

Wellchi preliminary conclusions
How can we orientate the reform of childhood policies?
Challenges, dilemmas and proposals

Lluís Flaquer

Director of the Wellchi Network
Professor of Sociology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Institute of Childhood and Urban World, Barcelona

Introduction

The purpose of the WELLCHI NETWORK is to improve our knowledge of the impact of changing family forms, working conditions of parents, social policy and legislative measures on the well-being of children and their families. One of the main themes underlying the project is that equal opportunity for all children is more needed as a result of the rise in the pluralism of family forms. The focus of the project concentrates on the analysis of potential consequences of family diversification for the welfare of children and their parents. Research has concentrated on the extent to which various processes of family transformation such as the decline of the male breadwinner model and the emergence of new household forms may have been associated with adverse outcomes for children. Although a special emphasis has been made on partnership dissolution and single parenthood, differences in outcomes for children in single-earner vs. dual earner families as well as in differing family forms related to ethnic heterogeneity have also been considered. As factors impinging on the well-being of children the interplay between the nature of welfare state regimes, the regulation of the labour markets and provisions in the field of family law were specially highlighted. Lack of opportunity for children has been examined through indicators of child poverty and material deprivation as well as other adverse cognitive outcomes such as low school achievement and early school leaving.

One of the capital assets of the WELLCHI network is endeavouring to bring together different approaches to the study of the factors affecting the well-being of children. In the first place, it has confronted different ways of dealing with the problems concerning the 'children of divorce': through family law or through social policy. Academics and practitioners in both fields often find themselves addressing the same fundamental

issues, for example, the problem of child poverty or the role of fathers in caring as well as providing for children. In many countries researchers in these two fields have different research cultures, their discourses remain very separate and it is a challenge to foster dialogue and exchange of views across their respective fields as they try to analyse the effects of different legal and welfare provisions on children. In fact, the WELLCHI international conference held in Oxford in January 2005 was the first to bring together issues concerning the welfare of children in family law and family policy (Lewis and Maclean, Oxford, 2005).

In the second place, the WELLCHI network has strived to facilitate an encounter between two main theoretical paradigms that are currently dominating the sociology of childhood: the social investment approach and what can be termed the 'new studies of childhood' or the 'child as a fully-fledged citizen'. Our network has hosted with fruitful results contributions stemming from these two approaches and this has indeed provided considerable opportunities for cross-fertilisation.

The approach based on a child-centred social investment strategy derives from the pressing need for welfare state reconstruction. According to this view, the guideline for welfare restructuring should be investment in human capital rather than the direct provision of economic maintenance. The traditional welfare state should be replaced by a *social investment state*, operating in the context of a positive welfare society, insofar as positive welfare is functional for wealth creation (Giddens, 1998; Lister, 2006). In the new economy, life chances depend increasingly on the cultural, social and cognitive capital that citizens can accumulate. The mainsprings of people's life chances lie in the family conditions of their childhood and the crucial issue lies in the interplay between parental and societal investments in children's development (Esping-Andersen, 2002b). On the other hand, one of the assumptions of the 'new studies of childhood' is that it is not to be merely treated as a universal, biologically given phenomenon but that it must be necessarily placed in its social and cultural context. Childhood is to be examined as a social construction and children studied not as passive objects of socialisation but as social actors in their own right (Prout, 2005). Therefore, this approach is more reflexive and child-focused and tries to look at how the notion of childhood has been differentially constructed by welfare states as a way of questioning the status of children in the present (Smart, Leeds, 2004).

The child is a person, a citizen, and an individual in his or her own right, of equal value to any other individual. The difference is that children may not be able to express

themselves or represent their own interests at the time when they are vulnerable to the action or inactions of others, or to the effects of adverse social or physical environment (Rigby and Köhler, 2002). Children are then taken not merely as objects but rather as subjects of rights, having special needs and own interests that we can know through social research.

Therefore, in policy-oriented research not only the need for children's social protection is emphasised but also their capacity for agency and participation. Finally, this approach advocates for policy responses that are actually child-centred and driven by concerns about the well-being of children per se as against alternative views that can be described as instrumental, i.e. focused on the obtainment of other goals such encouraging fertility or facilitating women's employment (Lewis, 2006).

The tensions between different paradigms in the sociology of childhood are echoed in differing views of the multifaceted and elusive notion of individual well-being. There are a number of concepts of well-being that may lend themselves to interpersonal comparisons. Along one dimension, they may be divided into subjective mental states (hedonic satisfaction), degree of objective satisfaction of subjective desires, and objective states. Along another dimension, they may be differentiated through the principles by which states of pleasure or desire-satisfaction are admitted or discarded as components of well-being (Elster and Roemer, 1991).

The concept of well-being has been mostly developed by economists and psychologists. Objective views of well-being are widely employed by economists. Economic literature argues that individuals derive well-being from the satisfaction of their wants according to their own preferences. Real income and other monetary measures are the most common proxies for the individuals' well-being. Although measures of GDP per capita and economic growth remain critical for any assessment of well-being, they need to be complemented with measures of other dimensions of well-being such as leisure time, the sharing of income within households, distributional concerns, and environmental quality (Boarini, Johanson and Mira d'Ercole, 2006). Additionally, considering that levels of GDP per capita across OECD countries are only weakly related to survey data on happiness and life-satisfaction some social analysts have come to express doubts about the validity of monetary measures as indicators of well-being.

Indeed, welfare is not in essence an economic concept, but a psychic one, concerning as it does well-being (Giddens, 1998). Subjective well-being is a concept that has mainly been used by psychologists (Kahneman, Diener and Schwartz eds., 1999; Diener, 2000;

Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2002); Van Praag, Frijters and Ferrer-i-Carbonell, 2002), but it is also gaining acceptance among sociologists and economists. Finally, a number of researchers have tried to identify linkages between socio-economic conditions and subjective well-being (Fahey and Smyth, 2004) or they have advocated for multi-dimensional, composite measures of well-being, including the subjective dimension (Bradshaw et al, 2006).

When we come to discuss children's well-being, a new complication arises. Young children may not be able to express verbally their condition of well-being and to get this information we have to rely on informants such as their parents, carers or teachers. In the second place, survey data on the well-being children are seldom produced using the child as a unit of observation, as the purpose of many statistical sources is to get information about adult conditions, practices and representations. However, one must not forget that in the tradition of qualitative analysis very valuable research on children's well-being is being conducted by means of observant participation and ethnographic techniques and that the results of these studies have provided very helpful insights into the ways in which children view their lives, voice their concerns and participate in family dynamics (Smart and Neale, 1999; Smart, Neale and Wade, 2001; Smart, 2002; Mason, Flowerdew and Tipper, Leeds, 2004; Neale, Leeds, 2004; Highet, Leeds, 2004).

In order to integrate and reap profits from this variety of approaches, in this report an eclectic notion of well-being has been adopted. On the one hand, self-perceived states of life-satisfaction reported by children themselves are taken into consideration. On the other, well-being is defined as full potential for self-realisation not impaired by lack of opportunity and diminished outcomes as a result of certain deficits in the access to various forms of capital, including material, human, cultural, social, personal or emotional capital. In particular, levels of child poverty and inequities concerning school achievement are examined.

This takes us to the analysis of social risks affecting children that can negatively influence their well-being. In recent decades factors impinging on the well-being of children have become more complex so that nowadays the latter are not only affected by the –still persistent- (old) class inequalities but they also challenged by new social risks (Taylor-Gooby, 2004; Bonoli, 2005; Lewis, 2006; Jenson, 2006).

New risks tend to affect people at younger stages of their lives than did old social risks. They involve both labour market and family life and thus extend demand for state

intervention into areas of life that had been formerly seen as private. 'New social risks' are associated with access to employment and opportunities in work, and with managing the conflicting pressures of family life, social care, paid work and career. Fresh social needs and demands linked with new social risks include issues such as reconciling work and family life, lone parenthood, long-term unemployment, the working poor and insufficient social security coverage. These new risks tend to be concentrated among women, the young and the low skilled. Successfully managing new risks is increasingly important, particularly for the more vulnerable groups (Taylor-Gooby, 2004, Bonoli, 2005). Children is one of social groupings that are most affected by these risks insofar as they have a diminished mobilising capacity and more difficulties in representing their interests.

Overview of family change

A good deal of these new social risks result from family change. A number of ongoing social processes such as the trend towards individualisation of family relationships, the de-institutionalisation of marriage, the growth of marital instability and partnership dissolution and the proliferation of new household forms, together with the intensification of labour market insecurity, have brought about enhanced hazards that often carry cumulative high-risk vulnerabilities for some groups of children and their families.

In recent years in many western nations there has been a greater interest in the relationship between family change and welfare state change. Many analysts have begun to realise the extent to which household change in respect of both family form and the contributions that adult men and women make to families is driving policy, as well as being shaped by it (Esping-Andersen, 1999; Lewis, 2006).

One of most relevant changes underlying the transition to a post-industrial society is the loss of legitimacy of patriarchal domination (Flaquer, 1999). The patriarchal family, the cornerstone of patriarchalism, is being challenged by the inseparably related processes of the transformation of women's work and the transformation of women's consciousness. Driving processes behind these developments are the rise of an informational, global economy, technological changes in the reproduction of human

species, and the powerful surge of women's struggles and of a multifaceted feminist movement, three trends that have developed since the late 1960s (Castells, 1997).

Patriarchy is in full retreat everywhere. The legal rights of women and children have been extended in all countries, and the expansion of education and paid work has extended autonomy. Dramatic socio-economic, political and cultural changes have undercut the authority of fathers and elders (Therborn, 2004). The massive incorporation of women into paid work has increased women's bargaining power vis à vis men, and undermined the legitimacy of men's domination as main economic providers in the family (Castells, 1997). All these developments could not have not been possible without the fall of fertility due to the drastic reduction of infant mortality and the consequent growth of life expectancy.

