

**SICENTER**  
**Socio-economic Indicators Center**  
**Ljubljana, Slovenia**

**ANALYSIS OF SURVEY FOR SLOVENIA**

**Professor Pavle Sicerl and Matija Remec**  
[Pavle.Sicerl@sicenter.si](mailto:Pavle.Sicerl@sicenter.si)

**Ljubljana,**  
**March 2002**

# ANALYSIS OF SURVEY FOR SLOVENIA

Pavle Sicherl and Matija Remec  
SICENTER

## **Executive summary**

### **Chapter 1: Patterns of flexibility**

1. *Demographic variables*
2. *A provisional categorization of flexibility*
3. *Patterns of time flexibility*
4. *Patterns of place flexibility*
5. *Patterns of flexibility of conditions*
6. *Patterns of career flexibility*
7. *Perceptions of flexibility*

### **Chapter 2: Patterns of work**

1. *The accumulation of different kinds of work*
2. *Patterns informal and voluntary work*

### **Chapter 3: Household organisation**

1. *Domestic roles*
2. *Patterns of decision making in the household*

### **Chapter 4: Work/household relations**

1. *Integration of home and work*
2. *Employment and child care arrangements*
3. *Perceptions of family/work arrangements*

### **Chapter 5: Additional information on three flexibility categories in Slovenia**

1. *Categorization and work characteristics*
2. *Personal characteristics and social groups*
3. *Satisfaction with various aspects of work*
4. *Decisions about various aspects of work*
5. *Possible work/family conflicts*
6. *Personal perceptions of well being*
7. *Household characteristics*

## **REFERENCES**

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

**APPENDIX 1:** *Technical report on the survey*

**APPENDIX 11:** *Tables pertaining to the survey*

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The results of the Slovenian survey confirmed that temporary jobs are already an important category of flexible arrangements; their share in employment at around 12 per cent is about the same as for the EU15 average. However, part time jobs are much less frequent in our sample and are not an important category at all. The most common incidence is for a 40-hour week in the main activity. Men work more hours per week than women in the main activity and in all activities. In addition, 18 per cent indicated that they did voluntary work and 50 per cent unpaid work for a friend or a relative at least once monthly. The dominant working schedule is regular working hours (45 per cent), shift work applies to 22 per cent, and 11 per cent have the possibility of flexitime. About 30 per cent would prefer to work fewer hours than now and only about 5 per cent more hours. A high 39 per cent of men and 50 per cent of women commute daily to a place of work outside of the locality in which they live; about 6 per cent work at home. Permanent contracts are still the most prevalent (64 per cent), followed by fixed term contract (12 per cent) and self employment (8 per cent).

With regard to their position in the main activity, Slovenians are in general satisfied (66 per cent or more are somewhat satisfied and very satisfied) with other aspects of job satisfaction, but not with earnings (only 38 per cent in those two categories). Work is placed high in the system of values in Slovenia. Nearly 50 per cent of the respondents also state that they have never experienced a situation when their work would make it difficult to do some necessary household tasks or to fulfil the responsibility towards their family and other important persons in the last three months. The conflict between work and household tasks was not reported as a major issue, only 2 per cent always experience such a conflict and another 8 per cent experience it often. The family-work pattern is different for families with children, but the expressed level of conflict is low. Slovenian households are rather well equipped with household goods, and 78 per cent live in their own house or flat, additional 13 per cent are not paying rent. A rather high percentage of respondents (from 39 per cent to 46 per cent) say that they are those who are mainly responsible for the domestic activities asked, with a clear gender division of labour. The time use study shows that the combined time for domestic and employment roles accounts for about 27 per cent of all time available to men and for about 31 per cent of all time available to women - the rest is spare time and time for primary needs.

In Chapter 5 we have developed a concept of flexibility that could distinguish between desirable and undesirable forms of flexibility. We first grouped respondents into eight categories, combining them later into three major groups; the major criterion was employment status of the respondent, combined with some other 'objective' characteristics of flexibility. These three groups are: flexibility group A (flexible workers for who the flexibility seems to be a preferred pattern of work), flexibility group B (shift and irregular work patterns, temporary jobs and others), and standard employment group C (non flexible full time employment, regular working schedule, one activity). This produces statistically significant differences with respect to work characteristics: e.g. people in flexibility group A undertake more work activities, more hours of work per week, have a more flexible schedule, as well as a more varied type of contract and place of work. This group is more likely to have higher incomes and more household goods, including Internet and PCs. They also have more satisfaction with earnings but less with working hours. On the other hand, flexibility group B are more often disadvantaged. The three flexibility categories show very significant differences in ('objective') characteristics related to work and practically no significant differences in ('subjective') opinions about possible work/family conflicts or agreement on various household issues.

## **Chapter 1: Patterns of flexibility**

### *1. Background variables*

In the survey of the 1008 respondents, 53.5 per cent were women and 46.5 per cent were men. The largest number of households by size were households with four members (29.7 per cent) followed by households with three members (23.1 per cent), households with two members (19.9 per cent) and those with five or more members (19.5 per cent); there were only 7.1 per cent of one member households. Probably the most important family typology is the division into households with and those without children. In the Slovenian survey, the share of households with children under 15 years is 31.1 per cent; the share of households without children under 15 years is 68.9 per cent.

Respondents were classified by age into four groups. Of the 1006 respondents 46.5 per cent fell into the age group 26-50, 21.4 per cent into the age group 51-65, 16.6 per cent were older than 65, and 15.5 per cent belonged to the age group 18-25 years. With respect to urban/rural situation, 56 per cent of the respondents came from urban and 44 per cent from rural environment.

The economic standard of the households is analysed here in terms of ownership of dwellings, ownership of permanent goods in the households and by household income (sextiles). With respect to the ownership of dwellings, about 78 per cent of the respondents live in their own dwellings; an additional 13 per cent are not paying rent. More than 98 per cent own a washing machine, a refrigerator, and a colour TV, 95 per cent possess telephones and about 90 per cent of households own a car and a freezer. For this group of products there is little differentiation. However, there is a significant relationship between income and Internet access, PC, satellite dish/cable TV and ownership of a second dwelling (house or flat).

For the variable 'social group of respondent', we are here using an additional variable, which was available in the joint survey in Slovenia and thus dividing the respondents into three social groups: working class (31.5 per cent), middle class (51.9 per cent) and upper middle class (5.9 per cent) – 10.5 per cent of respondents do not fit in those three classes. As far as work typology is concerned, in the next section a more detailed explanation is provided of how a provisional categorization of flexibility groups was defined.

### *2. A provisional categorization of flexibility*

In this section we shall discuss a provisional categorization of the survey respondents in different categories of flexibility. This grouping will serve the purpose of initiating some hypotheses as to how certain aspects of flexibility could be arranged in broader groups that could be more subject to further empirical analysis. There are many aspects of flexibility, the broadest subdivision probably being the flexibility concerns of enterprises and flexibility concerns of households. For our study the latter is more important, although the actual implementation of policies and realizations of intentions of both sides happen only in interaction with the labour and product markets.

One possible approach for an operational definition of flexibility is that flexibility is contrasted to the standard form of arrangements. In terms of work flexibility, the standard form of employment, which is seemingly also the most desirable form from the point of view

of job security in Slovenia, is a permanent contract for full time employment with a regular working schedule. In combining the empirical prevalence of such cases with the prevailing subjective preference, we will form the first of the three major categories of employment as those employed full time, with regular working schedule and only one economic activity. This category will be labelled 'standard pattern of employment'. This means that the rest of cases could be labelled flexible forms of employment. Such a dichotomous variable has an advantage of being simple, but the simplicity is outweighed by at least two disadvantages. One disadvantage is that the highest level of aggregation of various flexibility forms encompasses too many diverse categories. In general, the higher the level of disaggregation, the more specific conditions can be taken into account; but the price for using many categories is small cell sizes (especially in surveys) and problems of using the results to generalize for policy purposes. It is difficult to find the proper balance between these two aspects. The second disadvantage is related to the fact that some forms of flexibility are very desirable from the point of view of the respondent, while some other forms of flexibility might be imposed on him/her as unfavourable conditions, which he/she has to accept to get the job.

In this report we have used several subdivisions of flexible (non-standard) employment forms. One was to break down these forms into eight subcategories. There were advantages in doing so, but in many cases it was difficult to draw statistically significant conclusions. Therefore, we have broken down the flexible (non-standard) employment forms into two major groups: flexible employment A and flexible employment B. The flexible employment B category was formed by adding together several forms of flexibility that entail some negative elements. Of course, it is not possible to be sure whether the breakdown into eight categories used in this process (see Tables 5.1a and 5.1b) is appropriate or not, without knowing the subjective evaluations of the persons involved. However, as a first approximation one can start from such assumptions and in a later analysis repeat the exercise with a more refined categorization. In the flexible employment B category there are those who work shift-work, those who work irregular hours, those working with fixed contracts, part time employees, casual workers and those employed but laid off. One can call these forms 'involuntary' or 'undesirable' forms of flexibility. The flexible employment category A encompasses flexible people employed full time with more than one economic activity or having a possibility of flexitime, or self-employed, or students with additional jobs as well as the retired doing additional jobs. This approximation is meant to indicate the likelihood of 'voluntary' or 'desirable' forms of flexibility.

In the empirical analysis, this categorization into three groups - flexible employment A, flexible employment B and full time regular schedule - provided interesting results that could be helpful in planning further work on the national reports or on analysis of surveys and possibly later in the comparative stage of the research across nations. The initial results can be helpful in searching for a more precise, yet pragmatic definition of flexibility at this level of analysis. With this categorization several interesting significant differences between the three groups were established from the Slovenian survey data, which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.

### *3. Patterns of time flexibility*

The normal pattern is the 40 hour working week in the main activity, as shown by the modus of the distribution, and this can be considered as the standard against which the non-standard patterns of hours of work can be discussed. A clear majority of all answers refer to that exact

figure of 40 hours per week. If we take a slightly wider class from 37 to 42 hours, about 57 per cent of all fall into this category, 11 per cent work less than 36 hours and about 32 per cent work 43 or more hours. It is to the groups below and above the standard working hours that the analysis of the time flexibility has to pay more attention. If we take into consideration all activities (i.e. some respondents work in more than one activity), then the share of those working 43 or more hours increases to nearly 40 per cent. Table 1.2 adds some information on hours of work for family members of the respondents. For this group the share of the 'standard' working week (37-42 hours) is 70 per cent, which is considerably higher than for the main activity of the respondents.

Table 1.1 Hours of work in main activity and all activities for respondents

Hours of work	Main activity		All activities		Main activity *		All activities *	
	N	%	N	%	M (%)	F (%)	M (%)	F (%)
Less than 36 hours	63	10.8	58	9.9	7.9	14.3	7.3	13.1
From 37 to 42	330	56.7	296	50.7	50.3	64.3	42.3	60.7
From 43 to 50	106	18.2	113	19.4	23.1	12.4	23.7	14.2
More than 50 hours	83	14.3	117	20.0	18.7	9.0	26.8	12.0
Total	582	100	584	100	100	100	100	100

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table 1.2 Distribution of hours of work (male and female) for family members

Distribution of hours of work (male and female)	M	F	Total
	n=552	n=456	n=1008
Less than 36 hours	6.9	10.3	8.4
From 37 to 42	66.8	72.8	69.5
From 43 to 50	14.7	12.1	13.6
More than 50 hours	11.6	4.8	8.5

Men are working more hours in employment per week than women. In the group of respondents with one or more economic activities, when analyzing the hours of work for the main activity, 42 per cent of men work more than the standard hours, and only 21 per cent of women. If hours of work in all activities are taken into account, the difference is even greater, 50 per cent of men work more than standard hours; the corresponding number for women is 26 per cent. On the other hand, the percentage of women in the category less than 36 hours is higher than that for men. Thus, the gender differences with respect to hours of work, both in the main activity and in all activities, are statistically significant at the 1per cent significance level. Cross-tabulation of hours of work with age groups shows that the age group of 26 to 50 years is concentrated in the standard category 37-42 hours; younger and older respondents show a wider distribution, i.e. they work shorter or longer hours.

Table 1.3. Hours of work for all activities by three flexibility categories (per cent) (n=565)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C
Less than 36 hours	14.8	11.9	1.7
From 37 to 42	21.4	55.0	75.7
From 43 to 50	23.1	16.8	18.8
More than 50 hours	40.7	16.3	3.9

The most interesting variables related to hours of work of the respondents are income of the individual and of the household, urban-rural disaggregation, working schedule and preferences for fewer, more or the same hours of work.

