1 Introduction to the *Handbook on Gender and Social Policy*

Sheila Shaver

Gender being central to social policy and the welfare state is now taken for granted. It was not always so. This centrality has come only after more than two decades of feminist challenge to mainstream theorizing, and at a time when gender has become increasingly salient in employment, family life and social politics.

The early literature of contemporary social policy was generally silent about gender. Feminist voices, such as those of Hilary Land (1976), Elizabeth Wilson (1977), Cora Baldock and Bettina Cass (1983), Kari Waerness (1984) and Helga Hernes (1987), spoke into this silence, naming it as an order of power and interest institutionalized in welfare state benefits and programmes. For a long time their voices went mostly unheard in mainstream debate, but by the mid-1980s there were the foundations of a substantial, but parallel, international literature on gender in social policy. Its themes have been enduring. The conversation between this new literature and mainstream social policy has been extraordinarily productive, not only for gender but for the study of the welfare state itself (Orloff 2009).

This new literature widened the two-dimensional focus of the mainstream on state and economy to a three-sided discourse of state, market and family.¹ Showing all three as deeply gendered, it brought new complexity to social policy thinking about social class relations, market structures and political agency. This invited a fresh look at aspects of policy that were already familiar, such as labour regulations, and focused new attention on labour that had gone unnoticed because it was unpaid, such as the work of caring for others (Finch and Groves 1983; Ungerson 1990; Folbre 2001). It highlighted policy history whose importance had largely been overlooked, such as maternalist women's movements advocating state support for mothers and children (Lewis 1980; Skocpol 1992; Koven and Michel 1993). It exposed the gendered assumptions underlying distributional biases in social programmes, most often favouring men as breadwinners and women as their dependents (McIntosh 1978; Shaver 1983). Also, it presented extensive evidence of disproportionate levels of poverty among women (Pearce and McAdoo 1981; Scott 1984; Lewis and Piachaud 1987).

It took a while before the emerging discourse on gender and social policy said much about men. The mainstream literature had been implicitly all about men, taking as given men's place as heads of household, wage workers and political leaders. It took the new discourse of gender and social policy to show that gender is not only about women; men have gender too. From an initial concern about the policy positioning of men as fathers and workers in the welfare state, it soon extended to wide-ranging discussions of masculinities, sexualities, fatherhood, men's health and male violence (Pringle 1995; Popay et al. 1998; Cornwall et al. 2011; Hearn 2010). The writers who took up this concern with men have done more to engage with feminist thinking about gender and social policy than feminist argument has done in return.

This introduction to the *Handbook on Gender and Social Policy* gives a necessarily brief account of the key terms of argument on gender and social policy that lie behind current discussion in this field. It begins with gender itself, and the contested meaning of equality and inequality around gender relations and gender difference, and shows these as inhabiting the central institutions of social policy.

The introduction then turns to social policy and the succession of theoretical perspectives that have shaped the study of welfare state formation and policy development. Comparative international study of social policy has been the engine of scholarship in this field, and the discussion largely follows its intellectual course. Gender was a significant dimension throughout these discussions, but rarely expressed in its mainstream voices. By the 1990s, as scholars' attention was turning to the economic and social implications of advanced economies of post-industrial employment, its importance was becoming evident. In particular, issues about women's employment and the balance of work and family moved to the centre of social policies in the economically advanced nations and the advice of international agencies such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

In the current period, scholarship on gender and social policy has been extending its vision beyond the developed world to global developments and the countries of the global South. The intellectual implications of this step are only beginning to be explored. The introduction describes this development, indicating issues about the conceptual frames and social processes relevant to it.

The second half of the introduction outlines the structure of the book and foreshadows the contents and arguments of its other 23 chapters.

GENDER AND GENDER EQUALITY

Gender is a concept that applies to both women and men, and to the social relations between and among them. Gender is not reducible to biology, but is inherently associated with male and female bodies and bodily capacities, including sexuality and sexual orientation, fertility and reproduction, and the human capacities to labour, nurture and care. It has been conventional to distinguish between sex and gender, with sex referring to biological levels and gender to socially constructed identities. This categorization, and especially its reduction to binary categories of male and female, is a false distinction, obscuring complexities and interactions of both the biological and the social (Westbrook and Schilt 2014).

As a social construct, gender is relational, ordering enduring patterns of relations between people and groups. It forms a basis for social identities of individuals in personal life and collective social arrangements. It is a key feature of social structure shaping relations between and among men and women; the division of labour in paid and unpaid work, the hierarchies of power and authority in daily life and democratic government, the discourses shaping everyday life, and the emotional foundations of social and sexual bonding (Connell 1987, 2002; Orloff 2009).

Gender is the basis of complex social inequalities, taking the forms of both material inequalities of income, assets and social status and social inequalities reflecting unequally valued social identities. Material inequalities are evident in social stratification in most

countries, with women typically, though not necessarily, having lower incomes and lesser economic security than men. Rates of poverty tend to be higher for women than for men, as does economic vulnerability in old age. Although varying significantly from country to country, there are almost universally also gender inequalities in administrative authority, ranks on corporate ladders and political power.

Much of women's greater vulnerability derives from their greater responsibility for children and families. The gender division of labour in families and wider social life has assigned them primary roles in social reproduction, such as domestic labour, childcare and elder care, and the provisioning of the household. Taking place in the private sphere, the social identities that these roles confer carry lesser status than paid employment in the public economy.

Feminist theorists have pointed to the care of others as socially necessary work which social theory long failed to recognize. It is a form of labour, requiring time, skills and commitment, but when embedded in close familial relationships it often has an emotional character different from paid work in the public sphere (Finch and Groves 1983; Tronto 1993). The concept of care has come to be central to social policy discourse and the structures and programmes of welfare states. It is now widely recognized that just as welfare states regulate paid employment, they also support and regulate the social organization of care, through the direct provision of services and indirect support of household provision. This recognition replaces the vision of the wage worker as an independent actor of labour market exchange, with a vision of the human interdependence of work and care (Jenson 1997; Daly and Lewis 2000; Lister 2003).

