Chapter Three

▸▸ HOUSEHOLDS, WORK AND FLEXIBILITY
Survey Comparative Report
(Volume 2: Thematic Reports)

How much work flexibility is there in Eastern and Western Europe?

[Endre Sik, TARKI, Hungary,
Claire Wallace, IHS, Austria]

[Contents]

HWf

[List of tables and figures]

INTRODUCTION

Europe is often compared unfavourably to the USA in terms of flexibility: whilst the US labour market is flexible, Europe is alleged to suffer from 'Eurosclerosis' (Ganßman 2000). The assumption is that all European countries more or less suffer from the same kinds of inflexibility to a greater or lesser extent. However, whilst flexibility is much discussed, it can actually mean a range of things (Pollert 1991). Apart from the well documented distinction between functoinal and numerical flexibility (Pollert 1988), for some, flexibility means the removal of regulations and instutions protecting workers (Riboud, Silva-Jauregui et al. 2001). For others flexibility is defined rather narrowly in terms of the extent of part-time work, the extent of fixed term contracts and the extent of self-employment. However, in most cases, flexibility is assumed from external variables. We have criticised these narrow model elsewhere (Wallace 2002). Here we set out to show the real extent of flexibility, based not upon assumptions about people's behaviour nor about a small range of activities but rather in terms of the actual behaviour of the population in organising their work and adjusting people to jobs or jobs to people.

The debates on flexiblity have focused upon whether what is good for the economy is also good for the individual workers in the economy: are they advantaged or disadvantaged by flexibility? Many studies have pointed to the implications of flexibility for creating a more precarious labour market for low paid employees (often women or young people) (Dex 1997; Perrons 1998;

Burchell, Day et al. 1999; Beck 2000; Bradley, Erikson et al. 2000; Standing 1999), whilst other have argued for the potential for using flexilbility to enhance personal development and the family-work balance (Handy 1994; Hörning, Gerhard et al. 1995; Bridges 1996) (Hill, Hawkins et al. 2001; Auer 2002; Spoonley and Firkin 2002; Tietze and Musson 2002). In this respect, we can ask the question: is flexibility evenly spread around the workforce or is it concentrated in particular groups? Furthermore, are these privileged groups of workers or those who are under-priviledged? In other words, are people able to take advantage of flexibility to enhance their lives or are they rather the victims of flexibility? Relevant here are the older generation of debates about the dual or segmented labour market which differentiates between 'core' protected group of employees and more peripheral groups of workers that can be more easily dismissed following fluctuations in demand (Doeringer and Piore 1971). More recent debates have argued rather that the secondary labour market has become more common for larger groups of workers, including middle class, managerial and professional workers who were previously seen as 'core' workers on regular (secure) contracts (Sennet 1998).

Whilst time flexibility has been rather well documented (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditoins 2002) (Dex 1997; O'Reilly and Fagan 1998; Conditions 2002) the emphasis has been mostly on the increasingly important role of part-time and a va-

HWf

riety of flexible hours contracts (annualised hours, shift working, evening and weekend working, time sharing, term-time working etc.) which have enabled employees to meet the demands of longer opening hours, round the clock demand, just in time production and so on. However, whilst part-time work, for example is often seen as evidence of flexibility, part-time workers can be rather 'rigid' in the sense of working only those hours. Part-time work need not be precarious and it has been the policy goal in countries such as Sweden and the Netherlands to introduce security for part time workers with comparable conditions to full time workers (Boje and Strandh 2003; Jager 2003). Contract flexibility has also been rather well discussed in terms of jobs often with fixed contract duration. However, flexiblity of place has enjoyed much less discussion, except in the analysis of telework and other IT professionals (Huws 1996; Hochgerner 1998). Nevertheless, we can see this as another way in which the needs of the labour market and the availability of the workers come together in different ways. Inflexiblity of place is seen as one of the main rigidities in some countries, standing in the way of meeting labour market needs and reducing joblessness (see the discussion for example in the Czech Republic – (Vecernik and Stepankova 2002). These are all sources of flexibility within a job. However, another source of flexiblity which is seldom considered is the extent to which people might combine several jobs or several sources of income. This kind of additional flexiblity can provide new opportunties for some (for example it can be way of venturing into self employment) or a source of hyper-exploitation as people undertake several jobs with declining wages to make ends meet (Nelson and Smith 1999). Additional job holding has been a common source of economic activity in Eastern and Southern Europe in order to make up low or declining wages.

For this reason, we have looked at flexibility of time, including a range of different working arrangements, flexibility of place, or where a person lives and works and flexibility of conditions:

what sort of contract arrangements are there? In addition, we have looked at the extent to which people have more than one source of income – in one job they may be flexible, in another not. Finally, we look at the extent to which these different kinds of flexibility relate to one another. Is it the case that time flexible workers are also precariously employed? And do those with flexible hours take on additional activities?

Flexibility is normally discussed in terms of 'atypical' or 'non-standard' jobs, assuming that regular, full-time employment is standard or typical work (Keller and Seifert 1995; Zilian and Flecker 1998). Atypical employment implies the introduction of new work forms. In fact we could argue that these workforms are not really so new, but that they are untypical in the sense of the Weberian mass society with its hierarchy of workers, managers and public servants in private and state bureaucracies. Such jobs are most often protected also by trade unions. This is still in fact the normal working pattern for the majority of Europeans. This was certainly the typical pattern in Eastern and Central Europe for most of the post-war period under Communist regulation, although it has been changing rapidly since 1989. Hence, standard, typical employment is not regarded as flexible.

The countries drawn upon exhibit different forms of flexibility in terms of policies and national statistics (Wallace 2003). These might be termed 'regimes of regulation' which affect flexibility through the combination of labour market developments, state and other regulation as well as social dialogue (Regini 2000). The UK has introduced more liberal, US style flexibility policies allowing people to be hired and fired under a variety of different conditions relatively easily with weak unions and decentralised collective bargaining. This has been mainly acheived by taking away regulations to protect workers. Even though this has been mitigated by the policies of the 'New Labour' since 1997, we might still regard this as partially 'deregulated flexibility' (Cousins and Tang 2003). The Netherlands and Sweden on the other hand have

introduced flexibility policies during the 1990s to counteract unemployment and they have been introduced in the context of strong regulations protecting the working conditions of flexible workers and with strong Trades Union and State intervention. We have termed this 'regulated flexbility'. However, we should be aware that Sweden and the Netherlands have been regulated in very different ways. In Sweden flexibility has been introduced so that people can take time out to raise families or study whilst maintaining full time employment and gender equality has been an explicit policy goal (Boje and Strandh 2003). In the Netherlands, by contrast, regulation takes place in the context of introducing part time employment or creating various flexible time options within employment in order to draw women into the workforce and ensuring the equal social benefits of time flexible workers compared to full time workers (Jager 2003). Hungary has tried to introduce flexible working arrangements since the beginning of the 1990s and although the legislation did not appear to have much impact, flexibility was nevertheless embraced at an early stage (Medgyesi 2002). We might term this 'partially regulated flexiblity'. The Czech Republic and Slovenia have tried to resist flexibility, seeing it as a threat to conditions, but nevertheless have introduced a range of legislation opening the way for different kinds of contractual arrangement, so they are also 'partially regulated' (Vecernik and Stepankova 2002; Kopasz 2003). Finally, Romania and Bulgaria have not introduced legislation to encourage flexibility to any extent, but the populations have been forced to become flexible due to the economic problems faced by people in the labour market (Stanculescu and Berevoescu 2003). This kind of flexibility tends to bypass state regulation or even not to be regulated at all, and we might term this 'unregulated flexibility' and forcing workers to become flexible, since most would prefer a regular job (Wallace 2002; Wallace 2003). We were therefore interested to consider what kinds of flexibility really occur under these different regulation regimes.

The types of labour market regulation-regime outlined above could be taken as predictors of flexibility. However, rather than assuming that labour market regulation or de-regulation leads to flexibility, we should look instead at the actual patterns of flexibility, which we can then map back onto the different regulatory regimes. It is often the case, for example, that regulations are introduced and are not implemented, or are introduced but have no effect, as is the case with some of the flexibility legislation in Hungary (Medgyesi 2002). Indeed, regulations can have entirely unintended consequences and since the transformation of the ECE countries has been a big 'experiment' we might expect this to be the case.

For this purpose we used the data set HWF, a survey carried out in 8 countries in 2001 as part of the European Union grant 'Households Work and Flexibility' (http://www.hwf.at). The survey is based upon a representative cross section of people between 18 and 65 numbering at least 1000 in each country. The total sample is 11194 respondents. In this survey, rather than beginning with the different forms of work, we began by asking people about all the kinds of work they did, the various hours and places that they worked, in order to try to define flexibility inductively rather than deductively.

In this paper we carry out the following analysis. First we define different kinds of flexibility. Then we look at how they relate to one another to see if there are patterns of multiple flexibility. Next, we consider how these different kinds of flexiblity differ between countries. Finally, we look at the socio-demographic characteristics of these different kinds of flexibility and consider whether there is one 'European model' or in fact a range of different models. In contrast to conventional approaches, we try to measure flexibility from the data itself, rather than starting with *a priori* assumptions and testing them. In other words we take an inductive rather than a deductive approach.

1. THE EXTENT OF FLEXIBILITY IN EUROPE

In the usual approach to flexibility, fairly simple indicators of non-standard employment are used to compare flexibility (despite the problem of defining each of these indicators) (Bastelaer, Lemaitre et al. 1997). Furthermore, the whole working population is taken as the base for such indicators. If we apply this to the HWF survey, we come out with striking differences between countries. These can be seen below in Table 1. Starting with part time work, this has a very different pattern in Eastern and in Western Europe. Whilst in Sweden, the Netherlands an the UK there are many part-time workers (about one quarter), mainly women combining child-rearing with labour market activities, this form of flexibility is mainly absent in Accession countries. Women work either full time or are housekeepers. Part-time wages are so low that almost nobody would look for this kind of work and those who are part-time are often men who are pensioners or nearing retirement or who have special individual reasons such as disablement or sickness for not working full time (Sicherl, Stanovnik et al. 2003; Wallace 2003). The conditions governing part-time work discourage employers also from introducing this kind of work. Secondly, shift work is found most often in those countries heavily dependent upon large industrial enterprises, as in the Accession Countries, but also in the de-regulated economy of the UK. Thirdly, self-employment is found more in certain countries than others. The UK, the Czech Republic, Sweden and Hungary have the highest number of self-employed workers, the majority of whom are men.

Table 1. Types of flexible work by sex by country

	Part time			Shift work			Self-employed			Farmer		
	M	**F**	**All**	**M**	**F**	**All**	**M**	**F**	**All**	**M**	**F**	**All**
United Kingdom	4	25	16	16	11	13	13	4	8	-	-	-
The Netherlands	*			4	3	4	9	7	8	1	1	1
Sweden	6	25	16	8	6	7	11	4	8	1	-	1
Slovenia	1	1	1	21	25	23	8	2	5	3	1	2
Czech Republic	1	3	2	12	18	15	12	7	9	1	-	1
Hungary	2	3	3	7	10	8	10	4	7	2	1	1
Romania	4	3	4	14	18	16	6	2	4	26	16	20
Bulgaria	4	4	4	18	21	19	8	5	7	2	-	1

Notes: *In the Netherlands there is the most part time work, done mainly by women, but in the HWF questionnaire this question was asked in a different form in the NL (see Jager 2003).
            **self defined

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

An additional dimension was the role of 'farmers' which while being a fairly marginal group in EU countries, are a much larger group in ECE countries. In particular, there are a very large number of farmers in Romania (20 per cent) these being people who are excluded from the conventional labour market though restructuring and have returned to a peasant-style agriculture which is mostly subsistence in nature. This was encouraged through land reforms that restituted land to the original owners or their heirs (Stanculescu and Berevoescu 2003). Since farmers, like the self-employed, are flexible by definition, we have excluded them from the analysis.

