



Listening to mother

Making Britain mother-friendly

Sally Gimson

“ Becoming a mother is probably the single event that will affect a woman's life and identity more than anything else. Children are a joy, a challenge and responsibility for life. So why have we stopped talking about motherhood?

It used to be that marriage was the turning point for women, but that is no longer the case. Women get married or cohabit and their lives remain remarkably similar. They continue in their full-time jobs and some keep their own name. The level of commitment to the person they marry or live with may alter substantially, but there are few other outside pressures on the relationship. There is little stopping it being one of equals. Women's educational achievements are now better than men's and the gender pay gap for younger women has almost closed (at 91 per cent).

It is no wonder that women are lulled into a false sense of security, believing that having children will have little effect on their lives (when it had such a big effect on those of their mothers). They are wrong. Although it is easy to discount how much better conditions have become for mothers in the last 11 years, we are not there yet. Becoming a mother still carries an enormous penalty and the poorer a woman you are, the greater the price you pay.”



"The language of parenting has not always equalised the relationship between men and women: it has sometimes masked inequalities which have not been properly thought through or tackled. Expectations on all sides have been raised and policymakers as well as mothers and fathers are still wrestling with what these changes mean to families whose lives are more and more complicated."

“If I had more time I would enjoy my three-year-old son more, take him to more activities like swimming and mums and toddlers groups which I can’t do being a single parent working full time. I wouldn’t rush about getting agitated, worrying about getting out.”

Motherhood and apple pie? The challenges of motherhood now

Becoming a mother is probably the single event that will affect a woman’s life and identity more than anything else.¹ Children are a joy, a challenge and responsibility for life. So why have we stopped talking about motherhood?

It used to be that marriage was the turning point for women, but that is no longer the case. Women get married or cohabit and their lives remain remarkably similar. They continue in their full-time jobs and some keep their own name. The level of commitment to the person they marry or live with may alter substantially, but there are few other outside pressures on the relationship. There is little stopping it being one of equals, particularly as women’s educational achievements are now better than men’s.²

The gender pay gap for younger women has almost closed (at 91 per cent).³ It is no wonder that women are lulled into a false sense of security, believing that having children will have little effect on their lives (when it had such a big effect on those of their mothers). They are wrong. Although it is easy to discount how much better conditions have become for mothers in the last 11 years, we are not there yet. Being a mother still carries an enormous penalty and the poorer a woman you are, the greater the price you pay.

The pressure on today’s mothers is great – pushed from pillar to post to be the model supermum at the heart of family life, helping to make ends meet, juggling jobs, children, and the home. Millennium mum has never been so conflicted. The life of the ordinary mother is a far cry from the glossy pictures in magazines of celebrity ‘yummy mummies’ who seem to have it all, with babies as cute accessories.

And so it is that many women underestimate the cost to their lives of child-bearing and rearing – both financial and social. But they also underestimate how little childbirth can still affect the traditional role of men in Britain and how childbirth can open a chasm between the life courses of men and women which continues for the rest of their lives. When mothers re-enter paid employment, they either find they have been shoved on the ‘mummy track’ which means limited career prospects or that they have to go in at a lower level than before childbirth.

As time goes on the wage gap widens, they find their careers are stalled, pensions reduced and they end up doing the lion’s share of the housework and childcare. Meanwhile their partners can use these years to work their way up the career ladder. They not only carry on as before, but they work even longer hours during the children’s early years – and some of the longest hours in the EU.⁴ A third of working fathers say they are working more than 48 hours a week and that proportion is increasing. Mothers and fathers resent it. The Family and Parenting Institute’s surveys show that long hours mean that fathers find it difficult to get time off work to see their children. Mothers have to contribute to the family finances too – for instance mortgage repayments which may have been calculated on a couple’s joint income before children – and so end up with little choice but to juggle childcare and work, feeling they are doing neither as well as they would like.⁵

Mothers end up measuring themselves against impossible standards, and in doing so may make themselves miserable by being the critical observer of their own mothering. The status of the caring they do is valued so little that they no longer feel as if they are naturally the backbone of family life as

they used to be, and so they have to strive to prove their worth.

