

Kim, Jin Wook; Choi, Young Jun

Working Paper

Feminisation of poverty in 12 welfare states: Strengthening cross-regime variations?

LIS Working Paper Series, No. 549

Provided in Cooperation with:

Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)

Suggested Citation: Kim, Jin Wook; Choi, Young Jun (2010) : Feminisation of poverty in 12 welfare states: Strengthening cross-regime variations?, LIS Working Paper Series, No. 549, Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), Luxembourg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/95610>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series

Working Paper No. 549

Feminisation of Poverty in 12 Welfare States: Strengthening Cross-Regime Variations?

Jin Wook Kim and Young Jun Choi

August 2010



Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), asbl

Feminisation of poverty in 12 welfare states: strengthening cross-regime variations?

The feminisation of poverty is said to have become a common feature in the majority of advanced welfare states, but it is equally true that there has been significant variation in the feminisation of poverty from one country to another. While the concept of the feminisation of poverty remains controversial, there have been very few attempts to reveal a detailed picture from a comparative perspective. Considering this background, this study aims to illustrate the feminisation of poverty in 12 welfare states (Liberal – Australia, Canada, UK, US; Conservative – Austria, France, Germany, Italy; Nordic – Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden) between the 1980s and the 2000s and to analyse whether or not there has been any convergence or divergence between these welfare states. This study will evaluate the scope and depth of the feminisation of poverty by conducting analyses not only in terms of different sex, but in terms of different population groups. Further, the changing role of welfare states will be assessed via an analysis of the antipoverty role of public transfers in each country. The Luxembourg Income Study dataset will be used for empirical analysis. This paper will argue that while the feminisation of poverty has been slowed down and even reversed in certain cases, cross-national differences have been increasingly visible. The results of this study also show that the welfare regime framework can prove to be a useful tool for understanding the similarities and the differences in the feminisation of poverty across different Western welfare state regimes.

Jin Wook Kim, Ph.D

Assistant Professor

Sogang University, South Korea

82-2-705-8959, sspjwk@sogang.ac.kr

Young Jun Choi, Ph.D

Assistant Professor

Korea University

82-3290-2276, sspyjc@korea.ac.kr

Introduction

Gender issues have been one of the central topics in discussions of contemporary welfare states. Women's disadvantaged positions in the labour market, family, political process, and even social programmes have been examined in a variety of previous studies. Women's poverty is one of the most prominent areas of research in this regard. Since Pearce (1978) initially coined the expression, 'feminization of poverty', there have been a number of studies analysing the breadth and depth of women's poverty. Despite a wealth of knowledge regarding this issue, however, the feminization of poverty has yet to be thoroughly elucidated. Firstly, it is unclear as to whether the feminisation of poverty remains an ongoing process, or if improving welfare state programmes have ameliorated that trend. It cannot be denied that post-industrial and demographic transitions, together with feminist movements, have considerably weakened the traditional male-breadwinner model, whereas prevalent female-headed households and persistent inequality in the labour market are expected to have undermined the economic security of women. Secondly, the effects of different welfare regimes on the feminisation of poverty over last two or three decades are relatively unknown. Although the feminisation of poverty was commonly detected in most countries, cross-national differences were also found to exist. Has recent welfare restructuring resulted in a converging trend toward the feminisation of poverty or strengthen existing cross-national variation over the decades?

This research aims to reveal whether there has been a feminisation of poverty in Western welfare-state regimes and also to explore the changes in cross-regime differences over time. In order to investigate them, this study will introduce the Luxembourg Income Study Dataset and analyse the feminisation of poverty in 12 welfare states (Australia, Canada, UK, US, Austria, France, Germany, Italy Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden) between the 1980s and the 2000s. In the following section, existing studies on the feminisation of poverty and gender & welfare regimes will be critically reviewed. Then, following the explanation of the research methodology, the findings of our data analysis will be presented. This paper will argue that, despite the increasing proportion of female-headed households, the feminisation of poverty has been slowing down and has even been reversed in Western countries, the differences between welfare-state regimes in the 2000s are more notable than in the 1980s. Finally, our future research agenda will be discussed.

Feminisation of poverty and welfare state regimes

Feminisation of poverty

The 'feminisation of poverty' is an intriguing, but puzzling, concept. When Pearce (1978) initially mentioned the concept, she emphasised a trend in which an increasingly large share of the economically disadvantaged were women, particularly relating to the issue of single mothers and welfare in the United States. According to this definition, the denominator is poor people and the numerator is poor women. However, scholars have conducted several analyses of the gender gap (Pressman, 1998, 2002), noting that women have a far higher incidence of poverty than men, and paying attention to women's poverty rate among total women, which is the denominator. While many have proven disinterested in strictly dividing these two concepts (Brenner, 1987; Thibos, Lavin-Loucks & Martin, 2007), Herr, Horton, & Thomas (1993) have argued that the former should be defined as the feminisation of poverty, whereas the latter should be defined as the pauperisation of women. Chant (2001, 2006) adopts the integrated position of the feminisation of poverty, as she accepts both women's disproportionate share in total poverty and the greater severity of women's poverty relative to men as the key features of the feminisation of poverty. Regardless of the definition, however, these studies appear to be unambiguously consistent with the severity of women's poverty.

Relating to the issue of the definition, two issues must be addressed further in the course of understanding the feminisation of poverty. First, the important issue is who 'women' are in the feminisation of poverty. They can be a group of individual women or female heads in the households. Some have maintained that since gender discrimination, subordination, and unequal power may exist inside the family and the household (BRIDGE, 2001; Kim, 2010), it is important to carefully assess individual women's poverty. In effect, several studies (e.g. Christopher, 2001) have been conducted to investigate the poverty of mothers, both single and married. However, in analysing individual poverty, it is very difficult to avoid the assumption that household resources are shared equally among household members, which may, in many cases, not be true. The alternative and more widely employed method is to study female-headed households. Chant (2006:3-4) has indicated that these households are the "poorest of the poor" and that the feminisation of power is linked strongly with an increasing share of this type of households. Given the serious issues of single mothers and elderly single households in modern welfare states, it is essential to research female-headed households and, implicitly or explicitly,

their household members, e.g. children. In effect, the majority of studies conducted on the feminisation of poverty have tended to rely on comparisons between female-headed and male-headed households (see BRIDGE 2001:2-3 for further discussion)¹. In general, it is found that female-headed households were more likely to be poor than male-headed households, but there is also a recognition of the heterogeneity of female-headed households, either between better-off and poor or between elderly and non-elderly households (Brenner, 1988).

Second, the feminisation of poverty should be understood as a dynamic process, rather than a static picture. Northrop states (1990:145) that “the feminisation of poverty is the process through which poverty became more concentrated among individuals living in female-headed households”. In other words, the comparison between at least two specific years is essential for an assessment of the feminisation of poverty. However, very little cross-national comparative research has been conducted to examine the feminisation of poverty. The majority of recent studies conducted thus far using the Luxembourg Income Study dataset have focused solely on a specific year (Christopher, 2001; Pressman, 2003; Misra, Budig & Moller, 2006; Gornick and Jaentti, 2010) and have been less concerned with the change over time. The economic insecurity of female-headed households is regarded as a ‘truism’, but there is a high possibility that increasing women’s labour market participation and recent expansions of welfare state programmes relating to women may positively influence the feminisation of poverty (Song, 2009; Gauthier, 2002/3). Wright (1992), in his case study regarding the feminisation of poverty in Britain, concludes that there has not been a great deal of change in female and male poverty shares, which rejects the thesis of the feminisation of poverty. Additionally, as Brenner (1988) has argued, the feminisation of poverty may derive from men’s shorter lifespans. While this may only be a result observed in British studies, thorough cross-national analyses will be required to clearly elucidate the recent trend.