Social policy's most direct connection with gender relations is through what it means for the gender division of labour in paid and unpaid work. Welfare states are structured around a variety of family models reflecting different expectations about the roles of marital partners and their care of children. Two of these stand out (Lewis 1992; Sainsbury 1996). The 'male breadwinner model' follows post-war norms of the traditional, heteronormative family in which the husband has primary responsibility for economic support of the household, and the wife the main work of caregiving and domestic provisioning. In the post-war period, western welfare states were commonly shaped around this expectation. In the decades after, it has been common for their terms to be rewritten as gender neutral and/or adjusted to accommodate part-time employment on the part of the primary carer. The model has also been adapted to concentrate its support for the male-breadwinner family form in the period when children are young, and to moderate this in later years. The 'dual-earner family model', also called the 'adult worker model', reflects policy aspirations to gender equality. It presumes that partners share responsibility for both employment and household. This model is most closely associated with Nordic countries, where policy measures usually include employment benefits such as paid parental leave and incentives for fathers to share such leave. Nancy Fraser (1994) has suggested that these two family models imply a third, the 'dual earner/dual carer' model in which partners have equal roles in both earning and caring.

Bringing gender into the picture has brought into view new facets of social policy and the welfare state. One such facet is the contribution of social provision to personal autonomy. Besides shielding the worker from abject dependence on the labour market, welfare provision can serve to protect citizens, especially those with dependent children, from unchosen dependence on the support of a partner. Orloff (1993a) defines this as

the 'capacity to form an autonomous household'. It is most important for sole parents, among whom poverty rates are high in most countries. Hobson (1990) has argued that since the support available to lone mothers gives married mothers an indication of the terms under which they might exit marriage, it gives a measure of this capacity. In this sense, a strong safety net under sole parents also empowers women within marriage. Defamilialization (also termed defamilization) (Lister 2003) is a very similar idea referring to the way welfare state provision may support women's independence. The term is often used in the more specific sense of benefits and especially services relieving the family of household tasks and caring work that would otherwise preclude women's paid employment. Policies supporting defamilialization and dual-earner families are important for gender equality.

SOCIAL POLICY²

The wellsprings of social policy and the welfare state lie in the insecurities of employment and income inherent in capitalist economies. The founding literature of the field studied the development of key forms of early social protection, such as indoor and outdoor relief, workers' compensation, sickness pay and old age pensions, at the beginning of the twentieth century in Europe, North America and Australasia. These were understood as state responses to social distress, dislocation and conflict that accompanied widespread social dependence on employment income. Recovery and rebuilding after the depression of the 1930s and the Second World War spurred further development of the institutions of what became known as the welfare state. While varying in form and scale, these came to provide frameworks of assistance to support the sick and unemployed, save for retirement, assist parents to support children, moderate housing costs and relieve poverty. The post-war period became the 'golden age' of industrial capitalism and the redistributive welfare state. With the neoliberal turn of the 1980s and the increasing economic importance of the service economy, the politics of social policy have turned to restraint, retrenchment and restructuring.

The theoretical perspectives that have been offered to frame explanations of the development of welfare programmes have been rich and various. We can describe these in three broad groups. All have continuing interest and relevance, including to the relationship between gender and social policy, but this relevance long went unrecognized in mainstream discussion.

Modernization

A broad school of thought associates the emergence of welfare institutions with the development of industrial society. One example portrays welfare institutions as responses to new social needs that emerge with modernization. Industrialization brings demographic change through urbanization, smaller family households, and a life cycle of education, employment and retirement. In these circumstances mutual support from kin and community is less available. Functions such as health care and education become domains of specialized, usually professional services (Wilensky and Lebeaux 1958). Another is the classic work of Richard Titmuss (1958, 1974). Inspired by the solidaristic responses

of the British to the Second World War, Titmuss viewed social policy institutions as creating social frameworks of benefits and taxes through which members of the nation might share the risks of adversity. Policy questions concerned their adequacy, efficiency and equity; his analysis of their redistributive effects, including 'occupational and fiscal welfare' provided through employment and taxation, often pointed to perverse outcomes. Titmuss identified three types of welfare state. The residual type sees the proper role of the state as limited, providing support when market or family fail. In the industrial/achievement type the state serves as an adjunct to the market, maintaining differentials of status and well-being in circumstances of adversity. The institutional type sees the state as an expression of social democratic community, supporting citizens with benefits and services available without test of means or stigma. Throughout his working life he pursued a continuing argument with the followers of Friedrich Hayek and the precursors of contemporary neoliberalism.

These accounts focused on the public domain of social policy, treating the private spheres of family and community as natural, inherently altruistic and to be protected from intrusion by the state. The result was to establish an implicit understanding of policy as the male world of state and economy. Identified with the private world of home and family, women were largely absent. Because these accounts were foundational for social policy, this gender blindness shaped the field for a considerable period.

Social Citizenship

A second perspective explains social policy as the product of the conflicts of class and political interest at the heart of industrial capitalism. Karl Polanyi's (1944) account of the English Poor Law Reform of 1834 showed social provision as emerging with the development of capital and the labour market. The Speenhamland Law of 1795 had given poor and unemployed workers the right to outdoor relief. Its replacement by the more punitive workhouse and indoor relief was necessary to create the 'free' market in labour required by the emerging 'laissez faire' order. Writing in the more optimistic circumstances of post-war Britain, T.H. Marshall (1949) portrayed the welfare state as an extended form of citizenship generated in the tension between class inequality and political equality. Welfare state protection represented new social rights, built on the foundation of civil and political rights achieved in previous centuries. By social rights he meant 'the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society' (Marshall 1949 [1963], p. 74). In the capitalist society of the twentieth century, the relative equality of social citizenship could help to counterbalance the inequality of the class system. Anna Yeatman's chapter in this volume re-examines Marshall's classic essay.