And because policymakers and politicians often talk in generalities about parents, they have sometimes not addressed mothers' specific needs. For example, mothers are being increasingly denied the routine support of health visitors and midwives to help them through the profound physical and emotional effects of child-bearing and motherhood.

Policy over the last 11 years – concentrating on employment

The message to mothers from politicians for the last 11 years has been clear. Go back to work.

Work has been seen as a way for women, particularly lone mothers, to get out of poverty. Labour has also seen it as the one way of helping poorer mothers play a full part in society, rather than existing on the sidelines, reliant on benefits. It is no coincidence that one of Tony Blair's first policy announcements on the family in 1997 was about welfare to work: the New Deal for Lone Parents. Getting mothers out of the house and into the workplace has been relatively effective, particularly during the economic boom in the early noughties. Mothers with husbands and partners are still more likely to work.

Policies to get parents back to work have been almost entirely targeted at women (under the guise of 'parents'). Not enough attention has been paid to whether this is fair, what fathers' role in all this should be and what type of work mothers are being pushed into. By talking about 'parents' when they really mean mothers, policymakers have blurred the distinction between mothers and fathers and failed to analyse how their lives are affected differently by the arrival of children.

The language of parenting has not always equalised the relationship between men and women: it has sometimes masked inequalities which have not been properly thought through or tackled. Expectations on all sides have been raised and policymakers as well as mothers and fathers are still wrestling with what these changes mean

to families whose lives are more and more complicated.

Back to work, at what cost?

What getting mothers back to work has not done is to make most women equal to men. The statistics are irrefutable. The average hourly wage for a woman juggling childcare and work is 67 per cent of a man's.⁶ Mothers' wages then stagnate for ten years and go up to 72 per cent of the male average wage.

The reason is that the majority of mothers move into part-time work which is badly paid. Low pay affects women across the board: almost half of highly qualified women professionals for instance find that after having a baby they downgrade to much lower skilled jobs. A third of female corporate managers move down the career ladder – two thirds of that number take a clerical position and the rest move into other lower skilled jobs.⁷

Even as women get pregnant, they begin to suffer disadvantage. Statistics from the Equal Opportunities commission (now merged into the Equality and Human Rights Commission)⁸ showed that around 30,000 women a year lose their jobs before they even give birth. Women in casualised labour – from journalism to agency cleaners – often find they are not entitled to any maternity benefits, although the Government is moving to change this situation.

If the situation is bad for women living with working partners, it can be far worse for lone mothers or those with partners on low incomes. Lone mothers who have few or no qualifications or who never worked before they had children find it particularly difficult to get back to work and even if they do it is low-paid work and they often cannot make enough money to justify the amount of benefits they will lose, or the extra childcare and travel costs they have to find.

In the FPI's response to the Green Paper *"In Work, better off: Next steps to full employment"* we highlighted how the New Deal for Lone Parents put work above everything else and could act as a barrier to women studying or improving their educational standards to find better work. The new rules cutting financial support

- ▶ In 2007 57 per cent of lone parents (mostly mothers) with children aged 16 or under were at work – up from 39 per cent in 1993. The proportion of all mothers working after having children has risen in the same period from 57 to 72 per cent.⁹
- ▶ Parents now also have the right to ask for flexible working if they have a child under six or a disabled child, and the Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, has announced that the right to ask for flexible working will be extended to include parents with children under 16.
- ▶ Paternity leave has been introduced and fathers can take it at £117 a week for up to two weeks. Thirteen weeks of unpaid parental leave can be taken by either parent for the first five years of a child's life. The Government has promised that by 2009/10 if the mother wants to return to work the father will be able to take some or all of the second half of the child's first year as paid paternity leave.
- ▶ Billions of pounds have been redistributed to families in the form of tax credits and benefits. In April 2008 six million families including 10 million children received either the working tax credit and/or the child tax credit or equivalent child support through benefits. For those most in need, 449,000 of them, the childcare portion of the working tax credit gave them £65 a week to spend on childcare.
- ▶ Every child from the age of three now is guaranteed 12.5 hours of free nursery care a week which can be claimed at both private and state-run nurseries. The Government has plans to increase the hours to 15 by 2010, and make it possible to take the childcare time more flexibly.
- ▶ Formal nursery care has expanded and the planned 3,500 children's centres will provide childcare and other forms of support for families.
- ▶ Every local authority now has a parenting strategy and is expected to provide support and services specifically for parents. Much support is based on 'outcomes' and targeted at parents whose behaviour the state hopes to change.¹⁰ Parenting orders which are widely used in the youth justice system act as the punitive side of this policy approach. These are overwhelmingly made on mothers.