Whereas in pre-industrial society, the family was mainly a community of need held together by an obligation of solidarity, the logic of individually designed lives has come increasingly to the fore in the contemporary world. Thus, the family is becoming an elective relationship and an association of individual persons (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002). Increases in divorce, cohabitation and childbearing outside marriage have all contributed to the separation of marriage and parenthood (Lewis, 1999, 2001; Kiernan, 2004). Marriage is less an act of economic necessity and more a question of personal choice. There is evidence that the traditional family model and traditional patterns of family formation are gradually losing their hegemony in most Western countries. Most of the changes involved simply reflect the emergence of alternative living arrangements and more complex ways of organising the individual family life (González-López, 2002). However, one must take into account that the trend toward individualisation does not necessarily mean more individualism. In fact, couples try to strike a balance between autonomy and togetherness (Björnberg, and Kollind, 2005).

The de-institutionalisation of family life is associated with major shifts in value systems away from collective responsibility and duties towards a post-material conception of individual rights and personal autonomy (Hantrais, 2004: 37). In advanced modern societies each person is expected actively to engage on their own life project, setting personal goals and monitoring their performance. The trend toward individualisation boils down to prioritizing individuals' aspirations over those of the social groups to which they belong, the associated emphasis on achievement rather than status, and the belief that both are by-products of modernisation. However, individual progress is

shaped by the interaction of individuals with new secondary institutions that create risk and opportunity in unequal measure (Walker, 2005).

In the context of development of a new 'active citizenship', the social rights of family members have been increasingly individualised, whereas derived social rights lose importance. Claiming responsibility for one's own life and well-being is, in this regard, not merely an option; to an increasing degree, it also represents an obligation. However, the 'active citizen', in a similar vein as the 'homo economicus', is but a construct without family and care responsibility, as the concept of the 'active citizen' that is based on full engagement of the citizen for his or her working life and career contradicts in part the idea of family life, which rests on the assumption that parents spend time with their children and take on care responsibility within the family (Pfau-Effinger, Hamburg, 2006).

The 'second demographic transition, which began in the 1960s and is still under way, involved a marked rise in unmarried cohabitation, divorce and partnership dissolution, births outside marriage and lone parenthood and sets the stage for a progress of family diversification (Cliquet, 1991; Hantrais, 2004: 37).

The demographics of divorce in most Western nations over the decades until the 1960s were relative stable with respect to age structure, ages of children and so on (Goode, 1993). Divorce and births outside marriage were relatively rare until the last 30 years of the 20th century, and cohabitation was at its nadir in the 1950s and 1960s when marriage was almost universal (Lewis, 2001). The 1960s and the early 1970s was a golden age of marriage in Western European nations. Never had marriage been as popular or occurred at such young ages. This tide of youthful marriage receded during the 1970s and continues to do so unabated into the new millennium. It is a new type of cohabitation that is strongly implicated in the decline in marriage (Kiernan, 2004). The dynamics of marriage and divorce have undergone major changes in the last two decades. The declining frequency of marriages, the increasing incidence of divorce, the increase of births out of wedlock and the rise of new forms of union such as premarital and consensual unions and LAT couples are the main characteristics of the new scenario (Bégeot and Fernández-Cordón, 1997).

However, divorce rates are recording fewer and fewer disruptions of couples with children. Whether because of the spread of informal marital break-ups or because of the rise in the number of separations affecting consensual unions the trend towards the de-institutionalisation of marriage has brought about the proliferation of diverse new living

arrangements very dissimilar to the monolithic traditional patterns. In this way, individual life courses have become increasingly diversified. Taking into account that many divorced people later remarry or cohabit with a new partner who was also married before and may also have children of their own, more and more children thus grow up with a non-biological parent (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002). The most dramatic change in children's lives of the past one hundred years has been the growth in the number of children spending at least some portion of the childhood in a single-parent family. Although most single parents are women, a growing number are men (Waldfoegel, 2006: 22-23; Lewis, 2006).

The changing nature of families and the contributions that men and women make to them as well as the restructuring or recasting of modern welfare states are processes that constitute important variables in the understanding of variations in children's well-being across different countries. In modern welfare states, there has always been a fundamental obligation on the part of the able-bodied man to engage with the labour market, but historically, the same expectations have not been applied to adult women. This is not to say that women did not enter the labour market, but it was perfectly acceptable for married women, especially mothers not to do so, in other words they could be dependent on men. This 'male breadwinner family model' effectively made provision for the support and care of children, albeit at the price of female economic dependence on men (Lewis and Maclean, Oxford, 2005).

In contemporary societies the dominance of the male breadwinner families is losing ground in practice and in terms of cultural legitimacy (Björnberg, 2006: 101). The decline of this family model and the transition towards an emerging universal adult breadwinner model in which it is assumed that the majority of the child population lives in dual-earner households is the backdrop against which we have to understand most of children's issues we are dealing with here. The universal adult breadwinner model corresponds with a postindustrial, informational economy leading to a knowledge-based society. The shift to tertiarisation created a big expansion in job opportunities for women, but it also meant the dramatic shedding of huge numbers of male, industrial employment.

The terms and conditions on which the transition to what appears to be an 'adult worker family model' is undertaken are crucial for children's well-being. What happens to adults is critical for the well-being of children. The increasing fluidity of family forms, with more divorce, unmarried motherhood and lone mother families, and the increase in

female economic autonomy has made it impossible for governments to assume the existence of the male breadwinner family model. But how are children to be supported when family forms are increasingly fluid? And how is their care to be arranged when women, who have traditionally taken the main responsibility for care, are increasingly in the labour market? How are the responsibilities for the support and care of children to be divided between mothers, fathers and the state? (Lewis and Maclean, Oxford, 2005). One of the important problems that the universal adult breadwinner model leaves unresolved is care work (Lewis, 2002b). In fact, nowhere is there a fully fledged adult worker model family' (Lewis, 2006: 7). In all advanced countries most men show a definite reluctance to be in charge of care work and this means that it is up to women to do it. The extent to which care work is carried out in or outside the household, is paid or unpaid and is formal or informal in character depends on various factors ranging from household strategies to the state regulation of the labour market.

However, there makes a big difference whether or not the model is supported by social policies rather than being only developed by the operation of the market. In the case of lone parents this difference can be critical. Insofar as lone mothers are single earners and carers of their children, feminist scholars have considered single parenthood as a touchstone for the kind of treatment that various welfare states give to families (Lewis with Hobson, 1997).

Child poverty and other adverse outcomes for children

In a market economy such as the European Union's, economic well-being is fundamental to all other forms of well-being (McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994: 19). In fact, child poverty levels are among the best indicators of the state of childhood in a particular country. In order to try to improve the general condition of children in any country it is absolutely necessary to envisage the eradication or reduction of child poverty, especially its most severe and persistent forms.

Deprivation during childhood, even over relatively short spells, can have major long-term, irreversible consequences, resulting in life-course or inter-generational (i.e. chronic) poverty transmission (Waddington, 2004).

In recent years child poverty rates have increased in most advanced nations. The proportion of children living in poverty in the developed world has risen in 17 of the 24 OECD nations for which data are available. No matter which of the commonly-used poverty measures is applied, the situation faced by children is seen to have deteriorated over the last decade (Unicef, 2005).

Although causes underlying child poverty are related to a number of complex factors, its recrudescence in recent years is basically connected with two kinds of transition processes, i.e., the shift from industrial societies to service and knowledge-based economies, on the one hand, and the shift from the male breadwinner family model to adult worker family model, on the other. The rhythm of these two transitions as well as the diversity of responses from governments in the face of strains generated by societal transformations contribute to understanding the great variety of child poverty regimes in various European countries.

In order to break the cycle of poverty and deprivation, preventive strategies are undoubtedly much more effective than remedial interventions, insofar as the latter are operating on often irreversible situations. Long-term public investment in children, in particular if it is based on early intervention, constitutes a good warrant allowing to secure adequate levels of child well-being. I am not only referring to investment in schools and education: the reduction of child poverty is a prerequisite for children with certain deficits to take advantage of opportunities that are offered to them by the school system.

The co-existence of single-earner and dual-earner households creates higher poverty risks for the former, especially when they are low-income ones. When the average standard of living takes for granted a double income, households with a single breadwinner are obviously facing higher poverty risks. Although this factor affects both two-parent families with a single breadwinner as well as single-parent households, it is the latter that face higher poverty risks. Deprivation is probably more severe in single-parent households not only because no other potential adults can get income from the labour market, but because maintenance payments after separation, if they exist at all, hardly compensate for the loss of economic support derived from income sharing during partnership (Andreß et al, 2006).

The event of separation is linked with financial changes for most of involved persons. However, it is especially women and first of all mothers who are more affected by economic losses, while the financial situation of men either does not or does just

slightly change. Thus, the costs of separation are not equally distributed between men and women (Andreß et al, 2006: 19).

If our basic concern is with economic hardship, lone mothers are the group at greatest risk (Ellwood and Jencks, 2004: 27). However, one must not forget that in the European Union, in terms of the volume of population concerned, most poor children live in two-parent households. On the other hand, the growth of child poverty cannot be simply explained by the increase of single-parent families, although in certain countries (such as the USA and the UK) their contribution to it can indeed be very significant.

Although activation measures of (female) paid work and enforcement of maintenance payments can make an important contribution to the fight against child poverty, the rise in the levels of social transfers, in particular of child benefits, is one of the measures that can produce better outcomes. In this sense, a good system of economic support to families with adequate levels of universal child benefits is an indispensable means to combat child poverty. It is difficult to confront child deprivation without increasing levels of social expenditure for families and children. In fact, the countries that are devoting more public resources to the family and children --the Nordic countries-- are those in which we find lower levels of child poverty.

Child benefits for all children are paid in most European countries. This means that payments are universal and not means-tested. The general trend is to extend the cut-off for child benefits from 16 to 18-19 years. Income supplements for the number of children are paid in Sweden and Norway. In the UK and Germany the amount paid per child increases with the number of children, whereas in Denmark and the Netherlands the amount paid per child increases with the age of the child (Björnberg, 2006: 94).

