

Research



How Female Labor Force Outcomes in the United States and Europe Differ

BEN GITIS, BRIANNA FERNANDEZ | JUNE 22, 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

When considering ways to improve female career growth and increase gender equity in the workforce, many argue the United States should implement generous paid family leave programs like those in European Union (EU) countries. But, are female workers in Europe really that much better off than in the United States? When comparing employment statistics between the United States and the EU, we find that:

- Women are more likely to be managers in the United States than in the EU.
- Labor force participation for women is lower in the EU than in the United States.
- Part-time employment among women is greater in the EU than in the United States.
- The gender wage gap is larger in the EU than in the United States.

While a number of factors can impact these results, there is a clear pattern indicating that EU countries generate outcomes that may not be desirable for working women in the United States. So, the United States may be better off if policymakers were to consider alternative ways to support working women and expand access to paid family leave, rather than mimic Europe's policies.

INTRODUCTION

When it comes to designing domestic policies, many on the left often look abroad and argue that the United States should follow Europe's lead. Indeed, from universal health care to welfare, countries in the EU tend to provide much more generous benefits than the United States. Most recently, liberal policymakers have urged that the United States should follow Europe's lead when designing policies intended to improve gender equity in the workplace and female labor force outcomes. This includes a proposal to provide paid family leave in largely the same way that EU countries do it: Senator Kirsten Gillibrand's FAMILY Act would guarantee paid family leave universally by creating a government-run program that utilizes taxpayer dollars to provide benefits to workers who take family leave.

Since one of the ultimate goals of paid family leave is to improve female labor force outcomes, it is relevant to ask, are female workers in European countries actually better off than female workers in America? In the following, we compare male and female labor force statistics in the United States to those in EU countries. While a number of factors can impact these statistics, a clear pattern emerges that the EU does not necessarily embody a desirable result. Compared to the United States, women in EU countries are less likely to become managers and more likely to fill lower-paid service occupations. In addition, in EU countries the gender pay gap is larger, the female labor force participation rate is lower, and women are much more likely to be part-time

workers. If policymakers were to take steps to try to improve female labor outcomes, such as expand access to paid family leave, female workers may be better off if the United States were to adopt an alternative approach.

CURRENT AND PROPOSED PAID FAMILY LEAVE POLICIES IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States, one of the most prominent ways policymakers are attempting to improve female workforce outcomes are efforts to expand paid family leave, as both sides of the aisle have proposed ways to increase access to the benefit. Pregnancy can result in a major disruption in a woman's career, and may impact the types of careers that women pursue, as women tend to prefer flexibility and stability in the workplace over less stable jobs that have higher earnings.[1] Evidence suggests that greater access to paid family leave can improve labor force participation and job continuity for mothers,[2] which has implications for greater earnings growth. Under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) of 1993, certain workers are allowed up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job protected family leave. No federal laws, however, guarantee workers are paid during their time away from work. In fact, the United States is the only developed country in the world that does not guarantee workers some form of paid family leave.[3]

In EU countries, the most common approach to providing paid family leave is a taxpayer-funded social insurance program that compensates working parents while they are on leave. These programs tend to be very generous by American standards. Taxpayers in Denmark, for instance, fund a program that provides payments to mothers for up to 50 weeks of maternity leave (just under a year). EU countries on average provide mothers 65.6 weeks of paid leave, with several countries providing paid leave for over 160 weeks (three years).[4]

In the United States, the leading liberal proposal to provide paid family leave, the FAMILY Act, would provide paid family leave universally using the same social insurance model. Specifically, the FAMILY Act would provide up to 12 weeks of paid leave by creating a trust fund that would be financed with a 0.4 percent payroll tax, split between employers and employees. For those 12 weeks, the federal government would provide benefits equal to two-thirds of regular earnings, with a minimum monthly benefit of \$580 and a maximum monthly benefit of \$4,000.[5] While the duration of the benefit would be shorter than the average EU paid leave benefit, the benefit would be delivered in the same way: using taxpayer dollars to universally provide a benefit to any worker on family leave. It would also be budgetarily expensive, costing at least \$85.9 billion per year with the payroll tax only covering 35.6 percent of the cost.[6]

While there are benefits to paid family leave, that does not necessarily mean that the United States should approach the benefit in the same way. Since one of the ultimate goals is to improve female career advancement and labor earnings, it is important to consider the female labor force outcomes in EU countries. In the following, we aggregate labor statistics across EU countries to compare female workers in the EU to those in the United States.