Welfare state regimes

Along with a general agreement regarding the feminisation of poverty, previous literature has referenced cross-sectional differences between countries. Women’s poverty in Anglo-Saxon countries is more problematic than in European countries. Nordic countries, in particular, are

¹ Fukuda-Parr (1999) challenges the income-based notion of the feminisation of poverty and calls for a new concept based on human development and outcomes. Although her argument is appropriate, income poverty remains an on-going and serious issue even in the developed world, and more research will be required to develop practical multi-dimensional measures of the feminisation of poverty.

generally regarded as good performers. Although no single reason explains the feminisation of poverty and explanations specific to each country are required (Pressman, 1987), the theory of welfare-state regimes as proposed by Esping-Andersen (1990) provides a useful framework for understanding cross-national differences. Adopting the concepts of decommodification, stratification, and welfare mix, he proposes three worlds of welfare capitalism; liberal, conservative, and social democratic welfare state regimes. Unsurprisingly, his theory has not been received particularly well by feminist critiques, owing to the fact that it pays too much attention to paid work ignoring the importance of unpaid work done principally by women (Lewis, 1997). After a series of criticisms (see Arts & Gelissen, 2002; Bamba, 2004, for detailed discussion), Esping-Andersen (1999) incorporated women and family into his framework by introducing the concept of defamilialisation, i.e. the extent to which welfare states support family. However, he refuses to revise the three-world framework.

These welfare regime studies provide three important points to consider for this research. First, Esping-Andersen's 'three worlds' model has proven remarkably resilient. Although the marginalisation of women in his initial framework was obviously problematic, the subsequent typologies suggested by both himself and other scholars do not appear to deviate overmuch from the original. Siaroff (1994) studied gender inequality in work and welfare, and devised a scheme for the classification of welfare states, proposing four models. The classification of the welfare states is almost identical to that of Esping-Andersen and, additionally, he adds the 'late female mobilisation' model, which is primarily relevant to Southern European countries. Bamba's typology (2004) and the protocols outlined by Bettio and Plantenga (2004) are also not substantially different from Esping-Andersen's framework. While feminist critiques remain valid, the usefulness of these perspectives have been proven.

Second, the critiques of Esping-Andersen's overemphasis on paid work (1990) lead naturally to the issue of unpaid care work done by women. Subsequent studies (e.g. Lewis, 1997; Leitner, 2003) have examined care regimes, defamilialisation, and family policy in an effort to classify welfare state regimes, whereas the feminisation of poverty or the effect of cash benefits on women's poverty has been less-well studied in the welfare regime literature. The study of McLanahan, Casper, and Sorensen (1992) is one of the few attempts thus far conducted to evaluate the relationship between welfare regimes and women's poverty. They confirmed that Esping-Andersen's framework is useful to understanding the cross-national patterns of women's

poverty, except in the cases of the UK and Italy². There are very few studies that have explicitly attempted to reconstruct or test Esping-Andersen's framework using the concept of the feminisation of poverty, particularly over a time course.

Third, several studies have been conducted to detect the existence of convergence or divergence in welfare state regimes, particularly in the context of globalisation and post-industrialisation. In fact, restructuring efforts such as cutting benefit levels in cash programmes or the introduction of quasi-markets in social services have been reported in most Western welfare states over the past two or three decades. Alber and Standing (2000) argued that competition states are replacing welfare states and, taking the German example, Seeleib-Kaiser and Fleckenstein (2007) have insisted that labour market policy has been transformed by liberal and British-style policies. However, Montanari, Nelson, and Palme (2007) and Gauthier (2004) have maintained that policy divergence, social insurance, and family policies, have become increasingly conspicuous in Western countries over the last 20 to 30 years. For example, Gauthier (2004:467) has demonstrated that cross-regime differences in state support for families have become clearer with elapsing time, particularly between social democratic regimes and the other two regimes. Pierson (1996) also referenced the path-dependent development of welfare state regimes. Although the convergence thesis involves two distinct positions, it should prove interesting to determine whether there is any sign of convergence in the feminisation of poverty in the Western world, or if cross-regime differences are strengthened in any way.

Methodology

Before passing over to the empirical analyses, we must discuss some methodological issues and to explain which methods are employed in the present research. First of all, the reliable micro income datasets are indispensable for comparative income studies. As was the case in many previous studies, we also employed the LIS datasets, which have been regarded as the best data sources for comparative studies. Although the LIS covered more than 30 middle- and high-income countries mostly in Europe and America so far, only 12 modal countries from three welfare-state regimes were selected for this study (Liberal – Australia, Canada, UK, US; Conservative – Austria, France, Germany, Italy; Nordic – Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden).

² The low poverty rate in the UK and the high poverty in Italy are the reasons for this exception. The UK situation is also listed as an exception in Bamba's study (2004) involving the concept of defamilialisation. It belongs not to the low defamilisation group, equivalent to liberal regimes, but to the medium group, the conservative regimes.

The real superiority of the LIS data lies in its methods of data accumulation; it also enables us to compare different points in time. To follow up the changes the different welfare outcomes in different welfare regimes, two waves are selected from the LIS: i.e., the second (mid-1980s) and the sixth waves (mid-2000s). However, there are some minor points to be referred to in advance. The 1987 Austrian data provide post-transfer income only, and the latest French data is the fifth wave dataset, which was compiled in 2000.

Secondly, a great deal of debate has raged around the definition of income (see Atkinson *et al.*, 1995 for details). A judicious review of the issues is beyond the scope of this study, but we have included a discussion of which methods were applied in this study. In accordance with most of the LIS' recommendations, we equalised household income by considering household size (dividing household income by the square root of the number of households), and would utilise the concepts of the market income (hereafter, MI) and the net disposable income (hereafter, DPI). Whereas the MI denotes the household income exclusively from the market mechanism (prior to income transfer), the DPI includes a variety of income transfer schemes encompassing both paying-ins and –outs (after income transfer).

Thirdly, it has been demonstrated that different concepts of poverty and different poverty lines can lead to differing poverty rates. As indicated previously, most notably by Mitchell (1991), the performance of an income transfer system may differ according to which poverty line is adopted. The notion of relative poverty (a specific proportion of household income) with multiple poverty lines (e.g. 40%, 50%, and 60% of median-equivalised household income) is generally accepted in comparative studies. In this study, we accept 50% of median equivalised household income as a primary yardstick for poverty, but employ a 40% poverty line as well in some stances to compare the results with a 50% standard.