Table 1.4 Hours of work for all activities: urban – rural (n=584)

Hours of work	Urban	Rural	Total
Less than 36	11.9	7.4	9.9
From 37 to 42	48.9	52.9	50.7
From 43 to 50	20.2	18.3	19.3
More than 50 hours	19.0	21.4	20.0

A higher than the average share of persons working 36 or fewer hours is observed in urban areas, most probably as a result of the greater availability of non-standard work possibilities. The fact that the lowest sextile of personal income distribution shows a distinctly higher share of people working fewer hours per week than other sextiles is also very pronounced. On the other hand, the highest class of personal incomes shows the highest share of persons working more than the average number of hours, while 52 per cent of those from the highest group of income work more than 43 hours in all activities (45 per cent in the case for hours of work in the first activity), which is much higher than in the lowest groups of personal income. These differences are somewhat less pronounced when the cross-tabulation of hours of work is done with household income, but the pattern is still very clear.

In addition to hours of work, working schedule is an important variable in analysing the time flexibility. About 45 per cent of respondents work regular working hours, which were in the survey defined as the pattern of working Monday morning to Friday afternoon. Flexitime was defined as the possibility that while working regular working hours one can start or finish work earlier or later. About 10 per cent of men and 12 per cent of women are in this category. Shift work is important for a substantial minority – 21 per cent of men and 24 per cent of women. The numbers with an irregular working schedule are also substantial, about 18 per cent of men and 15 per cent of women.

Table 1.5 Working schedule by gender

Working schedule by gender	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Regular working hours (Monday morning to Friday afternoons)	147	47.1	113	43.3	260	45.4
Shift work	64	20.5	63	24.1	127	22.2
Flexitime	30	9.6	32	12.3	62	10.8
Other regular schedule	16	5.1	12	4.6	28	4.9
Irregular, it varies	55	17.6	39	14.9	94	16.4
DK/NA	0	0.0	2	0.8	2	0.3
	312	100	261	100	573	100

Table 1.6 Preference for hours of work in main activity by gender

Preference for hours of work in main activity by gender	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
The same hours	197	62.7	167	63.7	364	63.2
More hours	16	5.1	9	3.4	25	4.3
Fewer hours	91	29.0	75	28.6	166	28.8
DK/NA	10	3.2	11	4.2	21	3.6
Total	314	100	262	100	576	100

A very interesting pattern of expressed preferences is presented in Table 1.6. A very clear majority of both men and women (about 63 per cent) prefer to work the same hours as they are working now. Even more interesting is the division of expressed preferences between working more or fewer hours. The predominant preference is for working fewer hours (about 29 per cent of both men and women) while only about 4 per cent indicate that they would prefer to work more hours.

While the reasons for choosing to work fewer hours or the same hours were broken down in eight categories in the questionnaire, it is of interest that other reasons than those suggested in the first seven categories are also important (23 per cent of reasons for working fewer hours and 14 per cent of reasons for working the same number of hours). As the most important reason for wanting to work the same number of hours, 25 per cent of men and 36 per cent of women indicate that in such a way they can meet their domestic commitments and spend time with their family. An important reason (about 20 per cent for both men and women) is that they would not like (or are not able) to work more hours. It is also interesting that 25 per cent of men and 9 per cent of women indicate that they are earning enough by working the present number of hours.

As mentioned above, among those who would prefer a change in the number of hours of work, those preferring to work fewer hours outnumber those who would prefer to work more hours by at least 6:1. The most important reason for working fewer hours is their preference to spending more time with their family (or fulfilling domestic commitments); 30 per cent of men and 44 per cent of women who would prefer to work fewer hours stated that reason. The next category of expressed reason in line is other reasons (24 per cent of men and 21 per cent of women) followed by the wish not to work long hours. About 7 per cent would like to work fewer hours in order to undertake education or training (see the respective tables in the appendix).

#### 4. *Patterns of place flexibility*

The most frequent arrangement for place of work is found in the category 'different locality to which one commutes': 39 per cent of men and 50 per cent of women fall into this category. This means that there is a high percentage of workers in Slovenia who daily commute to a place of work that is outside of the locality in which they live. Slovenia does not have a very high concentration of population in the capital city; the pattern of population settlement is not very concentrated. This means that people have to commute to the place of work, the distribution of which is more concentrated than the distribution of population settlement.

Table 1.7 Distribution of place of work by gender

Place of work	Male		Female		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
At home	20	6.4	13	4.9	33	5.7
Combined at home and elsewhere	20	6.4	7	2.6	27	4.7
Within the locality where you live	104	33.2	103	38.9	207	35.8
Within a different locality to which you commute	123	39.3	133	50.2	256	44.3
Abroad	5	1.6	1	0.4	6	1.0
Always changing	40	12.8	8	3.0	48	8.3
Other situation	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.2
Total	313	100.0	265	100.0	578	100



Obviously, the greatest difference is between urban and rural areas; 56 per cent of employed from the urban areas work in the same place as they reside; another 4 per cent of them work at home. In contrast, 68 per cent of employed from rural areas work in a place other than the settlement in which they live. As far as gender differences are concerned, 13 per cent of men as against 3 per cent of women always change their place of work. As far as social groups are concerned, 49 per cent of respondents from the working class work in a different locality to which they commute, as against only 30 per cent of the upper middle class. The category of workers who always change their place of work is pronounced, with 15 per cent in the upper middle class, followed by 11 per cent of the working class and 5 per cent of the middle class falling into this category. As far as the combination of age and place of work is concerned, older people are much more inclined to work at home than younger people and less inclined to commute. The highest percentage of those commuting is to be found in the 18-25 year and the 26-50 year groups with 53 per cent and 46 per cent, respectively, as opposed to only 29 per cent of workers older than 50 years. The differences with respect to the place of work are not related to household income; across all sextiles the differences in percentages are not pronounced. Differences are slightly higher for personal income, a higher percentage of the lower two sextiles that work at home is most probably an indication that they could not find another job.

With respect to changing place of work for the main activity, profound differences are found in comparing men and women; 85 per cent of women and 55 per cent of men stated that they never vary the place of work in their main activity. Again, nearly 19 per cent of men vary the place of work every day as against 2 per cent of women. As far as social groups are concerned, about 70 per cent of those belonging to the working class and to the middle class, never change the place of work, as against only 44 per cent for the upper middle class. Lower income groups seem to experience less flexibility as far as varying the place of work is concerned.

Table 1.8 Main activity - work in varying places by gender (n=569)

	Male (n=310)	Female (n=259)
	%	%
Never	55	85
Varies some other way	9	4
According to seasons	4	1
Each month	5	2
Each week	9	7
Each day	19	2

Table 1.9 Who decides on the place of work by gender (n=549)

	Male (n=305)	Female (n=244)
	%	%
I decide	24	16
Employer decides	55	69
Employer and I decide together	10	7
It is outside our control	12	9

An important point with respect to the flexibility of place is who decides about this flexibility. About 20 per cent respondents can decide on the place of work by themselves, 24 per cent of

men and 16 per cent of women. The prevailing trend is that the employer decides on the place of work and this is the case for 55 per cent of men and 69 per cent of women. When the flexibility of decisions with respect to the place of work is analysed across the three social groups, the percentage of those who decide by themselves is the highest in the upper middle class and lowest in the working class, while the direction is of course reversed for the percentage of those whose place of work is decided by the employer, which is much higher for the working class than for the middle or the upper middle class.

Table 1.10 Decision on the place of work by social groups (n=512)

	Working class (n=170)	Middle class (n=309)	Upper middle class (n=33)
	%	%	%
I decide	14	23	30
Employer decides	72	59	42
Employer and I decide together	5	9	15
It is outside our control	10	9	12

### 5. *Patterns of flexibility of conditions*

The conditions of work can be studied from many angles, including the hours and place of work, which were discussed already in the previous two sections. Further possibilities for analyzing the conditions of work are employment status, form of contract, number of activities worked and different sources of income. In the survey the respondents had the possibility to answer the question about different sources of income as a multiple response question. The results are presented in Table 2.2 in Chapter 2. The most important sources of income were wage or salary (52 per cent of cases), pensions (30 per cent of cases) and additional job (10 per cent of cases).

Table 1.11 shows the employment status of respondents. The two most important groups in these categorizations are those employed full time (about 40 per cent of total answers) and retired from paid work (about 27 per cent of all answers). There are about 7 per cent of unemployed family members, which is very close to the aggregate figure for unemployment in Slovenia by the ILO definition. As this question about employment status was also a multiple response question, 425 of respondents were employed full-time, which is about 42 per cent of 1008 respondents in the survey.

Table 1.11 Employment status of respondents

	N	%
Employed full time	425	39.6
Employed part time	10	0.9
Employed on fixed contract	62	5.8
In employment but temporarily laid off	4	0.4
Self employed	42	3.9
Casual worker (working from on a day to day arrangement)	36	3.4
Farmer	22	2.1
Pupil/student in education or training	87	8.1
Government training scheme	0	0.0
Unpaid worker in family business	4	0.4
Unemployed	60	5.6
Retired from paid work	279	26.0
Housekeeper	30	2.8
Sick or disabled	9	0.8
Other	3	0.3
Total	1073	100%

The share of those retired from paid work is about 28 per cent, which is high, but in agreement with the results of the Household Expenditure Survey for 1998, where this share was close to 30 per cent. This high percentage of pensioners was influenced by a high level of retirements at a lower age in the trough of the depression in the beginning of 1990s, when the average age of those retiring fell by two years for men and for 3 years for women (Stanovnik, 2001).

Table 1.12 Types of contract that respondents have with their employer in the MAIN activity

Type of contract	n	%
Permanent contract	365	64
Fixed term	69	12
Self employed	45	8
No contract	30	5
With a temporary work agency	16	3
On a fee only basis	13	2
Contract but with reduced or no working time	12	2
"On call" subject to requirements of employment	11	2
On a work experience project	2	0
Don't know, no answer	10	2
	573	100

When analyzing the group of respondents who had at least one economic activity in the last twelve months it is shown that the predominant pattern of contract in Slovenia is still a permanent contract, with 64 per cent of respondents giving this response. When asked the reason, 2.5 per cent responded that they could not get a permanent contract and another 3.6 per cent indicated that they could only get a contract for a shorter time. Those who responded that they did not wish to have a permanent contract (only 1.2 per cent) mentioned that the main reason for this is the wish to continue their education.

Having a fixed-term contract is reported by 12 per cent of the respondents, who answered the question as to what sort of contract they had with their employer in their main activity. This category is second most important after the prevailing category of a permanent contract. The fixed-term contract, however, has been increasing as a form of contract in recent times, as many people who are entering new employment are offered this rather than a permanent contract. The figure is close to about 10 per cent of persons with temporary employment as a percentage of all persons in employment in 1998 in the Household Expenditure Survey. It is of interest to observe that the share of people in temporary employment is declining from the lowest to the highest income deciles for both men and women (Stanovnik, 2001). In terms of international comparisons, the 12 per cent share of contracts of limited duration in Slovenia is very close to the EU15 average and to the situation in the Netherlands and Sweden, while the share in the UK is considerably lower. Also the gender distribution of temporary jobs is quite similar to that in the Netherlands and Sweden.

Part time employment results show a very different picture. Firstly, as seen in Table 1.11, only 1 per cent of the respondents answered that they are employed part time, even in a multiple response question. Here the results of the HWF survey are very different from the percentage reported in the statistics on part time employment by SORS. The statistical office namely defines part time employment as employment of less than 36 hours per week. In such a way Slovenia is then quoted in international comparisons with part time employment of about 6 per cent of total employment in 2000 (European Commission, 2001). The corresponding percentage arising from the HWF survey is about 2 per cent. Thus, part time employment is in Slovenia probably much lower than shown in the official statistics. Secondly, whether one or the other estimate is taken into account, in Slovenia part time employment is much lower than in the EU countries participating in the HWF project (the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK).

Employment status was also the main, though not the exclusive criteria for the provisional flexibility categorization into the three groups explained in section 2 of this chapter and further elaborated in Chapter 5. When sources of income are cross-tabulated with the three flexibility categories, it can be observed that the situation is quite different among these three flexibility categories. The group 'full time and regular schedule, one economic activity' is practically exclusively dependent on wages and salaries (100 per cent of responses), with the addition of other social transfers, which do not depend on the condition of work but on the social security conditions. Flexible employment group B is substantially more diversified with respect to the sources of income, but still very much concentrated in the wage or salary category (82.8 per cent of responses). Flexible employment group A has a much higher incidence of different and additional incomes: wage and salary is reported by 51.6 per cent of respondents as being the main source of income, 34 per cent of respondents report income from additional jobs. There are also important income sources among Group A flexibility respondents (self employed earnings for 17.6 per cent of responses and profit from a business for 8.0 per cent of respondents) which are practically negligible in the other two groups.