for second degrees are also likely to disadvantage mothers.

The usual assumption for women with or without partners is that if they take work, it will be their work which is fitted in around childcare arrangements. This means that women often end up in jobs which allow them to pick their children up from school – often those which are most poorly paid and involve home working or childcare of some kind – either as a nursery nurse, cleaner or teaching assistant. Women spend twice as

much as the father (just over four hours as opposed to just over two hours).

It is still also the assumption that if someone is going to stay at home it will be the woman. In 2008 only 197,000 men stayed at home to look after their children, compared to 2 million stay-at-home mothers, though the balance has shifted since 1993 when only 125,000 men stayed at home full time compared to 2.7 million women.¹¹

Maternity rights back this assumption. Women are entitled to up to 52 weeks

maternity leave, men only up to two. This is a clear indication that men are considered the main breadwinners and that after six weeks a woman needs to be subsidised by a man or the state to live above the poverty line (after six weeks at 90 per cent of salary, maternity pay falls to £117 which is £340 less than the average wage).

If men fail to support women, the effect of the benefits and tax credits system often means that the state acts as a the corporate grandfather, either subsidising a woman's own partner's inability to earn enough or stepping in with benefits when a relationship breaks up. The fact that benefits are not enough to help many lone mothers on low incomes out of poverty suggests that the state is not a particularly generous grandfather either.

The conclusion from this is clear – either the state has to be more generous, or mothers need to be paid substantially more for the work they do outside the home. Or a whole cultural shift in working patterns has to take place for mothers and fathers. The work/life culture also has to change because the pay gap has other wide-reaching effects. It not only affects the economics within the family, but the mother's negotiating power within a relationship.

Interestingly, fathers in lower paid, manual occupations tend to use part-time working, job-sharing, special shifts and nine-day fortnights to a greater degree¹² than men in non-manual occupations, while a higher proportion of fathers in lower socio-economic families are also involved in helping mothers with childcare. Mothers with more successful partners find it more difficult to negotiate help: not only are they doing less work and earning less in a lower status job part time, but also they are at home more of the time doing more domestic and caring work.¹³

The lack of help from her partner who may be putting in long hours also affects their relationship. One in five people working long hours complain that it puts a strain on their relationships, and 10 per cent said it led to their divorce.¹⁴

It does not seem surprising that British mothers say they have more job

satisfaction working part time, but less life satisfaction.¹⁵

Anecdotal evidence suggests that women in large companies with generous maternity benefits now are putting off birth until they have reached a senior managerial position – often in their mid to late thirties – when they can earn enough money to pay for expensive personalised childcare (a nanny) and have the leverage within their workplace and at home to make a flexible working deal which will not damage their career prospects.

“...twins safely settled at child-minders by 8.30am – dash to work. Finish going through emails by 10am and can actually get some work done. Short-lived as a photocopier chews up paper. Colleagues arrive for meeting – we run out of time and I tell her to call me at home. Rush off to pick up two reluctant toddlers from kind gentle childminder to home of stressed haridan of a mummy. Call from work – publisher chasing stats. Call London. Frantic running around to find things to occupy fighting twins whilst attempting to appear professional to snotty office worker...etc...etc...”

Muddling through with childcare – does this matter?