Fourthly, several poverty measures have been employed to derive a picture of the multifarious features of the feminisation of poverty in different welfare regimes. Household poverty rate, rather than the head count rate, was used as the primary measure of poverty. As discussed previously, the two definitions – the feminisation of poverty and the pauperisation of women – are separately analysed. Whilst the former is defined as the proportion of female heads in the total number of poor households, the latter focuses on the gender gap, which is calculated by the difference in the poverty rates between male-headed and female-headed households. These two concepts can be computed as follows:

- ✓ **Proportion of female poverty** = $\frac{(\text{number of poor female heads})}{(\text{total number of poor heads})} \times 100(\%)$
- ✓ **Gender gap of poverty** = $(\text{poverty rate of female heads}) - (\text{poverty rate of male head})$

Additionally, the poverty reduction effects of the income transfer system are deeply concerned throughout different empirical analyses. Here, the effects are calculated as poverty change rates by comparing pre-transfer with post-transfer poverty rates as follows:

- ✓ **Poverty change rate** = $\frac{(\text{pre-transfer poverty rate}) - (\text{post-transfer poverty rate})}{(\text{pre-transfer poverty rate})} \times 100(\%)$

Findings – women’s poverty and welfare regimes

Feminisation of poverty: disproportionate share of female-headed households

The first part of this empirical examination is a discussion of the general trends relevant to the proportion of female-headed households, overall poverty rates, and the share of female heads among total poor households (see Table 1). Generally speaking, the portion of female-headed households *per se* has increased rapidly in all welfare states for the past two decades. The average share rose to 37.4% in the mid-2000s, from 24.7% in the mid-1980s, with a greater variation (from 3.9% to 9.1% in standard deviation). This overall increase in female-headed households was attributed to the fact that the share among non-elderly households was almost doubled, from 18.9% to 34.3%. In terms of the overall post-transfer poverty rate and poverty reduction effects, the Liberal welfare regime was inferior to the other two regimes in both the mid-1980s and mid-2000s. Whilst no significant difference was determined to exist between the conservative and Nordic regimes in the mid-1980s, the Nordic regime generally achieved superior performance in the mid-1980s.

(Table 1 about here)

In relation to the feminisation of poverty, first of all, the ratio of female heads among poor household heads increased between the mid-1980s and mid-2000s in liberal and conservative regimes, generally in accordance with the increase in the general number of female-headed

households. However, it is interesting to note that the ratio was reduced somewhat in the Nordic regime. When the poverty line was set at 40% of the median household income, the relative share of female heads based on DPI was worst in the Nordic regime (48.6%), as compared with 40.3% in the liberal regime and 39.7% in the conservative regime in the mid-1980s. At the same time, the effects on the share of female heads among poor heads remained at its lowest level (-3.4% in mid-1980s). However, this system was in a state of significant flux until the mid-2000s. In all four Nordic welfare states, the income transfer system reduced the proportion of female heads by an average of 15.3%. Among liberal welfare states, Australia and the UK achieved good performance (-18.4% and -7.6% respectively). On the other hand, the proportion was somewhat increased after income transfer in the conservative regime, from 49.6% to 51.8%.

When the 50% poverty line was adopted, the reduction effects of the income transfer system disappeared for many countries (Australia, Italy, Denmark, and Finland in mid-1980s; Australia, the UK, Finland, and Sweden in mid-2000s). This implies that the reduction effects of female poverty are limited to the relative low poverty line. Another critical finding is that the inter-regime differences associated with the feminisation of poverty became increasingly prominent. Similar to the results seen with the 40% poverty line, both the proportion of female heads and the reduction effects of income transfer were lowest in the Nordic regime in the mid-1980s – 53.6% and 9.3% respectively. But for the last two decades, significant changes have occurred in all 3 regimes. Whilst the proportion of female heads increased greatly in the liberal (45.9 → 54.5%) and conservative regimes (42.5 → 54.0%), the rate was decreased in the Nordic regime (53.6 → 49.3%). At the same time, the changing rates in the relative share of female heads prior to and after the transfer increased in the liberal (3.5 → 6.6%) and conservative regimes (2.8% → 12.5%), but the rate was decreased somewhat in the Nordic regime (9.3 → 0%). These results imply that the redistribution effects of the income transfer system have been concentrated in the male heads, and this trend has been reinforced in the conservative and, to a lesser extent, liberal welfare regimes. Unlike the other two, the Nordic welfare regime appears to have paved the way to modify its income transfer system from a gender-biased one to, at least, a gender-neutral one.

As a consequence, we determined that the inter-regime differences associated with poverty-related performance became more prominent in the relative share of female heads (the feminisation of poverty) than in the overall poverty rates and poverty reduction effects. Although both conservative and Nordic regimes have achieved excellent performance in terms of the overall poverty rates and poverty reduction effects, the actual differences between the two

regimes could be detected in the direction and degree of changes in the relative share of female heads prior to and after transfer. What is more important is that it was impossible even to speculate on these trends until the mid-1980s; however, in the past two decades, these trends have been monitored fairly closely.

Pauperisation of women: gender gap analysis

The second part of our empirical analysis focuses on the other aspect of women's poverty, namely the pauperisation of women, by comparing men's to women's poverty rates. As is pointed out in Table 2, women's poverty rates, based on both Mi and DPI, are far higher than men's, regardless of whether the 40% or 50% poverty line was adopted. Another interesting point is that the variability of women's poverty rates is also substantially higher. This suggests that almost all welfare states have proven relatively successful in tackling poverty among men, whereas not all of them have achieved good performance in reducing women's poverty.

(Table 2 about here)

In the mid-1980s, the gender-based poverty gap was the largest in the liberal regime, and those of the conservative and Nordic regimes did not differ substantially. Rather, with a 50% poverty line, the DPI gender gap of the Nordic regime (11.7%) was slightly higher and its gender gap reduction effect through the income transfer system (-63.0%) was lower than those of the conservative regime (10.9 and -72.3%). However, until the mid-2000s, these trends have been reversed; the gender gap of poverty (4.6%) was slightly lower in the Nordic regime relative to that of the conservative regime (5.9%). When focusing on the gender gap reduction effects of income transfer, we can more clearly identify the inter-regime differences. The gender gap reduction rate was lowest in the liberal regime (-42.4%) than in the conservative regime (-64.7%), but highest in the Nordic regime (-80.3%). The superiority of the Nordic regime in terms of the gender gap reduction effect has become increasingly prominent until the mid-2000s, when the 50% poverty line was adopted. This indicates that, in Nordic welfare states, significant advances have been achieved in income maintenance systems for women, and possibly in women's social rights in the broader sense, over the past two decades.

(Table 3 about here)

So, what happens when we analyse the gender gap of poverty by dividing elderly from non-elderly households? Let us first look at non-elderly households. For non-elderly households, the poverty reduction effects of the income transfer system did not differ greatly between male-headed and female-headed households. For example, in the mid-2000s, the poverty reduction effects of male- and female-headed households were 38.3% and 40%, respectively, in the liberal regime, 61.9% and 59.9% in the conservative regime, and 67.1% and 70.7% in the Nordic regime. In other words, the gender gap has not materially changed prior to and after transfer in the majority of welfare states. This underlines the difficulty in determining whether gender-bias features exist in income transfer systems for non-elderly households. Nevertheless, similar to the previous empirical results thus far discussed, inter-regime differences have become increasingly prominent over the past 20 years; in terms of gender gap reduction effects, from 'liberal < Nordic < conservative' to 'liberal < conservative < Nordic regime'.