Feminist critics have argued that Marshall's vision of citizenship is flawed by patriarchal foundations. Carole Pateman (1989; see also Fraser and Gordon 1994; Lister 2003) finds these foundations in the heritage of liberal ideology that it draws on, arguing that it understands the polity as made up of (male) heads of households. The citizen is implicitly male and takes part in democratic rule on behalf of household members. Thus while liberalism posits values of independence, individualism and universalism, these refer to the public sphere and are implicitly masculine. The citizenship of wives, mothers

and children, denizens of the private sphere, is identified with womanly dependence and accordingly flawed. Pateman sees women caught in 'Wollstonecraft's dilemma' in which demands for equal treatment with men come in conflict with other necessary claims to support for gender-specific needs and responsibilities. Birte Siim (2000) finds different weaknesses in gender equality in the different citizenship models of republican France, liberal Britain and social democratic Denmark.

Power Resources

Third, power resources theory has brought politics and political organization to the forefront of social policy analysis. Walter Korpi (1983), John Stephens (1979) and others see welfare state institutions as generated through the political mobilization of the working class. This perspective has brought close attention to the role of institutions such as trade unions, political parties and political alliances in the growth of welfare state institutions and policies reducing social and economic inequality. Based on comparative international study, this perspective brought new complexity to thinking about social policy.

Gosta Esping-Andersen's (1990) analysis of welfare regimes and their role in shaping economic transitions from industrial to post-industrial capitalism draws on all these themes. He saw welfare states as not merely more or less developed, but as taking qualitatively differing forms as a result of the class and political alliances that have shaped them. Analysing data for countries who were members of the OECD during the 1980s, he found three types of welfare-state regime representing different trajectories of development. These were based on measures representing what he saw as the salient characteristics of welfare states: their capacity for 'de-commodification', their effects on social stratification, and the public/private mix in social provision. De-commodification rests on an idea drawn from Polanyi, and refers to the capacity of welfare provision to shelter the claimant from the 'disciplinary whip' of the labour market. The social stratification measure weighs the effects of social provision in shaping and reshaping the distribution of income and other resources. The public-private mix refers to the articulation of public and private sectors in welfare arrangements.

Esping-Andersen's analysis has been the object of powerful criticism for its gender bias. The most devastating of these concerns the concept of de-commodification as the liberating dimension of social benefits. This may capture something important about the vulnerability of individuals, usually men, to the vicissitudes of the labour market. It does not represent liberation for a person, paradigmatically a woman, outside the labour market and dependent on a partner's income. In this circumstance it is commodification that may be liberating, in the sense that an income of her own may give her a degree of independence from her partner, but there may be an equally compelling need for support from the state. It was in this context that Orloff, Lister and others brought concepts of the capacity to form an autonomous household and defamilialization (Lewis 1992; O'Connor 1993; Orloff 1993a; Lister 2003). A number of chapters in this book refer to this controversy.

In a result that parallels Titmuss's residual, industrial/achievement and institutional models, Esping-Andersen defined clusters of welfare states as belonging to liberal, corporatist and social democratic types of welfare regime. Liberal welfare regimes are found mainly in the English-speaking nations of the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia

and New Zealand. Reflecting political traditions of liberal individualism and ideological privileging of the market, welfare plays a residual role when market and family fail. Corporatist welfare regimes are found mainly in continental Europe and reflect political histories of conservative and religious party rule. These have generous welfare states designed to foster stability and social integration. Social democratic welfare regimes, paradigmatically those of the Nordic countries, contrast with both other types. Built over long periods of social democratic dominance, they are large welfare states aspiring to class and gender equalization and large and generous provision. Since the publication of Esping-Andersen's influential book other welfare state types have been canvassed and the range of countries considered has been greatly extended (Béland and Mahon 2016, pp.49–53).

Finally, the perspective of historical institutionalism points to the importance of the structures and actors within the state itself in responding to social claims (Skocpol 1985, 1992; Orloff 1993b; Pierson 1994). This has developed to encompass more general attention to the importance of political systems and the organization of power, and the role of actors and interests within and outside the state in shaping policy design. It has been particularly important in pointing to the capacities of state structures to constrain and facilitate responses to political demands, fostering path dependency in welfare state development. There has been considerable work on gender and social policy generated from within this perspective.

NEW SOCIAL RISKS AND THE POST-INDUSTRIAL TRANSITION

Gender has been central to the post-industrial transition of western economies and welfare states. The welfare state types that Esping-Andersen identified, supplemented by additional types in subsequent debate, represented social policy regimes shaping distinctive trajectories for the post-industrial transition. The gender blindness of this analysis obscured policy elements that have been important for this transition, and in particular for the rise of the service economy. These elements have been better revealed by gendered comparative analysis of welfare states, both of individual case studies and of groups and types (O'Connor et al. 1999; Sainsbury 1996; Ostner and Lewis 1995; Huber and Stephens 2000, 2001).

With post-industrialism have come new social risks. Prime among them has been a shift in the demand for labour away from the unskilled industrial work that many men did and towards occupations in professional and service sectors in which women have typically been employed. Driven by increasingly global demand and in many cases shaped by neoliberal ideologies, post-industrial economies have had more jobs established as non-standard, 'flexible' employment with reduced security of hours and tenure. Families, too, face new challenges. Families take more diverse forms, with greater numbers of sole parents and single-person households. It is increasingly the norm for mothers as well as fathers to be in paid employment and for families to experience tensions between work and family needs. As educational standards rise, children are dependent on their parents for longer, and with improved health and longer lifespans there are also growing demands on pension systems and needs for elder care (Taylor-Gooby 2004; Yerkes 2011).

Welfare states have responded to these changes differently, but with common concerns for labour market activation (Kalisch 1991; OECD 2015). Activation measures have been directed at the unemployed and persons of working age otherwise not employed, and range from facilitation of job search to training and retraining. In liberal welfare regimes activation has taken the form of ‘welfare reform’, increasing incentives to paid work, enforcing rule compliance and applying conditionalities to benefits. Corporatist regimes have mixed enhanced work incentives and individualized case management with training and retraining measures. Activation was less new in Nordic regimes, which have long predicated benefits on employment history, but there has been increased emphasis on training and job readiness. Many countries have applied activation strategies to mothers and especially to sole parents, marking the end of maternalist policies supporting them as full-time mothers (Orloff 2006).