Table 1.13 Different incomes of respondent by flexibility category (n=578)

	Flexibility group A (n=188)	Flexibility group B (n=209)	Standard group C (n=181)
	%	%	%
Wage or salary *	51.6	82.8	100
Self employed earnings *	17.6	2.9	
Income from additional jobs (can be occasional and / or casual work) *	34.0	11.5	2.2
Income from own farming or agricultural production (including produce) *	9.0	3.8	
Pension *	13.3	1.4	0.6
Unemployment benefit *	0.5	3.8	
Grant or scholarship for education and training, including loans *	9.6		1.1
Income from investments, savings or rents from properties *	6.4	0.5	1.7
Profit from a business *	8.0	1.0	1.1
Private transfers (e.g. alimony, or payment from others such as parents) *	9.6	0.5	0.6
Other sources	9.0	3.8	3.3
Other social transfers (e.g. child allowance, parental leave)	14.9	12.4	21.0
None, the respondent had no income last month	0.5	0.5	

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

### 6. Patterns of career flexibility

In the first decade of transition, employment opportunities changed radically. Indeed, the changes in the labour market were much more profound than the changes in the levels of production. The general trends are discussed in the Country Context Report for Slovenia. In this section the changes of the respondents in their occupational life in the last decade are presented. About 19 per cent entered employment for the first time and about 16 per cent retired from employment. In a considerable number of cases, retirement was due to the deteriorating economic situation and the corresponding problems in the employment field that were shortsightedly alleviated by early retirement schemes. About 13 per cent reported that they lost employment once and 12 per cent reported that they changed employment more than once. When one adds those who started to work in a second job (7 per cent) or started private business (6 per cent), it is obvious that considerable changes have taken place during the transition.

Table 1.14 Changes that have occurred in the occupational life of the respondents since 1989

Changes	%	n
Changed employment only once	20	918
Entered employment for the first time	19	927
Retired from employment	16	926
Promoted to a higher position	16	920
Lost employment only once	13	917
Changed employment more than once	12	923
Changed profession only once	11	914
Started to work in a second job	7	912
Started private business	6	919
Changed profession more than once	5	911
Lost employment more than once	3	912
Demoted to a lower position	3	909

What is of interest, however, is that the most frequent answer to two questions, describing the most characteristic factor for the present situation and describing the reason for the last

change in employment, were ‘other situation’ (20 per cent) and ‘other reason’ (41 per cent). That means that several categories offered as answers to these questions did not cover the range of reasons for changing jobs.

Table 1.15 If the respondent’s employment changed, which of the following possibilities best describes his/her present situation? (n=562)

Situation	%
Other situation	20
Retired	19
Went to a different company that existed in some form already prior to 1990.	16
Works basically in the same place, but the firm has been reorganized or privatized.	13
Went to a different company, which was established in or after 1990.	8
Started your own business.	6
Unemployed (looking for a job)	6
Stays at home	5
Does casual work (where and when you find it)	3
DK/NA	3
Went to work in agriculture	1

The most important specific reason was retirement (19 per cent), followed by change to a different company, which had existed already prior to 1990 (16 per cent), working in the same place in a firm that has been reorganized or privatized (13 per cent) and working for a different company established after 1990 (8 per cent). The rest reported that they had started their own business (6 per cent), are unemployed and looking for a job (6 per cent), decided to stay at home (5 per cent), do casual work (3 per cent), or went to work in agriculture (1 per cent).

Table 1.16 The main reason for the respondents’ last change in employment (n=525)

Reasons	%
Other reason	41
The company was closed or reorganized	20
Offer of a more interesting position	12
Production was cut down, economies were introduced /they were made redundant	9
Unsatisfied with the employment	8
DK/NA	6
Wanted to become self employed	4

Some of these changes in employment were forced upon the respondents (the company was closed or reorganized or they were made redundant or were working in unsatisfactory employment). On the other hand, some of them wanted to become self-employed, or were offered a more interesting position. Many describe negative rather than positive reasons for their last change in employment. However, firm conclusions are difficult to draw because 41 per cent of respondents cited ‘other reasons’ as the main reason for their last change in employment.

## 7. Perceptions of flexibility

Firstly, the answers about subjective satisfaction with the main work activity and various aspects of work will be analysed. In general, the answers to the question ‘how satisfied are you with your main work?’ show that the respondents are quite satisfied with their main work: 14 per cent are very satisfied and 57 per cent are somewhat satisfied, with another 20 per cent neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. This leaves about 7 per cent of those that are somewhat dissatisfied and about 2 per cent that are very dissatisfied.

When asked about their satisfaction with various aspects of work, it is of interest to observe that the highest degree of satisfaction was expressed for location of work and duration of contract. These two categories are followed by satisfaction with stability of work and hours of work; and the least satisfaction is expressed with respect to the earnings from the work.

Tables 1.17 How satisfied are you in general with your main work?

	In general with your main work	Stability of your work	Duration of your contract	Your hours of work	Your location of work	Your earnings
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied	14.2	13.5	16.6	8.5	19.7	5.7
Somewhat satisfied	56.8	51.3	49.3	58.2	63.9	32.2
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20.4	17.5	6.4	17.4	10.9	31.1
Somewhat dissatisfied	6.6	10.4	4.7	12.6	3.3	20.2
Very dissatisfied	1.7	3.1	2.8	2.4	1.2	8.8
Not applicable	0.2	2.4	17.8	0.5	0.9	0.7
Don't know, no answer	0.2	1.7	2.4	0.3	0.2	1.2
N	579	577	578	579	579	578

In Table 1.7 it was established that 39 per cent of men and 50 per cent of women work in a different locality to which they commute. Notwithstanding that, 20 per cent of the respondents were very satisfied with their location of work, and 64 per cent somewhat satisfied with their location of work, while less than 5 per cent were somewhat or very dissatisfied. It seems that there is a high degree of tolerance with respect to traveling to work. In a survey by the Statistical Office in 1999 the answers showed that about 60 per cent of employed persons would be prepared to commute to work. This percentage included also employed persons who were already commuting and would be prepared to spend more time doing so. For unemployed persons this share was a lot higher, about 94 per cent of them were prepared to commute to work (SORS, 1999, p.11).

With respect to the expressed satisfaction with the duration of the contract, nearly one half of the respondents were somewhat satisfied and one sixth were even very satisfied, which may be the consequence of the fact that about 64 per cent of the respondents, who were answering the question about the sort of contract that they have with the employer in their main activity, had a permanent contract. It will be of interest to see what the expressed satisfaction with the duration of contract is with those segments of respondents who had contracts of fixed duration or other non-permanent arrangements. The situation with the satisfaction with stability of work shows similar results: about two thirds of the respondents were somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with the stability of work. The interesting difference is that there is a higher percentage of those somewhat dissatisfied with stability of work (about 10 per cent) than with

the duration of the contract (about 5 per cent). Even a slightly wider distribution was observed with the satisfaction with hours of work. Nearly two thirds of the respondents were somewhat satisfied and very satisfied with hours of their work, but there were a higher number (about 13 per cent) of those who were somewhat dissatisfied with their hours of work.

In sharp contrast with the results with respect to the other four aspects of job satisfaction asked (where the combined categories of somewhat satisfied and very satisfied represented nearly two thirds or more, and the category of somewhat satisfied was between 49 per cent and 64 per cent), the satisfaction with the earnings is much lower. The category of very satisfied falls to about 6 per cent and somewhat satisfied to 32 per cent, neither satisfied or dissatisfied comes to 31 per cent, while somewhat dissatisfied amounts to whole 20 per cent and very dissatisfied to about 9 per cent. There are several elements that can be of relevance for explaining the higher level of satisfaction of work and lower level of satisfaction with earnings. Firstly, in general opinion surveys in Slovenia, it has been shown that work is an important element in the value system of the Slovenians. Secondly, it is obvious that if one compares the earnings in Slovenia with those in the EU countries, the disparity is large and this may also have influenced the expression of lower satisfactions with earnings.

Secondly, in addition to the questions about subjective satisfaction with various aspects with main work activity the respondents were asked to express preparedness for job changes under certain conditions, i.e. whether they would be willing to accept certain conditions in a situation where they would have no job. In Table 1.18 the results show a different degree of willingness to accept various conditions in such a situation. The ranking of positive responses with respect to the five explicitly asked conditions is very interesting. The respondents would be most willing to accept the condition that they would work more than 40 hours per week: 53 per cent of them would be always prepared to accept such a condition and only 23 per cent would never be willing to do so. Next in line is the willingness to learn a new foreign language: 49 per cent would be always willing to do so and only 26 per cent would refuse such a condition. Retraining for another profession is less acceptable but still substantial: 40 per cent would be always willing to do so, 32 per cent maybe and 28 per cent never.

Table 1.18 Expressed preparedness for job changes under certain conditions

	<b>Work more than 40 hours per week</b>	<b>Learn a new foreign language</b>	<b>Retrain for another profession</b>	<b>Move (migrate) to another settlement</b>	<b>Accept less attractive work conditions</b>
	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	53	49	40	26	24
Maybe	24	26	32	29	40
No	23	26	28	45	37
N	911	918	907	910	839

While the preparedness for accepting the three above-mentioned conditions is considerable, the two other mentioned conditions, accepting less attractive work conditions and moving (migrating) to another settlement, is less in favour with Slovenians. Even if they were without a job, only 24 per cent would always accept less attractive work conditions and 37 per cent would never do that. Seemingly, the possibility of moving (migrating) to another settlement is presenting the greatest cost in such benefit-cost considerations. A whole 45 per cent of the respondents would never consider moving or migrating to another settlement and only 26 per cent of people without a job would be always willing to do so. There may be several elements



that could explain such an attitude. On the one hand, in Slovenia only 8 per cent of the respondents are paying rent, all other respondents possess their own dwelling (55 per cent their own house and 23 per cent their own apartment) and about 13 per cent stay with their parents or have another arrangement so that they are not paying rent. The percentage of ownership is very high in international comparisons, which is very beneficial for the welfare of the population, but is seemingly a detriment to the willingness to move or migrate to another settlement. On the other hand, there is a high degree of tolerance to commute to a different location to work, which to a certain degree increases the flexibility of people with respect to the place of work even if they do not wish to move or migrate to a different settlement.

## Chapter 2: Patterns of work

### 1. The accumulation of different kinds of work

The answers in the survey about the number of activities and about their income are reluctantly answered or avoided by a considerable number of respondents. This means that respondents are rather suspicious about giving information about their additional kinds of work and additional income, possibly being afraid of the respective tax or employment consequences.

Table 2.1 Answers to the question ‘number of activities reported in the last 12 months’

Number of activities	Frequency	Total	Male	Female
		%	%	%
1	483	84.3	82.3	87.1
2	66	11.5	13.6	9.0
3	15	2.6	2.8	2.3
4	6	1.0	0.6	1.2
5	2	0.3	0.3	0.4
6	1	0.2	0.3	
	n = 573	100	n=317	n=256

Of the respondents answering this question 84 per cent reported only one activity. Of those who reported two or more income-earning activities, 12 per cent reported two income-earning activities and only about 4 per cent reported three or more income-earning activities in the last twelve months. From this data it seems that the flexibility in Slovenia in this respect is not very high, though in reality it may be higher.

Table 2.2: Sources of income – multiple response (47 missing cases )

		Responses	Cases
	N	%	%
Wage or salary	502	39	52
Pension	290	23	30
Other social transfer	125	10	13
Additional job	97	8	10
Other sources	44	4	5
Self-employed earnings	41	3	4
Farming	38	3	4
Unemployment benefit	37	3	4
Grant, scholarship	37	3	4
Private transfer	28	2	3
Profit from business	19	2	2
Income from investment	17	1	2
Total responses	1275	100	132.7

Another way of looking at accumulation of different kinds of work is the multiple response question on all the different sources of income that one had in the month of the survey, the results are presented in Table 2.2. There are two main sources of income, wage or salary reported for 52 per cent of cases, and pensions (30 per cent of cases). Income from an additional job is reported in 10 per cent of cases, while of the other possible sources of income individual sources are reported in the range between 2 per cent and 4 per cent. The total

number of responses shows that the number of multiple-responses is about a third higher than the number of the respondents. If one takes away other social transfers than pensions, then this set of answers comes closer to the 15 per cent magnitude that was mentioned for those having two or more economic earning activities.

Table 2.3 Number of activities in the last 12 months by flexibility categories (n=572)

Number of activities	Flexibility group A (n=187)	Flexibility group B (n=204)	Standard group C (n=181)
1	60	93	100
2	29	6	
3	7	1	
4	3		
5	1		
6	1		

Obviously most of the respondents accumulating various kinds of work are by design concentrated in flexible employment category A, and form a substantial part (40 per cent) of this group and represent practically the whole of the approximate 15 per cent of respondents with economic activities that have two or more economic activities. These results can be also compared with the results on employment status of the respondents in Table 1.11, where the question on employment status was also a multi-response question. In that table 1008 respondents enumerated 1073 cases of employment status. If those with employment status that are not considered economically active are eliminated, the duplication of employment status for the economically active respondents also comes roughly between 15 per cent and 20 per cent. Looking at the situation from these three different angles, one can estimate that roughly between 15 per cent and 20 per cent of economically active respondents have indicated in their response an accumulation of different economic activities.