On the contrary, for elderly households that have been influenced greatly by pension schemes, the poverty reduction effects of income transfer have been greater among male-headed households than among female-headed households. This implies that elderly women have generally enjoyed a less generous pension scheme than have elderly men. Nevertheless, major inter-regime variations have occurred in the level of the gender gap as well as its changing rate induced by the income transfer system. In the mid-1980s, there were only three countries – specifically, the UK, Finland, and Sweden – in which the gender gap was reduced after transfer. But until the mid-2000s, there have been some trends connected to the gender gap changes between before and after the transfer, whereas the gender gap increased after transfer in the conservative regime (6.5% → 8.0%), the gap of Nordic regime was reduced to less than half after transfer (13.8% → 6.5%). Although the overall gender gap level was highest in the liberal regime (14.3% gap after transfer), no coherent trend in gender gap change within the regime was noted; whilst the Canadian and British old age schemes performed a great level of gender gap reduction effects, the Australian and American schemes actually seemed to increase the gender gap between elderly male and elderly female heads. These results may reflect different institutional features of income maintenance systems for the elderly among various welfare regimes, which will be discussed in the final portion of this article.

Welfare regimes and lone-parent households

When the notion of the feminisation of poverty was initially suggested by Pierce (1978), in a

sense, the analytical focus was focused sharply on American single mothers. Although the proportion of single-parent households has been on the increase in the vast majority of welfare states, the policy responses to this trend have never been uniform (e.g., see Lewis, 1997). Our final analysis focused exclusively on single-parent and single-mother households to identify inter-regime differences in terms of poverty reduction effects of income transfers for single-parent households. Because most single parents are single mothers, the results observed with single parents and single mothers were not substantially different.

(Table 4 about here)

As seen in Table 4, inter-regime differences were most evident when extracting single-parent households. The poverty rates of single mother households were highest in Canada and the US (around 42%), followed by Germany (34.1%), Australia (26.8%), the UK (25.6%), France (25.2%) and Italy (24.9%). Although the DPI poverty rate in the liberal regime (34.2%) was higher than that seen in the conservative regime (25.6%), the poverty reduction effects of income transfers were similar (-46.1 % in liberal vs. -49.7% in conservative). It is interesting to note that conservative regimes have exerted great efforts to reduce poverty in general, but those effects have been targeted more specifically toward households headed by males. On the contrary, all Nordic welfare states again exhibited proven excellence in terms of their income transfer systems; after transfer, the poverty rate of single mother households was no higher than 7.1% on average, which corresponds to an 84.4% reduction relative to the MI poverty rate.

Discussion and further research agenda

In analyses of the feminisation of poverty in 12 welfare states over the past two decades, empirical evidence appears to indicate that the cross-regime differences are indeed more visible and consolidated. Some further important points still, however, need to be discussed. First of all, generally speaking, two contrasting trends have been noted. Although the proportion of female-headed households among the total has not changed greatly, the gender gap of poverty has clearly been reduced in all of the welfare state regimes. With regard to the former indicator, it should be noted that the average proportion of female-headed households *per se* has increased substantially, from 24.7% in the mid-1980s to 37.4% in the mid-2000s. Taking this trend into consideration, therefore, we can conclude that welfare states have effectively dealt with the feminisation of poverty to some degree for the past two decades.

Secondly, despite generally favourable performance, cross-regime differences have become increasingly apparent over the past two decades. According to a set of indicators related to women's poverty (DPI) and poverty reduction effects of income transfer systems, no real significant differences between conservative and Nordic regimes were detected in the mid-1980s period. However, Nordic regimes have alleviated women's poverty principally through a comprehensive and universal public transfer system, whereas conservative regimes maintained the *status quo* until the mid-2000s. Regardless of the different poverty lines (40% vs. 50% of median income) and population types (elderly vs. non-elderly), Nordic welfare states have achieved the highest measured level of reduction in the feminisation of poverty, but liberal welfare states have generally remained at the lowest level, despite some cross-country variations. Conservative welfare states with highly developed social insurance schemes have performed better than liberal welfare states with more reliance on public assistance systems, but their performance levels are lower than those of Nordic welfare states, in which social policy institutions have been formulated from a more gender-sensitive perspective. Furthermore, in terms of single-parent poverty, no fundamental discrepancies were noted to exist between conservative and liberal welfare regimes, whereas the Nordic regimes were again identified as outstanding performers. This confirms that, in addition to the convergence thesis, the thesis of welfare-state regimes initially established by Esping-Andersen is an effective tool for understanding the feminisation of poverty.

In relation to the previous point, thirdly, the results of our empirical analysis may bolster the argument that different institutional arrays of different welfare states are connected directly to different outcomes in women's poverty. This is most apparent when we view the results of gender gap analysis for elderly households. We can summarise the basic patterns of the relationship between the institutional features of overall old-age income security and the results of the gender gap analysis, as follows:

- ✓ Great reliance on public assistance (US, Australia): high gender gap & increase of gender gap after transfer.
- ✓ Basic pension with public assistance (UK, Canada): modest gender gap & decrease of gender gap after transfer
- ✓ Heavy reliance on social insurance (Conservative + Finland): modest gender gap & increase of gender gap after transfer

- ✓ High level of basic pension (Denmark, Norway, Sweden): low gender gap & decrease of gender gap after transfer

Although the poverty issue is somewhat old-fashioned and because many new gender studies focus more profoundly on care, poverty clearly remains a pivotal and apparent issue even in the developed world, and the findings of this study leave a few important remaining research agenda for the future. First, the relationship between care regimes and the feminisation of poverty must be investigated in more detail. The findings here, e.g. the increasing visibility of cross-regime differences, are highly similar to those of the care-regime typologies. For example, Gauthier's clustering (2002/3:467) between the 1970s and the 1990s using family policy is similar to the findings of this study. Whereas the poverty measure is predicated on cash rather than care, in-depth study may reveal the interaction between cash and care in gender regimes. Secondly, more studies will be required to examine a set of factors that explain variations in the feminisation of poverty. Among a host of variables including employment-related, cash-based or care-based indicators, which have contributed to changes in the feminisation of poverty? This question is expected to provide policy-makers with insights into methods of coping with women's poverty from the perspective of increasing female-headed households. Finally, scholars need to get "back to basics", and discuss whether headcount poverty is an effective tool for understanding the feminisation of poverty. As argued by Fukuda-Parr (1999), a new measurement of poverty will be required to capture the multi-dimensional features of the feminisation of poverty, including the issue of human capital.