The National Childcare Strategy identifies two aims for childcare: first to improve the outcomes for children by providing the most disadvantaged children with opportunities to learn which they would not get in the home and second to support parents to balance work and family. But according to reports by the Daycare Trust, the high cost of childcare and the lack of good consistent high quality care has meant that these two aims have not been totally successful.¹⁶

Take-up of the free early years education entitlement between 1999 and 2004 has been high, with only a small minority of 3-year-olds not taking it. But this amounts to

only 12.5 hours of care a week, not enough to cover a job, and the take-up is lower for disadvantaged groups. This may be partly because some families, in particular black and minority ethnic families, do not feel that there is the right kind of childcare on offer for them.

There has only been a modest increase in the take-up of full-time day care – unsurprising because the cost is beyond most people: the price of a day nursery in England has increased by more than twice the rate of inflation, so that the regional average for a childcare place for an under 2-year-old is £159 a week (in London it is £198 a week – £15,000 of taxable income).¹⁷ While, compared with 1999, in 2004 more mothers were working longer part-time hours, many seemed to be covering these hours by using ‘free education’ (i.e. the free entitlement and school for older children), combined with informal arrangements such as grandparents and fathers. Mothers are also working in the evenings and weekends when the fathers can be at home. The evidence suggests, for instance, that it is the children of the poorest, least educated mothers who benefit most from high quality institutional childcare¹⁸ and they are still the least likely to access it because of affordability. The Daycare Trust calls for the continuation of the subsidy of childcare in deprived areas, maternity leave increased to minimum wage levels and more free childcare (rather than complicated subsidies) which is easy to access, as well as a better and more consistently trained workforce.

Interestingly though, in the Family and Parenting Institute’s Family Friendly report from 2003, parents (mothers and fathers) told us that the right to have flexible working (rather than the right to ask for it) was their top priority for making Britain more family friendly (28 per cent of mothers and 21 per cent of fathers chose this option). The right to have flexible working was three times more important to mothers than paid maternity leave and seven times more important to them than men’s paid paternity leave. Only five per cent of parents thought childcare for the under 10s should be prioritised by the Government. All these statistics suggest that parents want choices on how to share care, but they want to do quite a lot of it at home.¹⁹

Many mothers told the FPI that it was not necessarily a lack of childcare, but the complexity involved in trying to work round fitting in the school run, nursery or childminder drop-off which presented them with difficulties.²⁰

These arrangements are often dependent on other support – for example father, friend and neighbours – and it was this in particular that mothers identified as a possible barrier to returning to work, as well as the costs of childcare.

Services for mothers and the decline of the health visitor

Services for mothers have also suffered as a result of the concentration on general support for parents. The Department of Health has led a policy which, while seeking to have a quick impact on family inequality, has in reality meant a withdrawal of help for many mothers at a time when they need space to form an attachment to their children.

The Government has increased spending on maternity services from £1 billion to £1.6 billion, but has not yet got maternity services right, though the recruitment of 4,000 new midwives announced in February 2008 should help women get more one-to-one care.

“I think the Government should emphasise the positive image of parents. It is of such benefit in work that you are learning skills through parenting, but nobody ever makes that link. When somebody recruits a parent, they think of the negatives rather than the positives.”

The gradual withdrawal of universal health visitor services from all but the very needy, which has been highlighted by Family and Parenting Institute research, reflects a withdrawing of the state from the support that it used to give mothers for being mothers.²¹ It is as if the state has convinced itself that most mothers do not need special help (even though they give birth) and are now so confident that they

are able to help themselves though leaflets and websites, though the FPI research in reaching vulnerable families suggests that many want to have a person like a health visitor who they can turn to for professional advice. In reality, women now spend less time in hospital after birth, their own parents may live further away or be too old to help with the baby and in many ways they may need the support of a health visitor more than ever before.