## 2. Patterns of informal and voluntary work

In addition to their work assignments and household activities respondents indicated whether they are at least once monthly engaged in voluntary work for a non-profit organization or have worked without payment for a friend or relative outside his/her own household.

Table 2.4 Percentage of respondents and household members doing voluntary or unpaid work at least monthly in the last year.

Voluntary work		Unpaid work	
yes	n	yes	n
%		%	
18	P0, n=994	50	P0, n=996
18	P1, n=916	50	P1, n=916
15	P2, n=612	40	P2, n=608
11	P3, n=378	33	P3, n=376
18	P4, n=130	30	P4, n=128
14	P5, n=42	30	P5, n=43
18	P6, n=17	33	P6, n=18

Both respondents themselves and the first member of his/her households show identical percentages of involvement in such activities. The survey shows that 18 per cent of the above

mentioned were involved in voluntary work and 50 per cent were involved in unpaid work. When analysed, no significant differences existed between men and women, although slightly more men were involved in unpaid work for a friend or relative outside of the household. These responses indicate that informal unpaid work is important in Slovenia, though the magnitude of this part of the informal economy cannot be judged by such a 'yes' or 'no' question without having more information on the magnitude of time spent in such activities, some information about this might come out of the time use survey, undertaken by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, when it is completed.

Table 2.5 Voluntary and unpaid work cross tabulated with selected variables

	Voluntary work		Unpaid work	
	n	%	n	%
	<i>Age groups</i>		<i>Age groups*</i>	
18-25	32	22	76	52
26-50	89	19	256	55
51-65	36	17	113	53
More than 65	17	10	53	33
	<i>Gender*</i>		<i>Gender*</i>	
Male	98	21	262	57
Female	77	15	239	45
	<i>Social class</i>		<i>Social class</i>	
Working class	52	17	154	50
Middle class	97	19	275	53
Upper middle class	12	21	30	52
	<i>Family composition*</i>		<i>Family composition</i>	
Without children (aged 14 and less)	105	15	327	48
With children (aged 14 and less)	70	23	174	56
	<i>Personal income</i>		<i>Personal income*</i>	
<b>Sextiles</b>				
First	24	19	60	48
Second	20	14	58	42
Third	24	18	59	45
Fourth	18	15	54	46
Fifth	23	19	79	65
Sixth	27	22	79	65
	<i>Household income</i>		<i>Household income*</i>	
<b>Sextiles</b>				
First	11	8	55	42
Second	20	16	55	44
Third	27	19	71	50
Fourth	16	18	51	58
Fifth	29	18	95	60
Sixth	18	27	43	64

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Tables 2.4 and 2.5 show the important distinction that many more respondents are engaged in unpaid work (50 per cent) than in voluntary work (18 per cent). As far as voluntary work is concerned, of the selected variables only gender and family composition show statistically significant differences: men do more voluntary work than women, and more voluntary work is done by those from families with children. For unpaid work, significant variables are age, gender and income. Those below 65, men and respondents in the fifth and sixth sextiles report more unpaid work.

## Chapter 3: Household organisation

### 1. Domestic roles

Summary table Table 3.1 shows which person in the household is mainly responsible for a given activity. It is of interest to see that quite a high percentage of respondents (from 39 per cent to 46 per cent) say that they are those who are mainly responsible for this activity.

When this percentage is broken down by gender, more clarity is brought into the picture. When the respondents were women, this percentage varied between 70 per cent and 90 per cent for activities like washing the laundry, cooking, cleaning the house, taking care of ill children, taking daily care of children, taking care of a sick friend or relative, and daily shopping. A similarly high role (77 per cent) was found for men in the case of routine maintenance and repair of the dwelling interior. Working in the garden or agricultural plot was quite even with slightly higher percentage of women. For other activities the responses were that all are equally responsible for such an activity, the percentage of such answers varied between 15 per cent and 31 per cent. However, for cooking and washing the laundry this percent is much lower, as they are performed by women, and maintenance and repair of dwelling interior is also much lower - in this case they are performed by men.

Table 3.1 Domestic works: person who is mainly responsible for this activity

Activity	Myself male/female	Partner	Father	Mother	Son	Daughter	Someone else	Shared equally	Friend	Pay someone	n
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Routine maintenance and repair of the dwelling interior	44	22	12	2	5	1	2	8	1	4	982
	77   23										
Cooking	46	25	1	20		1	2	6			990
	15   85										
Cleaning the house	41	21	1	12	1	2	2	19		1	988
	17   83										
Washing the laundry	45	28	1	18		2	3	5			987
	10   90										
Daily shopping	45	20	2	13	1	2	2	15	1		986
	31   69										
Taking daily care of the child/children	43	16	2	11		2	6	20	1		265
	24   76										
Taking care of children when they are sick	41	21	1	12		2	6	16	1		270
	20   80										
Taking care of sick friend or relative	43	13	1	12	1	1	4	26			266
	27   73										
Working in garden or agricultural plot	39	11	6	9	1	1	3	31	1		738
	44   56										

These conclusions are broadly in line with the Time Use Survey where taking care of the household and family occupied about 21 per cent of the average time per day for women and about 13 per cent of the average time per day for men.

## 2. Patterns of decision making in the household

The patterns of decision making in the household also depend upon both objective and subjective elements. The decision making in the household is interrelated with the human and material resources of the household. Therefore we shall first discuss elements of the household standard to indicate the material differences between different households. In Chapter 4 two related issues will be discussed: the Time Use Survey results will throw some light on the actual time use, on the one hand, and the subjective perceptions related to family/work arrangements will be elaborated, on the other.

Table 3.2 Ownership of dwellings (n=1002)

Dwelling type	%
Own house	55
Own flat	23
Social flat	1
Non-profit flat	4
Lodger	3
Not paying rent	13
Other	1

With respect to the tenure of the respondent in relation to the dwellings that they live in, Table 3.2 shows that about 78 per cent of the respondents live in their own dwellings, whether own house or own flat. As additional 13 per cent do not pay rent, are staying with parents or in other arrangements. This is a consequence of the fact that under the socialist self-management system, practically all flats were in social ownership. After gaining independence, privatization of socially owned flats was executed very early on and at favourable discounts. Thus the ownership of dwellings can help in overcoming the problems of having lower incomes for the greatest majority of the population, though young families have to deal with high market rents.

Table 3.3 Permanent goods in the household, number of items

Number of items	1	2	3	4	5	0
Washing machine (n=1002)%	95	4				1
Refrigerator (n=1001)%	91	6	1			1
Telephone (n=996)%	89	5	1			5
Freezer (n=989)%	83	6				11
Color TV (n=995)%	77	15	5	1		2
Satellite TV receiver (n=963)%	70	1				29
PC's (n=938)%	49	3	1			46
Car (n=976)%	49	31	8	2	1	10
Other dwellings (n=883)%	33	3	1			63
Cellular phone (n=967)%	32	25	14	9	2	18
Internet access (n=894)%	27	1				72
B/W TV (n=871)%	9					91

Table 3.3 indicates that the households of the respondents are rather well equipped with permanent household goods. Only 1 per cent of households do not own an automatic washing machine or a refrigerator, 2 per cent do not own a colour TV, 5 per cent are without a telephone and only 10 per cent of the households are without a car. This leads to two conclusions. Firstly, the wide ownership of cars allows people to travel to other places to

work, to undertake additional paid work, voluntary and unpaid work. Secondly, practically all households are equipped with an automatic washing machine and refrigerator, which helps them in performing household tasks.

Table 3.4 Percent owning permanent goods by household income class (sextiles)

	Sextiles					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Ownership or use of land (n=715)%	40	43	43	37	42	40
Car (n=696)%	64	84	96	97	99	100
Mobile phone(n=687)%	52	73	92	93	94	96
Satellite dish / cable TV (n=690)%	57	72	73	76	83	87
Second dwelling (house or flat) (n=624)%	32	28	37	41	43	60
Color TV set (n=711)%	97	98	99	100	99	100
BW TV set (n=615)%	14	7	9	9	9	12
Automatic washing machine (n=718)%	97	100	99	100	100	100
Internet access (n=630)%	8	11	19	29	47	63
PC (n=665)%	27	32	51	58	77	80

Table 3.5 Percent owning permanent goods by flexibility typology

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C
Mobile phone (n=573)	91	89	92
PC- computer (n=562)	70	54	65
Second dwelling (house or flat) (n=523)	47	34	33
Internet (n=534)	42	27	34

Table 3.4 shows the availability of these possessions by income classes. Except for the lowest two sextiles, practically all households own a car and a mobile telephone. The variables that show a significant relationship with income, are: Internet access, PC ownership, satellite dish/cable TV, and ownership of a second dwelling (house or flat). Table 3.5 shows the possession of permanent household goods in relation to the flexibility typology, i.e. the differences in these variables for the group of flexible employment A, the group of flexible employment B and the group of full-time and regular schedule employment C. The respective table about household income by flexibility categories is Table 5.6 in Chapter 5. The percentage differences are different for various variables mentioned, but the pattern is obvious: the most favourable position is occupied by the flexible employment group A, followed by the full-time and regular employment group C, with flexible employment group B having the least average household income and lowest possession of the three permanent household goods where differences are still important.

Table 3.6 General satisfaction with the way of living and economic situation.

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
The way you live%	9	69	17	4	1
The economic situation of your household%	4	55	26	11	3

Table 3.7 Opinion about changes in the economic situation in the household.

	Clearly improved	Somewhat improved	Stayed the same	Somewhat deteriorated	Clearly deteriorated	Do not know
If you compare your household present economic situation to that of five years ago, would you say the situation today has...? %	7	21	34	25	11	2
Do you believe that in next year the economic situation of household will...?%	3	18	54	11	3	11

The questions relating to the general satisfaction with the standard of living and economic situation show that Slovenians are considerably more satisfied with their standard of living than with the economic situation of the household. Assessment of the household present economic situation to that of five years ago is slightly skewed in the direction of the conclusion that the economic situation was better five years ago than today. On the other hand, optimism is clearly indicated in their response that they expect a better economic situation next year. The question is whether this rather favourable set of perceptions with respect to the standard of living as well as with respect to the perception of the family/work arrangements in Chapter 4 is really that firmly embedded in the decisions about work and family responsibilities.

Table 3.8 Do you and your other household members usually agree or disagree about the following things (per cent):

	Household finances	Allocation of household (domestic) tasks	Amount of time spent together	Amount of time spent at work (in employment)
Always agree	29	28	27	19
Sometimes agree	50	46	48	35
Neither agree nor disagree	11	12	14	12
Sometimes disagree	7	9	7	7
Always disagree	2	2	2	3
Don't know	2	2	3	23
N	935	934	933	913

There are hardly any differences as far as agreement or disagreement among household members in Table 3.8 are concerned for three categories: household finances, allocation of household tasks and amount of time spent together. In all three cases the 'sometimes agree' is the most important category with about 50 per cent of the answers, with 'always agree' sharply outnumbering those who always or sometimes disagree on these questions. The question about agreement on time spent at work shows a similar structure of answers but with an astonishingly high percentage of the undecided respondents.



## **Chapter 4: Work/household relations**

### *1. Integration of home and work*

The analysis of the integration of home activities and work and of domestic and employment roles in the household is a difficult undertaking, since it is not easy with statistical data to separate objective conditions and subjective aspirations in the household and the family strategy. There are also several measures and criteria according to which the conditions, decisions and outcomes can be evaluated. One should also distinguish perceptions and aspirations and revealed preferences, which are exposed by the pattern of spending time and money. It would have been considerably easier to discuss these issues if the amount of money for the survey had been much higher to allow the time use elements on both domestic and employment roles to be included with other information on flexibility patterns. The statistics on the use of time, though very costly, constitute an extremely important component of social and economic statistics. We shall thus complement results of this HWF survey with that of the Time Use Survey undertaken by the Statistical Office of Slovenia.

As any activity has dimensions of time and space, time is an important criterion for locating and interrelating events. However, time is much more than that - it is also a basic unit of measurement of the duration of an activity. From this point of view, the time constraint is a more binding constraint in the final analysis than money, since no matter how rich someone is in money terms, a person has no more than 24 hours per day at his/her disposal. Thus the preferences revealed by the use of time are, *ceteris paribus*, more characteristic for the lifestyle of a given group than their consumption pattern in terms of monetary expenditure. Needless to say, they are not independent of each other, and the freedom of choice may be severely limited by the available resources, as the lifestyle will in turn influence the utilization and availability of resources (Sicherl, 1989).