References

- Alber, J. and Standing, G. (2000) Social dumping, catch-up, or convergence? Europe in a comparative global context, *Journal of European Social Policy* 10(2):99-119
- Arts, W and Gelissen, J (2002) Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art report, *Journal of European Social Policy* 12(2)
- Atkinson, A.B., Rainwater L., and Smeeding T. (1995) Income Distribution in OECD countries- Evidence from the Luxembourg Income Study. Social Policy Studies No.18. Paris: OECD
- Bambra, C (2004) The worlds of welfare: illusory and gender blind? *Social Policy and Society* 3(3):201-211
- _____ (2007) Defamilisation and welfare state regimes: a cluster analysis, *International journal of social welfare* 16:326-338
- Bettio, F & Plantenga, J. (2004) Comparing care regimes in Europe, *Feminist Economics* 10(1):85-113
- Brenner, J.(1987) Feminist political discourses: Radical versus liberal approaches to the feminization of poverty and comparable worth, *Gender and Society* 1(4):447-465
- BRIDGE (2001) *Briefing Paper on the Feminisation of Poverty*, Institute of Development Studies.
- Brush, L. (2002) Changing the Subject: Gender and Welfare Regime Studies, *social politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 9:161-186
- Chant, Sylvia. (2006) *Re-visiting the "feminisation of poverty" and the UNDP gender indices: what case for a gendered poverty index?*, New series working paper, 18. LSE Gender Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK.
- Casper, L. M., McLanahan, S. S. and Garfinkel, I. (1994) The gender-poverty gap: What we can learn from other countries, *American Sociological Review* 59(4):594-605
- Chesnais, J. C. (1996) Fertility, family, and social policy in contemporary Western Europe, *Population and Development Review* 22(4):729-739
- Christopher, K. (2001) Welfare State Regimes and Mothers' Poverty, Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series, No. 286
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Oxford: Policy Press.
- _____ (1999) *Social Foundations of Post-Industrial Economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Gauthier, A. H, (2002/3) Family policies in industrialized countries: is there convergence?
Institute National d'Etudes Demographiques, population, 57:447-474
- Gornick, J. C. and Jantti M. (2010) Woman, Poverty, and Social Policy Regimes: A Cross-National Analysis, Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series, No. 534
- Herring, C., Horton, H. D. and Thomas, M. E. (1993) Feminization of Poverty or Pauperization of Women? Clarifying the Sources of Change in the Impoverishment of Women and Their Families. *National Journal of Sociology* 7:43-65
- Kim, S. J.(2010) Poverty of female headed households in Korea: Universal trend or peculiarity of Korea?, Paper presented at the international workshop on 'Poverty, Inequality and Social Policy in Korea and Japan from a Gender Perspective', 06/03/2010, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea (in Korean)
- Lewis, J. (1997) Gender and welfare regimes: further thoughts, *Social Politics : International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 4(2):160-177
- Leitner, S. (2003) Varieties of familialism: The caring Function of the Family in Comparative Perspective, *European Societies* 5(4):353-375
- Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) Database, <http://www.lisproject.org/techdoc.htm> (multiple countries; {accessed from February to June, 2010}).
- Mandel, H. and Shalev, M. (2009) How Welfare States Shape the Gender Pay Gap: A Theoretical and Comparative Analysis, *Social Forces* 87(4):1873-1911
- McLanahan, S. S., Casper, L. and Sorensen, A. (1992) Women's Roles and Women's Poverty in Eight Industrialized Countries, Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series, No. 77
- Mitchelle, D. (1991) *Income Transfer in Ten Welfare State*. Avebury; Aldershot
- Misra, J., Budig, M. J. and Moller, S. (2006) Reconciliation Policies and the Effects of Motherhood on Employment, Earnings, and Poverty, Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series, No. 429
- Montanari, I, Nelson, K and Palme, J. (2007) Convergence pressures and responses: Recent social insurance development in modern welfare states, *Comparative Sociology* 6:295-323
- Northrop, E. (1990) The Feminization of Poverty: The Demographic Factor and The Composition of Economic Growth, *Journal of Economic Issues* 24(1)
- Orloff, A. (1996) Gender in the welfare state, *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 51-78
- Pearce, D. M. (1978) The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare, *Urban and Social Change Review* 11:28-36

- Pierson, P. (1996) The New Politics of the Welfare State, *World politics*, 48(2):143-179
- Pressman, Steven. (1998) The gender poverty gap in developed countries: causes and cures, *The Social Science Journal* 35(2):275-286
- (2003) Feminist Explanations for the Feminization of Poverty, Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper Series, No. 351
- Sakiko Fukuda-Parr (1999) What Does Feminization of Poverty Mean? It Isn't Just Lack of Income, *Feminist Economics*, 5(2):99-103
- Seeleib-Kaiser, M. and Fleckenstein, T. (2007) Discourse, learning and welfare state change: the case of German labour market reforms, *Social Policy & Administration* 41(5):427 - 448
- Siaroff, A. (1994) Work, Welfare and Gender Equality: A New Typology, Sainsbury, D., *Gendering Welfare State*, sage publication.
- Song, L. (2009) Globalization and the changing male breadwinner model: a perspective from OECD countries, Universitas 21 International Graduate Research Conference: Sustainable Cities for the Future Melbourne& Brisbane. Nov 29-Dec 5
- Thibos, M., Lavin-Loucks, D. and Martin, M. (2007) The Feminization of Poverty, The J. McDonald Williams Institute
- Wright, Robert E. (1992) A feminization of Poverty un Great Britain? *Review of Income and Wealth* Series 38, No. 1

Table 1. Proportion of female-head households, overall poverty rates, share of female heads in household poverty (%)