However, the rationales for the establishment of child benefits in different countries are widely varied. It also differs the extent to which children are entitled to get benefits as a social right of citizenship and therefore they have in principle the right to make claims on the state or, alternatively, the extent to which the payment of benefits only represents a recognition that the costs of children should be shared between parents and the society.

Nevertheless, material deprivation is only one part of the story. We know that adults and children from divorced families, as a group, score lower than their counterparts in married-couple families on a variety of indicators of well-being (Amato, 2000: 1282). Half the disadvantage associated with growing up in a single-parent family is explained by economic factors (Ellwood and Jencks, 2004: 28). On average, children growing up

with just one parent do lose out relative to other children. As said, part of the penalty to single parenthood is financial: single-parent families tend to have lower incomes and, as a result, tend to live in poorer neighbourhoods with poorer schools. Another portion of the penalty has to do with time: children in single-parent families have, by definition, only one parent available to them. A single parent has to take on both the role of breadwinner and caregiver (Waldfogel, 2006: 23).

A common trend in European countries is the liberalisation of conditions for divorce while introducing at the same time more regulation of the parental relationship in separated families, especially in respect of conditions for paying maintenance. Maintenance agreements are increasingly supervised by public authorities and standardised. Regulations include the establishment of minimum amounts of maintenance, the advancement of payments to the custodial parent by public agencies in charge of recovering the money from the liable parent, usually the father, and the introduction of joint legal custody as the norm after divorce (Björnberg, 2006: 95, 102). An exception to this trend is Spain where the reform in 2005 relaxed to a great extent the conditions for divorce without tightening the enforcement of maintenance payments. Much research indicates that, for parents, financial support and contact are intertwined. Where there is contact support is more likely (Hunt and Roberts, 2004). In most countries, paying for children is in principle not separated from contact with the non-resident parent. Sanction for refusing access is only enacted against the parent who denies it, not against the parent who refuses to visit the child. This focus underlines that the main caring responsibility rests with the mother (Björnberg, 2006: 102).

International research tends to show that it is the nature and the quality of parenting by the contact parent that is crucial, not contact in itself. It is not the arrangements in themselves which matter most to children but how their relationships are managed. The care provided by the resident parent and the financial position of the household are also major influences on the welfare of the child. However, where there is abuse or neglect, exposure to domestic violence or severe parental conflict, contact can be extremely damaging to children (Hunt and Roberts, 2004).

Work and family arrangements

Most Western European countries are seeing a shift from the so-called 'breadwinner-model family' to an 'adult worker model' in which all adults are expected to do paid work (Klammer, 2006: 238). Children's living conditions depend on how employment opportunities are changing and the extent to which policies are responding to the needs of children in the context of the emerging new family model. The policy developments in most EU countries are contradictory and institutional regulations reflect ambivalent approaches regarding economic concerns, equal opportunities for women and social citizenship of children (Björnberg, 2006: 101).

The shift from the male breadwinner family towards a new adult worker model requires a fundamental reorganisation of welfare states. Different European societies find themselves at various points in this transition and also the policy responses given by governments in the EU are quite diverse. Most of these policy responses are heavily gendered because the emerging model leaves the problem of care unresolved. Only promoting men's participation in unpaid work at a similar level as women's and in particular fathers' participation in childcare would really address the problem and would improve gender equality. In this sense, an interesting body of research on the new role of fathers as carers is highly stimulating (Pfau-Effinger and Eichler, Hamburg, 2006; Hobson et al, 2006: 279). In this respect, some measures implemented in certain countries such as de-commodification schemes of daddy leaves and standard provisions for joint custody in case of divorce or dissolution of partnership are an important contribution to the promotion of men's family responsibilities.

In this context, the promotion of an adequate work life balance is essential. Children experience a need for stability and regular rhythms, which is in opposition to the labour market ideal of the flexible worker. Whereas mothers' (parents) work life balance has been broadly discussed, the children's perspective (on their parents's) work life balance, on their own time use and preferences has remained a neglected issue so far. Parents' time input in the family should be regarded as a contribution to children's education and socialisation (Klammer, 2006: 220, 238).

Work family arrangements show considerable variation in European countries because (1) female employment patterns differ to a great extent and accordingly (2) parents tend to make more use of private/public strategies of reconciliation in some countries than in others. At any rate, in recent years all European governments, whether as pioneers or latecomers, with differing degrees of commitment and intensity and using various rationales, have been offering services to families in order to facilitate the reconciliation

between work and family. One major drive in this development has often been the need to increase women's employment resulting from declining fertility and rapid ageing as a result of Lisbon agenda (Mahon, 2006: 1992).

It means that it is not obvious at all that children's interests are being necessarily considered or promoted when childcare facilities are created by governments. We do not only find important differences in the extent to which the provision of childcare is seen as a public good and is placed under collective responsibility but also to which children's rights and the importance of childhood in its own right is being emphasised in relation to labour market requirements and notions of social investment. Finally, the rationale for current changes does not in itself guarantee a shift from a childcare to a pedagogical discourse (Moss, 2006).

Implementing a number of public measures for the care of children aged 0-3, including schemes of paid parental leave of and a system of accessible, affordable and high-quality childcare facilities can produce benefits of various sorts. They not only can enable the entry or the permanence in the labour market of mothers with young children, especially those with lower educational attainment and therefore lesser professional skills as well as reduce to the minimum career breaks, but also earlier expose infants to stimuli that can contribute to their cognitive development, although this will only happen if the quality levels of childcare facilities are fully adequate. In the first year of life extended parental leave policies, giving parents the choice to stay home, could be paired with policies to improve the quality, availability, and affordability of infant childcare (Waldfogel, 2006: 5).

Conclusion

Considering that in the WELLCHI NETWORK we have drawn on the paradigms of the social investment approach and the 'child as a fully-fledged citizen' with fruitful results, coming to the conclusions, I would like to return to the beginning of my speech and ask whether is it possible to reconcile these two approaches.

In postindustrial societies the material well-being of children is essential to their progress and development as citizens and, in this sense, one of the main virtues of the

social investment strategy is that it posits the eradication of child poverty as a critical and radical issue and insists on combating social inheritance as a central axes.

Secondly, one of the advantages of the social investment strategy is that its discourse is policy-oriented and is couched in economic terms and therefore it is more appealing to policy-makers and social administrators.

Thirdly, one of the main merits of the social investment strategy has been to bring to the fore the welfare of the children as a public issue and to bring as well their care and support to the forefront of policy agenda (Lewis and Maclean, Oxford, 2005). For educational investment to be successful it is increasingly important that children can take advantage of benefits offered to them by school institutions, and this can only happen if child poverty is reduced to a minimum.

Fourthly, the social investment approach insists on developing preventive strategies in order to deal with potential rather than merely current social risks affecting children. Similarly, the need for early intervention is emphasised on the ground that the return on human capital is very high in the early years of life and diminishes rapidly thereafter. As it happens in the field of health, prevention is much better than intervention after the manifestation of the problem. Quite often late interventions are not only ineffective but expensive, since they can be a permanent cost during adult life.

However, one of the shortcomings of this approach is that it is instrumental and therefore hardly child-friendly. The question remains as to how far the needs and well-being of the child, as opposed to the economy and the wider society, are the focus of attention (Lewis and Maclean, Oxford, 2005). It is consubstantial to social investment strategy that children are seen as investment for the future rather than a value per se. This raises the issue of their status of citizenship. Are they to be considered just as future citizens or simply as present citizens here and now? This dilemma compels us to go beyond the social investment approach and consider the merits of the new alternative, emerging approach.

Expressing concern about the material condition of children and trying to improve their welfare is not enough. It is well-known that not all rich children are happy. Their emotional well-being does not only depend on their economic situation but on providing them with stable and loving relationships and fulfilling all their needs, including their nonmaterial dimension.

In the second place, children are not merely investment objects but subjects in their own right. The new sociology of childhood stresses agency and participation. The child is

not seen as a blank *tabula rasa* on which educators inscribe their teachings but as an active subject which interacts with his/her environment.

Similarly, in accordance with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, children are considered as subjects of rights. It is increasingly acknowledged that children have rights as citizens (Björnberg, 2006: 90). On the other hand, children are not simply tomorrow's citizens; they are today's citizens. Focusing on being rather than becoming requires a more child-centred approach (Lewis, 2006: 18)(Martin, Leeds, 2004).

If we accept that children are fully-fledged citizens, then a number of consequences follow. This means in the first place that they should be entitled not only to protection but also to some kind of participation as they are growing older. Here again the active over the passive dimension is emphasised. Secondly, citizenship rights should be expanded to cover not only the civil rights but also the political and social rights. I am not going to deal now with children's political participation, a very controversial issue. But I would like to insist on the need to develop a full array of social rights for children in keeping with the rights of adults. Even if in all European countries the rights of children to health care and education are fully guaranteed, the same is not true with their welfare rights. I am referring in particular to an important deficit that we find in some EU countries where there is no universal coverage of child benefits, the most typical children's welfare rights. Here again we can detect some convergence between the two paradigms that we have discussed so far. One of the requirements for the eradication of child poverty is a certain amount of expenditure on family and children and this basically boils down to pay generous universal child benefits to families.

In my view, in today's Europe both paradigms are still useful and necessary. They are both conveying a notion of children as a public good (Qvortrup, Leeds, 2004), albeit with quite a different meaning, the former in a more instrumental sense and the latter in a more expressive one. On the other hand, the degree to which children are familialised also varies with more privatisation in the case of the social investment strategy.

