\beta$	SE	$\beta$	SE
Intercept	128.66	352.52	-60.73	357.96	-119.99	414.57
Individual-level Variables						
Married (1=yes)	23.72***	1.68	24.54***	2.09	20.95***	1.84
Child (1=yes)	5.89	10.02	10.41	11.63	3.87	10.02
Hrs of paid work (on diary day)	-15.07	.34	-15.01***	.38	-15.81***	.36
Not employed (1=yes)	-18.92***	3.23	-18.41***	3.70	-19.53***	2.94
Low education (1=yes)	3.56	2.28	4.67+	2.57	6.54**	2.36
Age	.69***	.07	.67***	.08	.71***	.07
National-level Variables						
Year	-.02	.17	.07	.18	.11	.21
% of married women employed	.45***	.12	.49***	.13	.53***	.15
Employed women's weekly paid hrs	.42	.41	.28	.44	-.14	.48
Employed men's weekly paid hrs	.28	.61	.51	.63	1.25	.69+
% of children age 0-2 in child care	-.12	.16	-.13	.17	-.43*	.18
Weeks of parental leave	-.02	.03	-.03	.03	.00	.03
Parental leave avail. to men (1=yes)	4.98	3.90	1.32	3.96	2.02	4.54
Cross-level Interactions						
Child * Employed women's paid hrs	.64*	.31	.60	.34+	.70*	.31
Child * Weeks of parental leave	-.08*	.04	-.10***	.04	-.11**	.04
Child * Parental leave avail. to men	19.26***	4.46	12.52***	3.15	19.76***	4.46
Variance Components						
In intercept-only model						
Between-country var.	—		7.43		—	
Between-survey var.	514.28		511.84		449.14	
Within-group var.	17125.57		17125.52		17684.56	
Between-country var.						
Between-country var.	—		6.38		—	
Between-survey var.	208.81		216.64		173.45	
Within-group var.	12832.88		12832.54		13217.11	
R <sup>2</sup>	.26		.26		.26	
Individual-level N	93,033		93,033		74,462	
-2 log likelihood	-571,552.10		-571,538.6		-459,014.3	
AIC	1143212.00		1,143,239.0		918,080.5	

*(continued)*

**Table S2a. Continued**

	Model 4		Model 5	
	$\beta$	SE	$\beta$	SE
Intercept	-7.90	5.28	472.29	489.86
Individual-level Variables				
Married (1=yes)	.19***	.02	—	—
Child (1=yes)	-.08	.08	—	—
Hours of paid work (on diary day)	-.12***	.00	-9.66***	.43
Not employed (1=yes)	-.19***	.02	-19.24***	3.61
Low education (1=yes)	.04*	.02	4.47+	2.66
Age	.01***	.00	2.26***	.12
National-level Variables				
Year	.01*	.00	-.21	.24
% of married women employed	.01**	.00	.40*	.18
Employed women's weekly paid hrs	-.01	.01	.08	.56
Employed men's weekly paid hrs	.02*	.01	-.73	.82
% of children age 0-2 in child care	-.01**	.00	-.20	.21
Weeks of parental leave	.00	.00	.01	.04
Parental leave avail. to men (1=yes)	-.05	.06	4.46	5.25
Cross-level Interactions				
Child * Employed women's paid hrs	.01***	.00	—	—
Child * Weeks of parental leave	-.0005	.00	—	—
Child * Parental leave avail. to men	.15***	.04	—	—
Variance Components				
In intercept-only model				
Between-country var.	—	—	—	—
Between-survey var.		.03		331.17
Within-group var.		1.19		12608.68
Between-country var.				
Between-survey var.		.02		102.08
Within-group var.		.93		10447.72
R <sup>2</sup>		.23		.18
Individual-level N		74,462		20,850
-2 log likelihood		-102,883.3		-125,994.3
AIC		205,818.7		252,058.5

Notes: Model 1 is the model discussed in the paper. Model 2 uses a 3-level specification with surveys (N = 44) nested with nations (N = 20). Model 3 restricts the analyses to men reporting greater than zero minutes of unpaid work. Model 4 logs the dependent variable using this same subset. Model 5 restricts the analyses to single, childless men.

+  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$  (two-tailed tests).

**Table S2b.** Multi-level Models Predicting Men’s Unpaid Work Time (log minutes), Investigating Spouse’s Employment Status.