This withdrawal of support for 'parents' disproportionately affects mothers because the problems that health visitors are most equipped to deal with, like post-natal depression and domestic violence, are mainly female problems. Not only do these conditions affect women regardless of class, but they can have a profound effect on infant mental health. They are problems which health visitors, who deal mainly with mothers in the home, are best placed to pick up. The same is true of breast-feeding, which despite targets is still not increasing.

Is it any coincidence that breast-feeding, something only mothers do and which is deeply bound up with their identity as a mother, should be so difficult to support? This may be because this fundamental act of motherhood profoundly conflicts with other policies, which can seem to place a greater value on work than caring for children. While it is highly desirable that health visitors include fathers when they come to visit and encourage fathers' supportive role within the family, it does not mean that mothers' and fathers' roles are interchangeable.

Alongside this withdrawal of services specifically for mothers, there has been a huge rise in support for parents, which has focused on the behavioural problems and poor outcomes of their children, helping parents in some cases deal with these as if they were illnesses to be cured with a parenting course.^{21a}

Support for families in children's centres and Sure Start programmes (which have made a great difference to young families) can sometimes focus too much on behaviour or 'outcome' change, though those which are the most successful offer parents services that makes family life easier, as the FPI's report on Family Support in Children's

Centres demonstrates.²² This concentration on targets and outcomes only as opposed to family wellbeing can badly distort which services are funded and which are not, leading to public scepticism about the 'nanny state'.

The changing political landscape

"They (the Government) say they want to bring back the family unit and that they want families to be at home together. Then they encourage mothers to go back to work. They don't know what they are saying."

In policy terms the move away from motherhood is understandable. In the early 1990s single mothers were vilified by a Conservative Government for the burden that they were placing on the state. The 'Back To Basics' campaign stressed a 'return to family values' and castigated the role of the welfare state in providing housing and benefits and hence encouraging lone motherhood. This campaign included a 'patriarchal reconstruction' that focused on the re-promotion of the nuclear family and the reinstatement of the father as the head of the household.²³ And the rather blunt and, as it turned out, flawed policy response was to set up the Child Support Agency, a way of the state retrieving money from the mother's errant partner.

Policymakers really started talking about parents and parenting in 1997 as a way of making clear that raising children was not just the mother's responsibility but that of both parents, mothers and fathers. Yet one of the consequences of that ongoing discussion has been to undervalue motherhood and the huge effects having a baby has on a mother's life.

The Labour Government has concentrated on addressing poverty, by getting more mothers back to work, introducing family tax credit and flexible working and improving childcare. Mothers now find themselves expected to be earn money for their family, care for their children and support schools

and neighbourhoods (being involved in their children's school for instance, or caring for elderly parents). The trouble is that they just do not have the time.

Schools are in part being asked to make up for this lack of parental time at home (through extended schools for instance) and they have been fighting a vociferous rearguard action.²⁴

"I think that society has changed. There is more pressure on parents to own their own home, have a car, go on holiday, have a computer... In some ways children suffer from that because the parents are not there, they are at work every hour. Therefore the children are not getting the attention they need from their parents. Hence the problems."

It is all natural territory for the Conservatives under David Cameron to have lighted on. The Family and Parenting Institute has drawn attention to the policy gap on supporting mothers with the work we have done on health visitors, and the Conservatives have taken this up – promising to revitalise the service – as well as wanting to bring in a Dutch Kraamzorg or maternity nurse. The Liberal Democrats have also supported health visitors. The response from all political parties has been to look at ways of fathers and mothers sharing maternity/parental leave – especially as recent evidence of the possible detrimental effects of group care on children up to aged one or so is increasingly persuasive.

The Conservatives have been particularly interested in universal support for mothers because they think this might bolster marriage and the couple relationship as a solution to what they have identified as family and social breakdown, though they have been unclear about how they might pay for it and whether they might cut childcare subsidies and funding to Sure Start children's centres to do so.

The Conservative thinktank Policy Exchange's recent paper²⁵ suggests that all women (or men) should be given £50

to £60 for childcare for 0–3 year-olds and all targeted childcare benefits related to work abolished – a policy clearly intended to benefit mothers who stay at home as well as those who work, but not a million miles away from the idea of Wages for Housework, though pretty paltry wages even when taken with the benefits of other Conservative proposals such as married couples' allowance which would benefit married women on average by £20 a week.

