

doi: 10.3935/rsp.v28i3.1880

doi: 10.3935/rsp.v28i3.1881

## **UVODNA RIJEČ UZ TEMATSKI BROJ ČASOPISA: POLITIKE SKRBI U POSTJUGOSLAVENSKIM ZEMLJAMA**

## **INTRODUCTION TO THE THEMATIC ISSUE OF THE JOURNAL: CARE POLICIES IN THE POST-YUGOSLAV COUNTRIES**

Politike skrbi obuhvaćaju kombinaciju javnopolitičkih instrumenata usmjerenih i na djecu i na odrasle osobe u potrebi skrbi, kao i osobe koje pružaju skrb (npr. roditeljski i drugi dopusti, naknade, usluge ranog i predškolskog odgoja i obrazovanja ili dugotrajne skrbi, subvencije, različite mjere na tržištu rada). Noviji javnopolitički trendovi na europskoj razini koji ističu potrebu povećanja zaposlenosti i suzbijanja (dječjeg) siromaštva stavljaju pojedine aspekte politika skrbi u središte agende socijalnog ulaganja Europske unije (npr. European Commission, 2013.; European Commission, 2021.a, 2021.b). Međutim, zagovarane reforme usko su konstruirane; odnosno, imaju tendenciju prioritiziranja tek onih aspekata politika skrbi koji omogućuju (i potiču) zapošljavanje, dok se podcjenjuje sama perspektiva socijalnih prava (npr. Saraceno, 2015.). Štoviše, one nedovoljno sagledavaju nejednakosti koje proizlaze iz rodne raspodjele skrbi, a još manje nejednakosti do kojih dolazi zbog rastućih nejednakosti u prihodima, nesigurnosti na tržištu rada, pluralizacije obiteljskog života/ciklusa, »krhkih« statusa državljanstva itd., stvarajući nejednake mogućnosti za roditelje da se uključe na tržište rada i u pružanje skrbi (usp. Dobrotić i Blum, 2020.; Chieragato, 2020.). Osim toga, javnopolitičko okruženje i razvoj specifičan za svaku pojedinu zemlju može dodatno produbiti nejednakosti u mogućnostima roditelja da se uključe na tržište rada i u pružanje skrbi.

Potonje može biti osobito slučaj u većini postjugoslavenskih zemalja u kojima su ulaganja u politike skrbi bila često zanemarivana i predmet smanjivanja (socijalnih)

Care policies comprise a mix of policy instruments that target both children and (frail) adults as well as their carers (e.g., parenting and other leaves, benefits, early childhood education and care or long-term care services, subsidies and employment measures). Recent policy developments at the European level that have highlighted a need to raise employment and combat (child) poverty have put some aspects of care policies at the core of the EU's social investment agenda (e.g. European Commission, 2013; European Commission, 2021a, 2021b). However, advocated reforms tended to be narrowly constructed; that is, they tended to prioritise employment-enabling care policies while underplaying a social rights perspective (e.g., Saraceno, 2015). Moreover, they do not fully consider inequalities arising from the gendered division of care, and even more so from growing income inequalities, precariousness in the labour market, pluralisation of family lifestyles/cycles, fragile citizenship statuses, etc. creating unequal opportunities for parents to engage in employment and care (cf. Dobrotić and Blum, 2020; Chieragato, 2020). Besides, country-specific policy environments and developments could further exacerbate inequalities in parents' abilities to engage in employment and care.

The latter may be particularly the case in most of the post-Yugoslav countries, where investments in care policies were often overlooked and a subject of retrenchment. Moreover, a rising national ideology and a pronatalist discourse, characteristic of some countries, have sought to direct reforms towards familialistic policies (cf.

prava. Štoviše, unutar konteksta rastućeg nacionalizma i pronatalitetnog diskursa, karakterističnog za neke zemlje, reforme su se nastojale usmjeriti prema familističkim politikama (usp. Shiffman i sur., 2012.; Dobrotić, 2019., 2021.; Dobrotić i Stropnik, 2020.). Iako razvoj politika skrbi te njihovi ishodi u tim zemljama mogu doprinijeti rastućim kritičkim raspravama na području socijalne politike vezanima uz transformaciju režima skrbi te redistribucijske učinke politika skrbi (npr. efekt sv. Mateja u korištenju roditeljskih dopusta i usluga; vidi Ghysels i van Lancker, 2011.; Pavolini i Van Lancker, 2018.), kao i raspravama o potrebi za razvijanjem inkluzivnih politika (npr. Dobrotić i Blum, 2020.; Blum i Dobrotić, 2021.; Doucet, 2021.), regija ostaje slabo istražena.