There is a second reason why the current coexistence of these two approaches is beneficial. One must not forget that the 'new sociology of childhood' has been in part developed as a response and as a criticism to the adoption by some governments and supranational agencies of the child-centred social investment strategy. However, this approach, if not as a rhetoric motto, is still absent in policy-making in a number of EU countries where more traditional, more familialistic views are still prevailing. It is

difficult that in these countries more progressive conceptions of childhood can develop without a prior first-hand assessment of the ‘social investment approach’ shortcomings. This is a brief summary of our general conclusions. I have just selected a few themes that could have been discussed in this session. These conclusions will be placed in our website and they will be expanded as a result of contributions made by anyone who wishes to do so. A discussion forum will be launched after the end of the conference with the aim of producing more country-specific and policy-oriented conclusions. Participants are invited to send suggestions and proposals in order to enrich the present conclusions.

References 1 (Books and articles)

- Alesina, A. and E. Glaeser (2004). *Fighting Poverty in the US and Europe: A World of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amato, P. R. (2000). ‘The Consequences of Divorce for Adults and Children’. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62: 1269-87.
- Amato, P. R. and J. M. Sobolewski (2004). ‘The Effects of Divorce on Fathers and Children: Nonresidential Fathers and Stepfathers’. In M. E. Lamb (ed.) *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 341-367.
- Andreß, H.-J., B. Borgloh, M. Bröckel, M. Giesselmann, and D. Hummelsheim (2006). ‘The Economic Consequences of Partnership Dissolution—A Comparative Analysis of Panel Studies from Belgium, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and Sweden’. *European Sociological Review* 22 (5): 533-560.
- Archard, D. W. (2003). *Children, Family and the State: Live Questions in Ethics and Moral Philosophy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Atkinson, A. B. (1997). ‘Bringing Income Distribution in from the Cold’. *The Economic Journal* 107: 297-321.
- Atkinson, A. B. (1998). *Poverty in Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Atkinson, A. et al. (2002). *Social Indicators: The EU and Social Inclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bainham, A., B. Lindley, M. Richards and L. Trindler (eds.) (2003). *Children and Their Families: Contact, Rights and Welfare*. Oxford and Portland, Or.: Hart Publishing.
- Barnes, H. (2001). 'How Other Countries Monitor the Well-Being of Their Children?' In Bradshaw, J. (ed.) *Poverty: The Outcomes for Children*. Occasional Paper 26. London: Economic and Social Research Council/Family Policy Studies Centre/Social Policy Research Unit. pp. 215-236.
- Baumol, W. J. (1967). 'Macroeconomics of Unbalanced Growth: The Anatomy of Urban Crisis'. *The American Economic Review* 57 (3): 415-426.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. and E. Beck-Gernsheim. (2002). *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and Its Social and Political Consequences*. London: Sage Publications.
- Becker, Gary S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Reinventing the Family: In Search of New Lifestyles*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bégeot, F. and J.-A. Fernández-Cordón (1997). 'Demographic Convergence Beyond National Differences'. In J. Commaille and F. de Singly eds. *The European Family: The Family Question in the European Community*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers. pp. 23-44.
- Ben-Arieh, A. and Y. Boyer (2005). 'Citizenship and Childhood'. *Childhood* 12 (1): 33-53.
- Bennett, F. (2006). 'Paying for Children: Current Issues and Implications of Policy Debates'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 110-134.
- Bettio, F. and P. Villa (1998). 'A Mediterranean Perspective on the Breakdown of the Relationship between Participation and Fertility'. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 22: 137-71.
- Björnberg, U and A.-K. Kollind (2005). *Individualism and Families: Equality, Autonomy and Togetherness*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Björnberg, U. (2006). 'Paying for the Costs of Children in Eight North European Countries: Ambivalent Trends'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 90-109.

- Blair, T. (1999). 'Beveridge Revisited: A Welfare State for the 21st Century'. In R. Walker (ed.). *Ending Child Poverty: Popular Welfare for the 21st Century?* Bristol: The Policy Press. pp. 7-18.
- Blossfeld, H. P. and S. Drobnic (eds.) (2001). *Careers of Couples in Contemporary Societies: From Male-Breadwinner to Dual-Earner Families*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blossfeld, H. P. and A. Timm (2003a). 'Educational Systems as Marriage Markets in Modern Societies: A Conceptual Framework'. In H.P. Blossfeld and A. Timm (eds.) *Who Marries Whom?: Educational Systems as Marriage Markets in Modern Societies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic. pp. 1-18.
- Blossfeld, H. P. and A. Timm (2003b). 'Assortative Mating in Cross-National Comparison: A Summary of Results and Conclusions'. In H.P. Blossfeld and A. Timm (eds.) *Who Marries Whom?: Educational Systems as Marriage Markets in Modern Societies*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic. pp. 331-342.
- Boarini, R., A. Johansson and M. Mira d'Ercole (2006). 'Alternative Measures of Well-being'. *OECD Economic Department Working Paper N° 476* and *Social, Employment and Migration Papers N° 33*. Paris: OECD.
- Boyne, R. (2003). *Risk (Concepts in the Social Sciences)*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press
- Bradbury, B. and M. Jäntti (1999). 'Child Poverty across Industrialized Nations'. *Innocenti Occasional Papers. Economic and Social Policy Series N° 71*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Bradshaw, J. (2000). 'Child Poverty in Comparative Perspective'. In D. Gordon and P. Townsend (eds.). *Breadline Europe: The Measurement of Poverty*. Bristol. The Policy Press. pp. 223-250.
- Bradshaw, J. (2001). *Poverty: The Outcomes for Children*. London: Economic and Social Research Council, Family Policy Studies Centre and Social Policy Research Unit.
- Bradshaw, J. (2006). 'Child Benefit Packages in 15 Countries in 2004'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 69-89.
- Bradshaw, J. and J. Ditch (1993). *Support for Children. A Comparison of Arrangements in Fifteen Countries*. Research Report n. 21. London: HMSO.
- Bradshaw, J., C. Stimson, C. Skinner and J. Williams. (1999). *Absent fathers?* London and New York: Routledge.

- Bradshaw, J., P. Hoelscher and D. Richardson (2006). 'An Index of Child Well-being in the European Union'. *Social Indicators Research*.
- Cabrillo, F. (1999). *The Economics of the Family and Family Policy*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
- Calero, J. (2006). 'Desigualdades tras la educación obligatoria: Nuevas tendencias'. *Documento de trabajo 83/2006*. Madrid: Fundación Alternativas.
- Carneiro, P. and J. Heckman (2003). 'Human Capital Policy'. In J. Heckman and A. B. Krueger (eds.) *Inequality in America: What Role for Human Capital Policies?* Cambridge, Mss. And London: The MIT Press. pp. 77-239.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity. Vol. II. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Castles, F. G. (1998). *Comparative Public Policy: Patterns of Post-war Transformation*. Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Castles, F. G. and M. Flood (1993). 'Why Divorce Rates Differ: Law, Religious Belief and Modernity'. In F. G. Castles (ed.) *Families of Nations: Patterns of Public Policy in Western Democracies*. Aldershot: Dartmouth. pp. 293-326.
- Chen, W.-H. M. Corak (2005). 'Child Poverty and Changes in Child Poverty in Rich Countries since 1990'. *Innocenti Working Paper No. 2005-02*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Cherlin, A. (1978). 'Remarriage as an Incomplete Institution'. *American Journal of Sociology* 84 (3): 634-650.
- Cherlin, A. J. (1981). *Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cliquet, R. L. (1991). *The Second Demographic Transition: Fact or Fiction?* Population Studies. Council of Europe. Nº 23. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Commaille, J. (1991). 'La régulation politique de la famille'. In F. de Singly ed. *La famille: L'état des savoirs*. Paris: Éditions la Découverte. pp. 265-277.
- Commaille, J. et C. Martin (1998). *Les enjeux politiques de la famille*. Paris: Bayard Éditions.
- Commission of the European Communities (2006). *Commission Staff Working Document. Implementation and Update Reports on 2003-2005 Naps/Inclusion and Update Reports on 2004-2006 Naps/Inclusion*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

- Corak, M. (2004). 'Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe: An Introduction'. In M. Corak (ed.) *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1-37.
- Corak, M. (2005). 'Principles and Practicalities in Measuring Child Poverty for the Rich Countries'. *Innocenti Working Paper 2005-01*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Corak, M., C. Lietz and H. Sutherland (2005). 'The Impact of Tax and Transfer Systems on Children in the European Union'. *Innocenti Working Paper No. 2005-04*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Cornia, G. A. and S. Danziger (1997). 'Common Themes, Methodological Approach, and Main Findings'. In G.A. Cornia and S. Danziger (eds.). *Child Poverty and Deprivation in the Industrialized Countries, 1945-1995*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press. pp. 1-22.
- Corsi, M. and K. Orsini (2002). 'Measuring Poverty in Europe'. *Development Local/Global Encounters* 45 (3): 93-101.
- Council of the European Union (2002). *Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion*.
- Council of the European Union (2003). *Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion*.
- Council of the European Union (2004). *Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion*.
- Council of the European Union (2005). *Draft of the Joint Report by the Commission and the Council on Social Inclusion and Social Protection*.
- Cousins, C. (1999). *Society, Work, and Welfare in Europe*. London: Macmillan.
- Dang, T.-T., H. Immervoll, D. Mantovani, K. Orsini and H. Sutherland (2006). 'An Age Perspective on Economic Well-Being and Social Protection in Nine OECD Countries'. *Social, Employment and Migration Papers N° 34*. Paris: OECD.
- Danziger, S. and J. Waldfogel (2000). 'Investing in Children: What Do We Know? What Should We Do?'. In S. Danziger and J. Waldfogel (eds.) *Securing the Future: Investing in Children from Birth to College*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. pp. 1-15.
- Dennis, I and A.-C. Guio (2003a). 'Poverty and Social Exclusion in the EU after Laeken. Part 1'. *Eurostat. Statistics in Focus (Population and Social Conditions)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