	Routine (1)		Routine (2)		Other (1)	
	$\beta$	SE	$\beta$	SE	$\beta$	SE
Intercept	.764	7.438	2.644	6.223	9.637	8.041
Individual-level Variables						
Child (1=yes)	-.218*	.096	-.153	.097	-.006	.101
Hours of paid work (on diary day)	-.104***	.008	-.105***	.008	-.105***	.005
Not employed (1=yes)	.065*	.033	.093**	.036	-.075*	.032
Low education (1=yes)	-.032	.023	-.013	.024	.076**	.029
Age	-.001	.002	.000	.002	.008***	.001
Spouse employed (1=yes)			.182***	.025		
National-level Variables						
Year	.001	.004	.000	.003	-.003	.004
% of married women employed	.019***	.004	.016***	.003	.003	.004
Employed women's weekly paid hrs	.019+	.010	.011	.009	.000	.011
Employed men's weekly paid hrs	-.012	.013	-.011	.011	.013	.015
% of children age 0-2 in child care	-.019**	.006	-.014*	.005	-.035***	.007
Weeks of parental leave	.003**	.001	.002**	.001	.003**	.001
Parental leave avail. to men (1=yes)	-.187+	.098	-.175+	.082	.219	.112+
Cross-level Interactions						
Child * Employed women's paid hrs	.006+	.003	.005	.003	-.002	.004
Child * Weeks of parental leave	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000
Child * Parental leave avail. to men	.096*	.042	.088*	.042	.054	.043
Variance Components						
In intercept-only model						
Between-group var.		.097		.097		.073
Within-group var.		1.027		1.027		1.268
Between-group var.		.008		.006		.011
Within-group var.		.900		.892		1.091
R <sup>2</sup>		.19		.20		.18
Individual-level N		16,582		16,582		19,294
-2 log likelihood		-22614.92		-22542.58		-28,186.9
AIC		45319.85		45191.16		56,463.7

(continued)

**Table S2b. Continued**

	Other (2)		Child care (1)		Child care (2)	
	$\beta$	SE	B	SE	$\beta$	SE
Intercept	9.678	7.938	-3.032	8.716	-4.120	8.866
Individual-level variables						
Child (1=yes)	.015	.103	—	—	—	—
Hours of paid work (on diary day)	-.105***	.005	-.062***	.006	-.062***	.006
Not employed (1=yes)	-.073*	.032	.018	.048	.013	.048
Low education (1=yes)	.078**	.029	-.172**	.045	-.173***	.046
Age	.008***	.001	-.028***	.004	-.028***	.004
Spouse employed (1=yes)	.015	.022			-.012	.029
National-level variables						
Year	-.003	.004	.004	.004	.004	.005
% of married women employed	.002	.004	.001	.004	.003	.004
Employed women's weekly paid hrs	.000	.011	.001	.012	.000	.012
Employed men's weekly paid hrs	.013	.014	.013	.014	.009	.014
% of children age 0-2 in child care	-.035***	.007	.011	.007	.009	.008
Weeks of parental leave	.003**	.001	-.003**	.001	-.003**	.001
Parental leave avail. to men (1=yes)	.228+	.110	.292*	.108	.262*	.109
Cross-level interactions						
Child * Employed women's paid hrs	-.003	.004	—	—	—	—
Child * Weeks of parental leave	.001+	.000	—	—	—	—
Child * Parental leave avail. to men	.048	.042	—	—	—	—
Variance components						
In intercept-only model						
Between-group var.		.073		.110		.110
Within-group var.		1.268		.997		.997
Between-group var.		.011		.006		.006
Within-group var.		1.091		.921		.921
R <sup>2</sup>		.18		.16		.16
Individual-level N		19,294		8,514		8,514
-2 log likelihood		-28,184.2		-11,716.1		-11,710.6
AIC		56,474.4		23,502.3		23,505.2

*Note:* The sample is restricted to married respondents in the 20 surveys containing a spousal employment variable. This is not a random assortment of the surveys; only eight countries are represented and the surveys disproportionately come from after 1990 (Canada in 1981, 1992, and 1998, France in 1998, Germany in 1992, Italy in 1989, the Netherlands in 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, and 2000, Norway in 1980, 1990, and 2000, the UK in 1975, and 2000, the US in 1975, 1998, and 2003).