The approach we applied in our research agenda was contrary to the standard strategy for analysing flexibility – that is to cluster individuals into a single-dimensional scheme, so that an employee is either flexible or not, depending whether for example s/he has part-time or full time job,

depending upon whether they are 'a-typical'. We defined flexibility as either multiple job holding or as a multidimensional phenomenon within a certain job or as a main job with additional sources of income. For this reason we have selected typical jobs since these should not so much reflect the structure of the labour market as do the usual a-typical jobs. In this case we defined the following forms of flexibility.

Time flexibility is defined as people on a non-regular or irregular working schedule[1]. *Place flexibility* is defined as people working at home either the whole time or part of the time, abroad or having an irregular place of work (commuters were excluded). *Contract flexibility* was defined as people having anything but a permanent regular contract (i.e. no contract, fixed term contract, on call, with a temporary work agency, on a fee only basis, subject to performance or on a work experience project). *Income flexibility* includes all those with more than one income source. As to the more complex flexibility measures, while *combined flexibility* covers those with time and/or place- and/or contract-flexibility, *cumulative flexibility* covers those characterised by all three forms of flexibility simultaneously. The first aim of this analysis is to answer the following questions: to what extent are the four basic and the two combined forms of flexibility present in the eight European countries? What are the characteristic relations among the four dimensions of the flexibility phenomenon and to what extent are they similar or different in the eight countries?

However, we know that certain patterns of flexibility are strongly associated with certain labour market patterns. Therefore, in order to compare like with like, we excluded several kinds of flexibility which were only country-specific and thus attempted to homogenise the sample. In the first step of the analysis we discounted shift work from our analysis because it relates mainly to those countries with traditional industries, the Accession countries.

Next we took farmers and self-employed out of the sample. The reason for this is that these groups are flexible by definition and are likely to display all aspects of flexibility simultaneously. Their presence in the data would consequently disguise the more subtle associations among the four forms of flexibility and would distort the models by which we explain the social construction of flexibility. Therefore, we just give a brief overview in Table 2 of the total sample and from Table 3 on we exclude these two groups. In this way we create a more homogenised sub-sample which is focused on the traditional part of the labour force, i.e. to the wage workers, managers and professionals and public servants.

Thirdly, we excluded part time workers because with this exclusion we can claim that our paper concentrates upon the theoretically most homogeneous form of labour in contemporary Europe, i.e. employees working in full time employment. This part of the labour force is still the majority of those between 18 and 65 from which our sample is drawn. This is the part of the contemporary labour force which in theory is the closest to the Weberian type of worker in the mass production and bureaucracy dominated modern production system where the dominant forms of jobs were those in the factories and offices.

Thus, for the purpose of this analysis we have selected only a sample of people that are not usually assumed to be flexible in any way – those in regular, full-time employment. If we find flexibility in this group, we can assume that this is a strong test of the spread of flexibility. Instead of focusing on flexibility in a-typical jobs, we have tried to focus more on typical jobs. Hence, we would be able to add a more nuanced picture of flexibility and of the socio-genesis of the different forms of flexibility by the basic socioeconomic variables.

In order to compare how the exclusions that we have operated apply to the different kinds of flexibility we can compare the tables below, which show the difference between all 'income earners' and the employed full time workers we have defined them. As we would expect, the different kinds of flexibility are reduced considerably and

some of the starker differences between Eastern and Western Europe and especially between Romania and every where else, are evened out. This removes the stronger role of part-time work in Western Europe and farmers in Eastern Europe, especially Romania.

Table 2.   All Income earners'. The rate of the different flexibility types by countries, including farmers and self- employed, part-time workers (per cent)

	Income-flexibility	Time-flexibility	Place-flexibility	Contract-flexibility	Combined flexibility	Cumulative flexibility	N
United Kingdom	14	41	17	33	58	7	682
The Netherlands	10	40	11	28	55	4	785
Sweden	10	20	10	20	35	2	1185
Slovenia	7	30	19	34	51	7	584
Czech Republic	24	32	16	32	50	8	1072
Hungary	6	36	14	30	49	7	745
Romania	7	39	23	36	47	18	851
Bulgaria	9	21	9	42	45	5	1012
Total	**11**	**31**	**15**	**32**	**47**	**7**	**6916**

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table 3.   Full-time workers. The rate of different flexibility patterns by countries, within full-time workers, excluding farmers, self- employed and part-time workers (per cent)

	Income-flexibility	Time-flexibility (part-time excluded)	Place-flexibility	Contract-flexibility	Combined flexibility	Cumulative flexibility	N
United Kingdom	4	18	13	15	34	2	404
The Netherlands	5	16	8	11	29	1	416
Sweden	6	14	9	10	27	0	732
Slovenia	3	19	11	6	30	0	385
Czech Republic	10	20	7	13	34	1	762
Hungary	2	28	7	13	37	1	537
Romania	4	17	4	4	21	0	524
Bulgaria	1	12	2	26	35	0	679
Total	**5**	**18**	**7**	**13**	**31**	**1**	**4438**

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

The removal of the farmers, self-employed and part-time workers has had a different impact in different countries. This implies that doing the analysis on the full sample actually distorts the analysis in certain countries more than in others. For example, while in the U.K. and in the Netherlands time flexibility in the course of homogenisation is reduced to the average level, in Hungary exactly the opposite happens. In the U.K. place flexibility becomes more important, in Slovenia a large part of contract flexibility disappears with homogenisation.

All in all, even in the homogenised approach, one third of the wageworkers and public servants work in flexible job (with at least more than one of the three aspects of flexibility). However, in this

sphere of the labour market, among regular job holders, cumulative flexibility is much less common. The more a-typical work forms are most likely to be associated with the accumulation of different kinds of flexible incomes.

First we give a rough overview of the spread of the flexibility phenomenon. The aim of this exercise is simply to set the scene to develop a more sophisticated research agenda for the second phase of comparative analysis.

2.   DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COUNTRIES IN THE EXTENT OF FLEXIBILITY

To what extent are there differences among the eight countries regarding the extent of flexibility?

In terms of income flexibility, the Czechs stand out, with 10 per cent of them having more than one source of income and this was followed by those in Sweden (Table 3). In the Czech Republic second job holding is quite widespread and in Sweden this is due to the labour market and welfare regulations that allow people such as students for example take on additional jobs to supplement their grants.

The Hungarians are the most time flexible. This may be the last remnant of the former second economy where flexy time schedules were the essential element to give the underpaid employed the opportunity to earn some extra 'on the side'. However, it is also likely to reflect the fact that Hungary was the first and most enthusiastic of the Accession countries to embrace flexibility. This is followed by the Czechs and the Slovenians and only thereafter the UK. Therefore it would seem that the more successful transition countries have managed to introduce a range of flexible working practices, even if they have not always explicitly embraced flexibility. Western countries are no longer so time flexible once we remove part-time work.

Place flexibility is common in Slovenia, the country thought to have the least flexible labour market (Riboud, Silva-Jauregui et al. 2001). This is partly on account of the fact that employment is provided in a few industrial and urban centres, whilst the population live in more scattered communities. In the UK there has been an effort to build up home-working and teleworking(Huws 1996).

Contract flexibility is most common in Bulgaria, where 26 per cent of the employees in full time employment do not have a permanent working contract. We could say that this shows a high degree of precariousness in the Bulgarian labour market. However, this is also the case for 15 per cent of full time employees in the UK, where encouraging this kind of precariousness has been a specific governmental goal during the 1980s.

Looking at the combined forms of flexibility, we can see that combining different kinds of flexibility is rather common and is found among about one third of full time workers. Combined flexibility is most common in Bulgaria, Hungary, the Czech Republic and the UK. Romanian full-time employed work in very non-flexible jobs in terms of place- and contract and consequently the level of combined flexibility is also very low in Romania – which may be the remnant of the inflexible socialist full-time economy. Hence, we could say that there are several dimensions of flexibility in Romania –on the one hand the difference between the very flexible peasant farmers and the normally employed workforce on the one hand but also within the normally employed workforce there is a strong separation between a traditionally employed sector, which is rather inflexible and a flexible sector. Cumulative flexibility (that is all forms of flexibility) is rather rare, but there are nevertheless 2 per cent of full time workers in the UK who exhibit this kind of flexibility.

3.   RELATIONS BETWEEN THE FOUR TYPES OF FLEXIBILITY

The overall association among the four forms of flexibility is a low level of positive correlation (Table 4). This means that the different kinds of flexibility tend to be associated with one another and this is the general 'European' model of multiple flexibility. However, contract flexibility and time flexibility are the most strongly correlated and this is followed by place flexibility and time flexibility. So there are two dimensions to the way in which different kinds of flexibility are associated together. On the one hand we have time and contract flexible workers and on the other hand we have time and place flexible workers.

Table 4.   Correlation between flexibility (per cent)

	Income flexible	Time flexible	Place flexible	Contract flexible
Income-flexible	1	0,088	0,079	0,080
Time-flexible		1	0,196	0,243
Place-flexible			1	0,150
Note:	* All correlation is significant at the p=0.01 level.			
Source:	HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection			

To understand the importance of having low level and positive association among the four dimensions of flexibility (i.e. the European mode of multiple flexibility) we should try to imagine a world with strong positive and negative association:

- The former would mean a dualized world of work where there were either flexible or inflexible jobs but in the first case these jobs were flexible in all four dimensions. Such a job market would be similar to what the segmented labour market theory suggests assuming that once such differences are established neither capital nor labour would be able to flow between the flexible and non-flexible parts of the job market.

- The world with negative association between the four dimensions of flexibility would be a

world with balanced and counter-balanced flexible jobs. If in one aspect of the job would be flexible in other aspects such jobs would be inflexible.

In fact we could call the strong-positive scenario more the 'normal' pattern of work in a dual labour market, since we would expect these different kinds of flexibility to be associated. The last scenario, along with the scenario where there would be no correlation at all, would be possible only with strong labour market and social policies which allowed, for example time flexibility but not contract flexibility, or tried to spread the risk of flexibility across the different social groups.

Now let us consider how this differs by country.

From the Table 5, we can see that although there is generally a positive correlation between the different kinds of flexibility in different countries, there are also important differences between countries. In the UK, there are generally strong correlations between the contract flexibility and all other kinds of flexibility. This implies a rather dualised labour market driven by contract flexibility.

In the Netherlands, there are mostly weak or non-significant correlations with the exception of time and contract flexibility, which are rather strongly associated. Income flexibility is also somewhat associated with contract flexibility. Hence, it would seem that in that country flexibility is concentrated in a particular population group who are excluded from the protection extended to other workers. In Sweden, flexibility is more spread around the population. Only contract flexibility and time flexibility are associated – all other correlations are non-significant. As in the Netherlands, there is a group excluded from the protective legislation who are contract-dependent.