The post-industrial transition has also seen common developments to facilitate women’s employment and a corresponding shift in family models towards dual-earner partnerships. Policy prescriptions have advocated measures for defamilialization, with the state encouraged to ameliorate work–family conflict with policies such as paid parental leave and support for the care for children and elderly family members. Some versions have labour market flexibility as the goal. More expansive versions frame policy packages as social investment in economic growth and human capital formation, joining support for families with early childhood education, lifelong learning, employability measures and the social inclusion of marginalized groups (Esping-Andersen et al. 2002; OECD 2007; Jenson 2009). The responses of liberal welfare states have been varied, but in general have given little support to defamilialization policies such as paid parental leave and early childhood education and care. There has been significant marketization of services, largely without state subsidy in the USA and with significant subsidy in the Australian case. Corporatist policy regimes have improved access to childcare and extended parental leave, while Nordic regimes have deepened their support to dual-earner households with the provision of parental leave to fathers on a ‘use it or lose it’ basis. Their extensive provision of services and large public sectors combined to sustain full female employment and welfare state generosity, but in recent years moves to reduce public expenditure have seen replacement of state services by contracted and often market-based services.

In the neoliberal political context, these addresses to new social risks have been accompanied by attempts to reduce welfare state provision, intensified by the ‘great recession’¹³ in the period since 2008. In the event, governments have found it difficult, but not impossible, to cut back established programmes. Historical institutionalist accounts (Pierson 1994) have shown that the politics of retrenchment differ from those of the post-war expansion. This is because of political feedback loops; as programmes have been established and grown they have created political constituencies ready to defend their interests in them. While welfare states have generally continued on the same developmental trajectory, the outcomes have been more akin to welfare state restructuring than to simple retrenchment (Béland and Mahon 2016, pp. 98–102). In the result, the gender equality goals of measures to address new social risks have been displaced by economically driven objectives of labour force utilization and economic growth (Jenson 2009). In a comparative study of four European countries’ responses to the great recession, Leschke and Jepsen (2014) found the stimulus policies of the early phase were directed at the sectors of the labour market dominated by men, and welfare cutbacks tended to hit women hardest. Two

countries deferred plans to extend fathers' leave, and expansion of childcare provision was constrained in all four.

WIDER WORLDS OF WELFARE

Comparative international study of social policy, initially confined to the OECD countries of the global North, has extended to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the global South. This development was set off in part by Esping-Andersen's (1990) derivation of welfare state regimes. These debates invited questioning about other regime types and other trajectories of development in the global post-industrial world.

In Southern Europe a fourth, 'Latin Rim' world of welfare (Leibfried 1992; Ferrera 1996) was identified, exemplified by Spain, Portugal and Italy. Among its defining gender characteristics is a low level of service provision, with women and families dependent on familial and private support. In Central and Eastern Europe the fall of communism sparked transitions from comprehensive socialist welfare support to hybrid adaptations to market economies. These have fostered dual roles for women as mothers and workers (Béland and Mahon 2016, pp. 50–51). East Asian countries have seen dynamic change from a 'Confucian' emphasis on family solidarity and care to 'productivist' policy regimes geared to employment and economic growth (Goodman and Peng 1996; Peng and Wong 2008; Peng 2012). In Latin America welfare regimes blend liberal market elements with some degree of universalism. Brazil and Mexico have led the development of conditional cash transfers, making benefit eligibility conditional on activities associated with employment and care (Martínez Franzoni 2008; Huber and Stephens 2012).

Social policy itself is a product of an increasingly global environment, and reflects national and international responses to global events. The 2008–09 great recession has been perhaps the most consequential such event for social policy. Its effects on nation states differed, marking both intensification of and critical questioning about neoliberal austerity policies (Béland and Mahon 2016, pp. 99–101). Over recent decades transnational and supranational bodies have become important sources of policy research, advocacy and intervention. The European Union has added an additional layer to the social policy frameworks of its member states. Global actors such as the World Bank, the OECD, and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have promoted and contested policy strategies from privatization of pensions to social investment in early childcare and education. United Nations agencies such as the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), regional bodies such as the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and international social movement organizations facilitate policy discussion and diffusion (Deacon 2007; Béland and Orenstein 2013; Mahon 2014).

With the global movement of people, historically and in contemporary life, welfare states serve increasingly diverse constituencies. This is not a new issue, especially for settler and colonizer nations, but as more societies recognize themselves as interracial and/or multicultural it has become increasingly pressing. Conceptually, it invites newly complex thinking about the social identity of the rights bearing citizen and the foundations of solidarity that underlie the welfare state. As well as class and gender, it is increasingly necessary to take into account race or ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation and other

dimensions of personal and social life, and their interactions with each other (Williams 1989, 1995; Quadagno 1994; Hobson 2003; Pfau-Effinger 2005). Scholars are using the concept of intersectionality as a way of capturing the multiplicity of interacting dimensions in complex society. Fiona Williams offers a conceptual discussion in this volume, and a number of other contributors also use the concept. Politically, increasing social diversity raises questions about the potential for racial, ethnic and religious division to weaken the solidarity welfare states require to fund benefits, sustain taxation capacities and facilitate redistribution among citizens and groups (Banting and Kymlicka 2006; Sainsbury 2012). The cultural dimensions of citizenship and social policy remain little understood in welfare state scholarship (Stevenson 2001).

There has been increasing migration of care workers, mainly women, from the global South to meet care needs in the countries of the global North. The 'global care chains' (Hochschild 2000; Williams 2012) that this sets up link women in rich and poor countries, raising new issues of policy and social justice at both ends. These include the vulnerability of care workers in what are often insecure and poorly paid labour markets in countries of the North, and care workers' separation from the children and others they have left behind in the South. The link between migration and care policies is new, and a rich field for policy research and experimentation.

THE HANDBOOK AND ITS CHAPTERS

Thirty-eight scholars have contributed to the *Handbook of Gender and Social Policy*. These include both distinguished writers in their particular areas of the field, and comparatively new researchers with fresh views on its enduring intellectual problems. Contributors come from the various disciplines of the social sciences, and from diverse countries and regions of the world. They have each tackled their subject as they have seen fit, expressing their own views with respect to theory, politics and policy. Hence the chapters do not necessarily address issues in the same ways or reach the same conclusions.