- Dennis, I and A.-C. Guio (2003b). 'Poverty and Social Exclusion in the EU after Laeken'. Part 2. *Eurostat. Statistics in Focus (Population and Social Conditions)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Dennis, I and A.-C. Guio (2004a). 'Monetary Poverty in New Member States and Candidate Countries'. *Eurostat. Statistics in Focus (Population and Social Conditions)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Dennis, I and A.-C. Guio (2004b). 'Poverty and Social Exclusion in the EU'. *Eurostat. Statistics in Focus (Population and Social Conditions)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Diener, E. (2000). 'Subjective Well-being: The Science of Happiness and a Proposal for a National Index'. *American Psychologist* 55 (1): 34-43.
- Diener, E. and R. Biswas-Diener (2002). 'Will Money Increase Subjective Well-being?: A Literature Review and Guide to Needed Research. *Social Indicators Research* 57: 119-169.
- Duncan, S. and R. Edwards (1999). *Lone Mothers and Paid Work*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Duncan, S. and R. Edwards (eds.) (1997). *Single Mothers in an International Context: Mothers or Workers?* Basingstoke: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Edwards, R. (2004). 'Present and Absent in Troubling Ways: Families and Social Capital Debates'. *The Sociological Review* 52 (1): 1-21
- Eekelaar, John (1991). *Regulating Divorce*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ellwood, D. T. and C. Jenks (2004). 'The Spread of Single-Parent Families in the United States Since 1960'. In D. P. Moynihan, T. M. Smeeding and L. Rainwater (eds). *The Future of the Family*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. pp. 25-65.
- Elster, J. and John E. Roemer (1991). 'Introduction'. In J. Elster and John E. Roemer (eds.) *Interpersonal Comparisons of Well-Being*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 1-16.
- Ermisch, J. F. (2003). *An Economic Analysis of the Family*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002a). 'Towards the Good Society, Once Again?' In G. Esping-Andersen et al. *Why We Need a New Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-25.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2002b). 'A Child-Centred Social Investment Strategy'. In G. Esping-Andersen et al. *Why We Need a New Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 26-67.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2004a). 'Unequal Opportunities and the Mechanisms of Social Inheritance'. In M. Corak (ed.) *Generational Income Mobility in North America and Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 289-314.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2004b) 'Untying the Gordian Knot of Social Inheritance'. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 21: 115-139.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2005a). 'Inequality of Incomes and Opportunities'. In A. Giddens and P. Diamond (eds.). *New Egalitarianism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. pp. 8-38.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2005b). 'Children in the Welfare State. A Social Investment Approach'. *DemoSoc Working Paper* No 2005-10. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2006). 'Families, Government and the Distribution of Skills'. Paper prepared for the Netspar-CPB Conference *Reinventing the Welfare State*. The Hague 27-28 April, 2006.
- Fahey, T. and E. Smyth (2004). "Do Subjective Indicators Measure Welfare?: Evidence from 33 Societies". *European Societies* 6 (1): 5-27.
- Flaquer, L (2000). 'Is there a Southern European model of family policy?' In A. Pfenning and T. Bahle (eds.). *Families and Family Policies in Europe*. Frankfurt a.M./New York: Peter Lang.
- Flaquer, L. (1999). *La estrella menguante del padre*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Flaquer, L. (2002). 'Family Policy and the Maintenance of the Traditional Family in Spain'. In A. Carling, S. Duncan and R. Edwards (eds.) *Analysing Families: Morality and Rationality in Policy and Practice*. London: Macmillan. pp. 84-92.
- Flaquer, L., E. Almeda and L. Navarro (2006). *Monoparentalidad e infancia*. Barcelona: Fundació 'la Caixa'.
- Forssén, K. (1998). 'Child Poverty and Family Policy in OECD Countries'. *LIS Working Paper Series. No. 178*.

- Forssén, K. (2000). 'Child Poverty in the Nordic Countries'. *Series B: 22/2000*. University of Turku, Department of Social Policy..
- Furstenberg Jr., F. F. and A. J. Cherlin (1991). *Divided Families: What Happens to Children When Parents Part*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The Third Way*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- González-López, M. J. (2002). 'A Portrait of Western Families: New Models of Intimate Relationships and the Timing of Life Events'. In A. Carling, S. Duncan and R. Edwards eds. *Analysing Families: Morality and Rationality in Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge. pp. 21-47.
- Goode, W. J. (1993). *World Changes in Divorce Patterns*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Gregg, P., E. Washbrook, C. Propper and S. Burgess (2005). 'The Effects of Mother's Return to Work Decision on Child Development in the UK'. *The Economic Journal* 115: F48-F80.
- Gruski, D. B. and R. Kanbur (2006). 'Introduction: The Conceptual Foundations of Poverty and Inequality Measurement'. In D. B Gruski and R. Kanbur (eds.) *Poverty and Inequality*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press. pp. 1-29.
- Hakim, C. (2003). *Models of the Family in Modern Societies: Ideals and Realities*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hamilton, C. and A. Perry (eds.) (2002). *Family Law in Europe*. London and Edinburgh: Butterworths.
- Hantrais, L. (2004). *Family Policy Matters: Responding to Family Change in Europe*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Hantrais, L. and M.-T. Letablier (1996). *Families and Family Policies in Europe*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hardey, M. and G. Crow (eds.) (1991). *Lone Parenthood: Coping with Constraints and Making Opportunities*. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Haskins, R. and C. Rouse (2005). 'Closing Achievement Gaps'. *Policy Brief Spring 2005*. Princeton-Brookings: The Future of Children.
- Heckman, J. and L. Lochner (2000). 'Rethinking Education and Training Policy'. In S. Danziger and J. Waldfogel (eds.) *Securing the Future: Investing in Children from Birth to College*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. pp. 47-86.

- Hirsch, D. (2006). *What Will it Take to End Child Poverty? Firing on All Cylinders*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Hobson, B. , A.-Z. Duvander and K. Halldén (2006). 'Men and Women's Agency and Capabilities to Create a Worklife Balance in Diverse and Changing Institutional Contexts'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 267-295.
- Holden, K. C. and P. J. Smock (1991). 'The Economic Costs of Marital Dissolution: Why Do Women Bear a Disproportionate Cost?' *Annual Review of Sociology*. 17: 51-78.
- Hunt, J. and C. Roberts (2004). 'Child Contact with Non-resident Parents'. *Family Policy Briefing 3*. Department of Social Policy and Social Work: University of Oxford.
- Iceland, J. (2006). *Poverty in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jäntti, M. and S. Danziger (2000). 'Income Poverty in Advanced Countries'. In A. Atkinson and F. Bourguignon (eds.) *Handbook of Income Distribution*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Jenson, J. (2006). 'The LEGO™ Paradigm and New Social Risks: Consequences for Children'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 27-50.
- Jeynes, W. (2002). *Divorce, Family Structure and Academic Success of Children*. New York, London and Oxford: The Haworth Press.
- Kahneman, D., E. Diener and N. Schwartz (eds.) (1999). *Well-being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kalmijn, M. (2005). 'The Effects of Divorce on Men's Employment and Social Security Histories'. *European Journal of Population* 21: 347-366.
- Kalmijn, M. and A.-R. Poortman (2006). 'His or Her Divorce? The Gendered Nature of Divorce and Its Determinants'. *European Sociological Review* 22 (2): 201-214.
- Kaufmann, F. et al. (ed.) (2002). *Family Life and Family Policies in Europe. Volume 2: Problems and Issues in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiernan, K. (2004). 'Unmarried Cohabitation and Parenthood in Britain and Europe'. *Law and Policy* 26: 33-55.

- Klammer, U. (2006). 'Work Life Balance from the Children's Perspective'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 220-242.
- Lamb, M. E. (ed.) (2004). *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lehmann, P and C. Wirtz (2004). 'Household Formation in the EU: Lone Parents'. *Statistics in Focus. Population and Social Conditions. 5/2004*. Luxembourg: European Communities.
- Letablier, M.-T. (2006). 'Childcare in a Changing World: Policy Responses to Working Time Flexibility in France'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 201-219.
- Lewis J. with B. Hobson (1997). 'Introduction'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Lone Mothers in European Welfare Regimes: Shifting Policy Logics*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. pp. 1-20.
- Lewis, J. (1992). 'Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes'. *Journal of European Social Policy* 2 (3).
- Lewis, J. (1993). 'Introduction: Women, Work, Family and Social Policies in Europe'. In J. Lewis, (ed.) (1993). *Women and Social Policies in Europe*. London: Edward Elgar. pp. 1-24.
- Lewis, J. (1997). 'Lone Mothers: The British Case'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Lone Mothers in European Welfare Regimes: Shifting Policy Logics*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, pp. 50-75.
- Lewis, J. (1999). 'The 'Problem' of Lone Motherhood in Comparative Perspective'. In J. Clasen (ed.) *Comparative Social Policy: Concepts, Theories and Methods*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 181-199.
- Lewis, J. (2001). *The End of Marriage?: Individualism and Intimate Relations*. Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Lewis, J. (2002). 'Individualisation, Assumptions about the Existence of an Adult Worker Model and the Shift towards Contractualism'. In A. Carling, S. Duncan and R. Edwards (eds.) *Analysing Families: Morality and Rationality in Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge. pp. 51-63.
- Lewis, J. (2006). 'Introduction: Children in the Context of Changing Families and Welfare States'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 1-24.