In the Accession countries we see a different pattern. In all of these countries, time and contract flexibility are rather strongly correlated as is time and place flexibility: temporary jobs are associated with irregular working hours and irregular

working hours are also associated with irregular working places. However, they differ also from one another. Slovenia has strong time-place and time-contract flexibility in a dualised labour market. The Czech Republic more resembles the UK with all the kinds of flexibility being associated with one another, especially time flexibility with place flexibility. In Hungary, time-flexibility is strongly associated with place and contract flexibility.

Romania is rather an exceptional place in this analysis. Here the correlations are strongest of all and they are especially strong in relating precarious contracts with time and place flexibility. Time flexibility is also rather strongly related to place flexibility. This suggests a very dualised labour market in Romania, even after we have excluded the farmers and the self-employed. However, this is not the case in Bulgaria, where contract flexibility if more weakly associated with place and time, but place flexibility is strongly associated with time flexibility.

In general, contract and time flexibility are strongly associated in all countries. However, in ECE countries, time is also associated with place flexibility to a greater extent than in the EU countries, whilst in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, place and contract flexibility are also associated. In other words in the ECE countries as well as the UK there is a wide range of flexibility, whilst in the Netherlands and Sweden there is a narrow range of flexibility in the case of regular, full time workers.

Table 5.   Correlation between flexibility types by country

		Time flexibility	Place flexibility	Contract flexibility
United Kingdom	Income flexibility	0.136	0.057*	0.153
	Time flexibility	1	0.076*	0.260
	Place flexibility		1	0.255
The Netherlands	Income flexibility	0.025*	0.086*	0.138
	Time flexibility	1	0.100*	0.260
	Place flexibility		1	0.054*
Sweden	Income flexibility	0.008*	0.017*	0.024*
	Time flexibility	1	0.028*	0.268
	Place flexibility		1	0.027*
Slovenia	Income flexibility	0.006*	0.059*	0.018*
	Time flexibility	1	0.236	0.291
	Place flexibility		1	0.108*
Czech Republic	Income flexibility	0.138	0.148	0.133
	Time flexibility	1	0.217	0.182
	Place flexibility		1	0.199
Hungary	Income flexibility	0.080*	0.080*	0.001*
	Time flexibility	1	0.264	0.244
	Place flexibility		1	0.123
Romania	Income flexibility	0.119	0.061*	0.144
	Time flexibility	1	0.381	0.403
	Place flexibility		1	0.408
Bulgaria	Income flexibility	0.010*	0.050*	0.101*
	Time flexibility	1	0.241	0.159
	Place flexibility		1	0.172

Note: * Correlation is not significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

4. THE SOCIAL BASIS OF MULTIPLE FLEXIBILITY

To illustrate how the various forms of flexibility associate with the basic socio-demographic variables we compiled Table 6 below. As far as the social basis of flexibility is concerned these tables (since it does not control for multiple influences) are only good for developing but not testing hypotheses. However, it makes sense to have a quick overview of the association of the socio-demographic variables with the dimensions of flexibility and to see how these association change when we change our focus of analysis.

Here we can observe the following:

- Income-flexibility increases with age. Time-flexibility is associated with younger and older people – the middle-age is the least likely to associate with time-flexibility. Place flexibility is not associated with age at all. Contract and combined flexibility is strongly and negatively associated with age, that is, the younger the full time employed are the more likely they have flexible contracts and become flexible in general as well.

- There is a male dominance in flexibility. However, women are slightly more prone to become contract flexible than men.

- Except in the case of income flexibility, low education increases the probability of all forms of flexibility. Time flexibility, however, is characterised by a U-curve, that is, in this case a high level of education increases the probability of this form of flexibility as well as lower education.

- The role of rurality is strong except in case of income and time flexibility.

- Income does not have a very strong association with flexibility except in case of contract flexibility (and cumulative-flexibility) where low income is a likely outcome.

To have a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of multiple flexibility we developed a simple multilevel model of flexibility. In the following table the dependent variables are the various forms of flexibility[3]. The independent variables were the basic socio-demographic dimensions of the individuals (except income which has overlapping influence with education but is much less reliably measured). In other words we did not intend to maximise the strength of our explanatory models but rather to have a first glance at the same very basic factors of flexibility using a strictly comparative analysis. First we ran our logistic regression models on the pooled sample then country by country[4]. Below we compare the social characteristics behind the different forms of flexibility in all eight countries. The question we want to answer with these models: Are the different forms of flexibility (time, place, contract and income flexibility) differently or similarly defined by the same basic socio-demographic variables? If yes, there is a general social pattern flexibility irrespective of its form and differentiating between them is pointless. However, if the social basis of the various forms of flexibility differs than from a sociological point of view these forms of flexibility are of different nature and in consequence their social role can be understood properly only if we analyse their patterns separately.

All forms of flexibility affect older and younger people the most. Young people are especially strongly affected by contract flexibility, as are older people. However, it is not clear from these data if this is an age or a cohort effect – if young people who are at present in a precarious situation will be able to leave this precarious situation once they get older, or whether they will remain there. In case of time-flexibility to be young significantly increases the probability of being flexible while to be in the older middle age group decreases its' probability. The latter is true for place-flexibility as well. As to contract-flexibility it is more likely both among the young and the old, i.e. in the two age groups most vulnerable on a traditional labour market.

Table 6. Six types of flexibility by basic socio-demographic indicators (per cent)[2]

	Income-flexy	Time-flexy	Place-flexy	Contract-flexy	Combined-flexy
Total	**4**	**22**	**9**	**22**	**37**
18-29 years old	3	25	10	34	46
30-59 years old	4	20	9	16	33
60+ years old	6	23	10	20	34
The significance level of Chi-square	*0.001*	*0.000*	*0.519*	*0.000*	*0.000*
Male	5	23	12	21	38
Female	3	21	6	23	35
The significance level of Chi-square	*0.000*	*0.062*	*0.000*	*0.038*	*0.009*
Primary Education	2	27	13	31	44
Secondary Education	4	20	10	23	36
Tertiary Education	5	24	7	14	36
The significance level of Chi-square	*0.047*	*0.000*	*0.003*	*0.000*	*0.004*
Urbanized area	4	22	8	20	35
Intermediate area	4	21	9	20	36
Rural Area	4	23	12	27	41
The significance level of Chi-square	*0.689*	*0.276*	*0.001*	*0.000*	*0.001*
Low income	5	20	10	30	37
Mid-low income	5	21	9	21	36
Mid-high income	3	20	9	19	35
High income	3	22	8	16	35
The significance level of Chi-square	*0.097*	*0.878*	*0.544*	*0.000*	*0.700*

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table 7. The odd ratios[5] of the four types of flexibility in traditional labour's Europe by predictors*

	Time-flexibility	Place-flexibility	Contract-flexibility	Combined-flexibility
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)				
18-28 years old (1)	**1.284**	1.116	**3.396**	**1.780**
29-36 years old (2)	0.904	0.949	**1.246**	1.022
46-54 years old (4)	**0.798**	**0.810**	1.054	0.870
55-65years old (5)	1.106	1.175	**1.664**	1.038
Gender				
1=male, 0=female	1.120	**2.049**	**0.820**	**1.145**
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)				
Primary (1)	**1.499**	**1.302**	**1.598**	**1.434**
Tertiary (3)	**1.304**	**0.796**	**0.589**	1.056
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)				
Urbanized area (1)	1.023	0.995	1.027	0.976
Rural area (3)	1.168	**1.413**	**1.448**	**1.270**

Note: * The detailed models are in Appendix Table A-D.

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Males are much more likely to be affected by all forms of flexibility except time flexibility than are females. Being male increases the possibilities of being place and slightly decreases the chance to become contract- flexible.

Education has a strong impact on flexibility. The lowest educated are the most flexible on all dimensions, whilst the higher educated are negatively associated with flexibility, except in the case of time flexibility. The role of higher education, therefore increases the chances of time flexibility but decreases the probability of flexibility of contract and place and in consequence the contradictory influence has no significant influence on combined-flexibility.

Living in a rural area strongly increases the chances of all forms of flexibility and living in an urban area decreases the changes of place as well as combined flexibility.

Thus, we can answer the question posed earlier: Yes, there are different characteristics associated with different forms of flexibility, especially between time and contract flexibility on the one hand and place flexibility on the other.

From this, we could tentatively suggest that there are two divergent types of flexibility: *favourable flexibility* of better educated people which is associated more with having flexibility of time and *unfavourable flexibility* which is associated with lower education, being male, being younger or older and living in a rural area. It is associated with contract, place and time flexibility as well as with the combination of all of these.

In the next section we compare the role of the same basic social determinants on the various forms of flexibility country by country. The question we want to answer by these models: Are there country specific differences in explaining the same forms of flexibility? If the answer is no than – from a sociological perspective - we can speak of a single European model of flexibility. However, the answer is yes than we have to focus on individual countries (or groups of them) if we want to understand the genesis and social consequences of flexibility.

5.   THE COUNTRY SPECIFIC SOCIOGENESIS OF THE DIFFERENT FORMS OF FLEXIBILITY

We start the analysis with combined flexibility – that is with the generalised picture of flexibility and continue the analysis by looking at the three subtypes of flexibility according to the different social characteristics with which they are associated.

In Table 8, we can see that:

▪   In the U.K. and the Netherlands it is women who are most likely to have this kind of flexibility, whilst in the Czech Republic, Hungary and especially in Romania the males have significantly higher probability of becoming flexible.

▪   Low education increases the probability of becoming flexible – but not in all countries in the same way. While in the U.K. and Slovenia low education actually decreases the possibil-

ity of combined flexibility, having low education strongly increases the chances of becoming flexible in the Netherland, Bulgaria and Romaina. Having a higher level of education increases the possibility of combined flexibility in Sweden, and in Romania but decreases it in the Netherlands and in the UK.

▪   Living in an urban area decreases the chances of combined flexibility in the Netherlands and increases it in Romania. Once more it is the Romanian rural areas which are distinctive.

However, as we saw before contradictory influences can overshadow the real processes determining the sociogenesis of combined flexibility. Therefore in the following three tables we analyse the mechanisms one by one and country by country.