Part I: Perspectives

This book opens with a group of chapters about various perspectives on gender and social policy, and the way that these perspectives frame the politics and policy questions that arise within them. These are big-picture discussions of concepts and problems for policy across diverse fields both theoretic and geographic.

In 'Gender, social policy and the idea of the welfare state', Anna Yeatman presents a bold new interpretation of T.H. Marshall's classic essay 'Citizenship and social class'. Her interpretation reminds us of why Marshall's essay has inspired generations of social policy scholars. More importantly for the present period, Yeatman shows us the vision it offers of the purpose and potential of the western welfare state in the realization of human freedom.

Fiona Williams was among the first social policy scholars to argue the necessity for the social policy field to deal with the multiplicity of social identity in contemporary society, where inequalities not only of class and gender but also race, age, disability, sexuality and more take social and political form. Here, in 'Intersectionality, gender and social policy',

she engages with this problem through the concept of intersectionality, and its implications for theory and method, policy analysis and political strategy.

Men often have only a shadowy presence in social policy discussion, where too often the default assumption equates gender with women. In 'Men, masculinities and social policy', Jeff Hearn, Keith Pringle and Dag Balkmar show us the complex field of gender with the lens focused on men and the diversity of men's experiences. Taking comparative international and transnational perspectives, they highlight both enduring features of men's needs and claims and the social movements responding to them.

Feminist scholarship has made care a central theme of social policy in the global North. Shahra Razavi and Silke Staab examine the meaning of care in countries of the global South. In 'Rethinking social policy: a gender perspective from the developing world', the authors discuss the key concepts of care, in theory and women's experience, as they apply in developing countries. These include commodification and de-commodification of labour in contexts where much employment is informal, the role of basic social protection in shaping the circumstances of care, and the conceptual meaning of care itself. The authors suggest that in the developing world at least, this concept is better understood in the broader terms of social reproduction.

The final chapter in this section addresses how prostitution is to be understood, as a legitimate form of paid work or as a criminal phenomenon of exploitation and sex trafficking. The answer to this question defines the policy domain to which it belongs. Joyce Outshoorn, writing 'Policy reforms on prostitution: the quest for control', examines national policies to control the sex industry in western nations, principally abolitionism, regulation, prohibition or legalization, new trends of client criminalization and legalization, and newer forms of governance reliant on non-state actors. Outshoorn views prostitution as sex work and its excesses best controlled through protection against forced labour.

Part II: Inequalities in Work and Care

The gender division of labour between breadwinning in paid work and unpaid work in the care of children and others is the policy fulcrum of gender and social policy. The balance of these activities, between and among women and men, is the product of multiple factors: earnings and career opportunities, inequalities of income and assets, the shape of families and the way that children and dependent others are cared for. The policies that weigh on that balance have consequences not only for the immediate situation but also for economic well-being over the life course.

This section of the book opens with Susan Harkness's incisive analysis of 'Gender and economic inequality'. Harkness looks at how gender shapes inequalities, between individuals and households, in high-income countries. Increases in female employment have reduced income inequality between men and women, yet women remain disproportionately likely to be poor. This is in part because, while women are more able to command an independent income, there have also been changes in family structure and particularly the growth in single-parent families. Harkness finds outcomes for women increasingly diverging. As expanding education has improved their economic position, women's circumstances have become more diverse, with less-educated women much less likely to work for pay and much more likely to experience single parenthood.

In 'Gender, employment and social policy', Jill Rubery and Hugo Figueiredo look in depth and detail at women's employment in OECD countries. They first discuss women's integration into employment, as a contingent or permanent labour supply, and the capacity of policies aiming to bridge work and family to shape labour force attachment. They then look at the quality of women's positions in the labour market, in gender segregation of employment, pay gaps, working-time arrangements and contractual employment. The chapter concludes with an intersectional perspective on the way gender and class interact in shaping inequalities of both kinds.

As employment has been changing, so too has family policy. In 'Family policies and the weakening of the male-breadwinner model', Rosa Daiger von Gleichen and Martin Seeleib-Kaiser present new analysis of the models of family at the centre of social policy. They find that, despite considerable country-to-country variation in specific policies, OECD countries are following the same trajectory of change away from support for the male-breadwinner family and toward the dual-earner household. The direction of change may be common, but the timing of change has differed. The policy rationales of leading and laggard nations appear to differ, with the normative aims of gender equality of the leading countries giving way to instrumental goals such as economic growth in countries where change has come later.

In 'Transmitting inequality: pensions policy and the gendered life course', Liam Foster and Jay Ginn put pensions policy in the context of the life course and the gendered interactions of family, employment and economy. The gender-biased design of state and private pension schemes is central to women's higher levels of poverty in retirement in OECD countries. The increasing dominance of neoliberalism in social policy has led to curtailment of public pensions and promotion of market pension schemes. The latter tend to create new risks and entrench women's lower pension incomes, while the gender structures of state pension schemes have varying capacities to moderate these effects. Foster and Ginn suggest the need for greater recognition of women's diverse life histories in policy measures to improve women's financial independence in later life.

Social investment has been put forward since the mid-1990s as offering a new, future-orientated rationale for social spending on families with young children. In 'Social investment, poverty and lone parents', Jane Jenson puts a critical spotlight on its practical outcomes for its key target group of sole parents. These families, most commonly headed by women, live at the intersection of two risk factors: having only one potential earner and being on the down side of the gender pay gap. Jenson teases out the effects of intersections of employment and social policy with comparative analysis both across the OECD and in case studies of three European countries: Sweden, Britain and the Netherlands.

Discussion of family models is followed by three chapters on the policies supporting, and in the process shaping, care. Mary Daly's chapter, 'Care policies for children and adults in high-income countries', focuses on policies for care in developed welfare states. Unusually, she brings together the policy frameworks applied to care of children and those supporting care of frail older people. In the contradictory present, when need for care is greatly expanding and the political climate favours cuts in social spending, care policies are everywhere objects for reform. Daly takes stock of each of these two policy domains. Her aim is to identify the main trends and orientations in each of the two fields and consider the gender orientations and impact of policy and their reform. In her

chapter she draws out the implications of care policies for individual women and men, especially in the context of employment and family patterns.