Where the Conservatives are less sure-footed is on the thorny problems of how to deal with mothers either without partners or those who find themselves alone with children after a divorce or separation. No political party has yet found a really satisfactory solution which keeps these mothers and their children out of poverty (and even helps them into well-paid work), but does not appear to be 'rewarding' lone parent/motherhood.

Conclusion

"Since my daughter was 12 months old (she is now two years) I sleep in two sessions: from about 8.30pm to midnight, then from 5am until she wakes up, usually between 7pm and 7.30pm. Between midnight and 5am I have time to myself... Monday to Friday I work mainly from home, where I can limit my days away to two per week (not overnight)... I don't work during the evenings or at weekends. Doing this is the best way I have found to balance time with my daughter and husband, time to devote to my work and time for myself with no other demands. It keeps me sane even if other people think I'm mad!"

Families are muddling through and in the last 11 years mothers have found themselves with more opportunities than ever before to work and have children. But we have not quite as a society got it right, with one foot

in the traditional past and one foot firmly placed towards a more equal future. The settlement between mothers, fathers and the state has not yet been finalised.

To go forward we must not forget the importance of motherhood, but we also need to make sure that most fathers spend more time at home and work more flexibly to reduce inequality between mums and dads and benefit children.

That means that attention has to be paid, not just to women and childcare, but to the couple relationship and how it works and how decisions about work and caring are taken in the home between fathers and mothers.

Policymakers need to concentrate on who does unpaid work. They also need to ensure that “women’s work” when done outside the home – for example caring and part-time work – is valued and properly paid.

This would mean women would earn more when they do it, but also so that it would attract more men into professions such as childcare. The state has a duty to help women who end up alone with children to have enough family income to keep them and their children out of poverty – be that through work, benefits or a combination of the two.

Mothers and fathers are not equal after childbirth. Mothers need special services which address their needs to give them and their baby a good start in life which means help with maternal and infant mental health, breastfeeding and other help to support their general wellbeing. Fathers need different help to support their partners.

It should not be ‘natural’ that mothers pay such a heavy financial and social penalty for childbirth.

Policy recommendations

- Mothers and fathers should have the right to work flexibly (not just to ask for flexible working), unless employers can make a strong case that it would be detrimental to their business. Small businesses should get government support to enshrine flexible working
- Employers should be encouraged to advertise jobs as available for flexible working and to promote different types of flexible working within their organisations
- Parental leave should be offered on a more equal basis, perhaps having a portion reserved for fathers as in some other European countries – a ‘daddy month’
- Maternity pay should be increased to minimum wage levels
- Free early education for 3- and 4-year-olds, as well as being extended beyond 12.5 hours a week, should continue during the school holidays
- Families where both parents are out of work or families headed by a lone mother should have priority for free childcare
- Part-time pay needs to be paid at the same rate as full-time pay and women in these jobs granted full maternity rights
- The government should review the continuing pay gap between traditional ‘women’s work’ and other sectors
- A well-funded, universal Health Visitor service should have better training in spotting post-natal depression. Services to treat post-natal depression should be quickly available to every mother to improve maternal and infant mental health.