Stoga su različiti aspekti razvoja i dizajna politika skrbi u zemljama bivše Jugoslavije bili u središtu interesa webinaru *Reimagining care policies in South-Eastern Europe and beyond*, koji je bio organiziran u okviru InCARE projekta *Social and gender inequalities in care: childcare-related policies and parenting practices in the post-Yugoslav countries and the role of policy ideas* financiranog sredstvima iz programa za istraživanje i inovacije EU-a Obzor 2020., u sklopu sporazuma o dodjeli bespovratnih sredstava *Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions* br. 786826. Webinar je bio dodatno financijski poduprt od strane John Fell fonda Sveučilišta u Oxfordu. Webinar je okupio stručnjake s područja socijalne politike iz svih zemalja bivše Jugoslavije, a kako bi promišljali o razvoju politika skrbi raspravljajući čimbenike, obrasce i ishode reformi politika skrbi za djecu i politika dugotrajne skrbi u regiji unazad desetak godina.

U ovom je tematskom broju objavljeno pet članaka prezentiranih na ranije spomenutom webinaru koji pokrivaju različite aspekte dizajna i razvoja politika skrbi u regiji. Prva se dva članka bave kako razvojem politika skrbi za djecu tako i razvojem

Shiffman et al., 2012; Dobrotić, 2019, 2021; Dobrotić and Stropnik, 2020). Although these policy developments and their outcomes may enlighten critical social policy debates concerned with the transformation of care regimes and redistribution effects of care policies (e.g., a Matthew effect in the use of leaves and services; see Ghysels and Van Lancker, 2011; Pavolini and Van Lancker, 2018), as well as general discussions on inclusive policy development (cf. Dobrotić and Blum, 2020; Blum and Dobrotić, 2021; Doucet, 2021), the region remains underexplored.

Various aspects of care policies development and design in the post-Yugoslav countries have been at the centre of the webinar *“Reimagining care policies in South-Eastern Europe and beyond”* organised as part of the InCARE project *“Social and gender inequalities in care: Childcare-related policies and parenting practices in the post-Yugoslav countries and the role of policy ideas”* financed by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No786826. The webinar was additionally supported by the University of Oxford’s John Fell Fund. The webinar brought together social policy experts from post-Yugoslav countries to (re)think care policies developments in the region by discussing the drivers, patterns, and outcomes of childcare and long-term care reforms in the last decade.

Five articles presented at the aforementioned webinar are published in this thematic issue, covering different aspects of care policy design and developments in the region. The first two articles address both childcare and eldercare policy developments. In the first article, *“Care policy in Slovenia: Divergent trends and convergent attitudes”*, Maša Filipovič Hrast and Tatjana Rakar discuss an extreme dichotomy in care in Slovenia reflected in the uneven development of care policies for children

politika skrbi za starije osobe. U prvom članku *Care policy in Slovenia: divergent trends and convergent attitudes* Maša Filipovič Hrast i Tatjana Rakar govore o ekstremnoj dihotomiji skrbi u Sloveniji, a koja se ogleda u neravnomjernom razvoju politika skrbi za djecu i starije osobe. Dok je skrb za djecu u velikoj mjeri defamilizirana, odnosno, počiva na dobro razvijenom sustavu javnih usluga ranog i predškolskog odgoja i obrazovanja te roditeljskih dopusta, to nije tako u slučaju politika skrbi za starije osobe. Naprotiv, politike skrbi za starije osobe izrazito su familizirane, a u ovom se sektoru može primijetiti i sve veća uloga tržišta. Autorice također ističu kako se ova dihotomija politika skrbi ne odražava u stavovima ljudi te njihovim sklonostima prema uređenju politika skrbi za djecu i starije osobe u Sloveniji.

U drugom članku, *Care Triangle or Care Diamond? The Case of Childcare and Eldercare in Serbia*, Natalija Perišić i Marina Pantelić analiziraju razvoj politika skrbi za djecu i starije osobe u Srbiji u zadnjem desetljeću. Polazeći od koncepta dijamanta skrbi Shahre Razavi autorice istražuju ulogu različitih »sektora« – obitelji/kućanstva, tržišta, države i neprofitnog sektora – u pružanju skrbi za djecu i starije osobe. Analiza ukazuje na veliku ulogu neformalne sfere u skrbi za djecu i starije osobe. Osim toga, dok su sva četiri »sektora« prisutna u pružanju skrbi za starije osobe tvoreći dijamant skrbi na području politika skrbi za starije osobe, to nije tako kod politika skrbi za djecu koje poprimaju oblik trokuta skrbi budući da neprofitni sektor ne postoji kao pružatelj skrbi za djecu u Srbiji.