OCCUPATIONAL EMPLOYMENT COMPARISONS[7]

2015 occupational data show that the female workers in the United States hold a larger portion of managerial and professional occupations than the female workers in Europe. Table 1 contains the portion of jobs in each major occupation category held by women in the United States and EU countries.

Table 1: Percent female by occupation, 2015

Occupation	United States	EU Countries
Total	46.8%	47.1%
Management	39.2%	33.9%
Business and financial operations	54.3%	54.1%
Professional and related	57.2%	50.5%
Service	56.7%	61.6%
Sales and office	61.5%	66.2%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance	4.70%	17.9%
Production, transportation, and material moving	21.8 %	33.1%

Overall, women accounted for about 47 percent of total employment in both the EU and the United States in 2015. In the United States, however, women held 39.2 percent of management positions, compared to 33.9 percent in EU countries. Furthermore, in the United States women held 57.2 percent of professional occupations, while in EU countries they held only 50.5 percent of the same high-skilled jobs. Meanwhile, in Europe, women held a larger portion of lower-paid service and sales occupations than in the United States. Specifically, service workers and sales and office workers in Europe were 61.6 percent and 66.2 percent female, respectively. In the United States the same occupations are 56.7 percent and 61.5 percent female.

These patterns could be a result of the comparably long and generous paid leave programs in EU countries unintentionally resulting in gender discrimination in the workplace. In particular, employers may be less likely to hire or promote prime-age female workers, knowing that at some point they may take family leave and be away from work for a year or more.

LABOR FORCE COMPARISONS

Overall, in Europe the female labor force participation rate and part-time worker rate is lower than in the United States. The female outcomes among prime-age workers, however, appear to be higher in EU countries revealing that paid family leave may help younger workers remain attached to the labor force.

As of 2015, the labor force participation rate was higher for both men and women in the United States than in Europe. Table 2 compares male and female labor force participation in the United States and the EU in 2015.

Table 2: Labor Force Participation Rate, 2015

Gender and Country	Total	Prime-Age (25 to 54)
Female		
United States	56.7%	73.7%
EU Countries	51.8%	79.5%
Male		
United States	69.1%	88.3%
EU Countries	64.7%	91.4%
Male-Female Gap		
United States	12.4 pts	14.6 pts
EU Countries	12.9 pts	11.9 pts

Source: OECD

Both men and women had higher labor force participation rates in the United States than in Europe. In 2015, the labor force participation rate in America was 56.7 percent for women and 69.1 percent for men. In the EU, the labor force participation rate was only 51.8 percent for women and 64.7 percent for men. Meanwhile, the gap between male and female labor force participation rates was slightly larger in the EU than in the United States. Specifically, while the male labor force participation rate was 12.9 percentage points higher than the female rate in Europe, it was 12.4 percentage points higher in the United States.^[8] This suggests that not only are both genders less likely to be in the labor force than in the United States, but there is also a wider gap between men and women.

It is important to note that the participation rate among prime-age workers (those who are 25 to 54 years old and most likely impacted by paid leave policies) is higher in EU countries than in the United States. This is particularly true among prime-age women, who in 2015 had a labor force participation rate of 79.5 percent in the EU, compared to just 73.7 percent in the United States. It is possible that the family leave policies may keep women more attached to the labor force during their prime-age years, when they are more likely to become pregnant and require time away from work.

In EU countries, women are also more likely to hold part-time jobs than in the United States. This suggests that EU policies have not helped women remain in full-time positions and advance their careers, opting instead to

pursue jobs with fewer hours and more flexibility. Table 3 compares the part-time employment rates of women to men in EU countries and the United States.

Table 3: Part-Time Employment Rate, 2015

Gender and Country	Rate
Female	
United States	25.0%
EU Countries	27.5%
Male	
United States	12.4%
EU Countries	8.5%
Male-Female Gap	
U.S.	12.6 pts
EU	19.0 pts

Source: OECD

In 2015, the part-time employment rate for women was 2.5 percentage points higher in EU countries than in the United States. Interestingly, the male part-time employment rate was greater in the United States than in Europe. As a result, the gap between male and female part-time employment rates is much larger in EU countries than in the United States. In the EU, the female part-time employment rate was 19 percentage points higher than the male rate and in the United States it was 12.6 percentage points higher. These data suggest that relative to men, the family leave policies in EU countries have not led to greater work hours for women.