- Lewis, J. (ed.) (1997). *Lone Mothers in European Welfare Regimes: Shifting Policy Logics*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lewis, J. (ed.) (2006). *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Lewis, J. and S. Sarre (2006). 'Risk and Intimate Relationships'. In P. Taylor-Gooby and J. O. Zinn (eds.). *Risk in Social Science*. Oxford University Press.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social Capital: A Theory of Social structure and Action*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lister, R. (2005). 'Children, Well-being and Citizenship'. Paper contributed to the 2005 Social Policy Association Annual Conference. Bath.
- Lister, R. (2006). 'An Agenda for Children: Investing in the Future or Promoting Well-Being in the Present? In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 51-66.
- Mahon, R. (2006). 'The OCDE and the Work/Family Reconciliation Agenda: Competing Frames'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 173-197.
- Mankiw, N. G. (2004). *Principles of Economics*. Mason, Ohio: Thomson South-Western.
- Mare, R. D. (2001). 'Assortative Mating, Intergenerational Mobility, and Educational Inequality'. *On-Line Working Paper Series. Paper CCPR-004-00*. California Center for Population Research. <http://repositories.cdlib.org/ccpr/olwp/CCPR-004-00>.
- Martin, C. (1997). *L'après divorce: Lien familial et vulnérabilité*. Québec: PUL.
- McLanahan, S. and G. Sandefur (1994). *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- McLanahan, S. And M. S. Carlson (2004). 'Fathers in Fragile Families'. In M. E. Lamb (ed.) *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 368-396.
- McLanahan, S., E. Donahue, and R. Haskins (2005). 'Introducing the Issue'. *The Future of Children*. Issue on Marriage and Child Well-being. 15 (2): 3-12.
- Micklewright, J. (2003). 'Child Poverty in English-Speaking Countries'. *Social Statistics Research Centre Applications and Policy Working Paper A03/05*. Southampton: University of Southampton.
- Micklewright, J. and K. Stewart (1999). 'Is the Well-Being of Children Converging in

- the European Union?’ Luxembourg: LIS.
- Millar, J. (1999). ‘State, Family and Personal Responsibility: The Changing Balance for Lone Mothers in the United Kingdom’. In G. Allan (ed.). *The Sociology of the Family: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 247-261.
- Millar, J. and E. Apospori (ed.) (2003). *The Dynamics of Social Exclusion in Europe: Comparing Austria, Germany, Greece, Portugal and the UK*. Cheltenham, UK; Northampton, MA: E. Elgar.
- Morrison, D. R. and A. Ritualo. (2000). ‘Routes to Children's Economic Recovery After Divorce: Are Cohabitation and Remarriage Equivalent?’ *American Sociological Review*. No. 65: 560-580.
- Moss, P. (2006). ‘From a Childcare to a Pedagogical Discourse – Or Putting Care in Its Place’. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 154-172.
- Naldini, M. (2003). *The Family in the Mediterranean States*. London/Portland, Or.: Frank Cass.
- Nock, S. L. (2005). ‘Marriage as a Public Issue’. *The Future of Children*. Issue on Marriage and Child Well-being. 15 (2): 13-32.
- O’Brien, M. (2004). ‘Social Science and Public Policy Perspectives on Fatherhood in the European Union’. In M. E. Lamb (ed.) *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons. pp. 121-145.
- OECD (2004). *Learning for Tomorrow's World: First Results from PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2005). *Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators. 2005 Edition*. Paris: OECD.
- Orloff, A. S. (1993). ‘Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States’. *American Sociological Review* 58 (3): 303-328.
- Pearce, D. M. (1978). ‘The Feminisation of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare’. *Urban and Social Change Review* 11 (1-2): 28-36.
- Perrons, D. (2006). ‘Squeezed Between Two Agendas: Work and Childcare in the Flexible UK’. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 243-266.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (1998). ‘Gender Cultures and the Gender Arrangement: A Theoretical Framework for Cross-National Gender Research’. *Innovation* 11 (2): 147-166.

- Pfau-Effinger, B. (1999). 'The Modernisation of Motherhood in Western Europe in Cross-national Perspective'. In R. Crompton (ed.) *Restructuring Gender Relations and Employment. The Decline of the "Male Breadwinner"?* Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp 60-79.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2002). "Changing welfare states and labour markets in the context of European gender arrangements". In J. G. Andersen and P. H. Jensen (eds.) *Changing Labour Markets, Welfare Policies and Citizenship*. Bristol: The Policy Press. pp. 235-256.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2004). *Development of Culture, Welfare States and Women's Employment in Europe*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2006). 'Cultures of Childhood and the Relationship of Care and Employment in European Welfare States'. In J. Lewis (ed.) *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 137-153.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. and B. Geissler (2002). 'Political Intervention and Family Policy in Europe and the USA: Cultural Change and Family Policies in East and West Germany'. In A. Carling, S. Duncan and R. Edwards eds. *Analysing Families: Morality and Rationality in Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge. pp. 77-83.
- Poortman, A. R. and M. Kalmijn (2001). 'Women's Labour Market Position and Divorce in the Netherlands: Evaluating Economic Interpretations of the Work Effect'. *Working Paper #2001-2.b*. Tilburg University: Research Programme on Divorce in the Netherlands 1998.
- Praag, B. M. S. van, P. Frijters and A. Ferrer-i-Carbonell (2002). 'The Anatomy of Subjective Well-being'. *Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper TI 2002-022-/3*. <http://www.tinbergen.nl>.
- Pringle, K. (1998). *Children and Social Welfare in Europe*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Prout, A. (2005). *The Future of Childhood: Towards the Multidisciplinary Study of Children*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Qvortrup, J. (1994). 'Childhood Matters: An Introduction'. In J. Qvortrup, M. Bardy, G. Sgritta and H. Wintersberger (eds.) *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*. Aldershot: Avebury. pp. 1-23.
- Rainwater, L. and T. M. Smeeding (2003a). *Poor Kids in A Rich Country: America's Children in a Comparative Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rainwater, L. and T. M. Smeeding (2003b). 'Doing Poorly: U.S. Child Poverty in Cross-National Context'. *Children, Youth and Environments* 13 (2).

- Rainwater, L. and T. M. Smeeding (2004). 'Single-Parent Poverty, Inequality and the Welfare State'. In D.P. Moynihan, T. M. Smeeding and L. Rainwater (eds). *The Future of the Family*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. pp. 96-115.
- Rector, R. E., K. A. Johnson, P. F. Fagan and L. R. Noyes (2003). 'Increasing Marriage Would Dramatically Reduce Child Poverty'. Washington D.C.: The Heritage Foundation.
- Redmond, G. (2000). 'Children in Large Families: Disadvantaged or Just Different?' *LIS Working Paper Series No. 225*. Luxembourg: LIS.
- Rigby, M. and L. Köhler (2002). *Child Health Indicators of Life and Development (CHILD). Report to the European Commission. Executive Summary*. European Commission-Directorate-General for Health and Consumer Protection: Centre for Health Planning and Management.
- Ringen, S. (1997). *Citizens, Families, and Reform*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press.
- Roca, E. (1999). *Familia y cambio social (De la "casa" a la persona)*. Madrid: Civitas.
- Roca, E. (2000). 'Regulation of Same-Sex Partnerships from a Spanish Perspective'. In M. MacLean (ed.) *Making Law for Families*. Oxford: Hart. pp. 95-115.
- Roca, E. (2001). 'Same-Sex Partnerships in Spain: Family, Marriage or Contract?'. *European Journal of Law Reform*. 3: 365-382.
- Rose, E. (2001). 'Marriage and Assortative Mating: How Have the Patterns Changed?' http://www.econ.washington.edu/user/erose/assort_aea_final.pdf .
- Ruhm, C. J. (2004). 'Parental Employment and Child Cognitive Development'. *The Journal of Human Resources* 39: 155-192.
- Salonen, T. (2003). *Child Poverty in Sweden – Annual Report 2003* (Summary of the study "Barnfattigdom i Sverige– årsrapport 2003"). Stockholm: Save the Children Sweden.
- Searle, B. A. (2004). 'Historical Developments in Understanding and Measuring Well-Being'. Paper contributed to the Social Policy Association Annual Conference 2004.
- Show, S. (1991). 'The Conflicting Experiences of Lone Parenthood'. In M. Hardey and G. Crow (eds.) (1991). *Lone Parenthood: Coping with Constraints and Making Opportunities*. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf. pp. 143-155.
- Simons, R. L. & Associates (1996). *Understanding Differences Between Divorced and Intact Families: Stress, Interaction and Child Outcome*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

- Smart, C. (2002). 'From Children's Shoes to Children's Voices'. Paper contributed to the seminar on The Children of Divorce: Parentage and Citizenship. Barcelona: 19-20 September 2002.
- Smart, C. and B. Neale (1999). *Family Fragments?* Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press and Blackwell.
- Smart, C., B. Neale, and A. Wade (2001). *The Changing Experience of Childhood: Families and Divorce*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity and Blackwell Publishers.
- Smock, P., Manning & Gupta (1999). 'The Effect of Marriage and Divorce on Women's Economic Well-Being'. *American Sociological Review* 64 (6): 794-812.
- Solsona, M., R. Houle and C. Simó (2000). 'Separation and Divorce in Spain'. In M. J. González, T. Jurado and M. Naldini (eds). *Gender Inequalities in Southern Europe: Women, Work and Welfare in the 1990s*. London and Portland Or.: Frank Cass. pp. 195-222.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. (2004). 'New Risks and Social Change'. In P. Taylor-Gooby (ed.) *New Risks, New Welfare: The Transformation of the European Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-28.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. and J. O. Zinn (eds.) (2006). *Risk in Social Science*. Oxford University Press.
- Therborn, A. G. (1993). 'The Politics of Childhood: The Rights of Children in Modern Times'. In F. Castles (ed.) *Families of Nations*. Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Therborn, A. G. (2004). *Between Sex and Power: Family in the World, 1900-2000*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Thompson, R. A. and P. R. Amato (1999). *The Postdivorce Family: Children, Parenting and Society*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Treviño, R. (2006). *Estructura y dinámica de la monoparentalidad en España*. Unpublished doctoral thesis submitted to the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- UNICEF (2005). 'Child Poverty in Rich Countries, 2005'. *Innocenti Report Card No.6*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
- Uunk, W. (2004). 'The Economic Consequences of Divorce for Women in the EU: The Impact of Welfare State Arrangements'. *European Journal of Population* 20: 251-285.