U trećem članku, *Bosnia and Herzegovina's family policy challenges in meeting the European Union's standards and recommendations*, Nikolina Obradović analizira recentni razvoj obiteljske politike u Bosni i Hercegovini, procjenjujući mogućnosti zemlje da odgovori na preporuke

and older people. While care for children is highly defamilialised, that is, built on a well-developed system of public childcare provision and parenting leaves, that is not the case with care for older people. On the contrary, the latter is highly familialised, and the increasing role of private actors can be observed in this sector. The authors also show that this dichotomy of care policies is not present in people's attitudes and their preferences for the arrangement of care policies for children and older adults in Slovenia.

In the second article, "*Care triangle or care diamond? The case of childcare and eldercare in Serbia*", Natalija Perišić and Marina Pantelić explore the evolution of childcare and eldercare policies in Serbia over the last decade. Relying on the concept of care diamond developed by Shahra Razavi, they explore the role of different 'sectors' – families/households, markets, the state and the voluntary sector – in care provision for children and older adults. The analysis points out the extensive role of the informal sphere in both childcare and eldercare provision. Moreover, while all four 'sectors' of care provision are present in eldercare, forming an eldercare diamond, that is not the case with childcare having a shape of a care triangle as the non-profit sector does not exist as a childcare provider in Serbia.

In the third article, "*Bosnia and Herzegovina's family policy challenges in meeting the European Union's standards and recommendations*", Nikolina Obradović explores recent family policy developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, assessing the country's capacity to respond to the EU recommendations asking to create conditions for a greater participation of women in the labour market. The author points at the fragmented governance structure and the lack of a coherent family policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina, resulting in underdeveloped care services and regional and occupation-

Europske unije kojima se traži stvaranje preduvjeta za veće sudjelovanje žena na tržištu rada. Autorica ukazuje na fragmentirani sustav upravljanja te nedostatak koherentne obiteljske politike u Bosni i Hercegovini, a što je dovelo do nerazvijenih usluga te regionalnih i okupacijskih razlika u pristupu plaćenim roditeljskim dopustima i drugim naknadama usmjerenima obiteljima. Zaključuje kako bi svako poboljšanje u smjeru većeg sudjelovanja žena na tržištu rada zahtijevalo veća ulaganja u politike skrbi, ali prije svega političku volju te poboljšanu suradnju i koordinaciju aktivnosti različitih ministarstava i razina vlasti.

U četvrtom članku, *Early Childhood Education and Care in Kosovo: A targeted educational approach producing and maintaining social and gender inequalities*, Artan Mustafa ukazuje na razvoj sustava ranog i predškolskog odgoja i obrazovanja na Kosovu te iznosi rezultate istraživanja koje je imalo za cilj istražiti i same stope obuhvaćenosti djece uslugama. Ukazuje na nisku dostupnost usluga ranog i predškolskog odgoja i obrazovanja na Kosovu, a koja je među najnižima u regiji. Osim toga, nove usluge koje su razvijane unazad nekoliko godina, dominantno su dolazile kroz privatne pružatelje usluga čime su brojne društvene skupine, poput obitelji nižeg socioekonomskog statusa ili obitelji u ruralnim područjima, stavljene u nepovoljniji položaj. Autor također ukazuje na elemente dizajna politika ranog i predškolskog odgoja i obrazovanja kao što su selektivni kriteriji pristupa te sustav subvencioniranja, a koji su bili ključni u kreiranju nejednakosti u pristupu uslugama. Konačno, analiza ukazuje kako sustavi ranog i predškolskog odgoja i obrazovanja koji počivaju na javno pruženim uslugama mogu smanjiti nejednakosti u ranom i predškolskom odgoju i obrazovanju.

U petom članku, *Fathers on leave: experiences of middle-class fathers on parental*

al inequalities in paid maternity leaves and other family benefits. Obradović concludes that any improvement towards greater participation of women in the labour market would ask for more investments in care policies, but above all a political will and improved cooperation and coordination of activities across different ministries and levels of government.

In the fourth article, "*Early childhood education and care in Kosovo: A targeted educational approach producing and maintaining social and gender inequalities*", Artan Mustafa presents the development of early childhood education and care (ECEC) system in Kosovo and its outcomes in terms of ECEC participation based on survey and administrative data. It points at the low availability of ECEC services in Kosovo, being among the lowest in the region. It also shows how new ECEC capacities that developed in recent years have been predominantly coming through a market-based provision, leaving large social groups such as low-income families, rural families as well as families with other disadvantaged backgrounds worse off. The author also points at the elements of policy design, such as selective enrolment criteria or subsidies system, which has been critical in creating inequalities in access to ECEC services. Finally, his analysis indicates how ECEC systems that rely on public provision may reduce inequalities in ECEC enrolment rates.