Men's unpaid work time is broken into its three components because spouse's employment matters for some types of men's unpaid work, but not others (washing out the effect of spouse's employment in a combined analysis). Because the number of zero reports increases when sub-types are analyzed, I restrict the analysis to respondents reporting more than one minute of that type of unpaid work on their diary day ("participators") and log the dependent variable. Models for routine and other housework are restricted to married respondents reporting participation on their diary day. Models for child care are further restricted to respondents living with children.

In each pair, model 1 includes the variables from the model presented in the main text and model 2 adds spouse's employment status coded to 1 if the respondent's spouse is employed either full- or part-time. Full-time employment could not be distinguished from part-time employment in many of the surveys.

The results show that male participators with employed spouses perform more routine housework per day than do men with non-employed spouses. The effect of spouse's employment is not statistically significant for other housework or child care. Overall, the results show that the national-level effects of women's employment are robust to the inclusion of individual-level data on the employment practices of wives.

+  $p < .10$ ; \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$  (two-tailed tests).

## NATIONAL-LEVEL DATA SOURCES

Percentage of children ages 0 to 2 in publicly supported child care compiled from the following:

- Annuaire Statistique De La Belgique*, vol. 81. 1960. Brussels, Belgium: Institut National de Statistique.
- Annuaire Statistique De La France*, vol. 77. 1972. Paris, France: Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques.
- Czechoslovakia: Statistical Abstract*. 1968. Prague, Czechoslovakia: Orbis.
- Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. 1978. *Statistical Yearbook of the Members States of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance*. London, England: IPC Industrial Press.
- David, Myriam and Irene Lezine. 1975. *Early Child Care in France*. London, England: Gordon and Breach.
- Deven, Fred. 1998. "Belgium as a Cross-Roads for Child Care in Europe." Pp. 105-21 in *Child Care and Female Labour Supply in the Netherlands: Facts, Analyses, Policies*, edited by J. Schippers, J. J. Siegers, and J. de Jong-Gierveld. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Thesis Publishers.
- Gornick, Janet C, Marcia K. Meyers, and Katherin E. Ross. 1997. "Supporting the Employment of Mothers: Policy Variation across Fourteen Welfare States." *Journal of European Social Policy* 7:45-70.
- Gornick, Janet and Marcia Meyers. 2003. *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Leira, Arnlaug. 1987. *Day Care for Children in Denmark, Norway and Sweden*. Oslo, Norway: Institute for Social Research.
- Meyers, Marcia and Janet Gornick. 2000. "Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC): Cross-National Variation in Service Organization and Financing." Presented at the Consultative Meeting on International Developments in Early Childhood Education and Care: An Activity of the Columbia Institute for Child and Family Policy, May, New York.
- Morokvasic, Mirjana. 1986. "Being a Woman in Yugoslavia: Past, Present and Institutional Equality." Pp. 120-38 in *Women of the Mediterranean*, edited by M. Gadant. London, England: Zed Books.
- Muller-Escoda, Beatrice and Ulla Vogt. 1997. "France: Institutionalization of Plurality." Pp. 49-76 in *Family Life and Family Policies in Europe*, vol 1: *Structures and Trends in the 1980s*, edited by F.-X. Kaufmann, A. Kuijsten, H.-J. Schulze, and K. P. Strohmeier. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- National Day Care Information Centre. 1972. *A Review of the Major Findings of the National Day Care Survey*. Ottawa, Ontario: Health and Welfare Canada.
- . 1978. *Status of Day Care in Canada: A Review of the Major Findings of the National Day Care Study 1978*. Ottawa, Ontario: Health and Welfare Canada.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2001. *Starting Strong: Early Childhood Education and Care*. Paris, France: OECD Publications.
- Questiaux, Nicole and Jacques Fournier. 1978. "France." Pp. 117-82 in *Family Policy: Government and Families in Fourteen Countries*, edited by S. Kamerman and A. J. Kahn. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rocznik Statystyczny*. 1966. Warsaw, Poland: Nakładem Głównego Urzedu Statystycznego.
- Statistical Pocketbook of the German Democratic Republic*. 1970. Berlin, Germany: Staatsverlag der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.
- Statistical Reference Book of Republic of Bulgaria*. 1987. Sofia, Bulgaria: The Office.
- Statistical Yearbook / Hungarian Central Statistical Office*. 1967. Budapest, Hungary: The Office.
- . 1976. Budapest, Hungary: The Office.
- Statistics Canada. 2004. "Age Groups (12) and Sex (3) for Population, for Canada, Provinces and Territories, 1921 to 2001 Censuses - 100% Data." Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada. Retrieved April 29, 2004 (<http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/standard/themes/RetrieveProductTable.cfm?Temporal=2001&PID=55522&GID=355313&METH=1&APATH=3&PTYPE=55440&THEME=37&AID=0&FREE=0&FOCUS=0&VID=0&GC=0&GK=0&SC=1&SR=1&RL=0&CPP=99&RPP=9999&D1=0&D2=0&D3=0&D4=0&D5=0&D6=0&d1=5>).
- Tietze, Wolfgang and Debby Cryer. 1999. "Current Trends in European Early Child Care and Education." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 563:175-93.