The Statistical Office of Slovenia (SORS, 2001) published provisional data on time use in Slovenia; the results are provisionally based on data for 1416 households collected in the first two quarters of the survey, which represent about one half of the foreseen sample of 4500 households. Table 4.1 provides the average time per day spent on primary activities by men and women in more detail, while the table 4.2 combines the various activities in four major categories. Time for primary needs is the same for men and women; it represents about 49 per cent of the available time. The difference between men and women is most pronounced with respect to time for taking care of the household and family, which represents about 13 per cent of total time for men and about 21 per cent of total time for women. The other side of the same situation is that men use about 4 per cent more of their total time than women for the time connected with employment and studies on the one hand, and for spare time on the other.

Thus, when one is discussing integration of home activities and work or domestic and employment roles in terms of the Time Use Survey for Slovenia, one is really talking about the allocation between domestic and employment roles of about 27 per cent of all time available to men and about 31 per cent of all time available to women. This can be compared with the spare time of 24 per cent of men and 20 per cent of women, respectively. In other words, the reallocation of time is not only between domestic and employment roles, but also with leisure time, not to mention the time for primary needs such as sleeping and eating.

Table 4.1 Average time per day spent on individual activities by people aged 10 and over, by sex, Slovenia April-September 2000 - counting only primary activities

	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Average minutes	Average minutes	Percent	Percent
Sleeping	519	523	36.1	36.3
Eating	92	88	6.4	6.1
Personal care	88	87	6.1	6.0
Employment	160	105	11.1	7.3
Study	26	26	1.8	1.8
Household care and informal help to other households	153	258	10.6	17.9
Family care	11	26	0.8	1.8
Participatory activities, religious activities	13	13	0.9	0.9
Culture, sport, hobbies	70	44	4.9	3.1
Social life	70	66	4.9	4.6
Television	131	110	9.1	7.6
Other mass media	28	31	1.9	2.2
Travelling	75	61	5.2	4.2
Other, unspecified	3	3	0.2	0.2
	1439	1441	100%	100%

Average time is calculated on the basis of diaries of those persons who participated in an individual activity.  
Source: SORS (2001), Rapid Reports, No 148, Level of Living, No 2, June 4, Chart 1

Table 4.2 Average time per day spent on individual activities by people aged 10 and over, by age and sex,

	Males	Females	Males	Females
	Minutes	Minutes	Percent	Percent
Time for primary needs	700	699	48.7	48.6
Time connected with employment and studies	206	146	14.3	10.2
Taking care of the household and family	181	301	12.6	20.9
Spare time	349	291	24.3	20.3
	1436	1437	100%	100%

Source: Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (2001), Rapid Reports, No 148, Level of Living, No 2, June 4, Table 3

Turning back to the results of the HWF survey, the share of households with children under 15 years is about 31 per cent and that of share of households without children 69 per cent. If we consider that the most important family typology is the division into households with or without children, and that the summary categorization of flexible or non-flexible employment pattern is that into flexible employment A, flexible employment B and full-time regular schedule employment C, then on this level of aggregation there is no significant direct relationship between the family-work typology (represented by division into households with or without children), on the one hand, and the three above mentioned summary flexibility categories, on the other.

However, as explained in section 3 below, this general conclusion has to be complemented by a more specific consideration as there are significant differences among households with children and households without children in response to three of the five questions analysed there: whether the work makes it difficult to do some household tasks, makes it difficult to

fulfill my responsibility toward my family and other important persons and to a lesser degree with respect to family responsibilities making it difficult to perform the work adequately. Yet in percentage terms the number of respondents who ‘always’ encounter such problems with respect to the first two questions only amounts to 4 per cent and ‘often’ 12 per cent. Especially in respect to the last question, it is important to underline that even for respondents in households with children, 69 per cent answered that they never encountered such a problem. It is possible to conclude that the integration of home activities and work is more difficult for families with children, but that according to the answers by the respondents, the integration of home activities and work is not an overwhelming issue in Slovenia.

Table 4.3 Household size by family typology and urban/rural environment

Household size (members)	Family typology		Environment	
	Households without children	Households with children	Urban	Rural
	%	%	%	%
1	10		9	4
2	28	2	21	18
3	24	21	24	23
4	27	36	33	26
5 and more	10	41	13	29

Obviously, households with children are in the higher household size categories, and these are also found more often in rural than in urban areas.

## 2. *Employment and child care arrangements*

Although the most important classification of families is probably the division into households with children and households without children, rather favourable conditions with respect to childcare arrangements soften the extent of possible work/family conflicts in Slovenia. As explained in more details by Stropnik (2001), the childcare arrangements as well as child benefits in Slovenia are at a very high level, in the school year 2000/2001, about 57 per cent of pre-school children were included in childcare in 814 day-care centres (14 of them private), 91 per cent of them in programmes lasting 6-9 hours per day. Not only are childcare services in Slovenia broadly available, they are also widely affordable, due to high public subsidies.

This is probably one of the most important reasons why the female employment rate is hardly different from that of men. The share of households with children and households without children is not significantly different between social groups, between income groups and for urban-rural disaggregation. Obviously, the share of households with children below 15 years is related to age, so for about 75 per cent of families with children the age of respondents is between 25 and 49 years. As mentioned above, there is no significant relationship between the family typology (with or without children) and various groupings of flexible or non-flexible employment pattern.

There is an interesting conclusion related to the question whether, in a situation with no job, one would be willing to take a new job under certain conditions. This issue has been treated already in Table 1.18. Here, the question was cross tabulated with family typology (with or

without children). As Tables 4.4 and 4.5 show, respondents from the households with children express a greater flexibility, in this case they show significantly greater willingness to retrain for another profession or to learn a new foreign language to attain a new job.

Table 4.4 Willingness to retrain for another profession (n=907)

	Households without children	Households with children
	%	%
No	33	17
Maybe	31	32
Yes	36	50

Table 4.5 Willingness to learn a new foreign language (n=918)

	Households without children	Households with children
	%	%
No	29	18
Maybe	25	27
Yes	46	55

### 3. Perceptions of family/work arrangements

There are two sides of the story about family/work arrangements. One is the actual time devoted to different roles, which was not included in our survey, so the objective situation cannot be ascertained and compared with the perceptions of family/work arrangements that were included in our questionnaire.

The answers in Table 4.6 indicate that respondents in Slovenia did not feel that their work makes it difficult to perform some of the household tasks and weakens their responsibility to the family and other persons: only 2 per cent indicate that they always experience such a problem, and 8 per cent often. So only 10 per cent seem to be worried about this problem, and even if one adds another 10 per cent that felt this problem rarely, the perception of conflicts between family and work arrangements is not high. Similarly, approximately the same share of the respondents had the feeling that their responsibilities toward their family and other persons prevent them from doing their work adequately; 67 per cent even felt that they had never experienced this problem in the last three months. This seems to be another indication of the importance, which Slovenians attach to work in their value system.

Table 4.6 How often have you experienced the following in the last three months? (n=1008)

	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Not know
My work makes it difficult for me to do some of the household tasks that need to be done%	2	8	21	10	48	10
My work makes it difficult to fulfill my responsibilities towards my family and other important persons in my life%	2	8	25	10	45	10
My responsibilities towards my family and other important persons in my life prevented me from doing my work adequately%	0	9	7	13	67	11
I have to take work from my employment home to finish%	2	3	6	6	69	14
I preferred to spend more time at work than to spend more time at home%	1	1	6	6	72	15

With respect to the question about whether they take work from their employment home to finish, 69 per cent answered that they never do that. This might alleviate the conflict between family and work arrangements, but it may, in addition to 14 per cent of the undecided, mean

that they might not yet be under stress for further work and further education needs. Similarly, with respect to the question whether they would prefer to spend more time at work than to spend it at home, only 2 per cent would do that always or often.

Table 4.7: Work makes it difficult for the respondents to do some of the household tasks that need to be done (in per cent).

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	n
<i>Gender*</i>						
Male	55	14	20	8	3	438
Female	52	9	27	10	2	470
						908
<i>Age groups *</i>						
18-25	51	13	25	11	1	140
26-50	41	14	29	12	4	450
51-65	67	8	19	4	1	190
More than 65	81	5	7	4	3	122
						902
<i>Personal income in sextiles *</i>						
First	63	8	18	10	1	112
Second	60	8	23	7	2	121
Third	54	7	31	7	2	121
Fourth	55	11	17	15	2	106
Fifth	51	18	21	9	2	114
Sixth	36	18	31	9	7	123
						697
<i>Personal income in sextiles *</i>						
First	69	4	19	5	3	110
Second	57	15	19	7	1	110
Third	53	8	25	12	2	131
Fourth	49	22	19	7	2	83
Fifth	49	13	24	13	1	158
Sixth	33	13	41	8	6	64
						656
<i>Family composition *</i>						
Without children (aged 14 and less)	60	11	20	8	2	615
With children (aged 14 and less)	40	13	31	12	4	293
						908
<i>Number of household members*</i>						
1	75	10	11	3		61
2	62	12	16	6	3	175
3	53	14	23	9	2	204
4	50	9	26	11	4	288
5,6,7	44	12	31	11	2	178
						906

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

The five major questions about perceptions of family/work arrangements in Table 4.6, which could indicate possible family/work conflicts, are further analysed with respect to a selected set of variables. Table 4.7 presents results of such an analysis for the question whether the work makes it difficult for the respondent to do some of the household tasks that need to be done. Significantly different answers to this question are shown for the following variables: gender, age, income, family composition and size of the household.

Table 4.8: My work makes it difficult to fulfill my responsibilities towards my family and other important persons in my life (in per cent)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	n
<i>Gender</i>						
Male	48	10	31	9	2	440
Female	53	11	24	8	3	465
						905
<i>Age groups *</i>						
18-25	46	10	34	9	1	140
26-50	35	13	35	13	3	452
51-65	66	9	20	4	1	191
More than 65	90	5	3	2	1	117
						900
<i>Personal income in sextiles *</i>						
First	66	5	22	5	2	110
Second	62	4	23	11	1	120
Third	50	11	32	6	2	121
Fourth	46	13	28	10	3	105
Fifth	46	14	32	6	1	114
Sixth	29	14	39	14	5	122
						692
<i>Household income in sextiles *</i>						
First	73	5	16	3	4	107
Second	63	5	23	9		110
Third	47	12	28	12	2	129
Fourth	41	13	36	7	2	83
Fifth	41	13	32	12	2	157
Sixth	25	17	44	9	5	64
						650
<i>Family composition *</i>						
Without children (aged 14 and less)	58	10	24	7	1	614
With children (aged 14 and less)	35	12	36	12	4	291
						905
<i>Number of household members *</i>						
1	87	2	7	2	3	60
2	63	10	18	7	1	174
3	50	11	30	7	1	202
4	40	11	32	13	4	288
5,6,7	43	13	34	8	1	179
						903

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

However, when discussing these differences, one should always keep in mind the overall results from Table 4.6, where 48 per cent of the respondents answered that they have never experienced such a problem (54 per cent if the 'do not know' answers are eliminated). Women experience such difficulties more often than men, but even among women, 52 per cent declare that they never experience them. Similarly, respondents in the age group 26-50 years are more likely to have had such difficulties, though even in this age group 41 per cent never face these difficulties. As far as income is concerned, the highest sextiles in both personal and household income distribution experience more difficulties. The distinction

between households with children and households without children shows that the former face such difficulties more often, but even for this variable the answer 'never' is expressed by 60 per cent of households without children and 40 per cent of households with children.

In answering the question whether their work makes it difficult for him/her to fulfill the responsibility toward the family and other important persons in their lives, significant differences were observed for the same set of variables as above, except that there were no statistically significant differences by gender. Results in Table 4.8 show that such difficulties are again more pronounced for the age group 26-50, for the highest sextiles in both personal and household income distribution, for families with children and for larger households. Similarly, even the groups that face more difficulties in this respect have still a substantial percentage of those in the group that never experience such difficulties (35 per cent for families with children, 29 per cent of those in the highest sextile of personal income, and more than 40 per cent in households with four or more members).

Table A4.1 in the appendix shows results about the reverse relationship, whether the responsibilities towards the family and other important persons prevent the respondent from doing his/her work adequately. Again, 67 per cent of all respondents (75 per cent if the 'do not know' answers are eliminated) never experience such problems, but there are still statistically significant differences for the variables age, personal and household income, and family composition with respect to children. The relationships are similar as for the above question, but the differences exist at a considerably higher percentage of answers, stating that such difficulties never appear (e.g. 79 per cent of respondents from households without children and 69 per cent of respondents from households with children report that they have never experienced this problem).

The respective tables in the appendix show the percentage distribution by the selected variables for the two questions whether one takes work from employment home to finish it and whether one prefers to spend more time at work than to spend more time at home. For the former question, a significantly higher percentage of answers is shown for the highest sextiles for personal and household income distribution, for upper middle class and for the flexibility group categorization, in the flexibility group A. However, for both questions these differences are not very important in absolute terms as in the total about 70 per cent (80 per cent if the 'do not know' answers are eliminated) of the respondents indicated that they never experienced this problem.