- Vleminckx, K. and T. M. Smeeding (eds). (2001). *Child Well-Being, Child Poverty and Child Policy in Modern Nations: What Do We Know?* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Waddington, H. (2004). *Linking Economic Policy to Childhood Poverty: A Review of the Evidence on Growth, Trade Reform and Macroeconomic Policy*. Chip Report 7. London: CHIP.
- Waldfogel, J. (2006). *What Children Need*. Cambridge Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Waldfogel, J., W.-J., Han, J. Brooks-Gunn (2002). 'The Effects of Early Maternal Employment on Child Cognitive Development'. *Demography* 39: 369-392.
- Walker, R. (ed.) (1999). *Ending Child Poverty: Popular Welfare for the 21st Century?* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Walker, R. (2005). 'Opportunity and Life Chances: The Dynamics of Poverty, Inequality and Exclusion'. In A. Giddens and P. Diamond (eds.). *New Egalitarianism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. pp. 69-85.
- Weitzman, L. J. (1985). *The Divorce Revolution: The Unexpected Social and Economic Consequences for Women and Children in America*. New York: The Free Press and London: Collier Macmillan.
- Wolfinger, N. H. (2005). *Understanding the Divorce Cycle: The Children of Divorce in their Own Marriages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

References 2 (Reports from workshops and conferences)

- Smart, C. (2004). Report on contributions to the workshop *New approaches and perspectives on childhood*. Leeds.
- Lewis, J and M. Maclean (2005). Report on contributions to the conference *Challenges and opportunities faced by European welfare states: The changing context for child welfare*. Oxford.
- Todorova, V. (2005). Report on contributions to the Workshop *Which are the provisions in Family Law that foster children's well-being and which kind of reforms should be envisaged in this respect?* Sofia.
- Martin, C. (2005). Report on contributions to the workshop *Working flexibility and caring arrangements*. Rennes.
- Alipranti, L (2005). Report on contributions to the workshop *Children in multicultural societies*. Athens.

- Pfau-Effinger, B. and M. Eichler (2006). Report on contributions to the conference *Different kinds of risks for children resulting from various structures and changes in the labour markets*. Hamburg.
- Björnberg, U. (2006). Report on contributions to the workshop *Transmission of inequalities from generation to generation*. Göteborg.
- Siefken, C., G. R. Farstad and A. Skevik Grødem (2006). Report on contributions to the workshop *The relationship between children and non-resident fathers and its impact on their quality of life*. Oslo.
- Flaquer, L. (2007). Report on contributions to the conference *How can the well-being of children in a knowledge-based society be ameliorated? Convergence and divergence patterns in a European perspective*. Barcelona.

References 3 (Papers contributed to WELLCHI workshops and conferences)

- Alanen, L. (2004). "Theorizing Children's Welfare". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Alberdi, I. (2007). "Experiences of Paternity between Young Fathers". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Alipranti, L.; Kalogirafou, A. (2007). "Family Forms and Risk of Poverty: an Overview". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Alipranti, L.; Nikolaou, A. (2005). "Women's Participation to the Labour Market and Reconciliation Policy in Greece". Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Alipranti, L.; Nikolaou, A. (2005). "Childhood in Poverty: a Disturbing Reality". Some Theoretical and Empirical Considerations". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Alipranti, L.; Nikolaou, A. (2006). "Child Poverty in Multicultural Societies". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Almeda, E. (2007). "Single Motherhood in Spain from a Comparative Perspective". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.

- Antokolskaia, M. (2007). "Joint Parental Responsibilities and Compulsory Arrangements with Regards of Children upon Divorce". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Bastard, B.; Voneche, L. (2005). "The Separation of Couple Law from Parental Law in PACS and the new Children Act". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Bastard, B. (2005). "Maintaining the Relationship between Children and their Imprisoned Parent. The French Experience of 'Relais Enfants –Parents'". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Bastard, B. (2006). "On "Contact Centres" in Europe". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Beinsenherz, H. G. (2006). "Concepts of Measuring Child-Poverty". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Bennet, Fr. (2005). "Paying for Children". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Bertram, H. (2006). "Policies for Children: the Case of Germany Children in Germany and the Foregotten Modernization". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Björnberg, U. (2005). "Trends in Sharing Costs for Children. Nordic-North European Comparisons". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Björnberg, U. (2005). "Towards a Child Oriented and Human European Refugee Policy". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Björnberg, U. (2006). "Asylum-Seeking Children's Welfare, Health and Well-Being". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Blanden, J.; Macmillan, L.; Gregg, P. (2006). "Accounting for Intergenerational Income Persistence: Non-Cognitive Skills, Ability and Education". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Blatný, M., Kepák, T. (2007). "How Can We Promote the Quality of Life of Children Who Have Survived Cancer?". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Blekesaune, M. (2004). "Single Parents, Adolescents and Depression". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.

- Boyer, D.; Fagnani, J. (2005). "Flexible Working Time Schedules and Childcare Policies: What is at Stake for Working Parents in France?" Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Bradshaw, J. (2005). "A Comparison of Family Benefits in Nine Countries at January 2004". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Bradshaw, J. (2006). "Child Poverty and Child Well-Being". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Bradshaw, J. (2007). "Beyond Child Poverty". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Brophy, J. (2005). "Significant Harm Criteria". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Brullet, Cr. (2007). "Towards a Post Patriarchal Family System? Childhood and Family Policies in Spain and Catalonia. State of the Question". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Bühler-Niederberger, D. (2007). "The Power of Innocence: Social Politics for Children between Separation and Participation". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Cantó, O. (2007). "What Helps Households with Children in Leaving Poverty? Evidence from Spain". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Cardia-Vonèche, L. (2007). "Social Support to Parenting in Difficult Settings: a Contact Centre for Drug-Addicted Parents and their Young Children". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Carrasco, S. (2005). "Children, Youth and Migration: Trends, Relations and Local Policies in Catalonia". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Carrasco, S. (2006). "Poverty of Children in Migrated Families". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Chapple, S. (2007). "From Conception to Early Childhood Education: The "Under Three Package" in a Life Cycle Context in OECD Countries". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Chauvel, L. (2006). "The New Generations Confronting Downward Social Mobility: France in a Comparative Perspective". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.

- Christopoulou, N.; Deleeuw, S. (2007). "Changing Childhoods: Migrant Children and the Confrontation of Uncertainty ". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Christopouou, N. (2005). "Refugee Children: Family and the Negotiation of Memory". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Coenraad, L. (2007). "Parental Plan and Informal Relationship Terminations". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Comas, D. (2007). "Family Change; General Patterns and Social Diversity". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- D'Addio, A. Cr.; Whiteford, P. (2007). "Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage and Disadvantage: Policy Implications". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Dalseng Haugen, Gr. M. (2006). "The Significance of Money in Father-Child Relationships where Fathers are not Living in the same Household". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Du Bois-Reymond, M. (2006). "Semi-Dependency in the Relationship of Young Adults and their Parents. An European Study". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Eekelaar, J. (2005). "Truth". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Eriksson, R. (2006). "Primary and Secondary Effects of Social Origins on Educational Transitions". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Ermisch, J. (2006). "Child Support and Non-resident Fathers' Contact with their Children". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Escobedo, A. (2007). "Leave Policies and Public Systems of Care for Children Under 3 Years Old and their Families in the EU". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (2007). "A Child-Centred Social Investment Strategy". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Eydal, G. B. (2006). "Caring Fathers in the Nordic Countries". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.

- Eydoux, Anne; Letablier, M.-Th. (2005). "Working Time Flexibility, Challenges and Opportunities for Childcare?" Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Eydoux, Anne; Letablier, M.-Th. (2007). "Working Flexibility and Caring Arrangements: The Impact of Changing Working Conditions on Childcare Services". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Fereti, I. (2005). "Violence against Children in Multicultural Society. New Dimensions and New Demands". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Fereti, I. (2007). "Legislative Measures for the Protection of Children from Violence". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Flaquer, Ll. (2005). "Individualization and Child Poverty in Southern Europe". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Flaquer, Ll. (2005). "Change of Family Structure and Informal Care Work". Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Flaquer, Ll. (2006). "Child Poverty in Wealthy Nations". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Flaquer, Ll. (2007). "Causes Underlying the Growth of Child Poverty and Strategies to Combat it: a Comparative Perspective". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Hege Kitterod, R. (2006). "Expenses, Norms or Practical Considerations? The Effect of Income and Education on Non-Resident Fathers'Contact with their Children". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Henricson, Cl. (2005). "The Child and Family Policy Divide". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Henricson, Cl. (2007). "Cultural Diversity and Moral Philosophy, and their Relationship with Families and the Upbringing of Children". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Henricson, Cl. (2007). "The Contractual Culture and its Impact on Children's and Family Services". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Heymann, J. (2006). "Forgotten Families". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.

- Highet, G. (2004). "Children and Family Transformation: A Social Resilience Perspective." Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Highet, G.; Jamieson, L. (2006). "Post-Separation Parent/Child Relationships: Exploring Emotional Relatedness". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Hiilamo, H. (2007). "The Children in the Margin of the Society in Finland". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Hill, M. (2005). "Children's Experience of Racism and Respect for their Cultures in School". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Hobson, B. (2005). "Work Regimes, Work Cultures and Men's Carework". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Hoelscher, P.; Richardson, D. (2007). "Monitoring Child Well-Being in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Holland, J. (2006). "Transitions and transmission: Young People and Social Capital in Biographical Context". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Hunt, J. (2005). "Professional Intervention: an International Review". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Huttunen, J. (2006). "Parenthood from the Father's Point of View". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Jamieson, L. (2006). "Intergenerational Relationships: Theory and Method". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Jenson, J. (2005). "The Investing in Children Paradigm: A Comparison of Canada and Britain". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Jurczyk, K. (2006). "Parental Working Time, Common Time, Children's Time- The Perspective of Children". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Kamenova, Tzv. (2005). "International Child Abduction Convention and its Application in Bulgaria". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.