GENDER WAGE GAP

One of the most frequently cited figures regarding workforce gender inequality is the gender wage gap, the percent difference between male and female wages.^[9] According to the Census Bureau, the median annual earnings of full-time, year-round female workers in the United States were 20 percent lower than their male counterparts in 2015.^[10] While much of the pay gap is attributed to individual choices, such as college majors, occupations, and industries pursued, a portion of it is tied to pregnancy.^[11] Pregnancy and parenthood can result in a major disruption in a woman’s career, as pregnant female workers are more likely to be fired or forced to quit their jobs if they lack access to paid leave.^[12] In addition, pregnancy may affect job choices. Women tend to prefer careers with job stability and flexibility in lieu of riskier careers that are more demanding and have higher compensation.^[13] Since paid family leave has been shown to increase job continuity and labor

force attachment, many hope that expanding access to the benefit in the United States would enable women to pursue higher paying careers and reduce the gender pay gap.

The paid leave policies employed in EU countries, however, have not resulted in more equal pay. The OECD publishes data on the wage gap among all workers (not just full-time, year-round), which indicate that the pay gap is larger in Europe than it is in America. These figures are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. Gender Pay Gap in the United States and Europe, 2014^[14]

Country	Gender Pay Gap
United States	17.5%
EU Countries	19.1%
US-EU Difference	1.6 pts

In 2014, the gender wage gap was 19.1 percent in EU countries, while the United States had a wage gap of 17.5 percent. Estonia, Latvia, and Finland have the largest gender wage gaps in the EU at 28.3 percent, 21.1 percent, and 19.6 percent, respectively. These countries also have among the most generous paid leave benefits for women at 166 weeks, 94 weeks, and 161 weeks, respectively.^[15] These benefit durations far exceed the average length of paid leave in EU countries of 65.6 weeks.

Furthermore, most of the EU countries with the smallest gender wage gaps have paid leave policy lengths below the EU average. Greece, Denmark, Italy, Slovenia, Luxembourg, and Belgium have shorter paid leave programs than the EU country average and all reported gender wage gaps below 10 percent in 2014. Given that EU countries with shorter paid leave programs have smaller gender wage gaps than the United States, paid family leave policies could help to reduce gender wage gaps. However, the length of such policies should be taken into consideration as countries with lengthier policies seem to have greater gender inequity. Moreover, research has concluded that overly long paid leave programs negatively impact women's pay, employment, and career growth.^[16]

PAID FAMILY LEAVE MOVING FORWARD

While none of the statistics presented in this report make a direct connection between the existence of paid family leave programs and female workforce outcomes and many of the outcomes could be due cultural differences and other factors, a clear pattern still emerges: overly generous paid leave is associated with negative workforce outcomes for women. More modest paid leave programs, however, could improve female labor force outcomes. This is particularly true among workers in low-income households who must remain attached to the workforce in order to become more self-reliant and raise their earnings.^[17]

So, rather than pursuing policies that mimic European-style universal social insurance programs (like the FAMILY Act), policymakers in the United States may leave workers better off if they expanded paid family leave in an alternative way that specifically targets low-income workers. Not only would this help those who

would benefit most, but it would also be the most cost-effective and direct way to expand paid family leave in America. In the United States, workers already have access to bevy of employer-provided paid leave benefits, which they string together to afford time off. Indeed, between vacation days, sick days, general paid-time-off, and existing paid family leave benefits, workers who take family leave in the United States are paid 63 percent of the time.[18] Those who lack access to any paid leave tend to be from lower-income households,[19] earn low-wages, and have lower skill and education levels.[20] A program that targets workers in low-income households would directly assist these workers and, in many cases, provide them with more generous benefits. For instance, the American Action Forum’s proposed Earned Income Leave Benefit would provide 12 weeks of paid family leave to 8.4 million low-income workers, with 92.6 percent of the program’s benefits going to workers under 200 percent of the federal poverty threshold.[21] A similar program would provide paid parental leave to 57.1 million low- and middle-income workers, with 62.3 percent of the benefits going to workers under 200 percent of the poverty threshold.[22] Under the universal FAMILY Act, only 12.5 percent of the benefits would go to the same low-income workers.[23]

CONCLUSION

Paid family leave is popular and most Americans would like greater access to it.[24] As policymakers consider the best ways to enhance females in the workforce and expand paid leave, many on the left insist on introducing a European-style universal benefit. While EU countries have extremely generous paid leave policies, their female labor force outcomes are generally worse than in the United States. Primarily, relative to the United States, women in Europe hold a smaller portion of higher paying manager and professional occupations and a larger portion of lower paying service and sales jobs. In addition, the female labor force participation rate is lower, the female part-time employment rate is higher, and the gender wage gap is larger than in the United States. These are not results the United States should strive to emulate. Rather than following Europe’s lead, perhaps Americans would be better off with a more modest approach that specifically targets the low-income workers who would benefit most.