## Chapter 5: Additional information on three flexibility categories in Slovenia

### 1. Categorization and work characteristics

This chapter deals in more detail with the results of the categorization of survey respondents in three categories, which was outlined in section 2 of Chapter 1. The empirical results of this categorization into three groups, flexible employment group A, flexible employment group B and standard employment group C, have provided interesting differences among them, which will be elaborated in this chapter, showing the respective characteristics coming out of the Slovenian survey data. The results pertain to a subset of respondents, who answered that they had one or more economic activities during the last 12 months and could by this criterion be considered economically active. In the survey it seems that a number of respondents were reluctant to answer questions about their additional kinds of work and additional income, possibly being afraid of the respective tax or employment consequences, so that some of the this information might be less reliable. Thus, in this chapter we mainly deal with a subset of less than 600 economically active respondents who provided the necessary information. One of the possible subdivisions of this set into eight flexibility categories, in the first round, and into the three above-mentioned categories in the second round, is shown in Table 5.1. The rationale for this categorization was presented in section 2 of Chapter 1.

Table 5.1a Flexibility grouping into eight categories

Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
1. Full time employment, more activities, flexitime	83	14.4
2. Full time employment, shift and irregular work	115	19.9
3. Part time employment	7	1.2
4. Fixed contract	60	10.4
5. Self employed	41	7.1
6. Students and retired with one or more activities	64	11.1
7. Others	27	4.7
8. Employed full time, regular schedule, one activity	181	31.3
	n=578	

Table 5.1b Flexibility grouping into three categories

Category	Frequency	Percent (%)
Flexibility group A (1+5+6)	188	32.5
Flexibility group B (2+3+4+7)	209	36.2
Standard employment group C (8)	181	31.1
	n=578	

We have first grouped respondents into eight categories, the major criterion for categorization being employment status of the respondent, which was then combined with some other characteristics of flexibility. As mentioned before, the emphasis here is on 'objective' elements of work status and flexibility, which may or may not correspond to the subjective evaluation of the respondents with respect to these characteristics. For instance, we have considered that working in shifts or an irregular schedule is a negative element of work; while in a survey by the Statistical Office a rather large number of those working in shifts expressed their satisfaction with such a position. Of course, it is difficult to disentangle whether, in answering that question, they were satisfied that they had a job or whether they were satisfied with the shift arrangement as such. Thus the approach taken here has the advantage that such 'objective' elements could be compared for different social groups or different countries, but



obviously should not be considered as a statement of the difficulty or satisfaction with a particular position with respect to a given element of work.

Some of the subdivisions in Table 5.1a are self-explanatory. Part time employment and fixed contract (temporary) employment are two categories of flexible work conditions, which we could compare in time and cross nationally. The same goes for the category self-employed. The major dilemma is how to categorize those employed full-time by their flexibility characteristics, who comprise about two thirds of the subset of economically active respondents analysed in this chapter. As explained earlier, the first of the three major categories of employment comprises those employed full time, with regular working schedule and only one economic activity. This category will be labeled 'standard pattern of employment' and in the tables is labeled as 'standard employment category C'. The other two categories of those employed full time are then considered categories of flexible employment, as distinct from the above-mentioned standard employment category, as they exhibit some 'positive' or 'negative' elements of flexibility in their work situation. Category 1 in Table 5.1a comprises those employed full time that have two or more economic activities or are employed full time and have the advantage of flexitime privileges, i.e. they can start or finish their working time in a flexible arrangement. In category 2 in the table those with some 'negative' characteristics of work flexibility, here approximated by shift and irregular work schedule, are enumerated. These two categories will be the backbone of the subdivision of those with some flexibility characteristics (as distinct from the standard employment category) into flexibility group A and flexibility group B.

The grouping of respondents into three categories, presented in Table 5.1b, is done from the eight categories in the Table 5.1a in the following way. Standard employment group C is a category by itself, which could be in certain instances compared to the rest of the respondents as those with some flexibility characteristics. However, both for policy and for research considerations it is more interesting to subdivide those with some flexibility characteristics at least into the two groups used here, which could be later refined and/or amended. Flexibility group A encompasses those with some 'objective' positive characteristics of flexibility, which are in this instance a summation of categories 1, 5 and 6 from Table 5.1a. We consider that in addition to the category 1 explained above, one could add into this group also the self-employed, and students and the retired with one or more activities. One could argue that both students and pensioners do not have to engage in an economic activity for their basic status, or that economic activity is conditioned by their basic status position, respectively, so that their engagement in one or more economic activities is a voluntary decision. For the self employed in Slovenia we may consider that this position is in majority of cases a voluntary decision, aimed at more independence and flexibility in their work, rather than a consequence of being laid off and being forced into such a status. This may be very different in some other transition countries and in international comparisons one should subdivide the self-employed category accordingly.

Flexibility group B comprises four categories from Table 5.1a (adding categories 2, 3, 4 and 7). The most important component is category 2 with shift and irregular work as explained above. Part-time employment, which is rather rare in Slovenia, and fixed contract (temporary) employment are placed in this flexibility group with 'negative' objective elements on presumption that the majority of these cases are involuntary from the point of view of the employees, as they would prefer a more firm commitment from the employers. The group of 'others' comprises casual workers, unpaid workers in family businesses, the unemployed with an additional job, farmers with one economic activity and those laid off. The greatest majority

of those included in the category 'others' have 'negative' elements of flexibility associated with their work position. To sum up, there are no doubt other possible criteria for categorizing respondents by various flexibility characteristics. In this study we have made an attempt to bring attention to the 'objective' elements of flexibility to initiate a discussion on the positive and negative aspects of flexibility arrangements at work, looking from one side, that can be later connected also with the work-family situations, from the other. As the most important policy issue with respect to work flexibility we see the question of how to balance the positive and negative aspects of work flexibility from both the employees' and the employers' side. The analysis of work characteristics, personal and social characteristics, satisfaction and decisions with various aspects of work, possible work/family conflicts and personal perceptions of well-being across the three chosen flexibility groups will hopefully initiate further discussion and research on a partial aspect of the important policy issue about work flexibility.

Table 5.2 presents the percentage distribution for the three flexibility groups by the elements of some work characteristics. The number of activities in the last twelve months is distributed as expected. The standard group C is by definition involved only in one economic activity. From the flexibility group A, 40 per cent of respondents have two or more economic activities. Similarly, this group is distinctively different from both flexibility group B and even more from the standard group C in working more hours in all activities (i.e. the summation of hours worked in activities from 1 to 6); 41 per cent of them are working more than fifty hours per week. In the standard group C 76 per cent are working the 'standard' working week (the group from 37-42 hours), only 21 per cent of flexible group A are working the same hours. For all three aspects of work characteristics in Table 5.2 (number of activities in the last 12 months, hours of work in all activities and working schedule) the percentage difference distribution among the three flexibility categories is statistically significant at the 0.01 significance level of chi-square tests. Flexibility group A thus works on average in more activities, works more hours per week and has a more flexible schedule than the other two groups. As it will be shown later, it shows also higher values in income distribution and household goods distribution.

The type of contract in the main activity also differs significantly among the three groups; it is very concentrated in standard group C as expected and most diversified in flexibility group A. The prevailing type of contract in the main activity is a permanent contract at about 65 per cent of the respondents. In the standard group C the percentage of permanent contract is 95 per cent (some small percentages for this group are a consequence of the fact that the variable on employment status that was used for classification purposes was a multi-response variable), with 54 per cent for flexibility group B and 46 per cent for flexibility group A. However, the distinction between flexibility groups A and B is pronounced in the other categories of contract, self employment being the most important in flexibility group A and fixed term employment in the flexibility group B. The differences among the three categories with respect to the place of work are somewhat less pronounced: in all categories the highest share is commuting to work in a different locality. However, the flexibility group A is characterized also by the widest distribution of other cases, and it has distinctly higher percentages of people 'working at home', 'combined at home and elsewhere' and 'always changing'.

Table 5.2 Work characteristics (in per cent)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>Number of activities in last 12 months *</i>				
1	60	93	100	483
2	29	6		66
3	7	1		15
4	3			5
5	1			2
6	1			1
				572
<i>Hours of work in all activities *</i>				
Less than 36 hours	15	12	2	54
From 37 to 42	21	55	76	287
From 43 to 50	23	17	19	110
More than 50 hours	41	16	4	114
				565
<i>Working schedule *</i>				
Regular working hours: Monday morning to Friday afternoons	25	16	100	257
Shift work	12	51		124
Flextime	30	3		59
Other regular schedule	6	7		25
Irregular, it varies	27	21		91
DK/NA	1			1
				557
<i>Type of contract in main activity *</i>				
No contract	9	7		29
Self employed	22	2	2	45
Permanent contract	46	54	95	359
Reduced working time contract	2	2	2	11
Fixed term	3	30		65
"on call" subject to requirements	2	2	1	9
With a temporary work agency	8	1		15
On a fee only basis	5	2	1	13
On a work experience project		1		1
DK/NA	2	2		7
				554
<i>Place of work</i>				
At home	8	6	1	28
Combined at home and elsewhere	11	2	2	26
Within the locality where you live	31	37	39	199
Commuting to different locality	36	49	50	251
Abroad	1	1	2	6
Always changing	14	5	7	47
Other situation	1			1
				558

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

## *2. Personal characteristics and social groups*

Percentage distributions for the three flexibility groups by their personal characteristics and the respective social groups are presented in Table 5.3. Again the flexibility groups are significantly different with respect to the age distribution. For the standard group C, 75 per cent belong to the age group 26-50 years, 67 per cent for flexibility group B and 54 per cent for flexibility group A. Flexibility group A has the widest distribution over the age groups. This is most probably a consequence of inclusion of students and retired people with one or more activities in the group A. It also shows that some flexibility characteristics can be fruitfully used at both ends of the age distribution. Gender differences are not so pronounced and are not statistically significant. If we compare the distribution of men between the three categories, the percentage differences are not large. With respect to women the differences are larger with under representation of women in flexibility group A category.

With respect to social class the differences are statistically significant. We use two definitions of social classes. One is the definition from the SJM questionnaire (survey of the public opinion in Slovenia by the Faculty of Social Sciences), from which we use the distinction between working class, middle class and upper middle class. Flexibility group A respondents on the average belong distinctly in the middle and the upper middle class, 67 per cent and 13 per cent respectively. The greatest disparity is between flexibility group A and flexibility group B, where the corresponding percentages are 52 per cent and 3 per cent, respectively, with 45 per cent of the latter group belonging to the working class. Likewise, if one uses as an approximation of social classes the occupational status (ISCO 1 digit), the differences are statistically significant. Here, the distinction is not very pronounced between flexibility group A and standard group C, but rather between them and flexibility group B, which is heavily concentrated in ISCO groups 5 and 8 (service workers, market sales workers and plant and machine operators). As far as education is concerned, a similar pattern appears. Flexibility group A and standard group C show similar distributions; while flexibility group B shows an under representation with respect to tertiary education. There are two characteristics with respect to which the differences among the three flexibility categories are not statistically significant. This is 'type of settlement'; the urban/rural distribution is very even in this respect. The family composition, defined as having children aged 14 and less and not having children of that age, is also not statistically significant between the three flexibility categories. In sum, age, social class, occupational status and education exhibit statistically significant differences for the three categories, gender differences exist but are not very pronounced, while the urban/rural classification and family composition with respect to children are not significantly different among the three flexibility categories.

## *3. Satisfaction with various aspects of work*

It is of interest to confront the 'objective' differences among the three applied flexibility categories with respect to work characteristics, personal characteristics and social groups with the expressed satisfaction with various aspects of work in the survey. These results are presented in Table 5.4. The first aspect asked was the general satisfaction with work. The differences are significant at the 1 per cent significance level if we group the answers into three categories, and are significant at the 5 per cent level if the answers are grouped into five categories. As discussed before, the percentage of satisfied or very satisfied appears to be very high in all categories, so it may be difficult to draw a firm conclusion from this set of answers. However, the level of satisfaction with various aspects of work is more informative in this respect.