Table 8. The odd ratios of combined-flexibility *

	United Kingdom	Netherlands	Sweden	Slovenia	Czech Republic	Hungary	Romania	Bulgaria
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)								
18-28 years old (1)	1.396	**1.947**	1.168	4.390	**1.893**	**1.743**	**1.726**	1.435
29-36 years old (2)	0.811	1.442	0.747	1.079	1.223	1.043	0.689	0.951
46-54 years old (4)	0.625	0.963	0.647	0.861	0.825	0.920	0.818	1.084
55-65years old (5)	1.354	1.495	0.488	1.160	1.292	1.077	1.141	1.192
Gender								
1=male, 0=female	0.759	0.783	1.118	0.968	1.453	1.556	**1.751**	0.976
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)								
Primary (1)	**0.597**	**9.944**	1.373	0.934	**1.904**	**1.735**	**3.565**	**6.335**
Tertiary (3)	0.793	0.746	**1.786**	1.106	1.045	1.056	**1.871**	1.063
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)								
Urbanized area (1)	1.053	**0.613**	0.864	1.151	1.177	1.267	**0.517**	1.147
Rural area (3)	1.180	0.762	1.302	1.258	0.823	1.216	1.480	1.111

Note: * The detailed models are in Table E

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table 9. The odd ratios of time-flexibility by countries and predictors*

	United Kingdom	Netherlands	Sweden	Slovenia	Czech Republic	Hungary	Romania	Bulgaria
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)								
18-28 years old (1)	1.146	1.178	0.841	**1.901**	1.266	1.479	1.186	0.909
29-36 years old (2)	0.795	1.253	**0.481**	0.879	0.924	0.913	**0.489**	1.334
46-54 years old (4)	0.892	0.789	**0.487**	0.632	0.761	1.106	0.738	1.086
55-65years old (5)	**1.745**	1.455	**0.477**	1.382	1.229	1.132	1.430	1.147
Gender								
1=male, 0=female	0.668	**0.554**	0.908	0.746	1.440	**1.977**	**1.761**	1.341
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)								
Primary (1)	0.734	**2.528**	1.090	1.456	1.688	1.509	**3.406**	**2.361**
Tertiary (3)	0.787	0.861	1.744	**1.905**	1.359	1.294	**2.552**	**1.881**
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)								
Urbanized area (1)	1.220	0.684	0.739	1.185	1.374	1.391	**0.549**	1.438
Rural area (3)	1.015	**0.516**	1.084	1.317	0.869	1.322	**1.702**	1.444

Note: * The detailed models are in Table F

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

As far as time-flexibility is concerned (Table 9) we see differences according to gender. In the three western countries (especially in the Netherlands) females are the most likely to become time-flexible, and this is also the case in Slovenia. However, in the remaining four ECE countries being male increases the chances of being time-flexible. Except for Slovenia, there is a clear East-West cluster in this case – gender and time.

Being at either end of the age range (young and old) increases time flexibility in the UK, in the Netherlands somewhat, in the Czech Republic, in Hungary and in Romania. In Bulgaria, age makes less difference to time flexibility. In Sweden the prime aged group of 37-45 are the most flexible, presumably because they are able to take advantage of the various leave arrangements for combining family and work .

In most countries, apart from the UK, time flexibility is associated with having low education and this is especially the case in Romania, Bulgaria and the Netherlands. There is therefore an almost all-European pattern. However, in Sweden, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria (and to a lesser extent Hungary and the Czech Republic) it is also increased by having higher education.

In Bulgaria while age and gender do not influence the probability of time-flexibility both education and residence have bifurcated influence upon it, i.e. the extreme categories are the most likely to be time-flexible, the in-betweens the least. Time flexibility is a rural phenomenon in Romania and in Bulgaria, although in the Netherlands rurality decreases time flexibility.

Therefore, we can see that there are important differences between European countries in terms of time flexibility. There is a general tendency for the lower educated to be time-flexible, but we can identify a favourable flexibility for the higher educated as well as an unfavourable flexibility for the lower educated in terms of time.

Table 10. The odd ratios of place-flexibility by countries and predictors*

	United Kingdom	Netherlands	Sweden	Slovenia	Czech Republic	Hungary	Romania	Bulgaria
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)								
18-28 years old (1)	0.792	1.349	0.851	1.115	1.556	**0.639**	**2.778**	**0.643**
29-36 years old (2)	0.945	0.940	0.777	0.801	0.940	0.881	0.830	1.343
46-54 years old (4)	0.434	**0.326**	1.161	0.935	0.740	0.981	1.153	0.874
55-65years old (5)	**1.924**	0.721	0.681	1.207	1.526	1.037	1.295	1.531
Gender								
1=male, 0=female	1.111	**6.175**	**2.259**	**2.485**	**1.850**	**1.845**	**3.919**	1.422
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)								
Primary (1)	**0.349**	**4.233**	**2.833**	0.782	1.274	0.775	**4.953**	1.327
Tertiary (3)	0.752	0.820	1.296	**0.593**	**0.399**	1.480	**0.371**	0.757
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)								
Urbanized area (1)	0.715	**0.405**	1.163	1.025	0.932	1.210	0.850	1.373
Rural area (3)	1.204	0.791	0.705	0.846	0.902	**2.197**	**3.312**	1.429

Note: * The detailed models are in Table G

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Turning now to place flexibility, we can see that being young increases the chances of place flexibility in Romania but decreases it in Hungary and Bulgaria, whilst in the UK place flexibility is increased for the older age group and this is also the case to some extent in Bulgaria. Being male strongly increases the chances of being place flexible in all eight countries. Having a low education increases place flexibility in Romania, Sweden, and the Netherlands, but decreases it in the UK, Slovenia and Hungary. Being in a rural area increases the chances of place flexibility in Romania and Hungary.

Place flexibility is more homogenous across the different countries than is time flexibility. It most often affects men., so this is another all-European pattern. It is associated with prime aged men, perhaps working in particular kinds of jobs (lorry driver, plumber, builder etc.).

As to contract flexibility, we see that it is overwhelmingly found in the youngest and oldest age cohorts in each country. This is especially the case in Slovenia and in Sweden. In almost all countries, it is being female which increases the chances of contract flexibility, although in Hungary and Romania it is being male. Having a low education strongly increases the chances of contract flexibility in all countries except for the UK and this tendency is especially strong in Bulgaria, Romania and the Netherlands. In most countries, having higher education decreases the chances of contract flexibility. In Sweden and in Hungary, the changes of having contract flexibility are much stronger in rural areas.

In the UK none of the socio-demographic dimensions proper have significant influence on the probability of contract flexibility. In the Netherlands, the uneducated youth and in Sweden the youth in general are the most likely people to experience contract-flexibility. We could assume that it is the entrance to the labour market involves more contract flexibility in these countries. Whether it is a new phenomenon (a cohort effect) or only the usual form of job search patterns for the youngest (having several, less committing jobs in the beginning of their labour market career) or that of a dual labour market, we do not know, but the Dutch association between low education and youth in the case of contract flexibility is closer to a dual labour market than the Swedish version.

Table 11. The odd ratios of contract-flexibility by countries and predictors*

	United Kingdom	Netherlands	Sweden	Slovenia	Czech Republic	Hungary	Romania	Bulgaria
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)								
18-28 years old (1)	2.921	3.274	9.977	13.451	3.013	4.893	2.816	1.659
29-36 years old (2)	0.828	1.029	3.992	1.914	1.400	1.791	1.018	0.778
46-54 years old (4)	1.109	0.959	0.432	1.237	1.119	1.283	0.929	0.934
55-65years old (5)	2.092	1.209	2.240	5.712	2.109	1.932	2.342	1.162
Gender								
1=male, 0=female	0.657	0.665	0.475	0.474	0.841	1.135	1.705	0.965
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)								
Primary (1)	0.770	3.288	1.427	1.626	2.851	2.041	9.924	23.644
Tertiary (3)	0.633	0.552	1.006	0.768	0.666	0.583	0.294	0.504
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)								
Urbanized area (1)	1.459	0.937	1.042	1.230	0.865	0.937	0.487	1.042
Rural area (3)	1.261	1.264	2.647	0.997	0.714	2.112	1.249	1.133

Note: * The detailed models are in Table H

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

In Slovenia, age has a particularly strong influence on contract flexibility: it is the middle-aged who seem to have only chance to not have a contract flexible job. In contrast to the Slovenian case, in the Czech Republic age has no influence on contract flexibility at all. It is the uneducated who have significantly less chance of getting a contract.

In Hungary the social basis of contract-flexibility is again entirely different. Age has a strongly but bifurcated role, i.e. those with the weakest labour market positions (the youngest and the oldest) are the most likely to be contract-flexible. In Romania all aspects of being a rural and poor are there to create a contract-flexible situation, i.e. being rural, uneducated, old and male. In Bulgaria it is the uneducated who has an extremely high chance of being (and very likely remaining for the rest of their life) contract-flexible.

Thus contract flexibility displays one homogenous feature across the different countries: it most affects younger people and older people. It is also associated with the less well educated. However, in other respects it differs from country to country.

Looking at this now country by country, we find that in the UK combined flexibility is not strongly associated with anything except that it is negatively associated with low education. Time flexibility in the UK is strongly found among the older age cohort and more among females than males. It is mostly associated with the middle educational group. Place flexibility is also found among the older cohorts and is negatively associated with being low educated. The strongest associations are found among contract flexibility where being young or being old are important as well as being female and having middle levels of education. The profile of the different kinds of flexibility in the UK is therefore that time flexibility is associated with older females of all educational types and place flexibility with older people. We can assume that these are women with families who need to combine work in the labour market with family care. Contract flexibility shows the strongest associations but it is young

and old people, females and middle educational groups. Women are therefore most flexible on all dimensions in the UK. We could say that flexibility is feminized in the UK, but on other dimensions it appears to be spread more around the population.

Turning to the Netherlands, we find strong associations with combined flexibility: it is found mainly among the young and the lower educated and females. Time flexibility is strongly associated with being female, with being lower educated and with living in a semi-urban area. Place flexibility is also more associated with younger people, with being male and having lower levels of education as well as not living in a rural area. Contract flexibility in the Netherlands is associated with younger people, with being female with low education. The profile in the Netherlands is that for most types of flexibility it is young, lower educated and female people who are most flexible, except in the case of place, where it is the young, lower educated males who are flexible. In the Netherlands, flexibility is therefore concentrated very clearly at the lower educated and younger ends of the labour market and some aspects of flexibility are strongly feminized. Thus, whilst the Dutch legislation aims to protect workers from precarious employment whilst maintaining flexibility of time (see Jager 2003), in fact there seems to a group of young people with lower educated that are excluded and unprotected. It is possible that they prefer precarious jobs if they are just entering the labour market or studying. Their lower education, however, perhaps suggests that they are excluded.

Looking at Sweden, we find that combined flexibility is negatively associated with being in the older age group and unlike in other countries, is associated with higher as well as lower levels of education. Time flexibility is negatively associated with almost all age groups except those between 37 and 45 and there is not much difference between males and females. Those with tertiary education are more likely to be time flexible. Time flexibility is therefore spread around the popula-

tion and is even associated with more privileged groups rather than less privileged groups like in other countries. The strongly gender egalitarian regulatory regime in Sweden, means that this is the only country where gender plays no strong role. Place flexibility in Sweden is not much associated with age but strongly associated with gender – being male. It is associated with lower education. Contract flexibility in Sweden is strongly associated with people in younger age groups (up to 36) an with older people over 55. It is associated with being female and with living in a rural area. In Sweden therefore, flexibility is spread around the population with no groups being strongly affected. Unlike in other countries, time flexibility is not concentrated in any demographic group. In fact in Sweden, unlike other countries, higher educated people are often most flexible. Only in contract flexibility do we find young and old people most affected and that it is feminized. So, as in the Netherlands we find a protected sector of the labour market and an unprotected sector characterised by contract work. However, the division is not so stark as in the Netherlands.

In Slovenia, combined flexibility is strongly concentrated among the youngest cohort, between 18 and 28, but otherwise has no particularly strong socio-demographic characteristics. Time flexibility in Slovenia is associated most with the youngest and the best educated group, although place flexibility is strongly male in character and negatively associated with higher education. Contract flexibility is very strongly concentrated in the younger groups (especially 18-28) as well as older people over 55. It is more associated with women than with men. The profile of flexibility in Slovenia then is that neither combined nor time nor place flexibility are strongly concentrated, although flexibility affects more younger and older groups of workers. Furthermore, unlike in most other countries, it is the better educated who are likely to be time flexible, as in Sweden. Place flexibility is again different as it affects less educated males.