APPENDIX: OCCUPATIONAL STATISTICS METHODOLOGY

Estimates for female occupational employment are based on 2015 Current Population Survey (CPS) estimates and the 2015 EU Labour Force Survey estimates. CPS uses the 2010 Census occupational classifications, while the EU classifies occupations using the International Standard Classification of Occupations 2008 (ISCO-08). [25] Due to this discrepancy in occupational classification, the EU Labour Force Survey estimates were reclassified from ISCO-08 categories to 2010 Census categories using publicly available classification crosswalks. Therefore, all estimates are reported in 2010 Census occupational categories. Only EU occupational data was converted. U.S. occupation data remained in its original form.

There is no direct crosswalk between the 2010 Census occupational classification and the ISCO-08 occupational classification, so EU occupations were first reclassified from the ISCO-08 occupational classification to the 2010 Standard Occupational Classification System (SOC). Then a final reclassification was performed, changing the EU occupations from the newly converted SOC classification to the 2010 Census classification, in which the United States occupational data is reported. Due to an overall imperfect crossover between ISCO-08 classification and 2010 Census classification, the 23 major groups in 2010 Census were condensed to seven occupational groups. Table A1 identifies which major groups were combined to form the seven occupational categories used in this analysis.

Table A1: Census Major Groups Condensed

Occupational Categories	Census Major Groups
Management	0010-0430 Management occupations
Business and financial operations	0500-0950 Business and financial operations occupations
Professional and related	15-000 Computer and mathematical occupations 17-000 Architecture and engineering occupations 19-000 Life, physical, and social science occupations 21-000 Community and social service occupations 23-000 Legal occupations 25-000 Education, training, and library occupations 27-000 Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations 29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations
Service	3600-3655 Healthcare support occupations 3700-3955 Protective service occupations 4000-4160 Food preparation and serving related occupations 4200-4250 Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations 4300-4650 Personal care and service occupations
Sales and office	4700-4965 Sales and related occupations 500-5940 Office and administrative support occupations
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance	6005-6130 Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations 6200-6940 Construction and extraction occupations 7000-7630 Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations
Production, transportation, and material moving	7700-8965 Production occupations 9000-9750 Transportation and material moving occupations

The crosswalks used to translate ISCO-08 occupations to 2010 Census occupations indicate that several ISCO-08 occupations can be sorted into two or more 2010 Census occupational categories. The ISCO-08 occupations that sort into multiple 2010 Census categories account for 4 percent of the EU occupational data. Due to this issue, we conducted three separate analyses of the EU occupational employment data: (1) an analysis that excludes that 4 percent, (2) an analysis where we select “best fit” occupational categories for the EU occupations that sort into multiple 2010 Census categories, and (3) an analysis in which we divide the number of employed in an EU occupation category equally into the multiple 2010 Census occupational categories it falls in. [26] Table A2 contains the portion of female workers in each occupation category under each of the three

methods employed.

Table A2: Percent female by occupation, 2015

Occupations	United States	EU Countries		
		Without 4%	Best fit	Split
Total	46.8%	47.1%	47.1%	46.8%
Management	39.2%	33.9%	33.9%	33.9%
Business and financial operations	54.3%	54.1%	54.1%	54.1%
Professional and related	57.2%	50.9%	50.5%	51.2%
Service	56.7%	63.0%	61.6%	61.7%
Sales and office	61.5%	66.4%	66.2%	66.2%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance	4.70%	18.0%	17.9%	18.0%
Production, transportation, and material moving	21.8 %	32.6%	33.1%	32.1%

The “best fit” method is what we featured in table 1 for the portion of each occupation held by female workers in EU countries. Across all three methods, the estimates for each occupation category are consistent with one another. Further detail regarding how EU occupations that fit into several 2010 SOC categories were placed into the occupational category of “best fit” is in Table A3.