Table 5.3 Personal characteristics and social groups (in per cent)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>Age groups *</i>				
18-25	26	22	6	105
26-50	54	67	75	378
51-65	15	11	19	85
More than 65	5		1	10
				578
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	36	33	31	319
Female	28	40	32	259
				578
<i>Social class *</i>				
Working class	20	45	34	182
Middle class	67	52	62	321
Upper middle class	13	3	4	36
				539
<i>Education (ISCED 1 digit)</i>				
Pre-primary education (ISCED 0)	1	1	1	5
Primary education (ISCED 1)	1	2	1	9
Lower secondary education (ISCED 2)	10	18	14	81
Secondary education (ISCED 3)	67	68	61	73
First stage of tertiary education (5)	20	10	23	181
Second stage of tertiary education (6)	1	1	1	127
				578
<i>Occupational status (ISCO 1 digit) *</i>				
Legislators, senior officials and managers (ISCO 1)	5	2	4	20
Professionals (ISCO 2)	14	9	17	70
Technicians and associate professionals (ISCO 3)	17	10	15	75
Clerks (ISCO 4)	15	6	21	75
Service workers and shop and market sales workers (ISCO 5)	12	28	9	93
Skilled agricultural and fishery workers (ISCO 6)	6	6	1	24
Craft and related trade workers (7)	15	6	21	75
Plant and machine operators and assemblers (ISCO 8)	9	19	11	72
Elementary occupations (ISCO 9)	4	8	4	31
				547
<i>Type of settlement</i>				
Urban	56	54	56	319
Rural	44	46	44	259
				578
<i>Family composition</i>				
Without children (aged 14 and less)	68	60	57	355
With children (aged 14 and less)	32	40	43	223
				578

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table 5.4 Satisfaction with various aspects of work (in per cent)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>General satisfaction with work *</i>				
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	8	12	3	44
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20	23	19	117
Satisfied / very satisfied	72	65	78	397
				558
<i>Stability of work *</i>				
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	9	23	7	71
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	20	20	15	98
Satisfied / very satisfied	72	57	78	368
				537
<i>Duration of contract *</i>				
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	2	19	2	37
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11	11	3	36
Satisfied / very satisfied	87	70	95	375
				448
<i>Hours of work *</i>				
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	18	17	10	83
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	24	13	18	99
Satisfied / very satisfied	59	70	72	373
				555
<i>Location of work</i>				
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	3	6	3	24
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	13	12	7	59
Satisfied / very satisfied	84	82	90	472
				555
<i>Earnings *</i>				
Dissatisfied / very dissatisfied	21	34	32	160
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	28	31	35	172
Satisfied / very satisfied	51	35	33	217
				549

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

The differences with respect to satisfaction with the stability of work are statistically significant. As expected, the dissatisfaction is much higher in the flexibility category B, where also temporary jobs and part-time jobs are included, together with a pronounced share of ISCO categories 5 and 8. This is an indirect confirmation of a plausible element for a distinction between flexibility categories A and B. The ‘objective’ elements for such distinction are here confirmed by ‘subjective’ opinions about satisfaction with this aspect of work. Similarly, the differences in satisfaction with duration of contract are statistically significant and again very pronounced in the percentage of dissatisfaction in flexibility group B.

Satisfaction with respect to hours of work is again statistically significant, but with a different position of the three flexibility categories. In this case, the least satisfaction is expressed in flexibility group A, which as we saw earlier, are working substantially more hours. The reverse position is observed with respect to satisfaction with earnings, where differences are statistically significant, but here the level of satisfaction is distinctly higher in the flexibility group A category. Thus, flexibility category A is more satisfied with respect to earnings and less satisfied with respect to hours of work than the other two categories. The differences with

respect to location of work are not significant; the high percentage in the groups 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' (between 82 per cent and 90 per cent) is again rather surprising.

#### *4. Decisions about various aspects of work*

With respect to decisions about various aspects of work, there are again statistically significant differences in percentage distribution of cases within a given question for the three flexibility groups. Results are presented in appendix, Table A5.1. For all four aspects asked, decisions about number of hours of work, general working schedule, overtime and place of work, flexibility group A is very different from the other two groups. In all the items, 34 per cent to 41 per cent of respondents from flexibility group A decide themselves, and in another 15 per cent to 32 per cent they decide about this together with the employer. For the other two categories, standard group C and flexibility group B, the employer decides about these four aspects with 55 per cent for overtime work and 78 per cent for general working schedule. The freedom of decision making with respect to the analysed aspects of work is thus distinctly higher for flexibility group A.

#### *5. Possible work/family conflicts*

The analysis above has shown that for practically all analysed aspects of work characteristics, personal characteristics and social groups, satisfaction with various aspects of work, and decisions about various aspects of work, the differences among the three flexibility categories were statistically significant. Of the important aspects where the differences are not statistically significant, type of settlement (urban/rural) and family composition (defined as families with or without children aged 14 and less) should be mentioned; the differences in gender and education are greater, but still not statistically significant in comparing the three aggregate flexibility categories. Thus on the side of work issues, the applied categorization has proved to be very relevant in bringing up the major differences between the three flexibility categories.

The next important stage of analysis is to look into the question of whether the applied categorization implies also significantly different situations with respect to the work/family conflicts as asked about in the questionnaire. Table 5.5 shows the results for the five aspects of work/family conflicts asked, whether such conflicts appear always, often, sometimes, rarely or never. There are two surprising outcomes in analyzing this part of the questionnaire. First, on the general level a surprisingly high level of answers indicate that such conflicts never appeared (see Chapter 4 where perceptions of family/work arrangements are discussed). Second, of the five aspects of possible work/family conflicts only one, whether one takes work home to finish, shows significant differences among the three flexibility categories, in all other four the differences are not statistically significant.

In addition, the same pattern is observed in Table A5.2 in the appendix, where the degree of agreement about household finances, about allocation of household tasks, about time spent together and about time spent at work, also do not show statistically significant differences among the three flexibility categories. Also in this case, the degree of agreement is rather high. According to the answers in the survey, the three flexibility categories show very significant differences in ('objective') characteristics related to work and practically no

significant differences in ('subjective') opinions about possible work/family conflicts or agreement on various household issues.

Table 5.5 Possible work/family conflicts (in per cent)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>Work / some household task</i>				
Never	42	43	43	239
Rarely	11	13	16	76
Sometimes	30	31	28	168
Often	12	10	11	63
Always	5	2	2	18
				564
<i>Work / family responsibilities</i>				
Never	33	36	36	199
Rarely	9	12	20	75
Sometimes	42	36	33	209
Often	12	14	10	67
Always	4	2	2	15
				565
<i>Family responsibilities / adequate work</i>				
Never	61	67	73	373
Rarely	22	18	19	110
Sometimes	15	13	7	66
Often	1	2	1	8
				557
<i>Take work home to finish *</i>				
Never	57	84	74	395
Rarely	14	5	11	55
Sometimes	20	5	7	57
Often	7	3	5	27
Always	2	2	3	14
				548
<i>Prefer to spend more time at work</i>				
Never	71	80	82	425
Rarely	11	8	10	51
Sometimes	14	10	6	55
Often	4	0	2	11
Always	1	1		5
				547

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

## 6. Personal perception of well being

Another set of subjective opinions in the survey was related to the personal perception of well being. The results are presented in Table A5.3 in the appendix. Four issues were asked: how the respondent is satisfied with the way of living, with the economic situation of the household, how he/she compares the economic household situation to that of five years ago, and what are his/her expectations about the economic household situation for the next year. Two sets of conclusions follow. First, with respect to the satisfaction with the way of living and the economic situation of the household, the differences among the three flexibility



categories are not statistically significant. As in the earlier questions about the level of satisfaction, the level of satisfaction is rather high here too, higher still when we take into account the economic situation of the household. Second, also for the comparison with the situation five years ago and the expectations for the next year, the differences are not significant. For both questions, the category ‘stayed the same’ comprises the highest percentage of answers.

### 7. Household income and durable goods

One of the important characteristics associated with the three flexibility categories is also the economic characteristics of the household of the respondents. These characteristics represent important additional information to the information shown in the sections on work characteristics, personal characteristics and social groups. Table 5.6 presents the distribution of respondents from the three flexibility categories into sextiles. The differences are statistically significant and show that the household income is the highest for the flexibility group A and lowest for flexibility category B. A similar conclusion holds for personal income by sextiles (see Table A5.4 in the appendix).

Table 5.6 Household income in sextiles by flexibility typology (n=445)

Sextiles	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C
First	7	12	11
Second	11	16	14
Third	12	26	21
Fourth	15	15	16
Fifth	36	24	28
Sixth	19	8	10

Table 3.5 in chapter 3 shows that for the three categories of permanent household goods where the differences among households are still important (second house or flat, Internet access and PC) the relationship is the same. Both for income and for these durable goods the ranking is the same: flexible employment group A occupies the most favourable position, followed by standard group C, while flexible group B shows the lowest average income and lowest possession of these household goods. Again, it is interesting to see that the ‘objective’ indicators show significant differences among the three flexibility categories, while the ‘subjective’ indicators represented by personal perception of well being (satisfaction with the way of living and satisfaction with the economic situation of the household) in section 6 do not show significant differences among the three flexibility categories.

## REFERENCES

Eurostat (2001), Labour Force Survey. European Commission, Luxembourg.

European Commission (2001), Employment in Europe 2001, Employment and Social Affairs, Luxembourg

RIS, Research on Internet in Slovenia, <http://www.ris.org>

Sicherl, P. (1989), Methods of Measuring Disparity between Men and Women, United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women, Santo Domingo

Sicherl, P., Remec, M. (2000), Review of the Literature and Debates about Flexibilisation in Slovenia, SICENTER, Ljubljana

Sicherl, P., Stanovnik, T., Stropnik, N., Zoric, J. (2002), Country Context Report for Slovenia, SICENTER, Ljubljana

SORS (1999), Rapid Reports, No 337, Labour Market, No 32, November 25

SORS (2001), Rapid Reports, No 148, Level of Living, Time use survey, Slovenia, April 2000 – September 2000, Provisional data, No 2, June 4

Stanovnik T. (2001), 'Dohodki; dohodkovna neenakost in trg dela v Sloveniji: pred tranzicijo in tranzicija', IB Revija, No. 1, XXXV

Stropnik, N. (2001), Social Policies Related to Family: Trends over the last 10 years, in Country Context Report for Slovenia, SICENTER, Ljubljana

## ABBREVIATIONS

DK/NA do not know or not applicable

HWF Household, Work and Flexibility project

ISCO International standard classification of occupations

ISCED International standard classification of education

PSU Primary Sampling Unit

SICENTER Socio-economic Indicators Center

SJM Slovensko javno mnenje (Slovenian Public Opinion)

SORS Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia

## **APPENDIX 1: Technical report on the survey**

This analysis of survey in Slovenia is based on the general questionnaire agreed upon in the consortium. The principal researcher Professor Pavle Sicherl wrote the text of this report. Matija Remec dealt with the coordination questions regarding the survey and prepared the statistical calculations for the report. Gregor Laura and Mojca Bartol also provided research assistance. The English version of the questionnaire was translated in the Slovenian language and the pilot survey was performed in the weekend December 1-2, 2000. SICENTER completed 21 interviews with different profiles of the households and comments were forwarded to the coordinator. Some of the optional questions were not included in the final version of the Slovenian questionnaire, as we did not find them important and relevant for our situation.

The fielding of the survey and preparation of SPSS files was performed by Public Opinion and Mass Communication Research Center (CJMMK), Institute for Social Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, and University of Ljubljana under the contract with Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna.

CJMMK undertook the following activities for the survey:

### **Sampling procedure**

Universe: The adult residents of Slovenia, older than 18 years, who are living on permanent address. Excluded: Institutionalised people. Central Register of Population (a list of names and addresses constantly updated by public administration) is employed as a sampling frame. The sample is two-stage stratified random sample, where every population unit has equal probability of selection. First stage PSU (Primary Sampling Unit – geographical enclosed unit with approximately equal number of people, PSUs are defined by national Statistical Office) selection is made by probability proportional to size of CEA (Clusters of Enumeration Areas). CEA are stratified according to 12 regions \* 6 type of settlement. At second stage systematic random selection inside CEA brings fixed numbers of persons with name and address.

On the first stage there has been 100 PSUs selected and final sample size has been 1559 cases. The sample is representative at the individual level and not at the household level. Realisation was 1008 cases. There was no weighting, since CJMMK determined that it is not necessary.

Sampling: March to April 2001.

Preparation and print of questionnaire: March to April 2001.

Seminars for interviewers: end of March 2001.

A letter of introduction describing survey was sent to all the respondents end of March 2001.

Preparatory of data entry program: beginning of April 2001.

Fielding of the survey was done between April 20 and May 18, 2001. Face-to-face surveys were performed, for more than one half interviews in one visit, in other cases in several visits. In 82% the face-to-face interview was performed with the respondents alone, in other cases partners and other persons were also present when the respondent was interviewed. The data was entered into computer promptly. The response rate was 65 per cent.