**NATIONAL-LEVEL DATA SOURCES** (*Continued*)

Parental leave measures compiled from the following:

- Adamik, Maria. 1991. "Hungary - Supporting Parenting and Child Rearing: Policy Innovation in Eastern Europe." Pp. 115-44 in *Child Care, Parental Leave, and the under 3s: Policy Innovation in Europe*, edited by S. Kamerman and A. J. Kahn. New York: Auburn House.
- Arndt, Herbert, et al. 1971. *Introducing the GDR*. Dresden, Germany: Verlag Zeit im Bild.
- Baker, Maureen and Shelley Phipps. 1997. "Canada." Pp. 103-206 in *Volume I: Family Change and Family Policies in Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States*, vol. I, *Family Change and Family Policies in the West*, edited by S. Kamerman and A. J. Kahn. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- den Dulk, Laura. 1999. "Work-Family Arrangements in the Netherlands: The Role of Employers." Pp. 21-40 in *Work-Family Arrangements in Europe*, edited by L. den Dulk, v. Doorne-Huiskes, and J. Schippers. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Thela Thesis.
- Duric, Suzana and Gordana Dragicevic. 1965. *Women in Yugoslav Society and Economy*. Belgrade, Serbia: Medunarodna Politika.
- Gauthier, Anne Helene. 1996. *The State and the Family: A Comparative Analysis of Family Policies in Industrialized Countries*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Gauthier, Anne Helene and A. Bortnik. 2001. "Comparative Maternity, Parental and Childcare Database, Version 2." Calgary, Canada: University of Calgary. Retrieved January 10, 2004 ([http://www.soci.ucalgary.ca/fypp/family\\_policy\\_databases.htm](http://www.soci.ucalgary.ca/fypp/family_policy_databases.htm)).
- Halasz, Zoltan. 1963. *Hungary: Geography, History, Political and Social System, Economy, Living Standard, Culture, Sports*. Budapest, Hungary: Corvina Press.
- Kocourkova, Jirina. 2002. "Leave Arrangements and Childcare Services in Central Europe: Policies and Practices before and after Transition." *Community, Work, & Family* 5:301-18.
- Laciak, Beata. 1994. "Family Benefits and Social Policy in Poland." Pp. 277-88 in *Families, Politics and the Law: Perspectives from East and West Europe*, edited by M. Maclean and J. Kurczewski. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Menniti, Adele, Rossella Palomba, and Linda Laura Sabbadini. 1997. "Italy: Changing the Family from Within." Pp. 225-52 in *Family Life and Family Policies in Europe*, vol. 1: *Structures and Trends in the 1980s*, edited by F.-X. Kaufmann, A. Kuijsten, H.-J. Schulze, and K. P. Strohmeier. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Schiersmann, Christiane. 1991. "Germany: Recognizing the Value of Child Rearing." Pp. 51-80 in *Child Care, Parental Leave, and the under 3s: Policy Innovation in Europe*, edited by S. Kamerman and A. J. Kahn. New York: Auburn House.
- Scott, Hilda. 1974. *Does Socialism Liberate Women? Experiences from Eastern Europe*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- United Nations. 1987. "Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties under Article 18 of the Convention: Initial Reports of States Parties: France." New York: United Nations.
- . 1992. "Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties under Article 18 of the Convention: Second Periodic Reports of States Parties: Australia." Vienna, Austria: United Nations.
- . 1994. "Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties under Article 18 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women: Second and Third Periodic Reports of the States Parties: Republic of Bulgaria." New York: United Nations.