In the fifth article, "*Fathers on leave: Experiences of middle-class fathers on parental leave in the City of Zagreb*", Mirna Varga presents the results of her research with fathers in Croatia, aiming to explore implications of the 2013 introduction of two-month fathers' quotas (i.e. non-transferable leave months) within the parental leave policy design. Providing insight into fathers' experiences on parental leave in the City of Zagreb, the author points out

*leave in the City of Zagreb*, Mirna Varga iznosi rezultate istraživanja s očevima u Hrvatskoj, a čiji je cilj bio istražiti implikacije uvođenja dvomjesečnih kvota za očeve unutar sustava roditeljskog dopusta 2013. godine (tzv. neprenosivih mjeseci dopusta). Pružajući uvid u iskustva očeva na roditeljskom dopustu u Gradu Zagrebu, autorica ukazuje na snažnu unutarnju motivaciju očeva da koriste dopust i provode više vremena sa svojom djecom u ranoj fazi roditeljstva. Većina očeva koristila je dopuste u trajanju od tri mjeseca ili duže, a to im je iskustvo omogućilo da nauče nove vještine glede brige za djecu i kućanskih poslova, ali i da preispitaju svoj odnos prema poslu i obitelji. Istraživanje također ukazuje na elemente dizajna politika roditeljskih dopusta koji mogu otežati korištenje dopusta od strane očeva, kao što su niska gornja granica roditeljskih naknada i nedostatak informacija o njihovim pravima. Također naglašava važnost podrške na radnom mjestu kako bi očevi više koristili dopuste te potrebu za promjenom percepcije očeva kao »sekundarnih pružatelja skrbi« u Hrvatskoj.

the strong intrinsic motivation of fathers to use the leave and spend more time with their children in the early parenting phase. Most of the fathers used leaves for three months or longer, and this experience allowed them to learn new skills in relation to childcare and housework, but also to rethink their relation to work and family. The research also points at elements of policy design that may hinder fathers' use of leave, such as a low ceiling on parental benefits and a lack of information about their entitlements. It also stresses the importance of support at the workplace for fathers' use of leave and a need to change the perception of fathers as "secondary" carers in Croatia.

Guest Editor  
Ivana Dobrotić

Gostujuća urednica  
Ivana Dobrotić

## LITERATURA

- Blum, S., & Dobrotić, I. (2021). The inclusiveness of social rights: The case of leave policies. *Social Inclusion*, 9(2), 222–226. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v9i2.4523>
- Chierigato, E. (2020). A work-life balance for all? Assessing the inclusiveness of EU Directive 2019/1158. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 36(1), 59–80. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3502888>
- Dobrotić, I. (2019). *Changing faces of social and gender inequalities in childcare-related policies design in the post-Yugoslav countries*. Technical Report – InCare project. Available at [https://www.incare-pyc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/INCARE\\_final\\_en.pdf](https://www.incare-pyc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/INCARE_final_en.pdf)
- Dobrotić, I. (2021). „Rastuća (ne)vidljiva većina“? Nesigurna i netipična zaposlenost i roditeljstvo. Research Report – InCare project. Available at <https://www.incare-pyc.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/InCARE-report-final-web.pdf>
- Dobrotić, I., & Blum, S. (2020). Inclusiveness of parental-leave benefits in twenty-one European countries: Measuring social and gender inequalities in leave eligibility. *Social Politics*, 27(3), 588–614. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxz023>
- Dobrotić, I., & Stropnik, N. (2020). Gender equality and parenting-related leaves in 21 former socialist countries. *International Journal of Sociology & Social Policy*, 40(5-6), 495–514. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-04-2019-0065>
- Doucet, A. (2021). Socially inclusive parenting leaves and parental benefit entitlements: Rethinking care and work binaries. *Social Inclusion*, 9(2), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v9i2.4003>
- European Commission. (2013). *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Towards Social Investment for Growth and Cohesion – including implementing the European Social Fund 2014-2020*, COM/2013/083 final. Available at <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A52013DC0083>
- European Commission. (2021a). *European Pillar of Social Rights*. Available at <https://op.europa.eu/webpub/empl/european-pillar-of-social-rights/en/>
- European Commission. (2021b). *The EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child and the European Child Guarantee*. Available at [https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/rights-child/eu-strategy-rights-child-and-european-child-guarantee\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/rights-child/eu-strategy-rights-child-and-european-child-guarantee_en)
- Ghysels, J., & Van Lancker, W. (2011). The unequal benefits of activation: An analysis of the social distribution of family policy among families with young children. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 21(5), 472–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928711418853>
- Pavolini, E., & Van Lancker, W. (2018). The Matthew effect in childcare use: A matter of policies or preferences?. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(6), 878–893. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2017.1401108>
- Saraceno, C. (2015). A critical look to the social investment approach from a gender perspective. *Social Politics*, 22(2), 257–269. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxv008>
- Shiffman J., Škrabalo, M., & Subotić, J. (2012). Reproductive rights and the state in Serbia and Croatia. *Social Science & Medicine*, 54(4), 625–642. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536\(01\)00134-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0277-9536(01)00134-4)