In the Czech Republic younger people with lower education and most likely to experience combined flexibility in their work. Time flexibility has a slight tendency to be associated with those with lower education and with being male, but not with any other characteristics. Place flexibility is strongly associated with males and negatively associated with having higher education, so it is males in the middle educational group who are most likely to have this kind of flexibility. Contract flexibility is strongly associated with older and younger groups and those with lower education. It is weakly feminised. The profile of the flexible full time worker in the Czech Republic is therefore someone who is low educated and young and male in the case of combined or time flexibility, but in the case of contract flexibility younger or older and with a slight tendency towards being more likely to be female. Place flexibility is for middle level educated males.

In Hungary, combined flexible workers are younger people (below 28), male and less well educated. Time flexible workers are also male and more often lower educated (although higher education is also positively associated). Place flexible full-time workers are males in rural areas, mostly older age groups. Contract flexible workers are very often in the youngest group, but also in the oldest are low educated (higher education is negatively associated with contract flexibility) and from rural areas. The profile of flexibility in Hungary therefore is that there is an age, education and rural dimension. Combined as well as time flexibility being associated with younger people male and lower educated, whilst contract flexibility is associated with younger and older workers, the lower educated and rural areas. Place flexibility is different again being something for older male workers in rural areas.

In Romania, all forms of flexibility are heavily concentrated in particular population groups, much more strongly than in other countries. Here we find a strongly horizontally and vertically segmented labour market: between farmers and non-farmers on the one hand and between pre-

carious flexible workers and non-flexible traditional workers on the other. Combined flexibility is found most among the youngest group, males and the lowest educated, although higher education is also strongly positively associated with combined flexibility. Time flexibility is not strongly associated with any age group except that it is negatively associated with the 29-36 year old group. Lower and higher education is strongly associated with time flexibility and time flexibility is positively associated with rural areas and negatively associated with urban areas. Place flexibility is strongly associated with younger groups, males and lower educated (and negatively associated with higher education). It is strongly found in rural areas. Finally, contract flexibility is found among the youngest and the oldest groups most positively, it is very strongly associated with lower education and negatively with higher education and it is negatively associated with urban areas. Hence we find two groups of people affected in Romania according to the type of flexibility. For combined and for time flexibility, we find a group of higher educated people and a group of lower educated people. Otherwise it is young people, males and those in rural areas who are most flexible, although contract flexibility can also be found among older workers. In the rural areas, this fits with a 'return to the land' for the socially excluded workers, although unlike in the case of farmers, these are younger people in rural areas who find themselves to be 'forced' into flexibility. Time flexibility can also be found among higher educated people, probably teachers and professionals (Stanculescu and Berevoescu 2003).

In Bulgaria, combined flexibility is found most strongly amongst the low educated, but it has no particular gender dimension, although there is a slight tendency for younger workers to be more combined flexible. For time flexibility, there are no particularly strong associations to be found except that it is associated both with the lower educated and with the higher educated and is more likely to be male, suggesting a similar

structure to Romania. There is no urban-rural dimension to the same extent in Bulgaria as there is in Romania. Place flexibility is negatively associated with young people and positively associated with those over 55 and is also male, being more strongly associated with the lower educated. Place flexibility is found both in rural and in urban areas. Contract flexibility is much more strongly associated with young people, has no particular gender dimension but is very strongly associated with the lower educated. As in place flexibility, there is no particular urban or rural dimension. In Bulgaria, the gender and the rural-urban dimensions were not as strong as in other countries, such as Romania, although education was a fairly consistently strong variable. For combined flexibility and contract flexibility we find younger workers with lower education are most likely to be affected, whilst for place it was older male workers with lower education. Time flexibility showed a dual structure with both higher and lower educated males likely to be affected by this kind of flexibility. We could assume that like in Romania, this represented the flexibility of various professional groups such as teachers. Although there are large numbers of flexible workers in Bulgaria, they do not seem to be as concentrated among different population segments as in Romania. Rather, flexibility is a risk facing almost everyone.

Hence, the socio-demographic composition of flexibility showed a variegated picture. It was not necessarily the most vulnerable in the labour market that were affected in each country and it was not necessarily a feminised phenomenon, as the Western literature generally suggests. Place flexibility always had a different profile to the other forms of flexibility. Therefore, when we concentrate upon time and contract flexibility (which we know are strongly associated with one another – see Table.4) we find that whilst in all western EU countries plus Slovenia, flexibility is a feminised phenomenon, albeit more weakly so in Sweden and in Slovenia. In all the remaining ECE countries flexibility is more masculinised. If we

count the least educated as a marginalised group, then we could say that they are most likely to experience flexibility of time and contract in all countries apart from the UK. However, time flexibility was also associated with the better educated in Sweden, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria and in these countries flexibility could have favourable as well as unfavourable dimensions as there was both a marginal and a privileged group who were affected. Age was generally an important dimension. It was always young people who were most likely to experience flexibility (except the UK) and contract flexibility also affected older workers in many countries. Only in the UK did the young seem less affected by time flexibility than in other countries. The urban-rural dimension was important in Hungary and Romania, where rural workers were most flexible.

Place flexibility seemed to follow a different dynamic in most countries. Place is associated rather strongly with time flexibility in ECE countries, whilst it was not the case in the old EU countries. It was nearly always a masculine phenomenon and associated with lower education in some countries, with middle level education in other countries. Except in Romania and the Netherlands, place flexibility was usually associated with older workers or those in the middle age ranges. However, we know from previous analysis (Table 12) that flexibility of place was also associated with flexibility of time as well as contract.

Thus we could say that time and contract flexibility did seem to affect marginalised groups in most countries. These marginalised groups are mostly younger and sometimes older workers, but in some countries mostly Western ones (the UK, the Netherlands) such workers are mostly female, whilst in other, Eastern, countries (Romania, Hungary, Czech Republic and Bulgaria) they are more likely to be male. In Romania and Hungary, marginal flexible workers were also rural.

Related to this, we could say that the domestic roles of women affect their vulnerability to flexibility as precarious workers in the old EU

countries. However, this does not seem to affect women in the same way in ECE countries where there has been a tradition for women to work full time in the labour market for most of their careers (Corrin 1992). Even though in most of the Applicant countries (with the exception of Slovenia) much of the state support enabling women to go into full time employment has disappeared, full time employment for women nevertheless continues to be a tradition.

Place flexibility is not necessarily an attribute of marginal workers, being more associated with prime aged males, probably people doing certain kinds of jobs that required mobility.

Another dimension of time flexibility is that in some countries (Sweden, Slovenia, Romania and Bulgaria) it was also associated with highly educated people. In these countries, time flexibility could be an attribute of more privileged groups.

If we try to put together the regulatory regime with the effects of flexibility, we find the pattern in Table 13 above. The most de-regulated regime (the UK) seems to spread flexibility around a wider group of workers, but it is mostly women who are affected. However, the strongly regulated regimes in Sweden and the Netherlands, seems to protect the main group of workers but to produce a marginalized sub-group of low educated, younger and female workers who are flexible. The gender dimension and the strength of this exclusion was higher in the Netherlands than in Sweden, where the gender egalitarian nature of the labour market regulations do seem to have had some impact. In the partially regulated regimes of ECE, we find a group of favourably flexible workers in Slovenia and a group of unfavourably flexible workers who tend to be male, lower educated and younger or older. In the mainly unregulated regimes, we find strong labour market segregation in one country (Romania) and a flexibility more spread out in Bulgaria. In these two countries there are also favourable and unfavourable forms of flexibility to be found.

Table 12. Regulatory regime and spread of flexibility

	Regulatory regime flexibility	Type of flexibility (time and contract)		Multiple or narrow range of flexibility
		Gender	*Education and age*	
United Kingdom	Partially de-regulated	Women		Multiple
Sweden	Regulated	Women (contract flexibility)	High and Low educated, young and old	Very narrow
Netherlands	Regulated	Women (time flexibility)	Low educated, young	Narrow
Slovenia	Partially regulated	Women (contract flexibility)	High and low educated, younger and older	Narrow
Czech Republic	Partially regulated	Men (contract flexibility)	Low educated, young	Multiple
Hungary	Partially regulated	Men	Low educated, young and older rural	Multiple
Romania	Unregulated	Men (strongly)	Low and high educated, rural, younger and older	Multiple
Bulgaria	Unregulated	Men	Low and high educated, young	Multiple

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

It would seem therefore, that in the less regulated regimes of Bulgaria and the UK, the risk of flexibility is spread around many different kinds of workers, whilst in the most regulated it is concentrated among a small very specific group. In Sweden the regulation has had the effect of spreading flexibility around different groups too, but not so much in the Netherlands. The gendered nature of flexibility seems to reflect less the regulatory regime than the division of labour in the home and the labour market which is traditional in different parts of Europe.

6.   CONCLUSIONS

The first conclusion is that seen from this 'bottom up' perspective, there is actually a great deal of flexibility in Europe. Every second worker is flexible in some way (Wallace, Chvorostov, Nagaev et al. 2003) and about one-third of full time employees are flexible on more than one dimension too. Even if we exclude 'atypical' forms of employment and concentrate upon mainstream full time regular workers, we find a substantial amount of flexibility within these jobs.

We can return to our question: is there a European model of flexibility? In general, we can say that there is, since the different kinds of flexibility are weakly associated with one another, meaning that if a worker is flexible on one dimension, he or she is also likely to be flexible on others. However, whilst in some countries flexibility was concentrated heavily among a certain part of the population, in other countries it was more evenly spread. However, even in the group of countries where strong labour market protection helps to protect many workers from flexibility, there is a precarious group of young contract workers with lower education, who appear to be excluded. Therefore, it is necessary to look more closely also at the different patterns that flexibility takes across Europe.

Contract flexibility is strongly associated with time flexibility and is associated with marginalised groups. These are usually younger workers and sometimes older workers at the beginning and end of their labour market careers and they are also low educated. They could be said to be the victims of flexibility. However, time flexibility and income flexibility is also associated with more privileged groups – those with higher income and higher education. We could say that for these types of flexibility at least, there are pos-

sibilities that flexibility can work to the benefit of the worker and may even represent an improvement in work conditions. We have termed this the difference between 'favourable' and 'unfavourable' flexibility.

The role of gender is not uniform across Europe. In Western European countries (to a lesser extent Sweden) and in the Czech Republic, women are most at risk from flexibility because of their domestic roles which lead them to have a worse position on the labour market. However, in the other Applicant countries, it is often men rather than women who are the most vulnerable to flexibility and women's domestic roles do not seem to affect their labour market position in this respect at any rate. That is because they are either in the labour market (and inflexible) or out of it altogether. The levels of female labour force participation have dropped dramatically in the ECE countries since the transition from Communism (Wallace 2003). The Western literature on flexibility have therefore imported a bias in this respect and cannot be so easily applied in post-communist countries with their different traditions of gender regimes.