Welfare State Regime	Country	Year	Proportion of female-head household among total			Size of poverty: 40% of median income						Size of poverty: 50% of median income					
						Overall poverty rate			Ratio of female-head			Overall poverty rate			Ratio of female-head		
			All	Elderly	Non-El.	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change
1. Mid-1980s																	
Liberal	Australia	1985	20.4	40.6	15.3	25.5	5.0	-80.4	44.7	41.6	-6.9	27.4	14.5	-47.1	42.9	54.7	27.5
	Canada	1987	21.6	38.4	17.9	22.7	7.6	-66.5	42.3	42.8	1.2	26.2	12.8	-51.1	40.4	43.9	8.7
	U.K.	1986	24.1	42.6	17.7	34.6	4.0	-88.4	44.9	20.2	-55.0	37.4	7.0	-81.3	43.8	30.6	-30.1
	U.S.	1986	26.6	45.0	21.7	23.6	12.8	-45.8	52.7	56.4	7.0	27.3	18.6	-31.9	50.4	54.5	8.1
	Group Mean		23.2	41.7	18.2	26.6	7.4	-72.4	46.2	40.3	-13.4	29.6	13.2	-55.3	44.4	45.9	3.5
Cont. Europe	Austria	1987	35.9	60.3	25.1		3.1			77.9			9.4				
	France	1984	21.8	46.5	14.6	32.7	4.4	-86.5	39.1	28.3	-27.6	37.2	7.6	-79.6	36.3	33.8	-6.9
	Germany	1984	28.3	51.8	20.1	34.4	5.3	-84.6	53.6	65.3	21.8	35.6	9.5	-73.3	52.4	59.4	13.4
	Italy	1986	17.3	35.8	11.6	32.4	5.0	-84.6	35.4	25.6	-27.7	35.3	10.8	-69.4	33.6	34.2	1.8
	Group Mean		22.5	44.7	15.4	33.2	4.9	-85.2	42.7	39.7	-11.2	36.0	9.3	-74.2	40.8	42.5	2.8
Nordic	Denmark	1987	27.6	46.4	21.6	30.0	5.0	-83.3	46.8	44.2	-5.6	32.4	9.6	-70.4	45.6	49.6	8.8
	Finland	1987	28.3	53.8	22.2	17.8	3.6	-79.8	54.5	48.1	-11.7	21.5	7.1	-67.0	51.9	55.0	6.0
	Norway	1986	27.2	45.7	20.2	27.5	3.4	-87.6	56.3	60.4	7.3	29.4	10.2	-65.3	54.7	68.8	25.8
	Sweden	1987	29.0	41.3	24.7	34.6	6.0	-82.7	43.2	41.7	-3.5	37.3	9.2	-75.3	42.6	41.1	-3.5
	Group Mean		28.0	46.8	22.2	27.5	4.5	-83.6	50.2	48.6	-3.4	30.2	9.0	-70.1	48.7	53.6	9.3
Average (11 Welfare States)			24.7	44.4	18.9	28.7	5.6	-79.1	46.7	43.1	-9.2	31.5	10.6	-64.7	45.0	47.8	5.4
Standard deviation (SD)			3.9	5.4	3.9	5.7	2.6	12.6	6.8	14.3	21.1	5.5	3.5	15.2	6.8	12.1	15.8
2. Mid-2000s																	
Liberal	Australia	2003	23.5	36.8	20.0	30.2	5.8	-80.8	40.8	33.3	-18.4	32.8	14.6	-55.5	39.6	45.2	14.1
	Canada	2004	37.6	44.9	35.9	25.3	8.9	-64.8	55.3	57.2	3.4	29.3	14.2	-51.5	53.6	57.4	7.1
	U.K.	2004	37.2	43.7	35.0	31.9	5.7	-82.1	53.8	49.7	-7.6	35.1	11.7	-66.7	52.8	52.8	0.0
	U.S.	2004	48.6	53.3	47.3	26.5	12.1	-54.3	60.2	63.8	6.0	30.4	18.4	-39.5	59.6	62.6	5.0
	Group Mean		36.7	44.7	34.6	28.5	8.1	-71.5	52.5	51.0	-4.1	31.9	14.7	-53.8	51.4	54.5	6.6
Cont. Europe	Austria	2004	53.6	62.7	50.9	35.4	4.2	-88.1	61.9	50.6	-18.3	37.8	8.2	-78.3	61.2	59.9	-2.1
	France	2000	24.9	37.3	20.6	39.7	3.6	-90.9	38.0	48.9	28.7	43.9	8.4	-80.9	36.6	46.9	28.1
	Germany	2004	43.5	47.3	41.8	37.9	4.5	-88.1	52.2	61.1	17.0	40.5	9.8	-75.8	52.1	59.8	14.8
	Italy	2005	38.5	46.8	34.4	39.3	6.0	-84.7	46.3	46.6	0.6	42.9	11.2	-73.9	45.4	49.5	9.0
	Group Mean		40.1	48.5	36.9	38.1	4.6	-88.0	49.6	51.8	7.0	41.3	9.4	-77.2	48.8	54.0	12.5
Nordic	Denmark	2004	33.3	46.0	29.2	31.3	2.8	-91.1	48.1	41.1	-14.6	33.7	5.5	-83.7	47.6	44.5	-6.5
	Finland	2004	41.3	53.8	37.7	36.7	3.0	-91.8	52.6	45.7	-13.1	39.5	7.0	-82.3	51.8	55.8	7.7
	Norway	2004	27.4	44.4	22.3	31.3	5.1	-83.7	48.0	38.8	-19.2	34.7	9.0	-74.1	46.6	46.1	-1.1
	Sweden	2005	39.1	46.9	36.6	34.2	3.1	-90.9	51.2	43.9	-14.3	37.1	5.8	-84.4	50.7	50.7	0.0
	Group Mean		35.3	47.8	31.5	33.4	3.5	-89.5	50.0	42.4	-15.3	36.3	6.8	-81.2	49.2	49.3	0.0
Average (12 Welfare States)			37.4	47.0	34.3	33.3	5.4	-83.0	50.7	48.4	-4.1	36.5	10.3	-70.7	49.8	52.6	6.4
Standard deviation (SD)			9.1	7.1	9.9	4.7	2.7	11.6	7.0	9.0	15.5	4.7	3.9	14.4	7.2	6.4	9.5

Table 2. Gender gap of poverty: male vs. female-head household poverty rates (%)