Table A3: Sorting EU ISCO-08 Occupations Into “Best Fit” Occupational Category

ISCO-08 Occupation	2010 SOC Occupation Group	Best Fit Occupational Category
3112 Civil Engineering Technicians	17-000 Architecture and engineering occupations 33-000 Protective service occupations 47-000 Construction and extraction occupations	Professional and related
3251 Dental Assistants and Therapists	29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations 31-000 Healthcare support occupations	Service

3255 Physiotherapy Technicians and Assistants	29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations 31-000 Healthcare support occupations	Service
3256 Medical Assistant	29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations 31-000 Healthcare support occupations	Service
3257 Environmental and Occupational Health Inspectors and Associates	29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations 45-000 Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations 53-000 Transportation and material moving occupations	Service
3259 Health Associate Professionals Not Elsewhere Classified	29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations 31-000 Healthcare support occupations	Professional and related
3411 Legal and Related Associate Professionals	23-000 Legal occupations 33-000 Protective service occupations	Professional and related
3423 Fitness and Recreation Instructors and Programme Leaders	25-000 Education, training, and library occupations 29-000 Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations 39-000 Personal care and service occupations	Service
3435 Other Artistic and Cultural Associate Professionals	27-000 Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations 39-000 Personal care and service occupations	Professional and related
4212 Bookmakers, Croupiers and Related Gaming Workers	39-000 Personal care and service occupations 43-000 Office and administrative support occupations	Sales and office
4224 Hotel Receptionists	39-000 Personal care and service occupations 43-000 Office and administrative support occupations	Sales and office
5212 Street Food Salesperson	35-000 Food preparation and serving related occupations 41-000 Sales and related occupations	Sales and office
5419 Protective Services Workers Not Elsewhere Classified	33-000 Protective service occupations 43-000 Office and administrative support occupations	Service
6113 Gardeners; Horticultural and Nursey Growers	37-000 Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations 45-000 Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	Service

7213 Sheet Metal Workers	47-000 Construction and extraction occupations 51-000 Production occupations	Natural resources, construction, and maintenance
7214 Structural Metal Preparers and Erectors	47-000 Construction and extraction occupations 51-000 Production occupations	Production, transportation, and material moving
8342 Earthmoving and Related Plat Operators	47-000 Construction and extraction occupations 53-000 Transportation and material moving occupations	Production, transportation, and material moving
8343 Crane, Hoist and Related Plant Operators	39-000 Personal care and service occupations 53-000 Transportation and material moving occupations	Production, transportation, and material moving
9129 Other Cleaning Workers	37-000 Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations 47-000 Construction and extraction occupations	Production, transportation, and material moving
9214 Garden and Horticultural Labourers	37-000 Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations 45-000 Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations	Service
9331 Hand and Pedal Labourers	43-000 Office and administrative support occupations 53-000 Transportation and material moving occupations	Service
9621 Messengers, Package Deliverers and Luggage Porters	39-000 Personal care and service occupations 43-000 Office and administrative support occupations	Sales and office
9622 Odd-job Persons	37-000 Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations 49-000 Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	Service
9623 Meter Readers and Vending-machine Collectors	43-000 Office and administrative support occupations 49-000 Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations	Sales and office
9629 Elementary Workers Not Elsewhere Classified	39-000 Personal care and service occupations 53-000 Transportation and material moving occupations	Service

- [1] Matthew Wiswall & Basit Zafar, “Preference for Workplace, Investment in Human Capital, and Gender,” Staff Reports, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Staff Report No. 767, March 2016, Revised March 2017, https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/research/staff_reports/sr767.pdf?la=en.
- [2] Maya Rossin-Slater, “Maternity and Family Leave Policy,” NBER Working Paper No. 23069, March 2017, http://econ.ucsb.edu/~mrossin/RossinSlater_maternity_family_leave.pdf.
- [3] Gretchen Livingston, “Among 41 Nations, U.S. Is the Outlier When It Comes to Paid Parental Leave,” Pew Research Center, September 26, 2016, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/26/u-s-lacks-mandated-paid-parental-leave/>.
- [4] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, “Key Characteristics of Parental Leave Systems,” March 15, 2017, https://www.oecd.org/els/soc/PF2_1_Parental_leave_systems.pdf.
- [5] Family and Medical Insurance Leave Act, S. 337, 115th Congress, 2017, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/337>.
- [6] Ben Gitis, “The Earned Income Leave Benefit: Rethinking Paid Family Leave for Low-Income Workers,” American Action Forum, August 15, 2016, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/solution/earned-income-leave-benefit-rethinking-paid-family-leave-low-income-workers/>.
- [7] Please see the appendix for details on the methods required to compare occupations in the United States to those in EU countries.
- [8] “Labor force participation rate, female (modeled ILO estimate),” The World Bank Group, 2017, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.TLF.CACT.FE.ZS?end=2016&start=2015>.
- [9] OECD reports the gender wage gap as the difference between median earnings of men and women relative to median earnings of men. Data include full-time employees and self-employed.
- [10] Bernadette D. Proctor, Jessica L. Semega, and Melissa A. Kollar, “Income and Poverty in the United States: 2015,” Current Population Reports, Census Bureau September 13, 2016, <https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2016/demo/p60-256.html>.
- [11] “An Analysis of Reasons for Disparity in Wages Between Men and Women,” CONSAD Research Corp, Prepared for Department of Labor, January 12, 2009, <https://www.shrm.org/hr-today/public-policy/hr-public-policy-issues/Documents/Gender%20Wage%20Gap%20Final%20Report.pdf>.
- [12] Ben Gitis, “Do Pregnant Workers Need Greater Labor Market Protection?” American Action Forum, June 25, 2015, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/do-pregnant-workers-need-greater-labor-market-protection/>.
- [13] Matthew Wiswall & Basit Zafar, “Preference for Workplace, Investment in Human Capital, and Gender,” Staff Reports, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Staff Report No. 767, March 2016, Revised March 2017, https://www.newyorkfed.org/medialibrary/media/research/staff_reports/sr767.pdf?la=en.