We might ask what the role of regulatory regimes might be? The high levels of flexibility in full time employment seem to exist despite or because of strong labour market regulation according to different regulatory regimes. In Applicant countries where there has been little attempt to introduce legislation encouraging flexibility, there is nevertheless a great deal of flexibility, often of the 'forced flexibility' kind. In Sweden the labour market regulatory regimes seems to have protected many people from the adverse effects of flexibility, especially women, who are otherwise victims of their domestic roles in other old EU countries. In that country, as well as Slovenia, a 'favourable flexibility' is created among high incomes groups. However, this seems to also create an unprotected group of workers at the bottom of the labour market who are precarious in multiple ways. This is especially the case in the Netherlands. In the UK, the widespread flexibility seems

to be more evenly spread across the population but perhaps for different reasons – because nobody is protected from flexibility - and this is also the case in Bulgaria. However, women seem to be most vulnerable in that country. The lack of regulatory regimes in ECE countries leads to a 'forced flexibility' for low educated younger and older men, who in Hungary and Romania are most likely to be found in rural areas. These are strongly excluded from the secure jobs enjoyed by the rest who continue to favour the traditional type of life long secure (if low paid) employment. Hence, the protection of certain groups of unionised workers (as in the Netherlands, Sweden and Romania) leads to the creation of a an excluded group of unprotected workers.

Age is an important factor in flexibility. Young people are most vulnerable to flexibility in most countries, and in some countries older workers are also affected. This reflects the general fragmentation of young people's careers (Kovacheva, Tang et al. 2003). This need not be a problem if it is a temporary phenomenon (that is, a so-called 'cohort effect') whereby young people move into more permanent jobs as they get older. However, if it leads to a generation permanently excluded from the regular labour market, it is something which should be addressed.

Thus although there was some similarity in the kinds of flexibility experienced by regular, full time workers in Europe, there were also some important differences in the social composition of flexibility indifferent countries. This seemed to reflect regimes of regulation as well as the gender dynamics of home and labour market. It also seems to be the case the strong regulation can lead to the spread of flexibility to different parts of the population (as in Sweden) but that lack of regulation can do the same (as in the UK and Bulgaria). The obverse side of the strong protection of certain workers is the creation of a socially excluded group who cannot get into the regular labour market and are disadvantaged in terms of age, gender or lack of education.

NOTES

1. In the 2nd Table however time flexibility covers also those who work part-time (less than 29 hours a week).
2. Cumulative flexibiliy is omitted because of the low incidence.
3. Income and cumulative flexibility are excluded from this analysis because they are less widespread and therefore could be explained much less reliably than the other forms of flexibility
4. The computation was carried out by Bori Simonovits.
5. Odds ratios are interpreted by looking at how far above or below 1 they are. Approximately 1.6 and above can be seen as having a strong positive, 0.7 and below a strong negative impact (in relation to the reference group stated in the table) on the dependent variable.

ANNEX

Table A. The logistic regression model of time-flexibility, by predictors

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
-2 Log likelihood: 5501,642, Chi-square: 49,664, df: 9, Sig: 0,000**				
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		26.278	0.000*	
18-28 years old (1)	0.250	6.942	0.008*	1.284
29-36 years old (2)	-0.100	0.970	0.325	0.904
46-54 years old (4)	-0.225	4.696	0.030*	0.798
54-65years old (5)	0.101	0.648	0.421	1.106
Gender (1=male)	0.113	2.791	0.095	1.120
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		19.550	0.000*	
Primary (1)	0.405	12.547	0.000*	1.499
Tertiary (3)	0.265	10.738	0.001*	1.304
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		3.771	0.152	
Urbanized area (1)	0.022	0.078	0.780	1.023
Rural area (3)	0.156	3.499	0.061	1.168
Constant	-1.490	260.747	0.000*	0.225
		26.278	0.000*	

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0,05 level, according to the Wald test
            **The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table B. The logistic regression model of place-flexibility, by predictors

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
-2 Log likelihood: 2987,198, Chi-square: 78,136, df: 9, Sig: 0,000**				
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		6.094	0.192	
18-28 years old (1)	0.110	0.621	0.431	1.116
29-36 years old (2)	-0.053	0.127	0.721	0.949
46-54 years old (4)	-0.211	1.895	0.169	0.810
54-65years old (5)	0.162	0.798	0.372	1.175
Gender (1=male)	0.717	45.410	0.000*	2.049
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		6.699	0.035*	
Primary (1)	0.264	2.499	0.114	1.302
Tertiary (3)	-0.229	3.096	0.078	0.796
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		10.670	0.005*	
Urbanized area (1)	-0.005	0.001	0.970	0.995
Rural area (3)	0.345	8.697	0.003*	1.413
Constant	-2.761	375.080	0.000*	0.063

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
            **The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table C.   The logistic regression model of <u>contract-flexibility</u>, by predictors

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
-2 Log likelihood: 4775,568, Chi-square: 301,372, df: 9, Sig: 0,000**				
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		210.906	0.000*	
18-28 years old (1)	1.223	139.518	0.000*	3.396
29-36 years old (2)	0.220	3.596	0.058	1.246
46-54 years old (4)	0.053	0.200	0.655	1.054
54-65years old (5)	0.509	12.557	0.000*	1.664
Gender (1=male)	-0.199	7.521	0.006*	0.820
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		51.128	0.000*	
Primary (1)	0.469	14.679	0.000*	1.598
Tertiary (3)	-0.529	28.879	0.000*	0.589
Place of residence (refrencegroup: 2=intermediate area)		20.646	0.000*	
Urbanized area (1)	0.026	0.090	0.765	1.027
Rural area (3)	0.370	17.998	0.000*	1.448
Constant	-1.674	260.265	0.000*	0.188

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
            **The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table D.   The logistic regression model of combined-flexibility, by predictors

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
-2 Log likelihood: 6836,783, Chi-square: 119,460, df: 9, Sig: 0,000**				
Age(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		88.374	0.000*	
18-28 years old (1)	0.577	48.391	0.000*	1.780
29-36 years old (2)	0.022	0.062	0.804	1.022
46-54 years old (4)	-0.139	2.469	0.116	0.870
54-65years old (5)	0.038	0.114	0.735	1.038
Gender (1=male)	0.135	5.406	0.020*	1.145
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		12.393	0.002*	
Primary (1)	0.361	12.367	0.000*	1.434
Tertiary (3)	0.055	0.592	0.442	1.056
Place of residence (refrencegroup: 2=intermediate area)		14.486	0.001*	
Urbanized area (1)	-0.024	0.120	0.729	0.976
Rural area (3)	0.239	11.122	0.001*	1.270
Constant	-0.836	110.882	0.000*	0.433

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
            **The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table E. The logistic regression model of combined-flexibility, in traditional labour's Europe, by predictors and country

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
United Kingdom	-2 Log likelihood:612,212, Chi-square:15,101, df: 9, Sig: 0,088				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		8.792	0.067	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.333	1.556	0.212	1.396
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.210	0.552	0.457	0.811
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.470	2.199	0.138	0.625
	54-65years old (5)	0.303	0.722	0.395	1.354
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.275	1.959	0.162	0.759
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		3.775	0.151	
	Primary (1)	-0.517	3.461	0.063	0.596
	Tertiary (3)	-0.232	0.951	0.329	0.793
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.468	0.791	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.052	0.052	0.819	1.053
	Rural area (3)	0.165	0.466	0.495	1.180
	Constant	-0.142	0.281	0.596	0.868
The Netherlands**	-2 Log likelihood:687.094. Chi-square:32.769. df: 9. Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		8.837	0.065	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.666	6.096	0.014*	1.947
	29-36 years old (2)	0.366	1.736	0.188	1.442
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.038	0.015	0.902	0.963
	54-65years old (5)	0.402	1.337	0.248	1.495
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.245	1.473	0.225	0.783
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		10.722	0.005*	
	Primary (1)	2.297	7.460	0.006*	9.944
	Tertiary (3)	-0.293	2.339	0.126	0.746
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		4.828	0.089	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.489	4.779	0.029*	0.613
	Rural area (3)	-0.272	1.509	0.219	0.762
	Constant	-0.213	0.505	0.477	0.808
Sweden**	-2 Log likelihood:946.227. Chi-square: 21.591., df: 9, Sig: 0.010				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		12.701	0.013*	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.155	0.456	0.499	1.168
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.292	1.390	0.238	0.747
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.435	2.988	0.084	0.647
	54-65years old (5)	-0.718	5.897	0.015*	0.488
	GENDER (1=male)	0.111	0.465	0.495	1.118
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		10.343	0.006*	
	Primary (1)	0.317	1.615	0.204	1.373
	Tertiary (3)	0.580	10.226	0.001*	1.786
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		2.083	0.353	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.146	0.678	0.410	0.864
	Rural area (3)	0.264	0.908	0.341	1.302
	Constant	-1.262	33.117	0.000*	0.283

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Slovenia**	-2 Log likelihood: 671.280, Chi-square: 52.998, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		46.262	0.000*	
	18-28 years old (1)	1.479	32.097	0.000*	4.390
	29-36 years old (2)	0.076	0.082	0.774	1.079
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.149	0.294	0.588	0.861
	54-65years old (5)	0.148	0.133	0.715	1.160
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.033	0.031	0.861	0.968
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		0.180	0.914	
	Primary (1)	-0.069	0.008	0.930	0.934
	Tertiary (3)	0.101	0.168	0.682	1.106
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.752	0.687	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.141	0.237	0.626	1.151
	Rural area (3)	0.230	0.721	0.396	1.258
	Constant	-0.708	5.566	0.018*	0.493
Czech Republic**	-2 Log likelihood: 1170.079. Chi-square: 36.237. df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		18.640	0.001*	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.638	9.651	0.002*	1.893
	29-36 years old (2)	0.201	0.828	0.363	1.223
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.192	0.771	0.380	0.825
	54-65years old (5)	0.256	1.028	0.311	1.292
	GENDER (1=male)	0.374	6.979	0.008*	1.453
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		7.299	0.026*	
	Primary (1)	0.644	7.286	0.007*	1.904
	Tertiary (3)	0.044	0.046	0.830	1.045
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		3.077	0.215	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.163	0.899	0.343	1.177
	Rural area (3)	-0.195	1.203	0.273	0.823
	Constant	-0.822	18.820	0.000*	0.440
Hungary	-2 Log likelihood:813.008. Chi-square:22.560. df: 9, Sig: 0.007				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		7.761	0.101	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.556	4.688	0.030*	1.743
	29-36 years old (2)	0.042	0.029	0.864	1.043
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.084	0.107	0.744	0.920
	54-65years old (5)	0.074	0.049	0.825	1.077
	GENDER (1=male)	0.442	6.881	0.009*	1.556
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		6.344	0.042*	
	Primary (1)	0.551	6.240	0.012*	1.735
	Tertiary (3)	0.055	0.052	0.819	1.056
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		1.754	0.416	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.237	1.525	0.217	1.267
	Rural area (3)	0.196	0.587	0.444	1.216
	Constant	-0.854	14.798	0.000*	0.426

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Romania**	-2 Log likelihood:606.845. Chi-square:51.134. df: 9. Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		12.620	0.013*	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.546	4.218	0.040*	1.726
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.372	1.522	0.217	0.689
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.200	0.443	0.506	0.818
	54-65years old (5)	0.132	0.064	0.800	1.141
	GENDER (1=male)	0.560	7.877	0.005*	1.751
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		9.338	0.009*	
	Primary (1)	1.272	4.261	0.039*	3.567
	Tertiary (3)	0.626	5.832	0.016*	1.871
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		17.329	0.000*	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.660	6.598	0.010*	0.517
	Rural area (3)	0.392	2.638	0.104	1.480
	Constant	-1.208	20.166	0.000*	0.299
Bulgaria**	-2 Log likelihood:1075.789. Chi-square:17.917. df: 9, Sig: 0.036				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		3.838	0.428	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.361	2.645	0.104	1.435
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.051	0.052	0.819	0.951
	46-54 years old (4)	0.080	0.159	0.690	1.084
	54-65years old (5)	0.175	0.352	0.553	1.192
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.024	0.027	0.870	0.976
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		10.140	0.006*	
	Primary (1)	1.846	10.078	0.002*	6.335
	Tertiary (3)	0.062	0.110	0.740	1.063
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.691	0.708	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.137	0.626	0.429	1.147
	Rural area (3)	0.106	0.316	0.574	1.111
	Constant	-0.781	16.058	0.000*	0.458