Preparation and cleaning of SPSS files for the consortium, documentation

## APPENDIX 11: Tables pertaining to the survey

Table A1.0 Main independent variables by gender (in%)

	Male	Female	n
<i>Age groups</i>			
18-25	50	50	149
26-50	50	50	468
51-65	45	55	215
More than 65	37	63	169
			1001
<i>Occupational status (ISCO 1 digit)</i>			
Legislators, senior officials and managers (ISCO 1)	70	30	20
Professionals (ISCO 2)	46	54	74
Technicians and associate professionals (ISCO 3)	55	45	76
Clerks (ISCO 4)	35	65	79
Service workers and shop and market sales workers (ISCO 5)	34	66	95
Skilled agricultural and fishery workers (ISCO 6)	66	34	29
Craft and related trade workers (7)	85	15	88
Plant and machine operators and assemblers (ISCO 8)	68	32	73
Elementary occupations (ISCO 9)	41	59	32
			566
<i>Social group</i>			
Working class	48	52	318
Middle class	47	53	523
Upper middle class	56	44	59
			900
<i>Family composition</i>			
Without children (aged 14 and less)	47	53	695
With children (aged 14 or less)	45	55	313
			1008
<i>Personal income</i>			
First	39	61	127
Second	23	77	141
Third	39	61	132
Fourth	54	46	119
Fifth	55	45	121
Sixth	65	35	124
			764
<i>Household income</i>			
First	40	60	134
Second	38	62	124
Third	40	60	144
Fourth	53	47	88
Fifth	56	44	163
Sixth	49	51	67
			720

Table A1.1 Hours of work and personal income (in %)

	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth	n
Less than 36 hrs	25	12	12	5	6	9	49
37 to 42 hrs	33	68	56	53	61	40	245
43 to 50 hrs	10	9	13	22	18	32	87
More than 50 hrs	31	12	18	20	15	20	88
							469

Table A1.2 Reasons for preference for working fewer hours

Reason for preference for working fewer hours	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
You are earning enough already	5	5.6	0	0.0	5	3.0
Someone in your household is earning enough to support the household	1	1.1	1	1.3	2	1.2
You do not like working long hours	19	21.1	10	13.0	29	17.4
You want to reduce this activity in favour of other opportunities for earning money	6	6.7	5	6.5	11	6.6
You want to drop this activity	3	3.3	2	2.6	5	3.0
You are undertaking or want to undertake education or training	6	6.7	6	7.8	12	7.2
You want to spend more time with your family (or fulfilling domestic commitments)	27	30.0	34	44.2	61	36.5
You have other reasons	22	24.4	16	20.8	38	22.8
DK/NA	1	1.1	3	3.9	4	2.4
Total	90	100%	77	100%	167	100%

Table A1.3 Reasons for preference for working same hours

Reason for preference for working same hours	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
You are earning enough already	49	24.5	16	9.4	65	17.6
Someone in your household is earning enough to support the household	4	2.0	7	4.1	11	3.0
You have more time for earning other money	9	4.5	2	1.2	11	3.0
You would not like (or not be able) to work longer hours	39	19.5	36	21.2	75	20.3
In this way you can do some education or training	10	5.0	14	8.2	24	6.5
In this way you can meet your domestic commitments and spend time with your family	49	24.5	61	35.9	110	29.7
You have other reasons	28	14.0	23	13.5	51	13.8
DK/NA	12	6.0	11	6.5	23	6.2
Total	200	100%	170	100%	370	100%

Table A4.1: My responsibilities towards my family and other important persons in my life prevented me from doing my work adequately

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	n
<i>Gender</i>						
Male	75	17	7	1	0	435
Female	77	13	9	1	0	458
						893
<i>Age groups*</i>						
18-25	74	18	8			137
26-50	67	19	13	1	0	445
51-65	88	9	2	1		186
More than 65	95	5				119
						887
<i>Personal income in sextiles *</i>						
First	81	13	6			106
Second	84	8	7			121
Third	79	10	10			116
Fourth	77	11	10	2		105
Fifth	75	17	5	3		114
Sixth	60	28	11	1		122
						684
<i>Household income in sextiles*</i>						
First	90	2	7	1		110
Second	84	9	6	1		107
Third	77	13	9	1		131
Fourth	64	30	6			81
Fifth	69	19	10	1		154
Sixth	62	25	11	2		63
						646
<i>Family composition *</i>						
Without children (aged 14 and less)	79	14	5	0	0	607
With children (aged 14 and less)	69	15	14	2	0	286
						893
<i>Number of household members</i>						
1	95	3		2		61
2	83	10	6	1		174
3	76	16	7	1	1	200
4	71	18	10	1	0	285
5,6,7	71	16	12	1		171
						891

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table A4.2: I have to take work from my employment home to finish (in%)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	n
<i>Gender</i>						
Male	80	7	8	3	1	422
Female	80	6	7	5	3	447
						869
<i>Age groups *</i>						
18-25	85	7	4	2	2	132
26-50	73	9	11	6	2	440
51-65	83	5	6	3	3	179
More than 65	99			1		113
						864
<i>Personal income in sextiles *</i>						
First	88	4	3	2	3	100
Second	93	3	1	1	2	118
Third	90	3	7			116
Fourth	87	3	8	3		104
Fifth	74	10	7	5	4	113
Sixth	49	14	18	12	7	119
						670
<i>Household income in sextiles *</i>						
First	94	2	2	1	1	106
Second	90	6	3	2		106
Third	85	5	6	2	2	130
Fourth	70	9	10	7	4	81
Fifth	71	9	10	7	4	147
Sixth	58	15	15	13		62
						632
<i>Family composition *</i>						
Without children (aged 14 and less)	82	6	7	2	3	588
With children (aged 14 and less)	76	7	8	7	1	281
						869
<i>Number of household members</i>						
1	95		2	2	2	61
2	83	5	8	2	2	166
3	78	7	11	3	2	197
4	77	8	9	5	1	276
5,6,7	80	8	2	6	4	167
						867

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table A4.3 : I prefer to spend more time at work than to spend more time at home (in %)

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	n
<i>Gender</i>						
Male	81	9	8	1	1	418
female	87	5	6	2	1	443
						861
<i>Age groups *</i>						
18-25	79	8	10	1	2	132
26-50	81	9	9	1	0	438
51-65	86	5	4	2	3	175
More than 65	98			2		111
						856
<i>Personal income in sextiles *</i>						
First	89	3	4	2	2	98
Second	90	3	5	1	1	115
Third	90	3	6	1	1	115
Fourth	83	10	7		1	103
Fifth	83	9	7		2	115
Sixth	69	15	11	4	1	119
						665
<i>Household income in sextiles *</i>						
First	92	4	2	2		103
Second	87	1	9	1	3	104
Third	86	5	5	2	2	128
Fourth	79	12	9			82
Fifth	80	8	9	1	1	148
Sixth	67	21	8	2	2	61
						626
<i>Family composition</i>						
Without children (aged 14 and less)	85	6	6	1	2	586
With children (aged 14 and less)	82	8	9	1		275
						861
<i>Number of household members</i>						
1	92	3	2	3		59
2	84	5	7	2	1	166
3	89	5	4		2	195
4	81	8	8	1	1	276
5,6,7	80	9	10	1	1	163
						859

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table A4.4 Hours of work and perceptions of work/family conflict

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	n
<i>My work makes it difficult for me to do some of the household tasks that need to be done</i>						
Less than 36 hrs	61	9	25	5		57
37 to 42 hrs	43	15	31	9	2	291
43 to 50 hrs	32	18	33	13	4	112
More than 50 hrs	41	7	25	20	6	108
						568
<i>Work makes it difficult to fulfill my responsibilities towards my family and other important persons in my life</i>						
Less than 36 hrs	56	14	26	4		57
37 to 42 hrs	38	16	35	9	3	290
43 to 50 hrs	21	14	50	14	1	113
More than 50 hrs	30	6	35	22	6	109
						569

Table A5.1 Decisions about various aspects of work (in %)



	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>Number of hours of work *</i>				
I decide	37	16	11	119
Employer decides	32	61	72	310
Employer and I decide together	24	15	14	98
It is outside our control	7	6	3	30
DK/NA	1	1		3
				560
<i>General working schedule *</i>				
I decide	41	15	10	122
Employer decides	31	65	78	327
Employer and I decide together	22	14	10	86
It is outside our control	6	4	1	20
DK/NA	1	1	1	5
				560
<i>Overtime *</i>				
I decide	37	16	15	123
Employer decides	21	55	55	245
Employer and I decide together	20	15	20	102
It is outside our control	7	5	2	27
DK/NA	14	9	8	59
				556
<i>Place of work *</i>				
I decide	34	16	8	106
Employer decides	37	64	73	324
Employer and I decide together	15	6	3	45
It is outside our control	11	9	10	55
DK/NA	3	6	5	27
				557

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table A5.2 Possible conflicts on agreements (in %)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>Agreement on household finances</i>				
Always disagree	3	2	1	10
Sometimes disagree	7	8	6	38
Neither agree nor disagree	11	10	15	66
Sometimes agree	57	58	53	308
Always agree	22	23	24	126
				548
<i>Agreement on allocation of household tasks</i>				
Always disagree	5	2	2	16
Sometimes disagree	9	14	12	62
Neither agree nor disagree	19	10	18	85
Sometimes agree	46	53	47	266
Always agree	22	22	21	117
				546
<i>Agreement about time spend together</i>				
Always disagree	4		1	9
Sometimes disagree	6	10	9	45
Neither agree nor disagree	19	21	16	100
Sometimes agree	53	52	54	287
Always agree	18	18	20	100
				541
<i>Agreement about time spend at work</i>				
Always disagree	4	2	5	18
Sometimes disagree	10	13	9	55
Neither agree nor disagree	23	15	14	89
Sometimes agree	46	53	51	257
Always agree	17	17	21	95
				514

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table A5.3 Personal perception of well being (in %)

	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C	n
<i>Satisfied with the way of living</i>				
Very dissatisfied	2	1	1	7
Dissatisfied	2	7	2	22
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	16	18	17	98
Satisfied	70	64	75	400
Very satisfied	10	10	4	47
DK/NA		1		2
				576
<i>Satisfied with economic situation of the household</i>				
Very dissatisfied	1	1	2	9
Dissatisfied	8	16	12	69
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	22	29	27	150
Satisfied	64	49	57	325
Very satisfied	5	3	2	20
DK/NA		1	1	3
				576
<i>Present economic household situation compared with 5 years ago</i>				
Clearly deteriorated	7	13	10	59
Somewhat deteriorated	19	22	25	127
Stayed the same	34	26	30	174
Somewhat improved	27	25	25	147
Clearly improved	11	11	8	58
DK/NA	2	3	1	11
<i>Expectation about economic household situation for next year</i>				
Clearly deteriorated	2	4	5	20
Somewhat deteriorated	8	8	13	55
Stayed the same	49	53	54	300
Somewhat improved	27	20	17	123
Clearly improved	4	4	4	23
DK/NA	9	11	8	54
				575

Significance level of chi-square tests: \* 0.01.

Table A5.4 Personal income in sextiles by flexibility typology (n=464) (per cent)

Sextiles	Flexibility group A	Flexibility group B	Standard group C
First	14	13	3
Second	7	21	14
Third	19	18	16
Fourth	14	20	17
Fifth	15	15	26
Sixth	31	13	23

## About Households, Work and Flexibility project

**The EU-Project aims to look at how changing forms of flexibility affect work and family life. 8 partner countries should give a comparison especially between Eastern and Western Europe and show consequences of different social policies.**

**Project co-ordination:** Institute for Advanced Studies / Institute für Höhere Studien IHS, Austria

**Project partners:** Sweden, Netherlands, UK, Slovenia, Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania and Bulgaria

### *Duration:*

The project began in April 2000 and continues until 2003.

### *Understanding flexibility:*

The project is based upon a sample survey of people in each country who are asked about their own experiences of different kinds of employment along with those of other members of their households. The questionnaire considers paid as well as unpaid work and the strategies through which households approach these different kinds of work. Flexibility is construed as flexibility of time, place and conditions of work.

### *Project coordination:*

The project is co-ordinated by Professor Claire Wallace who works in the Department of Sociology at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Vienna, Austria. The project is co-ordinated by the Institute for Advanced Studies in Vienna, otherwise known as the Institut für Höhere Studien und Wissenschaftliche Forschung. The institute comprises around 140 research staff and covers the areas of Sociology, Political Sciences, Economics and Finance. The institute is a private non-profit organisation which was set up in 1963 by Paul Lazarsfeld and Oskar Morgenstern to develop social science education and research in Austria.

Claire Wallace is also visiting professor at the University of Derby, UK and has been undertaking work on transformations in Eastern and Central Europe for the last decade. Before that she worked on projects associated with unemployment, informal economies and changing patterns of work in the UK.

### *Slovenian member:*

SICENTER (Socio-economic Indicators Center) is a private non-profit research institution registered with the Ministry of Science and Technology in Slovenia. Its main focus of activities is research and consultancy in the field of analysis of economic and social indicators at various levels of aggregation, with application in economics, politics, business and statistics.

The principal researcher for the HWF project is Professor Pavle Sicherl, Director of SICENTER and Professor of Economics at the Faculty of Law, University of Ljubljana. He was also consultant to the World Bank, OECD, UN, ILO, UNIDO, INSTRAW, UNRISD, and Harvard Institute for International Development.