Welfare State Regime	Country	Year	Gender gap of poverty: 40% of median income									Gender gap of poverty: 50% of median income								
			Male poverty rate			Female poverty rate			Gender gap			Male poverty rate			Female poverty rate			Gender gap		
			MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change
1. Mid-1980s																				
Liberal	Australia	1985	17.7	3.7	-79.1	55.7	10.1	-81.9	38.0	6.4	-83.2	19.7	8.3	-57.9	57.5	38.8	-32.5	37.8	30.5	-19.3
	Canada	1987	16.7	5.6	-66.5	44.3	15.1	-65.9	27.6	9.5	-65.6	19.9	9.2	-53.8	48.9	26.0	-46.8	29.0	16.8	-42.1
	U.K.	1986	25.1	4.2	-83.3	64.5	3.4	-94.7	39.4	-0.8	-102.0	27.7	6.4	-76.9	68.0	8.9	-86.9	40.3	2.5	-93.8
	U.S.	1986	15.2	7.6	-50.0	46.8	27.2	-41.9	31.6	19.6	-38.0	18.5	11.6	-37.3	51.8	38.2	-26.3	33.3	26.6	-20.1
	Group Mean		18.7	5.3	-69.7	52.8	14.0	-71.1	34.2	8.7	-72.2	21.5	8.9	-56.5	56.6	28.0	-48.1	35.1	19.1	-43.8
Cont. Europe	Austria	1987		1.1			6.8		0.0	5.7			2.8		21.1		0.0		18.3	
	France	1984	25.4	4.0	-84.3	58.7	5.7	-90.3	33.3	1.7	-94.9	30.3	6.4	-78.9	62.0	11.8	-81.0	31.7	5.4	-83.0
	Germany	1984	22.3	2.6	-88.3	65.0	12.2	-81.2	42.7	9.6	-77.5	23.6	5.4	-77.1	65.8	19.9	-69.8	42.2	14.5	-65.6
	Italy	1986	25.3	4.5	-82.2	66.2	7.4	-88.8	40.9	2.9	-92.9	28.3	8.6	-69.6	68.3	21.3	-68.8	40.0	12.7	-68.3
	Group Mean		24.3	3.7	-84.9	63.3	8.4	-86.8	39.0	4.7	-88.4	27.4	6.8	-75.2	65.4	17.7	-73.2	38.0	10.9	-72.3
Nordic	Denmark	1987	22.0	3.8	-82.7	50.8	8.0	-84.3	28.8	4.2	-85.4	24.3	6.7	-72.4	53.6	17.3	-67.7	29.3	10.6	-63.8
	Finland	1987	11.2	2.6	-76.8	34.3	6.2	-81.9	23.1	3.6	-84.4	14.4	4.4	-69.4	39.4	13.8	-65.0	25.0	9.4	-62.4
	Norway	1986	16.5	1.8	-89.1	57.0	7.5	-86.8	40.5	5.7	-85.9	18.3	4.4	-76.0	59.1	25.8	-56.3	40.8	21.4	-47.5
	Sweden	1987	27.7	4.9	-82.3	51.4	8.6	-83.3	23.7	3.7	-84.4	30.2	7.6	-74.8	54.8	13.0	-76.3	24.6	5.4	-78.0
	Group Mean		19.4	3.3	-82.7	48.4	7.6	-84.1	29.0	4.3	-85.0	21.8	5.8	-73.2	51.7	17.5	-66.3	29.9	11.7	-63.0
Average (11 Welfare States)			20.5	4.1	-78.6	54.1	10.1	-80.1	33.6	6.0	-81.3	23.2	7.2	-67.6	57.2	21.3	-61.6	34.0	14.2	-58.5
Standard deviation (SD)			5.3	1.6	11.3	9.8	6.5	14.6	7.1	5.5	17.2	5.4	2.2	12.9	8.8	10.1	19.3	6.5	9.0	24.1
2. Mid-2000s																				
Liberal	Australia	2003	23.3	5.0	-78.5	52.5	8.2	-84.4	29.2	3.2	-89.0	25.9	10.4	-59.8	55.4	28.1	-49.3	29.5	17.7	-40.0
	Canada	2004	18.1	6.1	-66.3	37.1	13.5	-63.6	19.0	7.4	-61.1	21.8	9.7	-55.5	41.6	21.6	-48.1	19.8	11.9	-39.9
	U.K.	2004	23.5	4.5	-80.9	46.2	7.6	-83.5	22.7	3.1	-86.3	26.4	8.8	-66.7	49.9	16.5	-66.9	23.5	7.7	-67.2
	U.S.	2004	20.5	8.5	-58.5	32.8	15.8	-51.8	12.3	7.3	-40.7	23.9	13.4	-43.9	37.2	23.7	-36.3	13.3	10.3	-22.6
	Group Mean		21.4	6.0	-71.1	42.2	11.3	-70.8	20.8	5.3	-69.3	24.5	10.6	-56.5	46.0	22.5	-50.1	21.5	11.9	-42.4
Cont. Europe	Austria	2004	29.1	4.5	-84.5	40.9	4.0	-90.2	11.8	-0.5	-104.2	31.6	7.1	-77.5	43.2	9.2	-78.7	11.6	2.1	-81.9
	France	2000	32.8	2.5	-92.4	60.8	7.1	-88.3	28.0	4.6	-83.6	37.0	6.0	-83.8	64.6	15.9	-75.4	27.6	9.9	-64.1
	Germany	2004	32.1	3.1	-90.3	45.6	6.3	-86.2	13.5	3.2	-76.3	34.3	6.9	-79.9	48.6	13.4	-72.4	14.3	6.5	-54.5
	Italy	2005	34.3	5.2	-84.8	47.2	7.2	-84.7	12.9	2.0	-84.5	38.1	9.2	-75.9	50.6	14.4	-71.5	12.5	5.2	-58.4
	Group Mean		32.1	3.8	-88.0	48.6	6.2	-87.4	16.6	2.3	-87.2	35.3	7.3	-79.3	51.8	13.2	-74.5	16.5	5.9	-64.7
Nordic	Denmark	2004	24.3	2.4	-90.1	45.3	3.4	-92.5	21.0	1.0	-95.2	26.5	4.6	-82.6	48.3	7.4	-84.7	21.8	2.8	-87.2
	Finland	2004	29.6	2.7	-90.9	46.7	3.3	-92.9	17.1	0.6	-96.5	32.4	5.3	-83.6	49.5	9.5	-80.8	17.1	4.2	-75.4
	Norway	2004	22.4	4.3	-80.8	55.0	7.3	-86.7	32.6	3.0	-90.8	25.5	6.7	-73.7	59.1	15.2	-74.3	33.6	8.5	-74.7
	Sweden	2005	27.4	2.9	-89.4	44.8	3.5	-92.2	17.4	0.6	-96.6	30.1	4.7	-84.4	48.2	7.6	-84.2	18.1	2.9	-84.0
	Group Mean		25.9	3.1	-87.8	48.0	4.4	-91.1	22.0	1.3	-94.8	28.6	5.3	-81.1	51.3	9.9	-81.0	22.7	4.6	-80.3
Average (12 Welfare States)			26.5	4.3	-82.3	46.2	7.3	-83.1	19.8	3.0	-83.7	29.5	7.7	-72.3	49.7	15.2	-68.6	20.2	7.5	-62.5
Standard deviation (SD)			5.2	1.8	10.5	7.5	3.9	12.5	7.1	2.5	17.6	5.3	2.6	13.1	7.5	6.6	15.7	7.2	4.5	20.2

Table 3. Gender gap of poverty: elderly and non-elderly household poverty rates (%)