In the following chapter, 'Care policies in the South', Valeria Esquivel takes the discussion of care to the developing world of the global South. Here the meaning of care and the policies relevant to it are more wide-ranging, incorporating infrastructural dimensions such as water and sanitation and regulatory dimensions such as maternity protection and paid working hours as well as the public and private service provision usually discussed in the North. Esquivel gives a near global view, reviewing and comparing the framing of care policies in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America.

Escalating demand for care services in the global North is drawing migrant care workers there, mainly from the countries of the global South. Deborah Brennan and Elizabeth Adamson examine 'Care and migration' and the emerging debates about it. Governments in many high-income countries are reducing direct provision of care services in favour of subsidized private provision, constituting care recipients as consumers in a marketplace rather than as citizens with entitlements to services. These trends intersect with the feminization of migration and the weakening of traditional labour market protections such as collective bargaining. Brennan and Adamson show the connections between policies that govern care, employment and international migration, and outline some the key issues under discussion.

In 'Shaping the way international organizations "see" gender equality: the OECD and ECLAC', Rianne Mahon takes the discussion of policy agendas for the reconciliation of work and family life to international levels of policy discussion, policy learning and influence. Her chapter examines the way the OECD and ECLAC – two important international organizations, widely known for their policy-orientated research – have attempted to grapple with the issue. She addresses two key questions: through which kind of unit does each organization understand and interpret the issue, and how does this affect its understanding thereof? Are 'femocrats' (feminists in strategically located administrative and managerial positions) well placed to develop and assert their perspectives within the organization?

Part III: Family Policy

The family is the quintessentially private social institution, but it is constituted, protected and sometimes dissolved by the state. This section of the book has three chapters discussing change in law and social policy as they affect marriage, family relations and the protection of their vulnerable members.

'Making and unmaking families', by Belinda Hewitt and Michelle Brady, presents an up-to-date synthesis of recent international research in key areas of family policy. Most countries across the world have policies and legal structures in place that regulate relationships between intimate partners and their children. The emergence and persistence of more diverse family structures and the restructuring of the family life course at the societal level have thrown up significant challenges. Both historically and in contemporary times, these policies often work in gendered ways that shape the roles and entitlements that men and women can expect when relationships are formed and dissolved. Few contemporary policies explicitly discriminate against men or women, but in practice they continue to have gendered outcomes in part owing to the gendered structures of family life.

Mary Bernstein and Brenna Harvey examine the politics of same-sex marriage in advanced industrial countries from Europe, North America and Australasia. They take a historical institutionalist approach to argue that the existing structures of the state are very important in shaping the demands of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender activists for relationship recognition. 'The movement towards marriage equality in advanced industrialized countries' explores the impact of these on everything from the demands that are made, which types of relationships activists would like recognized, who demands and resists which policies, and the timing and pathways to outcomes. However, the symbolic meaning of different types of reforms can shift quickly.

Silke Meyer's chapter on 'Women, domestic violence and child protection' examines current child protection policies relevant to domestic and family violence. Policies informing the delivery of adult victim support services enfold the protection of children into their overall service mandate. Child protection policies, however, have primarily focused on the protection of the child, holding the parent failing to protect the child to account. Meyer contends that in circumstances of domestic violence child protection interventions have carried gendered expectations around parenting and victim blaming attitudes towards mothers, with women accused of a 'failure to protect' their children if they were unable or unwilling to separate from the abusive partner. She calls for holistic interventions and differentiated responses that place greater emphasis on involving abusive fathers in the responses of child protection services.

Part IV: Case Studies, Countries and Regions

This final section of the book presents five original case studies of social policy in particular countries or, in the case of Latin America, a region. The countries represented do not stand for particular welfare state regime types, although the chapters may discuss their fit with this literature. Instead, each is considered on its own terms, with a focus on particular issues relevant to its institutions, culture and politics.

In 'Gender policy in the Netherlands: from a redistributive to an identity-based approach', Trudie Knijn reflects on gender and family policies in the context of the Dutch political system. The Netherlands is known for its coalition governments and a hybrid Dutch welfare state, which since the 1980s have taken a neoliberal turn. From a gender perspective that turn has opened windows of opportunity for liberal and human rights-based identity politics, but also closed doors to further development of redistributive and equal rights-based welfare policies. She discusses that country's gender diversity policy approach, its high rates of women working part-time and underdeveloped care policies. Knijn notes the advent of austerity politics that are discursively framed as 'the participation society' and that threaten its fragile efforts to reconcile work and care.

Celia Valiente provides us with 'An overview of research on gender and social policy in Spain'. She notes that feminist scholars in Spain have been critical of the Spanish welfare state because it offered very few care services, assumed that the main provider of care for people would be the family (that is, women), and gave only modest help to women to combine work and family. In the past decade there have been new measures enacted that appear to portend path-breaking policy change: the 2006 'dependency law' established the universal right of dependent people to receive care partly or wholly funded by the state. Valiente considers whether this is so.

The emerging earner–carer models of the Nordic welfare states, aimed at the equal engagement of mothers and fathers in paid and unpaid work, have been an exemplar in much policy debate. These earner–carer models have emerged through complex processes over several decades. In ‘Norway: the evolution of a Nordic earner–carer model’, Anne Lise Ellingsæter traces the development of the Norwegian version. What makes this model particularly notable is that it has been seen as a hybrid, combining dual-earner support with traditional breadwinner elements. Her chapter asks how manifestations of this hybridity have changed over time, and whether it continues to be a defining feature. Side-glances to other Nordic countries locate particularities of the Norwegian path.

Ellen Reese, Logan Marg and Julisa McCoy examine the unique interplay of gender, class, race and religion in ‘Social policy in the United States’. Female poverty, especially among single mothers, is far higher in the USA than other wealthy democracies. In part, this is because US social policies are more market based than those of otherwise comparable countries. The USA’s social policies have also been strongly influenced by socially conservative ideologies that seek to reinforce heterosexual marriage and the male-breadwinner role within families, and that criminalize the poor. The chapter explores the role of the Christian right in shaping US social policies since the 1990s, and considers the conjoined punitive turn in penal and welfare policies since the late 1980s, and their disproportionate impact on low-income African-American men and their families.