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
          **The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table F. **The logistic regression model of <u>time-flexibility</u>, in traditional labour's Europe, by predictors and country**

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
United Kingdom	-2 Log likelihood: 504.65, Chi-square:9.066, df: 9, Sig: 0.431				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		4.396	0.355	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.137	0.200	0.655	1.146
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.229	0.474	0.491	0.795
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.114	0.102	0.750	0.892
	54-65years old (5)	0.557	2.069	0.150	1.745
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.404	3.322	0.068	0.668
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		1.408	0.495	
	Primary (1)	-0.309	0.972	0.324	0.734
	Tertiary (3)	-0.239	0.750	0.386	0.787
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.678	0.713	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.198	0.596	0.440	1.220
	Rural area (3)	0.015	0.003	0.958	1.015
	Constant	-0.909	9.030	0.003*	0.403
The Netherlands**	-2 Log likelihood: 559.32, Chi-square:19;423. df: 9, Sig: 0.022				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		2.775	0.596	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.164	0.277	0.599	1.178
	29-36 years old (2)	0.226	0.510	0.475	1.253
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.237	0.401	0.526	0.789
	54-65years old (5)	0.375	0.903	0.342	1.455
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.590	6.810	0.009*	0.554
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		3.387	0.184	
	Primary (1)	0.927	2.486	0.115	2.528
	Tertiary (3)	-0.150	0.454	0.500	0.861
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		6.708	0.035*	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.380	2.344	0.126	0.684
	Rural area (3)	-0.662	6.465	0.011*	0.516
	Constant	-0.558	2.802	0.094	0.572
Sweden	-2 Log likelihood: 664.74, Chi-square:16531, df: 9, Sig: 0.057				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		10.106	0.039*	
	18-28 years old (1)	-0.173	0.391	0.532	0.841
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.731	5.309	0.021*	0.481
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.719	5.227	0.022*	0.487
	54-65years old (5)	-0.739	4.339	0.037*	0.477
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.096	0.222	0.638	0.908
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		6.316	0.043*	
	Primary (1)	0.086	0.070	0.792	1.090
	Tertiary (3)	0.556	6.090	0.014*	1.744
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		2.066	0.356	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.302	1.782	0.182	0.739
	Rural area (3)	0.081	0.052	0.820	1.084
	Constant	-1.558	36.597	0.000*	0.211

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Slovenia**	-2 Log likelihood: 572.69, Chi-square:21.567, df: 9, Sig: 0.010			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		14.284	0.006*	
18-28 years old (1)	0.642	5.491	0.019*	1.901
29-36 years old (2)	-0.129	0.172	0.678	0.879
46-54 years old (4)	-0.458	1.841	0.175	0.632
54-65years old (5)	0.324	0.540	0.463	1.382
GENDER (1=male)	-0.293	1.961	0.161	0.746
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		6.130	0.047*	
Primary (1)	0.375	0.190	0.663	1.456
Tertiary (3)	0.645	6.055	0.014*	1.905
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.846	0.655	
Urbanized area (1)	0.170	0.267	0.605	1.185
Rural area (3)	0.275	0.806	0.369	1.317
Constant	-1.374	15.935	0.000*	0.253
Czech Republic**	-2 Log likelihood: 995.45, Chi-square:21.651, df: 9, Sig: 0.010			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		5.908	0.206	
18-28 years old (1)	0.236	1.086	0.297	1.266
29-36 years old (2)	-0.079	0.100	0.752	0.924
46-54 years old (4)	-0.273	1.220	0.269	0.761
54-65years old (5)	0.206	0.559	0.455	1.229
GENDER (1=male)	0.364	5.268	0.022*	1.440
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		5.573	0.062	
Primary (1)	0.524	4.348	0.037*	1.688
Tertiary (3)	0.307	1.920	0.166	1.359
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		4.691	0.096	
Urbanized area (1)	0.318	2.909	0.088	1.374
Rural area (3)	-0.141	0.483	0.487	0.869
Constant	-1.426	44.766	0.000*	0.240
Hungary**	-2 Log likelihood: 739.28, Chi-square:24.317, df: 9, Sig: 0.004			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		3.831	0.429	
18-28 years old (1)	0.392	2.069	0.150	1.479
29-36 years old (2)	-0.091	0.115	0.734	0.913
46-54 years old (4)	0.101	0.136	0.712	1.106
54-65years old (5)	0.124	0.123	0.726	1.132
GENDER (1=male)	0.682	14.082	0.000*	1.977
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		3.584	0.167	
Primary (1)	0.411	3.187	0.074	1.509
Tertiary (3)	0.258	1.045	0.307	1.294
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		3.036	0.219	
Urbanized area (1)	0.330	2.619	0.106	1.391
Rural area (3)	0.279	1.076	0.299	1.322
Constant	-1.505	38.019	0.000*	0.222

HWƒ

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Romania**	-2 Log likelihood: 528.52, Chi-square:49;726, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		9.095	0.059	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.170	0.357	0.550	1.186
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.715	4.329	0.037*	0.489
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.304	0.872	0.351	0.738
	54-65years old (5)	0.358	0.459	0.498	1.430
	GENDER (1=male)	0.566	6.719	0.010*	1.761
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		14.581	0.001*	
	Primary (1)	1.226	4.101	0.043*	3.406
	Tertiary (3)	0.937	11.627	0.001*	2.552
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		16.404	0.000*	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.600	4.364	0.037*	0.549
	Rural area (3)	0.532	4.036	0.045*	1.702
	Constant	-1.583	28.644	0.000*	0.205
Bulgaria	-2 Log likelihood: 689.29, Chi-square:16.085, df: 9, Sig: 0.065				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		1.728	0.786	
	18-28 years old (1)	-0.096	0.089	0.765	0.909
	29-36 years old (2)	0.288	1.020	0.312	1.334
	46-54 years old (4)	0.082	0.088	0.766	1.086
	54-65years old (5)	0.137	0.123	0.726	1.147
	GENDER (1=male)	0.294	2.131	0.144	1.341
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		9.464	0.009*	
	Primary (1)	0.859	2.386	0.122	2.361
	Tertiary (3)	0.632	7.451	0.006*	1.882
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		2.983	0.225	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.363	2.328	0.127	1.438
	Rural area (3)	0.367	2.036	0.154	1.444
	Constant	-2.384	71.170	0.000*	0.092

Notes: * : The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
           **: The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table G.   The logistic regression model of place-flexibility, in traditional labour's Europe, by predictors and country

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
United Kingdom	-2 Log likelihood:348.240, Chi-square:15.150, df: 9, Sig: 0.087				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		6.927	0.140	
	18-28 years old (1)	-0.233	0.355	0.551	0.792
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.057	0.021	0.884	0.945
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.835	2.461	0.117	0.434
	54-65years old (5)	0.654	2.011	0.156	1.924
	GENDER (1=male)	0.105	0.133	0.716	1.111
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		4.944	0.084	
	Primary (1)	-1.054	4.737	0.030*	0.349
	Tertiary (3)	-0.285	0.670	0.413	0.752
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		1.916	0.384	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.336	0.918	0.338	0.715
	Rural area (3)	0.186	0.320	0.571	1.204
	Constant	-1.572	17.579	0.000*	0.208
The Netherlands**	-2 Log likelihood:262.291, Chi-square:29.121, df: 9, Sig: 0.001				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		4.480	0.345	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.299	0.420	0.517	1.349
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.062	0.018	0.893	0.940
	46-54 years old (4)	-1.121	2.651	0.103	0.326
	54-65years old (5)	-0.327	0.284	0.594	0.721
	GENDER (1=male)	1.821	9.571	0.002*	6.175
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		5.615	0.060	
	Primary (1)	1.443	4.512	0.034*	4.233
	Tertiary (3)	-0.198	0.297	0.586	0.820
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		4.144	0.126	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.904	4.128	0.042*	0.405
	Rural area (3)	-0.235	0.379	0.538	0.791
	Constant	-3.485	25.281	0.000*	0.031
Sweden**	-2 Log likelihood:414.691, Chi-square:19.465, df: 9, Sig: 0.022				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		1.883	0.757	
	18-28 years old (1)	-0.162	0.150	0.699	0.851
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.252	0.366	0.545	0.777
	46-54 years old (4)	0.149	0.165	0.684	1.161
	54-65years old (5)	-0.385	0.635	0.425	0.681
	GENDER (1=male)	0.815	7.208	0.007*	2.259
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		8.249	0.016*	
	Primary (1)	1.041	8.200	0.004*	2.833
	Tertiary (3)	0.259	0.705	0.401	1.296
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.844	0.656	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.151	0.274	0.601	1.163
	Rural area (3)	-0.349	0.398	0.528	0.705
	Constant	-3.089	58.459	0.000*	0.046

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Slovenia	-2 Log likelihood:409.433, Chi-square:16.491, df: 9, Sig: 0.057				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		0.913	0.923	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.109	0.100	0.751	1.115
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.221	0.310	0.578	0.801
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.067	0.031	0.860	0.935
	54-65years old (5)	0.188	0.108	0.742	1.207
	GENDER (1=male)	0.910	10.901	0.001*	2.485
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		1.780	0.411	
	Primary (1)	-0.246	0.050	0.824	0.782
	Tertiary (3)	-0.522	1.756	0.185	0.593
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.507	0.776	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.024	0.004	0.950	1.025
	Rural area (3)	-0.168	0.206	0.650	0.846
	Constant	-2.127	25.660	0.000*	0.119
Czech Republic**	-2 Log likelihood:518.210, Chi-square:18.631, df: 9, Sig: 0.029				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		5.868	0.209	
	18-28 years old (1)	0.442	1.670	0.196	1.556
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.062	0.024	0.877	0.940
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.301	0.553	0.457	0.740
	54-65years old (5)	0.423	1.081	0.298	1.526
	GENDER (1=male)	0.615	6.030	0.014*	1.850
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		4.295	0.117	
	Primary (1)	0.242	0.396	0.529	1.274
	Tertiary (3)	-0.918	3.666	0.056	0.399
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.139	0.933	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.070	0.053	0.819	0.932
	Rural area (3)	-0.103	0.123	0.726	0.902
	Constant	-2.643	61.175	0.000*	0.071
Hungary	-2 Log likelihood:351.762, Chi-square:11.249, df: 9, Sig: 0.259				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		1.171	0.883	
	18-28 years old (1)	-0.447	0.893	0.345	0.639
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.127	0.098	0.755	0.881
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.020	0.002	0.963	0.981
	54-65years old (5)	0.036	0.004	0.947	1.037
	GENDER (1=male)	0.613	4.142	0.042*	1.845
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		1.867	0.393	
	Primary (1)	-0.255	0.365	0.546	0.775
	Tertiary (3)	0.392	1.126	0.289	1.480
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		4.116	0.128	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.191	0.322	0.571	1.210
	Rural area (3)	0.787	4.111	0.043*	2.197
	Constant	-2.734	50.085	0.000*	0.065