- [14] “Gender wage gap (indicator),” OECD, 2017, <https://data.oecd.org/earnwage/gender-wage-gap.htm#indicator-chart>.
- [15] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, “Key Characteristics of Parental Leave Systems,” March 15, 2017, https://www.oecd.org/els/soc/PF2_1_Parental_leave_systems.pdf.
- [16] Maya Rossin-Slater, “Maternity and Family Leave Policy,” NBER Working Paper No. 23069, March 2017, http://econ.ucsb.edu/~mrossin/RossinSlater_maternity_family_leave.pdf.
- [17] Ben Gitis & Curtis Arndt, “Material Well-Being vs. Self-Sufficiency: How Adjusting Poverty Measurements Can Reveal a Diverging Trend in America,” American Action Forum, March 9, 2017, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/research/material-well-vs-self-sufficiency-adjusting-poverty-measurements-can-reveal-diverging-trend-america/>.
- [18] Ben Gitis, “What Pew’s Report on Paid Leave preferences Means for Policy,” American Action Forum, April 19, 2017, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/pews-report-paid-leave-preferences-mean-policy/>.
- [19] Ibid.
- [20] Ben Gitis & Angela Rachidi, “Affordable and Targeted: How Paid Parental Leave in the US Could Work,” American Action Forum & American Enterprise Institute, March 29, 2017, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/solution/affordable-targeted-paid-parental-leave-us-work/>.
- [21] Ben Gitis, “The Earned Income Leave Benefit: Rethinking Paid Family Leave for Low-Income Workers,” American Action Forum, August 15, 2016, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/solution/earned-income-leave-benefit-rethinking-paid-family-leave-low-income-workers/>.
- [22] Ben Gitis & Angela Rachidi, “Affordable and Targeted: How Paid Parental Leave in the US Could Work,” American Action Forum & American Enterprise Institute, March 29, 2017, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/solution/affordable-targeted-paid-parental-leave-us-work/>.
- [23] Ben Gitis, “The Earned Income Leave Benefit: Rethinking Paid Family Leave for Low-Income Workers,” American Action Forum, August 15, 2016, <https://www.americanactionforum.org/solution/earned-income-leave-benefit-rethinking-paid-family-leave-low-income-workers/>.
- [24] Juliana Horowitz, Kim Parker, Nikki Graf, & Gretchen Livingston, “Americans Widely Support Paid Family and Medical Leave, but Differ Over Specific Policies,” Pew Research Center, March 2017, <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/03/23/americans-widely-support-paid-family-and-medical-leave-but-differ-over-specific-policies/>.
- [25] Publicly available EU occupational data is only reported in major groups (ISCO 1-digit breakdown). To acquire data reported in detailed occupations, an extraction was requested from Eurostat of a detailed breakdown (ISCO 4-digit breakdown) of 2015 occupational data.
- [26] For example, ISCO occupation 3240 veterinary technicians and assistants could be classified under two SOC categories: 29-000 healthcare practitioners and technical occupations and 31-000 healthcare support occupations. In the analysis that divides the number of employed equally among the multiple SOC categories that the ISCO occupation fits into, the total number of veterinary technicians and assistants was divided by two.

One half was then added to the total employment for occupational category “Professional and related,” and the other half was added to the occupational category “Service.”