In ‘A long decade of gendering social policy in Latin America: transformative steps and inequality traps’, Camila Arza and Juliana Martínez Franzoni examine recent expansions of social provision in Latin American countries with potential to bring transformative changes in gender relations. They argue that this expansion has brought transformative economic benefits putting income in women’s own hands, but had mixed outcomes in reducing gender inequality. Benefit levels are often low, and the conditions attached to receipt reinforce women’s roles as mothers and exclusive caregivers. They call for a new agenda of policy reform to confront and redress gender and inequality traps.

Finally, ‘Women and care in China’, written by Megan Blaxland, Xiaoyuan Shang and Karen R. Fisher, presents three case studies of disadvantaged groups of women in rural China. Using original empirical data, they examine social programmes serving widowed mothers, young women with disabilities in state care and making the transition to adulthood, and aged care for older women. Applying an ethic of care framework, their findings are that human rights, economic security and gender identity of disadvantaged women are constituted, regulated and supported (or not) by the social policies and lived experience in a Chinese society where, amid rapid change elsewhere, disadvantaged rural women are being left behind.

NOTES

1. To include civil society this may be extended to four sides, as state, family, market and community.
2. In the preparation of this summary I have been greatly assisted by Béland and Mahon (2016).
3. Also termed the ‘global financial crisis’.

REFERENCES

- Baldock, Cora B. and Bettina Cass (eds) (1983), *Women, Social Welfare and the State in Australia*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Banting, Keith and Will Kymlicka (eds) (2006), *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Béland, Daniel and Rianne Mahon (2016), *Advanced Introduction to Social Policy*, ebook, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Béland, Daniel and Mitchell Orenstein (2013), 'International organizations as policy actors: an ideational approach', *Global Social Policy*, **13** (2), 125–43.
- Connell, R.W. (1987), *Gender and Power*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R.W. (2002), *Gender*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Cornwall, Andrea, Jerker Edström and Alan Greig (eds) (2011), *Men and Development: Politicizing Masculinities*, London: Zed.
- Daly, Mary and Jane Lewis (2000), 'The concept of social care and the analysis of contemporary welfare states', *British Journal of Sociology*, **51** (2), 281–98.
- Deacon, Bob (2007), *Global Social Policy and Governance*, London: Sage.
- Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Esping-Andersen, Gosta, Duncan Gallie, Anton Hemerijck and John Myles (eds) (2002), *Why We Need a New Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferrera, Maurizio (1996), 'The "Southern model" of welfare regimes in social Europe', *Journal of European Social Policy*, **6** (1), 17–36.
- Finch, Janet and Dulcie Groves (eds) (1983), *A Labour of Love: Women, Work and Caring*, Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Folbre, Nancy (2001), *The Invisible Heart, Economics and Family Values*, New York: New Press.
- Fraser, Nancy (1994), 'After the family wage: gender equity and the welfare state', *Political Theory*, **22** (4), 591–618.
- Fraser, Nancy and Linda Gordon (1994), 'A genealogy of dependency: tracing a keyword of the U.S. welfare state', *Signs*, **19** (2), 309–36.
- Goodman, Roger and Ito Peng (1996), 'The East Asian welfare states: peripatetic learning, adaptive change, and nation-building', in Gosta Esping-Andersen (ed.), *Welfare States in Transition, National Adaptations in Global Economies*, London: Sage, pp. 192–224.
- Hearn, Jeff (2010), 'Reflecting on men and social policy: contemporary critical debates and implications for social policy', *Critical Social Policy*, **30** (2), 165–88.
- Hernes, Helga M. (1987), *Welfare State and Women Power*, Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Hobson, Barbara (1990), 'No exit, no voice: women's economic dependency and the welfare state', *Acta Sociologica*, **33** (3), 235–50.
- Hobson, Barbara (ed.) (2003), *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. (2000), 'Global care chains and emotional surplus value', in William Hutton and Anthony Giddens (eds), *On the Edge: Living with Global Capitalism*, London: Jonathan Cape, pp. 130–46.
- Huber, Evelyne and John D. Stephens (2000), 'Partisan governance, women's employment and the social democratic service state', *American Sociological Review*, **65** (3), 323–42.
- Huber, Evelyne and John D. Stephens (2001), *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Huber, Evelyne and John Stephens (2012), *Democracy and the Left: Social Policy and Inequality in Latin America*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenson, Jane (1997), 'Who cares? Gender and welfare regimes', *Social Politics*, **4** (2), 182–7.
- Jenson, Jane (2009), 'Lost in translation: the social investment perspective and gender equality', *Social Politics*, **16** (4), 446–83.
- Kalisch, David (1991), 'The active society', *Social Security Journal*, August, 3–9.
- Korpi, Walter (1983), *The Democratic Class Struggle*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Koven, Seth and Sonya Michel (eds) (1993), *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States*, New York: Routledge.
- Land, Hilary (1976), 'Women: supporters or supported?', in Diana Barker and Sheila Allen (eds), *Sexual Divisions and Society: Process and Change*, London: Tavistock, pp. 108–32.
- Leibfried, Stephan (1992), 'Towards a European welfare state?', in Zsuzsa Ferge and Jon Eivind Kolberg (eds), *Social Policy in a Changing Europe*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, pp. 245–79.
- Leschke, Janine and Maria Jepsen (2014), 'Is the economic crisis challenging the prevailing gender regime? A comparison of Denmark, Germany, Slovakia, and the United Kingdom', *Social Politics*, **21** (4), 485–508.