- Klammer, U. (2005). "Labour Market Participation and Working Time. The Role of the State and the Role of Enterprises. Towards a New Distribution of Responsibilities in Germany?" Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Klocke, A. (2006). "Growing up Poor and the Health Behaviour of Children". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Kontou, M. (2005). "Migrant Children in Family Businesses: The Interrelationship of Work in Business and School Achievement". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Kotzamani, A. (2005). "Educational Opportunities for Migrant Children. Legal Framework: Theory and Practice". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Kotzeva, T. (2005). "Changing Family Forms in Bulgaria: In Pursuit for a Policy Response". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Knijn, Tr. (2005). "Saving for Children: Life Courses and Markets". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Kurczewski, J.; Fuszara, M. (2005). "What is a Parent?". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Kurczewski, J.; Oklej, A. (2007). "Polish Grandparents and Grandchildren – Mutual Normative Expectations". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Lange, A. (2006). "Part Time Work and Patterns of Balancing Family and Work": The need for a blending of sociological and psychological perspectives". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Larsson, J. (2005). "Conciliating Work and Family Life with Atypical Times of Work". Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Larsson, J. (2007). "Factors Improving Parents' Work–Life Balance". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Le Bihan, Bl.; Martin, Cl. (2005). "Conciliating Work and Family Life with Atypical Times of Work". Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Le Bihan, Bl.; Martin, Cl. (2007). "How French Parents Working on Non-Standards Hours are Facing their Parental Responsibilities. Results of the French National

- Inquiry on Caring Arrangements”. Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Le Clainche, Chr. (2007). “Social Policy and “Luck Egalitarianism”: Why a Monetary Capital for Young Adults is Legitimate? The Case of France”. Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Letablier, M.-Th. (2005). “Restructuring Childcare Policy in France: Responses to Parents’ Flexibilisation in Working Time”. Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Lewis, J. (2005). “The Development of Work/Family Reconciliation as a Policy Target at the European Level. The Policy Shifts”. Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- MacInnes, J.; Solsona, M. (2007). “Family Trajectories after Divorce. Recent Contributions from Demography”. Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Maclean, M. (2005). “Legislative Caution in Family Disputes”. Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Maclean, M. (2006). “The UK Children and Adoption Act 2006”. Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Mahon, R. (2005). “Farewell to Maternalism OECD-Style – or is There One?”. Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Marí-Klose, P.; Marí-Klose, M. (2007). “Is the South still Different? Family Solidarity and Welfare Provision for Youth”. Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Marre, D. (2005). “Intercultural Relations, Racialisation and Experiences of International Adoption in Europe”. Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Marsh, A. (2006). “Employment and Child Poverty in Britain”. Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Martin, Cl. (2004). “Putting Children at the Centre of Public Policy”. Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Martin, Cl. (2006). “Childhood and Public Policies: The French Case”. Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.

- Masardo, A. (2006). "Research on Father's Experiences of the Negotiation and Management of Shared Residence in Britain and France ". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Masson, J. (2005). "A Contextual Critique of the Climbe Report". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Masson, J. (2005). "Securing the Relationship between Carers and Children - Trial and Error in England". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Mavromatis, G.; Avramidi, F.; Cavounidis, J. (2005). "Migrant Student Concentration and School Performance: The Case of Attica". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Mavromatis, G.; Avramidi, F. (2007). "Migrant Student Population in Secondary Education: Shedding some Light on their Presence in the Two Biggest Urban Conurbations (Athens - Thessalonica)". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Meil, G.; Ayuso, L. (2007). "Family Change and Socialisation Styles". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Millar, J. (2006). "Lone Mother Entering Employment: from Home to Work and the Impact on Children". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Moss, P. (2005). "Getting beyond Childcare and the Barcelona Targets". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Moxnes, K. (2004). "Divorce: Changing the Status of Children?". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Moreno, A. (2007). "The Breadwinner Family Model and Child Care in Spain from a Compared Perspective: A Model in Transition". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Morrow, V. (2004). "The Ethics of Social Research with Children and Young People: an Overview". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Mueller J., K. (2005). "Contact Support in Germany". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Mühling, T. (2006). "Caring Fathers in Germany- Where Are the "New" Fathers?". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.

- Navarro, L. (2007) "Different Outcomes for Children in Two-Parent and Single-Parent Families in Spain". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Neale, B. (2004). "Becoming the Author of Your Own Life: A Sociology of Young Lives after Parental Divorce". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Neale, B.; Bagnoli, A. (2007). "Tracking Young Lives over Time: a Review of Longitudinal Evidence on the Status and Condition of Children in Europe". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Nikolaidou, S. (2005). "Street Children in Multicultural Societies: The Case of Greece". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Nikolaou, A. (2007). "Child Poverty in Greece: Results from the Survey of Income and Living Conditions, EU-SILC". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Nollmann, G. (2006). "Kuznets Revisited: Single Mothers, Child Poverty, and the Structural Change of Labor Markets". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Obiol, S. (2007). "Child Benefit System in Spain ". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- O'Brien, M. (2006). "Fathers, Family Life and Work: Can Fathers Have it All?". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Olk, Th. (2006). "Children in the "Social Investment State"". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Opielka, M. (2006). "Do Children Need Time their Parents?". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Östberg, V. (2006). "Status Relations in School and their Relevance for Health in a Life Course Perspective". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Palme, M. (2006). "Intergenerational Mobility, Human Capital Transmission and the Earnings of Second-Generation Immigrants in Sweden". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Papathodorou, Chr. (2005). "Child Poverty and Social Protection in Greece". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.

- Perez, Cr.; Clarke, L.; Forste, R. (2007). "Young Offenders: Victims of Family Background?". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Perrons, D. (2005). "Are Family Policies for the Family? Contradictions of Family Policy in a Flexible Era". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2005). "Cultures of Childhood and Care in European Welfare States". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2006). "'Active Citizenship'- the New Paradigm of Welfare States Policies, What does it Mean for Children?". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (2007). "The Relationship between Family and Employment and the Well-Being of Children". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Picontó-Navales, T. (2007). "The Consolidation of the Spanish Child Welfare System". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Platt, L. (2006). "Ethnicity and Intergenerational Social Mobility in England and Wales: Findings and Issues". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Prodanov, V. (2005). "The Changing Patterns for Socialization of Children in Bulgaria". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Qvortrup, J. (2004). "Children as Legitimate Claims Makers on Societal Resources". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Qvortrup, J. (2006). "Citizenship of Children". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Ridge, T. (2006). "Child Poverty from a Child's Perspective". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Roca, E. (2005). "Same Sex Parenting". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Roca, E. (2007). "Homosexual Families: Adoption and Foster Care". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.

- Sakka, D. (2005). "Adolescent's Views on Violence and Hostility in Relation to the 'Other'". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Saraceno, Ch. (2006). "Family Interdependency and Solidarity as a Resource and a Constraint for Intergenerational Social Mobility. The Southern European Case". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.
- Sawyer, C. (2005). "The Newest Europeans: Children's Legal Status as a Guarantee of their Well-Being". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Scheiwe, K. (2005). "Parental Education, Public Education – a Shifting Balance. Some Remarks on Recent Developments in Germany". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Schneider, N. F. (2006). "Changing Expectations on Employees and Parents and the Well-Being of Children". Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.
- Selman, P. (2007). "The Impact of Intercountry Adoption on the Well-Being of Children in Europe". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Siefken, C. (2006). "Absent Fathers- More Cash than Care? Non-Resident Fathering in Germany, Great Britain and Norway". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Symeonidou, H. (2007). "Fertility and the Reconciliation of Family and Working Life: The Case of Greece". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Skevik Grodem, A. (2007). "Child Poverty as Children See it: How Far Do We Get With Income Data?". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Skourtou, E. (2005). "Skills, Knowledge and Academic Performance of Bilingual Students". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Smart, C. (2005). "Unmanageable Conflict: Parents, Children and Separation". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Smart, C. (2005). "Children's Narratives of Post-Divorce Family Life: From Individual Experience to a New Social Ethic". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.

- Stainton Rogers, W.; Cull, L.-A. (2007). "The 'New Youth Justice' in the UK – How Not to Promote the Wellbeing of Children and Young People!". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Stalford, H. (2004). "Regulating Cross-National Divorce, Contact and Residence in the European Union". Paper contributed to the 1st Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Leeds.
- Stretmo, L. (2005). "A Child Perspective on the Victims of Human Trade. Age and Gender in European National Policy on Trafficking". Paper contributed to the 4th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Athens.
- Thevenon, O. (2005). "Change of Family Structure and Informal Care Work". Paper contributed to the 3rd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Rennes.
- Thuen, Fr. (2006). "The Situation of Non-Resident Fathers in Norway". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Todorova, V. (2005). "Contact after Transition: Family and State". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Todorova, V. (2006). "The New Bulgarian Family Code: a Better Law for Contact with Children.". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Trinder, L. (2005). "The Nature of Conflicted Contact". Paper contributed to the 1st Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oxford.
- Trinder, L. (2006). "The Relationship between Child and Adult Wellbeing and the Amount/Frequency of Contact Based on a Study of High-Conflict Families". Paper contributed to the 6th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Oslo.
- Trinder, L. (2007). "The Strengths and Limitations of the English Approach to Supporting Child Wellbeing Following Parental Separation". Paper contributed to the 3rd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Barcelona.
- Tzankova, Tz.. (2005). "Cohabitation in Bulgaria: A Need for Legal Reforms for the Well Being of Children". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Voneche, L. (2005). "The Alternative/Ultime Residence of Children after Divorce". Paper contributed to the 2nd Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Sofia.
- Wetzels, C. (2006). "Babies Born in Amsterdam: New Parents' Migration Background and the Gendered Division of Labour". Paper contributed to the 5th Workshop of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Göteborg.

Whiteford, P. ; Adema, W. (2006) “Child Poverty in OECD Countries: Assessing the Effectiveness of Alternative Strategies to Improve Family Incomes”. Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.

Zander, M. (2006) “Childhood in Poverty and the Coping Strategies of Children”. Paper contributed to the 2nd Conference of the WELLCHI NETWORK. Hamburg.