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Romania**	-2 Log likelihood:269.427, Chi-square:59.175, df: 9, Sig: 0.000			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		9.811	0.044*	
18-28 years old (1)	1.022	5.278	0.022*	2.778
29-36 years old (2)	-0.186	0.122	0.727	0.830
46-54 years old (4)	0.142	0.070	0.791	1.153
54-65years old (5)	0.259	0.089	0.765	1.295
GENDER (1=male)	1.366	14.826	0.000*	3.919
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		7.814	0.020*	
Primary (1)	1.600	4.743	0.029*	4.953
Tertiary (3)	-0.991	2.444	0.118	0.371
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		14.397	0.001*	
Urbanized area (1)	-0.163	0.099	0.753	0.850
Rural area (3)	1.198	8.331	0.004*	3.312
Constant	-3.877	46.528	0.000*	0.021
Bulgaria	-2 Log likelihood:273.474, Chi-square:4.959, df: 9, Sig: 0.838			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		2.207	0.698	
18-28 years old (1)	-0.442	0.517	0.472	0.643
29-36 years old (2)	0.295	0.364	0.546	1.343
46-54 years old (4)	-0.135	0.076	0.782	0.874
54-65years old (5)	0.426	0.457	0.499	1.531
GENDER (1=male)	0.352	0.956	0.328	1.422
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		0.413	0.814	
Primary (1)	0.283	0.068	0.794	1.327
Tertiary (3)	-0.278	0.338	0.561	0.757
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.797	0.671	
Urbanized area (1)	0.317	0.536	0.464	1.373
Rural area (3)	0.357	0.641	0.423	1.429
Constant	-3.309	46.662	0.000*	0.037

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
**The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

Table H. The logistic regression model of contract-flexibility, in traditional labour's Europe, by predictors and country

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
United Kingdom**	-2 Log likelihood:448.759, Chi-square:27.191, df: 9, Sig: 0.001				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		19.603	0.001*	
	18-28 years old (1)	1.072	10.799	0.001*	2.921
	29-36 years old (2)	-0.189	0.230	0.631	0.828
	46-54 years old (4)	0.104	0.065	0.799	1.109
	54-65years old (5)	0.738	2.915	0.088	2.092
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.421	3.108	0.078	0.657
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		2.430	0.297	
	Primary (1)	-0.261	0.621	0.431	0.770
	Tertiary (3)	-0.457	2.193	0.139	0.633
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		1.907	0.385	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.378	1.865	0.172	1.459
	Rural area (3)	0.232	0.588	0.443	1.261
	Constant	-1.503	19.450	0.000*	0.222
The Netherlands**	-2 Log likelihood:523.958, Chi-square:52.562, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		24.892	0.000*	
	18-28 years old (1)	1.186	14.471	0.000*	3.274
	29-36 years old (2)	0.029	0.007	0.934	1.029
	46-54 years old (4)	-0.042	0.012	0.913	0.959
	54-65years old (5)	0.190	0.189	0.664	1.209
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.409	3.072	0.080	0.665
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		12.175	0.002*	
	Primary (1)	1.190	4.092	0.043*	3.288
	Tertiary (3)	-0.595	6.267	0.012*	0.552
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		1.427	0.490	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.065	0.058	0.809	0.937
	Rural area (3)	0.235	0.814	0.367	1.264
	Constant	-1.114	9.858	0.002*	0.328
	-2 Log likelihood:411.513, Chi-square:77.974, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		48.478	0.000*	
	18-28 years old (1)	2.300	24.625	0.000*	9.977
	29-36 years old (2)	1.384	8.045	0.005*	3.992
Sweden**	46-54 years old (4)	-0.839	1.354	0.245	0.432
	54-65years old (5)	0.806	2.050	0.152	2.240
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.745	8.041	0.005*	0.475
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		0.661	0.719	
	Primary (1)	0.356	0.633	0.426	1.427
	Tertiary (3)	0.006	0.000	0.985	1.006
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		6.435	0.040*	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.041	0.020	0.886	1.042
	Rural area (3)	0.973	6.076	0.014*	2.647
	Constant	-3.018	41.826	0.000*	0.049

		B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Slovenia**	-2 Log likelihood:112.624, Chi-square:490.894, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		89.923	0.000*	
	18-28 years old (1)	2.599	63.453	0.000*	13.451
	29-36 years old (2)	0.649	3.297	0.069	1.914
	46-54 years old (4)	0.212	0.298	0.585	1.237
	54-65years old (5)	1.742	11.554	0.001*	5.712
	GENDER (1=male)	-0.746	9.951	0.002*	0.474
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		0.983	0.612	
	Primary (1)	0.486	0.273	0.601	1.626
	Tertiary (3)	-0.264	0.672	0.412	0.768
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.728	0.695	
	Urbanized area (1)	0.207	0.345	0.557	1.230
	Rural area (3)	-0.003	0.000	0.992	0.997
	Constant		89.923	0.000*	
Czech Republic**	-2 Log likelihood:826.480, Chi-square:48.355, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)	-1.679	18.841	0.000*	0.187
	18-28 years old (1)		25.818	0.000*	
	29-36 years old (2)	1.103	17.011	0.000*	3.013
	46-54 years old (4)	0.336	1.242	0.265	1.400
	54-65years old (5)	0.113	0.139	0.709	1.119
	GENDER (1=male)	0.746	5.204	0.023*	2.109
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)	-0.173	0.966	0.326	0.841
	Primary (1)		19.653	0.000*	
	Tertiary (3)	1.048	16.033	0.000*	2.851
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)	-0.407	1.949	0.163	0.666
	Urbanized area (1)		2.319	0.314	
	Rural area (3)	-0.144	0.432	0.511	0.865
	Constant	-0.336	2.275	0.131	0.714
Hungary**	-2 Log likelihood:552.565, Chi-square:52.583, df: 9, Sig: 0.000				
	AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		30.185	0.000*	
	18-28 years old (1)	1.588	21.805	0.000*	4.893
	29-36 years old (2)	0.583	2.839	0.092	1.791
	46-54 years old (4)	0.249	0.436	0.509	1.283
	54-65years old (5)	0.659	2.163	0.141	1.932
	GENDER (1=male)	0.126	0.342	0.559	1.135
	Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		11.590	0.003*	
	Primary (1)	0.713	7.416	0.006*	2.041
	Tertiary (3)	-0.540	2.100	0.147	0.583
	Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		7.156	0.028*	
	Urbanized area (1)	-0.065	0.065	0.799	0.937
	Rural area (3)	0.748	6.257	0.012*	2.112
	Constant	-2.224	46.841	0.000*	0.108

	B	Wald	Sig.	Exp(B)
Romania**	-2 Log likelihood:381.171, Chi-square:58.847, df: 9, Sig: 0.000			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		14.977	0.005*	
18-28 years old (1)	1.035	8.369	0.004*	2.816
29-36 years old (2)	0.018	0.002	0.965	1.018
46-54 years old (4)	-0.073	0.028	0.868	0.929
54-65years old (5)	0.851	1.544	0.214	2.342
GENDER (1=male)	0.533	4.037	0.045*	1.705
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		16.919	0.000*	
Primary (1)	2.295	9.783	0.002*	9.924
Tertiary (3)	-1.225	6.078	0.014*	0.294
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		7.429	0.024*	
Urbanized area (1)	-0.720	3.942	0.047*	0.487
Rural area (3)	0.222	0.526	0.468	1.249
Constant	-2.098	32.048	0.000*	0.123
Bulgaria**	-2 Log likelihood:837.569, Chi-square:43.816, df: 9, Sig: 0.000			
AGE(reference group 3=37-45 years old)		9.083	0.059	
18-28 years old (1)	0.506	4.199	0.040*	1.659
29-36 years old (2)	-0.251	0.965	0.326	0.778
46-54 years old (4)	-0.068	0.088	0.767	0.934
54-65years old (5)	0.150	0.183	0.669	1.162
GENDER (1=male)	-0.036	0.044	0.835	0.965
Education (reference group: 2=secondary education)		18.364	0.000*	
Primary (1)	3.163	9.241	0.002*	23.644
Tertiary (3)	-0.685	8.887	0.003*	0.504
Place of residence (reference group: 2=intermediate area)		0.346	0.841	
Urbanized area (1)	0.041	0.043	0.836	1.042
Rural area (3)	0.125	0.345	0.557	1.133
Constant	-0.736	11.514	0.001*	0.479

Notes: * The effect of the predictor is significant at 0.05 level, according to the Wald test
    ** The logistic regression model is significant according to the Chi-square test

Source: HWF Survey 2001 – Unified international data collection

REFERENCES

O'Reilly, J. and C. Fagan (1998). *Part-time Prospects*. UK, Routledge.

Perrons, D. (1998). Flexible Working and the Reconciliation of Work and Family Life - a New Form of Precariousness. Brussels, European Commssion, Directorate General Employment and Social Affairs.

Pollert, A. (1988). "The 'Flexible Firm': Fixation or Fact." *Work, Employment and Society* **2**(3): 281-316.

Pollert, A., Ed. (1991). *Farewell to Flexibility?* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Regini, M. (2000). The dilemmas of labour market regulation. *Why Deregulate Labour Market?* G. Esping-Andersen and M. Regini. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Riboud, M., C. Silva-Jauregui, et al. (2001). Does Eurosclerosis Matter? Institutional Reform and Labour Market Performance in Central and Eastern European Countries in the 1990s. Washington, World Bank Working Paper.

Sennet, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character: the personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. London, W.W. Norton.

Sicherl, P., T. Stanovnik, et al. (2003). Slovenia. *Country Contextual Reports*. C. Wallace. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, HWF Project.

Spoonley, A. d. B. and P. Firkin (2002). 'Managing non-standard work arrangements: choices and constraints.' *Journal of Sociology* **38**(4): 425-441.
self-mangement of non-standard work of skilled professionals in New Zealand. Using strategies of temporal and spatial marking, switching, defending and intruding.

Stanculescu, M., Sofia and I. Berevoescu (2003). Romania. *HWF Survey Report by Countries*. C. Wallace. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, HWF Project.

Stanculescu, M., Sofia and I. Berevoescu (2003). Romania. *Country Contextual Reports*. C. wallace. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, HWF Project.

Tietze, S. and G. Musson (2002). "When 'work' meets 'home'. Temporal flexiblity as lived experience." *Time and Society* **11**(2/3): 315-334. 25 professional management employees who worked at home but were full time salaried employees. Looks at how organisational policies of flexibility affect people's lives. Do not necessariyl corrode character nor provide individual with unlimited opportuntiey. Rather they recast relationship between home and work making people reflexively re-engage with both.

Vecernik, J. and P. Stepankova (2002). The Czech Republic. *Critical Review of Literature and Discourses about Flexibility*. C. Wallace. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies.

Wallace, C. (2002). Approaches to flexibility: a comparison of national debates across Eastern and Western Europe. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, HWF working paper.

flexibility

Wallace, C., Ed. (2002). *Critical Review of the Literature and Discourses about Flexibility*. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, HWF project.

Wallace, C., Ed. (2003). *Comparative Contextual Report*. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna.

Wallace, C., Chvorostov, A., Nagaev, S., et al., Eds. (2003). *HWF Survey Comparative Report, Volume 1*. Vienna, Institute for Advanced Studies, HWF Project.

Zilian, H. G. and J. Flecker, Eds. (1998). *Flexibilisierung - Problem oder Lösung*. Berlin.