Welfare State Regime	Country	Year	Elderly households (50% of median income)									Non-elderly households (50% of median income)								
			Male poverty rate			Female poverty rate			Gender gap			Male poverty rate			Female poverty rate			Gender gap		
			MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change	MI	DPI	change
1. Mid-1980s																				
Liberal	Australia	1985	59.2	13.5	-77.2	78.8	51.5	-34.6	19.6	38.0	93.9	12.6	7.3	-42.1	43.1	32.1	-25.5	30.5	24.8	-18.7
	Canada	1987	60.0	7.9	-86.8	74.2	22.7	-69.4	14.2	14.8	4.2	13.2	9.4	-28.8	36.8	27.7	-24.7	23.6	18.3	-22.5
	U.K.	1986	67.0	2.8	-95.8	82.0	7.6	-90.7	15.0	4.8	-68.0	18.1	7.3	-59.7	56.1	10.0	-82.2	38.0	2.7	-92.9
	U.S.	1986	52.6	15.9	-69.8	70.7	42.5	-39.9	18.1	26.6	47.0	12.1	10.7	-11.6	41.2	35.8	-13.1	29.1	25.1	-13.7
	Group Mean		59.7	10.0	-82.4	76.4	31.1	-58.7	16.7	21.1	19.3	14.0	8.7	-35.5	44.3	26.4	-36.4	30.3	17.7	-36.9
Cont. Europe	Austria	1987		5.9			27.7			21.8			2.0			14.2			12.2	
	France	1984	82.2	2.1	-97.4	88.8	9.0	-89.9	6.6	6.9	4.5	20.9	7.2	-65.6	37.3	14.4	-61.4	16.4	7.2	-56.1
	Germany	1984	84.6	8.8	-89.6	93.3	17.6	-81.1	8.7	8.8	1.1	10.7	4.6	-57.0	40.7	21.9	-46.2	30.0	17.3	-42.3
	Italy	1986	80.9	11.8	-85.4	88.9	27.8	-68.7	8.0	16.0	100.0	16.6	7.9	-52.4	48.8	15.1	-69.1	32.2	7.2	-77.6
	Group Mean		82.6	7.6	-90.8	90.3	18.1	-79.9	7.8	10.6	35.2	16.1	6.6	-58.3	42.3	17.1	-58.9	26.2	10.6	-58.7
Nordic	Denmark	1987	68.0	11.7	-82.8	78.1	22.1	-71.7	10.1	10.4	3.0	14.9	5.6	-62.4	37.0	14.0	-62.2	22.1	8.4	-62.0
	Finland	1987	44.9	2.7	-94.0	69.2	17.4	-74.9	24.3	14.7	-39.5	10.1	4.7	-53.5	22.1	11.6	-47.5	12.0	6.9	-42.5
	Norway	1986	64.0	7.1	-88.9	84.9	34.4	-59.5	20.9	27.3	30.6	6.5	3.7	-43.1	36.9	18.4	-50.1	30.4	14.7	-51.6
	Sweden	1987	86.3	4.6	-94.7	93.0	6.1	-93.4	6.7	1.5	-77.6	14.8	8.4	-43.2	32.5	17.0	-47.7	17.7	8.6	-51.4
	Group Mean		65.8	6.5	-90.1	81.3	20.0	-74.9	15.5	13.5	-20.9	11.6	5.6	-50.6	32.1	15.3	-51.9	20.6	9.7	-51.9
Average (11 Welfare States)			68.2	8.1	-87.5	82.0	23.5	-70.4	13.8	15.4	9.0	13.7	7.0	-47.2	39.3	19.8	-48.2	25.6	12.8	-48.3
Standard deviation (SD)			13.8	4.7	8.5	8.5	14.6	19.5	6.2	11.1	57.7	4.0	2.2	16.0	8.7	8.6	20.6	7.9	7.7	24.3
2. Mid-2000s																				
Liberal	Australia	2003	65.9	15.3	-76.8	80.2	41.5	-48.3	14.3	26.2	83.2	17.7	9.4	-46.9	43.5	21.6	-50.3	25.8	12.2	-52.7
	Canada	2004	50.9	3.8	-92.5	68.7	9.8	-85.7	17.8	6.0	-66.3	15.9	10.8	-32.1	33.7	25.1	-25.5	17.8	14.3	-19.7
	U.K.	2004	60.9	11.0	-81.9	79.0	21.2	-73.2	18.1	10.2	-43.6	16.2	8.1	-50.0	37.5	14.6	-61.1	21.3	6.5	-69.5
	U.S.	2004	60.1	20.0	-66.7	73.7	34.9	-52.6	13.6	14.9	9.6	15.6	11.8	-24.4	26.7	20.5	-23.2	11.1	8.7	-21.6
	Group Mean		59.5	12.5	-79.5	75.4	26.9	-64.9	16.0	14.3	-4.3	16.4	10.0	-38.3	35.4	20.5	-40.0	19.0	10.4	-40.9
Cont. Europe	Austria	2004	85.0	5.0	-94.1	90.8	14.0	-84.6	5.8	9.0	55.2	19.7	7.6	-61.4	26.0	7.5	-71.2	6.3	-0.1	-101.6
	France	2000	88.5	7.2	-91.9	92.5	12.9	-86.1	4.0	5.7	42.5	22.8	5.6	-75.4	46.9	17.8	-62.0	24.1	12.2	-49.4
	Germany	2004	79.6	6.1	-92.3	89.8	13.1	-85.4	10.2	7.0	-31.4	17.0	7.2	-57.6	28.9	13.6	-52.9	11.9	6.4	-46.2
	Italy	2005	82.1	8.0	-90.3	87.9	18.1	-79.4	5.8	10.1	74.1	20.6	9.7	-52.9	25.7	12.0	-53.3	5.1	2.3	-54.9
	Group Mean		83.8	6.6	-92.1	90.3	14.5	-83.9	6.5	8.0	35.1	20.0	7.5	-61.9	31.9	12.7	-59.9	11.9	5.2	-63.0
Nordic	Denmark	2004	63.1	2.4	-96.2	77.8	4.3	-94.5	14.7	1.9	-87.1	17.5	5.1	-70.9	33.5	8.9	-73.4	16.0	3.8	-76.3
	Finland	2004	87.4	2.5	-97.1	94.3	11.6	-87.7	6.9	9.1	31.9	20.6	5.9	-71.4	30.9	8.6	-72.2	10.3	2.7	-73.8
	Norway	2004	64.7	2.5	-96.1	85.0	11.4	-86.6	20.3	8.9	-56.2	17.2	7.6	-55.8	43.8	17.4	-60.3	26.6	9.8	-63.2
	Sweden	2005	75.4	2.4	-96.8	88.7	8.3	-90.6	13.3	5.9	-55.6	18.0	5.3	-70.6	31.7	7.3	-77.0	13.7	2.0	-85.4
	Group Mean		72.7	2.5	-96.6	86.5	8.9	-89.9	13.8	6.5	-41.7	18.3	6.0	-67.1	35.0	10.6	-70.7	16.7	4.6	-74.6
Average (12 Welfare States)			72.0	7.2	-89.4	84.0	16.8	-79.6	12.1	9.6	-3.6	18.2	7.8	-55.8	34.1	14.6	-56.9	15.8	6.7	-59.5
Standard deviation (SD)			12.5	5.7	9.5	8.1	11.0	14.6	5.4	6.1	59.8	2.2	2.2	15.9	7.3	6.0	17.5	7.4	4.7	24.1

Table 4. Poverty rate of single-parent and single-mother households

Welfare State Regime	Country	Year	Proportion of female-head households			Poverty rate: single-parent households			Poverty rate: single-mother households		
			Overall	MI poverty	DPI poverty	MI	DPI	change (%)	MI	DPI	change (%)
Liberal	Australia	2003	81.6	88.3	86.4	61.3	25.3	-58.7	66.4	26.8	-59.6
	Canada	2004	81.6	90.7	91.0	54.5	37.8	-30.6	60.6	42.2	-30.4
	U.K.	2004	91.5	94.0	91.8	69.8	25.5	-63.5	71.7	25.6	-64.3
	U.S.	2004	85.5	93.0	93.7	50.3	38.3	-23.9	54.8	42.0	-23.4
	Group Mean		85.1	91.5	90.7	59.0	31.7	-46.2	63.4	34.2	-46.1
Cont. Europe	Austria	2004	86.0	92.3	86.2	44.7	18.1	-59.5	48.0	18.2	-62.1
	France	2000	88.5	93.0	91.6	56.9	24.4	-57.1	59.8	25.2	-57.9
	Germany	2004	95.0	97.2	97.8	60.0	33.1	-44.8	61.4	34.1	-44.5
	Italy	2005	93.7	97.0	95.9	33.1	24.4	-26.3	34.2	24.9	-27.2
	Group Mean		90.8	94.9	92.9	48.7	25.0	-48.6	50.9	25.6	-49.7
Nordic	Denmark	2004	85.2	90.3	83.0	39.5	4.6	-88.4	41.9	4.5	-89.3
	Finland	2004	85.8	91.5	88.1	41.3	6.4	-84.5	44.0	6.6	-85.0
	Norway	2004	80.7	92.9	92.3	43.7	9.2	-78.9	50.3	10.5	-79.1
	Sweden	2005	81.0	88.9	83.6	41.5	6.6	-84.1	45.5	6.8	-85.1
	Group Mean		83.2	90.9	86.8	41.5	6.7	-83.9	45.4	7.1	-84.4
Average (12 Welfare States)			86.3	92.4	90.1	49.7	21.1	-59.6	53.2	22.3	-60.0
Standard deviation			4.9	2.8	4.7	10.9	12.2	23.1	11.1	13.2	23.4

Note 1. We exclude single-father households for separate analyses because generally the sample sizes are too small.

2. The variable which makes us identify different types of households began to be provided from the fifth wave datasets (around 2000).