- Lewis, Jane (1980), *The Politics of Motherhood: Child and Maternal Welfare in England 1900–1939*, London: Croom Helm.
- Lewis, Jane (1992), 'Gender and the development of welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, **20** (5), 159–72.
- Lewis, Jane and David Piachaud (1987), 'Women and poverty in the twentieth century', in Caroline Glendinning and Jane Millar (eds), *Women and Poverty in Britain*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books, pp. 28–52.
- Lister, Ruth (2003), *Citizenship, Feminist Perspectives*, 2nd edn, New York: New York University Press.
- Mahon, Rianne (2014), 'The OECD's search for a new social policy language: from welfare state to active society', in Daniel Béland and Klaus Petersen (eds), *Analysing Social Policy Concepts and Language: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 81–100.
- Marshall, Thomas H. (1949), 'Citizenship and social class', repr. 1963 in T.H. Marshall, *Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays*, London: Heinemann, pp. 67–128.
- Martínez Franzoni, Juliana (2008), 'Welfare regimes in Latin America: capturing constellations of markets, families and policies', *Latin American Politics and Society*, **50** (2), 67–100.
- McIntosh, Mary (1978), 'The state and the oppression of women', in Annette Kuhn and Andrea Wolpe (eds), *Feminism and Materialism*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 254–89.
- O'Connor, Julia S. (1993), 'Gender, class and citizenship in the comparative analysis of welfare state regimes: theoretical and methodological issues', *British Journal of Sociology*, **44** (3), 501–18.
- O'Connor, Julia S., Ann Shola Orloff and Sheila Shaver (1999), *States, Markets, Families, Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2007), *Babies and Bosses: Reconciling Work and Family Life, a Synthesis of Findings for OECD Countries*, Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2015), 'Activation policies for more inclusive labour markets', in *OECD Employment Outlook 2015*, Paris: OECD, doi.org/10.1787/empl_outlook-2015-7-en.
- Orloff, Ann Shola (1993a), 'Gender and the social rights of citizenship: state policies and gender relations in comparative perspective', *American Sociological Review*, **58** (3), 303–28.
- Orloff, Ann Shola (1993b), *The Politics of Pensions: A Comparative Analysis of Britain, Canada and United States, 1880–1940*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Orloff, Ann Shola (2006), 'From maternalism to "employment for all": state policies to promote women's employment across the affluent democracies', in J. Levy (ed.), *The State After Statism: New State Activities in the Era of Globalization and Liberalization*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 230–68.
- Orloff, Ann Shola (2009), 'Gendering the comparative analysis of welfare states: an unfinished agenda', *Sociological Theory*, **27** (3), 317–43.
- Ostner, Ilona and Jane Lewis (1995), 'Gender and the evolution of European social policies', in Stephan Leibfried and Paul Pierson (eds), *European Social Policy: Between Fragmentation and Integration*, Washington, DC: Brookings, pp. 159–93.
- Pateman, Carole (1989), *The Disorder of Women*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Pearce, Diana and Harriette McAadoo (1981), *Women and Children: Alone and in Poverty*, Washington, DC: Center for National Policy Review.
- Peng, Ito (2012), 'The social and political economy of care in Japan and South Korea', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, **32** (11–12), 636–49.
- Peng, Ito and Joseph Wong (2008), 'Institutions and institutional purpose: continuities and change in East Asian social policy', *Politics and Society*, **36** (1), 61–88.
- Pfau-Effinger, Birgit (2005), 'Culture and welfare state policies: reflections on a complex interrelation', *Journal of Social Policy*, **34** (1), 3–20.
- Pierson, Paul (1994), *Dismantling the Welfare State? Reagan, Thatcher and the Politics of Retrenchment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Polanyi, Karl (1944), *The Great Transformation, The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Popay, Jennie, Jeff Hearn and Jeanette Edwards (eds) (1998), *Men, Gender Divisions and Welfare*, London: Routledge.
- Pringle, Keith (1995), *Men, Masculinities and Social Welfare*, London: UCL Press.
- Quadagno, Jill (1994), *The Color of Welfare*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sainsbury, Diane (1996), *Gender, Equality and Welfare States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sainsbury, Diane (2012), *Welfare States and Immigrant Rights: The Politics of Inclusion and Exclusion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scott, Hilda (1984), *Working Your Way to the Bottom: The Feminization of Poverty*, London: Pandora Press.
- Shaver, Sheila (1983), 'Sex and money in the welfare state', in Cora V. Baldock and Bettina Cass (eds), *Women, Social Welfare and the State*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin, pp. 146–65.

- Siim, Birte (2000), *Gender and Citizenship: Politics and Agency in France, Britain and Denmark*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skocpol, Theda (1985), 'Bringing the state back in: strategies of analysis in current research', in Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol (eds), *Bringing the State Back In*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–38.
- Skocpol, Theda (1992), *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Stephens, John (1979), *The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism*, London: Macmillan.
- Stevenson, Nick (ed.) (2001), *Culture & Citizenship*, London: Sage.
- Taylor-Gooby, Peter (ed.) (2004), *New Risks, New Welfare: The Transformation of the European Welfare State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Titmuss, Richard M. (1958), *Essays on 'The Welfare State'*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Titmuss, Richard M. (1974), *Social Policy*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Tronto, Joan (1993), *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*, New York: Routledge.
- Ungerson, Clare (1990), *Gender and Caring, Work and Welfare in Britain and Scandinavia*, Toronto: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Waerness, Kari (1984), 'Caring as women's work in the welfare state', in Harriet Holter (ed.), *Patriarchy in a Welfare Society*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, pp. 67–87.
- Westbrook, Laurel and Kristen Schilt (2014), 'Doing gender, determining gender: transgender people, gender panics, and the maintenance of the sex/gender/sexuality system', *Gender & Society*, **28** (1), 28–37.
- Wilensky, Harold and C.N. Lebeaux (1958), *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*, New York: Russell Sage.
- Williams, Fiona (1989), *Social Policy: A Critical Introduction. Issues of Race, Gender and Class*, Cambridge: Policy Press.
- Williams, Fiona (1995), 'Race/ethnicity, gender, and class in welfare states; a framework for comparative analysis', *Social Politics*, **2** (2), 127–60.
- Williams, Fiona (2012), 'Converging variations in migrant care work in Europe', *Journal of European Social Policy*, **22** (4), 363–76.
- Wilson, Elizabeth (1977), *Women and the Welfare State*, London: Tavistock.
- Yerkes, Mara (2011), *The Transformation of the Dutch Welfare State: Social Risks and Corporatist Reform*, Bristol: Policy Press.