References

- 1 Himmelweit, S. and Sigala, M. (2002) *The Welfare Implications of Mothers' decisions about Work and Childcare*, ESRC Future of Work Programme, Working Paper 20
- 2 Cassen, R. and Kingdon, G. (2007) *Tackling low educational achievement*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- 3 Paull, G. and Brewer, M.(2006) *Newborns and New Schools: Critical times in women's employment*. Department of Work and Pensions
- 4 Kodz, J., Davis, S., Lain, D., Strebler, M., Rick, J., Bates. P., Cummings, J., Meager, N. (2003)*Working Long Hours: a Review of the Evidence Volume 1 – Main Report* Department of Trade and Industry
- 5 Family and Parenting Institute (2003) *Making Britain Family Friendly*. Family and Parenting Institute
- 6 Paull, G. and Brewer, M.(2006) *Newborns and New Schools: Critical times in women's employment*. Department of Work and Pensions
- 7 Connolly, S. and Gregory, M. (2008) *The Price of reconciliation: part-time work, families and women's satisfaction*. The Economic Journal
- 8 Equal Opportunities Commission (2005) *Greater expectations*. Equal Opportunities Commission
- 9 Office of National Statistics (2008) *Social Trends*, Chapter Four. ONS
- 10 Henricson, C. (2007) *The Contractual Culture and Family Services*. Family and Parenting Institute
- 11 Office of National Statistics figures
- 12 Dex, S. and Ward, K. (2007) *Parental Care and Employment in Early Childhood* Equal Opportunities Commission
- 13 Klett-Davies, M. (2007) *Going it alone? Lone motherhood in late modernity*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- 14 Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2003) *Living to work?* London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development
- 15 Booth, A. and van Ours, J. (2008) *Job satisfaction and family happiness: the part-time work puzzle*. The Economic Journal
- 16 Daycare Trust/National Centre for Social Research (2007) *Childcare Nation?* Daycare Trust and National Centre for Social Research
- 17 Daycare Trust (2008) *Childcare Costs Survey* Daycare Trust
- 18 Sylva, K., Melhuish, E. C., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I. and Taggart, B. (2004),*The Effective Provision of Pre-School Education (EPPE) Project: Technical Paper 12 – The Final Report*. DfES, Institute of Education
- 19 Research conducted by Mori for the National Family and Parenting Institute (2003) *Attitudes towards Britain being 'Family Friendly'* Mori
- 20 Family and Parenting Institute (2003) *Making Britain Family Friendly*. Family and Parenting Institute
- 21 Gimson, S. *Health visitors: an endangered species* (2007) Family and Parenting Institute
- 21a Scott, S., Spender, Q., Doolan, M., Jacobs, B., Aspland, H. *Multicentre controlled trial of parenting groups for child antisocial behaviour in clinical practice*. British Medical Journal 2001, 323, 194-7
- 22 Apps, J., Reynolds, J., Ashby, V., and Husain, F. (2007) *Family Support in Children's Centres Planning, Commissioning and Delivery* Family and Parenting Institute
- 23 Klett-Davies, M. (2007) *Going it alone? Lone motherhood in late modernity*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- 24 Curtis, P. Schools replacing parents as 'moral guide' *The Guardian*, 10th March 2008
- 25 Hakim, C., Bradley, K., Price, M., and Michell, L. (2008) *Little Britons, Financing Childcare Choice*. Policy Exchange

The Family and Parenting Institute is a charity aiming to improve the wellbeing of children and families in the UK. We are a catalyst for change, working to make the voices of families heard.

We produce research and policy for the real world. Visit our website at www.familyandparenting.org for more information about our work and our other publications.

Subscribe to our free e-newsletter:
www.familyandparenting.org/keepupdated

About the author

Sally Gimson is Campaigns Manager at the Family and Parenting Institute.

© Family and Parenting Institute 2008

ISBN 978 1 903615 61 4

Note: the quotations in the text are from mothers interviewed for *Real Stories – How Families Spend Time; Reaching Parents*; and other Family and Parenting Institute reports.

Family and Parenting Institute is the operating name of the National Family and Parenting Institute (NFPI). NFPI is a company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales.

Registered company number: 3753345.

VAT Registration No. 833024365.

Registered office: 430 Highgate Studios, 53-59 Highgate Road, London NW5 1TL.

Registered Charity No. 1077444.

Published by The Family and Parenting Institute
430 Highgate Studios
53-79 Highgate Road
London NW5 1TL

Tel 020 7424 3460

Fax 020 7485 3590

Email info@familyandparenting.org

Web www.familyandparenting.org

Subscribe to our free newsletter: www.familyandparenting.org/keepupdated